



California Fair Political Practices Commission

November 8, 1988

Committee to Elect Roger Settlemire
Judge of Superior Court
Nancy C. Settlemire, Treasurer
P.O. Drawer "S"
Quincy, CA 95971

Re: Our File No. I-88-428

Dear Ms. Settlemire:

We have received your letter and the enclosed copy of a mass mailing sent by your committee. Your letter indicates that you sent the copy of the mass mailing to the commission pursuant to Government Code Section 84305.

The purpose of this letter is to advise you that Section 84305 no longer requires candidates and to send copies of mass mailings to the Commission. This requirement was eliminated in 1978. Therefore, it will not be necessary to provide copies of mass mailings to the Commission in the future.

We appreciate your efforts to comply with the Political Reform Act.

Sincerely,

Diane M. Griffiths
General Counsel

Kathryn E. Donovan

By: Kathryn E. Donovan
Counsel, Legal Division

DMG:KED:plh

FPPC

Nov 4 2 46 PM '88

Committee to Elect Roger Settle mire
Judge of Superior Court
Nancy C. Settle mire, Treasurer
279 W. Main
P. O. Drawer "S"
Quincy, CA 95971

November 2, 1988

California Fair Political
Practices Commission
428 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95804-0807

Re: Roger Settle mire, Mass Mailing
I.D. No. 880098

I am enclosing a copy of a mass mailing pursuant to Section 84305
of the Government Code.

Sincerely,



Nancy C. Settle mire
Treasurer

Enclosure

CERTIFIED MAIL

A MESSAGE FROM JUDGE ROGER SETTLEMIRE

Many people have commented that I have not made any campaign promises in the election. Why? The reason is that any political-type promises, philosophical statements, or superficial, emotionally appealing “30 second solutions” to complex legal and social problems are meaningless, because a Judge at the Superior Court level must accept and follow the law as it is established by the legislature and the precedents of higher courts. As a sitting Judge of the Justice Court, I do not feel comfortable making political or philosophical statements or giving you simple solutions to complex judicial problems.

As was demonstrated at the Candidates Nights, there was a tendency to make political statements and give simple “30 second solutions” to complex judicial problems. After participating in seven of these, I concluded that Candidates Nights had accomplished their positive purposes and were increasingly becoming “political exercises” in an election for the “non-political” office of Superior Court Judge. Because of the time involved in candidates’ nights, and because my duties as Justice Court Judge limit my available time, I will be concentrating on reaching voters by other means.

As a citizen, I am concerned about the persistent problems of drug abuse, repeat offenders, the high cost of our criminal justice system, divorce and broken homes, and, of course, juror inconvenience. As a Judge, I will continue to take a responsible and realistic approach in dealing with these problems.

Because of my extensive in-court experience as a Judge, I have seen first-hand the inconvenience and expense placed upon numerous jurors who have been called repeatedly for jury duty. The Superior Court Judge supervises the Jury Commissioner and I will review all jury selection procedures to make every effort to expand the jury pool in order to reduce the number of times that a prospective juror is called.

Superior Court is our county’s highest Court — it is no place to learn how to be a Judge.

The best place to learn to be a Judge — to gain the necessary experience and judging skills — is the Justice Court, the lower court. Justice Courts were upgraded 12 years ago to have the same jurisdiction as Municipal Courts in the cities, handling exactly the same types of cases. The significance of Municipal Courts (and by inference the Justice Courts) is illustrated by the State of California setting the salary of Municipal Court Judges at ninety-one (91%) of the salary of Superior Court Judges. While Justice Court Judges receive lower salaries (set by a Board of Supervisors), a Justice Court Judge must, obviously, have the same knowledge and skills as a Municipal Court Judge. This is recognized by the Judicial Council assigning Justice Court Judges to Municipal Courts. It is well established that the Justice Court and the Municipal Court are important judicial positions.

There is a lot to learn as a Judge. “Experience is the best teacher” in the judging profession as well as many other fields. I found that there is no way that a person can adequately prepare for being a Judge except by actually being a Judge-sitting on the Bench and hearing and deciding cases. Many people believe that California law should require at least several years’ experience as a Municipal Court or Justice Court Judge (the lower courts) before a person could be considered for Superior Court Judge (the higher court), especially in a “single-judge” Superior Court such as ours where there is no “break-in period” for a new judge to learn the job.

Responsible voters will decide, I believe, that the logical choice for Superior Court Judge should be one who has worked his way up in the judicial system, rather than a lawyer without any judging experience.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Roger Settemire". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

JUDGE SETTLEMIRE'S INDEPENDENCE DRAWS BROAD COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Judge Roger Settlemire has received strong support from all parts of Plumas County, cutting across the entire spectrum of society—people of various political persuasions, people in the higher positions, people in less fortunate circumstances, and from all walks of life. This is because Judge Settlemire is perceived as a fair man, a fair Judge, and a good Judge — a Judge that they would want to hear and decide their own cases in Court.

Judge Settlemire does not have a highly organized campaign committee stocked with powerful people, nor has he sought campaign contributions and endorsements from special interest groups or individuals. He has relied on his family and a few friends to help him with the election, and he has not accepted any campaign donations. He and his wife have used only their own money. That way you can be sure that he will be as independent after the election as he was before.

A candidate must run on his own record. Roger Settlemire has an established record as a judge. The opposition candidate, who has no judicial experience, has relied heavily on an endorsement from retiring Judge Stanley Young, a close personal friend. Most other knowledgeable people at the Courthouse — a retired judge, attorneys, and other personnel — do not share Judge

Young's opinion. They have had the opportunity to compare the qualifications and judicial experience of the two candidates, and most of these people support Judge Settlemire publicly or privately. Also, since Plumas County has a small population, many of the people have had first-hand contacts with the courts, as parties to a lawsuit, witnesses, or as jurors. These people are in a position to decide for themselves without relying on endorsements, and are among Judge Settlemire's strongest supporters.

In a county where there are no public opinion polls, the June 7, 1988 primary election results evidence the strong support for Roger Settlemire's election as Superior Court Judge. In a field of 5 candidates, he received an unprecedented 49.8% of the vote (only 17 votes short of a majority) while the runner-up received about 17%.

Judge Settlemire has been a Judge on the Bench dealing with real people, handling real problems, and making real rulings and decisions—thousands of rulings and decisions each year. You do not have to guess what kind of a judge he will be. He already has an established reputation for fairness and impartiality, a judicial temperament, and for making judicially correct decisions as a result of his 12 years as a judge.

**Elect
JUDGE ROGER SETTLEMIRE
To SUPERIOR COURT**

Currently JUDGE OF PLUMAS JUSTICE COURT