



the minimum. The maximum time for signature gathering is 160 days for jurisdictions of 50,000 or more registered voters.

This bill:

- 1) Requires those who are being paid to gather signatures on a state or local initiative, referendum, or recall petition to tell each person, without being asked and before providing the petition, that they are being paid to circulate the petition.
- 2) Sets the signature gathering period for a recall petition for a superior court judge at 80 days, regardless of the number of voters in the electoral jurisdiction.

### COMMENTS

- 1) Author's statement. California is one of eight states in the country that allows judges to be recalled. This system of checks and balances for judges is meant to be a tool of direct democracy allowing voters to hold corrupt judges accountable, but there is growing concern the recall process is increasingly being used in ways for which it was not intended, including to politically target judges based on unfavorable rulings.

Judges serve a unique role in our democracy. Unlike other elected officials, they are prohibited from campaigning or publicly defending their rulings. That ethical constraint protects impartiality, but it also makes judges uniquely vulnerable to politically motivated recall efforts. When recall efforts are driven by disagreement with case outcomes, rather than ethical misconduct, they raise serious concerns about attempts to influence judicial decision-making through political pressure instead of the established appellate process.

At the same time, gaps in our current recall process can leave voters without the information they need to make informed decisions. Individuals gathering signatures are not required to disclose that they are being paid, and recall petitions may lack sufficient accountability regarding the stated reasons for the recall. Recent recall campaigns targeting multiple sitting judges and the rise in threats and harassment surrounding judicial decisions highlight the need for reasonable safeguards.

This bill preserves the constitutional right of recall while strengthening transparency and accountability. It establishes a uniform 80-day signature-gathering period for superior court judges and requires paid circulators to disclose they are being compensated. Together, these measures ensure that judges can decide cases based on law and evidence, and not on fear of organized political retaliation.

- 2) Arguments in Support. The California Judges Association writing in support of this bill notes that judicial recall petitions are exceedingly uncommon and asserts that this reflects the long-standing recognition that the judiciary plays a distinct constitutional role. The Judges Association additionally points out that:

...complaints about judicial actions are referred to and heard by the Commission on Judicial Performance, which holds judicial officers accountable for their actions and has the authority to discipline or remove them. This is unlike any other elected official in California. Maintaining appropriate safeguards in the

recall process helps ensure that judges are able to make decisions based solely on the law and the facts presented in each case, without fear that routine or unpopular rulings will trigger politically motivated recall campaigns.

- 3) Arguments in Opposition. The California Chamber of Commerce, Family Business Association of California, and the Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce oppose this bill because the bill's "oral disclosure requirement is unnecessary, duplicative, and fraught with practical and constitutional concerns." Specifically, they note:

Requiring an oral disclosure before every single interaction imposes a substantial logistical burden on petition circulators. Petition gathering is inherently fast-paced and dependent on brief, momentary interactions (often occurring in crowded public spaces where circulators have only seconds to engage a passerby). Mandating a verbal script before each engagement slows the process, reduces efficiency, and increases costs. In high-traffic public settings, where circulators may engage hundreds of individuals in a short period, this requirement would substantially diminish productivity and undermine the viability of lawful petition efforts.

The opponents further raise constitutional concerns, noting that petition circulation is core political speech protected by the First Amendment. They point out that courts have recognized burdens on petition circulation, which reduce the size of the audience proponents can reach, as restrictions on political expression.

- 4) Double referral. Should this bill pass this committee, it will be referred to the Committee on Public Safety. As recent amendments deleted the provisions related to penalty of perjury, it is unlikely the Committee on Public Safety will hear the bill.

### **POSITIONS**

**Sponsor:** California and Hawaii Chapters of the American Board of Trial Advocates

**Support:** American Board of Trial Advocates  
 Association of Defense Counsel of Northern California and Nevada  
 Association of Southern California Defense Counsel  
 California Defense Counsel  
 California Judges Association  
 Consumer Attorneys of California  
 San Bernardino – Riverside Chapter of the American Board of Trial Advocates

**Oppose:** California Chamber of Commerce  
 Family Business Association of California  
 Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce