LEGISLATIVE UPDATE - JUNE 2026

Mary Pierce, Legislative Chair

FVAP vs. Superior Courts of California (four named counties) and AB 2783

On June 3, 2026, the long-awaited hearing before the California Supreme Court was conducted in Los Angeles, with the Petitioner, Family Violence Appellate Project (FVAP) asking the Supreme Court to rule on the ban against use of electronic recording in the courts, other than for limited civil cases, misdemeanors or infractions, unconstitutional.

The Respondent was the Superior Courts of Contra Costa, Santa Clara, Los Angeles and San Diego Counties, although I would not call the Respondents' arguments a defense against the Petitioner's request. There was little daylight between the position taken by FVAP and the Superior Court's representative counsels. So I was personally extremely grateful that CCRA and SEIU teamed up to hire Scott Kronland, from Altshuler Berzon, a highly respected public interest attorney from San Francisco, to write an amicus curiae brief on their behalf, asking to be heard at the hearing. And although it took a long time to get a decision on his brief and request to be heard, the Supreme Court did grant the request and permitted Mr. Kronland to speak in opposition to the Petitioner's position at the hearing.

But the granting of that request wasn't necessarily a reason to celebrate too wildly because Mr. Kronland was not alone in his filing of an amicus curiae brief. There were 14 other such briefs filed, all in support of Petitioner's request, from several other groups similar to the FVAP in their representation of low income litigants, but also from the Los Angeles Bar Association, another group headed by Erwin Chemerinsky, a constitutional law expert, and none other than the California Attorney General's office. So this was a very steep hill for Mr. Kronlond to climb.

I listened to the entire hearing and was disheartened to hear the drum continually being beaten about how there is a court reporter shortage and it is something that cannot possibly be reversed or cured, regardless of the drastic improvement in passing rates, the nine-fold increase in the numbers of new licensees in California in the last couple of years, and schools that continue to have waiting lists for students to enroll there.

Mr. Kronland represented SEIU/CCRA exceptionally well, and all of us really, but it is seems like somewhat of a stacked deck. But if Petitioner's motion is granted, I am hopeful that he will have mitigated the potential damage, or breadth thereof, the granting of FVAP's petition will do. A ruling will likely take six weeks, give or take. AB 2783 - Reciprocity for RPR holders. This is a bill sponsored by the California Assembly Judiciary Committee and proposes reciprocity for the skills test portion of the California CSR exam for anyone who has a current, valid RPR certificate. The bill has already passed out of the Assembly Judiciary and Appropriations Committee, with no opposing votes. It is now making its way through the same process in the State Senate.

There are very good arguments on both sides of this discussion, which has led to differing opinions among current licensees, as was very apparent in the floor discussion of the bill at the DRA convention in June.

The CalDRA Board of Directors subsequently had lengthy discussions about the bill, but was unable to come to a consensus opinion among its members. Therefore, DRA will not be taking a position on the bill either in support or opposition to the bill. We encourage you to read the bill for yourself (https://LegiScan.com) and attend hearings, if you'd like, where you are often afforded an opportunity to voice your opinion at the tail end of any particular hearing on a bill. You can also monitor the bill's progress on that same page and even elect to receive updates when new developments occur.

DRA will update our member as any significant developments on this bill take place.

AB 2290 (Lackey) – A Bill To Make Electronic Original Transcript Delivery Acceptable

The original proposal (and seemingly sole intent) of this bill is to provide that the noticing party, at their sole discretion, could elect to receive only an electronic final original in place of the traditional hard copy, bound and sealed, and then shipped to the taking attorney or party to maintain custody pending its potential use at trial. DRA saw that as problematic in many different ways, and really only beneficial to the coalition of national firms that proposed it. But seeing that some version of this law was going to go forward, we accepted the invitation to engage in offering amendments. Our legislative committee met and collaborated extensively with Ed Howard, our lobbyist, as well as CCRA and their team of lobbyists, to try to propose some amendments that would provide more transparency, while still maintaining the security of the original transcript so that if it is to be filed with the court, it can be deemed a reliable record. After a solid collaboration, the two state associations offered some joint amendments and some more unilaterally. At the time of this being written, we had completed that process and are awaiting the posting of the bill's analysis and upcoming hearings.

You can rest assured that DRA will stay deeply engaged in this process to do all that we can to ensure the trustworthiness and security of the verbatim transcripts produced by licensed CSRs in California.