

**OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY**

222 East Weber Avenue, Suite 202, Stockton, California 95202  
P.O. Box 990, Stockton, California 95201  
Telephone: (209) 468-2400 Fax: (209) 465-0371

**JAMES P. WILLETT**  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

**EDWARD J. BUSUTTIL**  
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY

August 26, 2010

Hon. Robin Appel  
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court  
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 303  
Stockton, California 95202

**Re: Law and Justice Authority and Overview  
San Joaquin County Courthouse, Stockton Main**

**District Attorney Response**

Dear Judge Appel:

I have reviewed the 2009-2010 Civil Grand Jury Final Report and Overview concerning the San Joaquin County Courthouse in Stockton.

In accordance with California Penal Code, section 933.05, our response to the Findings and Recommendations set forth in the above-referenced Final Report, are as follows:

**Finding No. 2**

*The process for implementation of previous video arraignment recommendations has not been addressed. ALL persons interviewed, regarding the video usage, concurred on the benefits of video conferencing.*

**Response**

The respondent agrees with the finding.

## **Recommendation No. 2**

*The District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Probation Department, San Joaquin County Bar Association (Lawyer Referral Services) and County Administrator, in furtherance of efforts to install a teleconferencing system:*

- a. Prepare a preliminary cost estimate for acquisition and installation*
- b. Prepare a cost benefit analysis*
- c. Identify potential grant sources to implement the system*

## **Response**


The recommendation requires further analysis. The installation of a teleconferencing system to accommodate video arraignments and other court proceedings is, in our opinion, an issue for the Unified Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

The District Attorney has long supported the use of video arraignments. As recent as the July 227.8 committee meeting, we raised the issue again as something the court should pursue and implement.

As you are aware, through your investigation, there has been consistent opposition by the Public Defender and other members of the defense bar in San Joaquin County.

We will continue to participate in discussions concerning the benefits of teleconferencing, but will not be preparing a preliminary cost estimate or cost benefit analysis, absent a strong indication from the Unified Courts that they will be pursuing such a project. We are not aware of any potential grant sources to fund such a system.

Very truly yours,

  
JAMES P. WILLETT  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY