

*The following is a real-time transcript taken as closed captioning during the oral argument proceedings, and as such, may contain errors. This service is provided solely for the purpose of assisting those with disabilities and should be used for no other purpose. These are not legal documents, and may not be used as legal authority. This transcript is not an official document of the Florida Supreme Court.*

**In re: Report on Judges' Participating in Fundraising**

**SC07-1135**

[NO AUDIO]

[NO AUDIO]

[NO AUDIO]

[NO AUDIO]

[NO AUDIO]

[NO AUDIO] SO, THE

ISSUE IS DIRECTING THE

COMMENTS OF THE JUDGE THERE

IS NO WAY YOU CAN CRAWL

ORGANIZATIONS OUTSIDE OF THE\$\$

THE --

>> I'M ALWAYS CONCERNED

ABOUT EVEN, A A RECEPTION,

THE JUDICIAL VEPIONS\$\$RECEPTIONS ALL

KINDS OF ASSOCIATIONS SEEM

TO HAVE HAVE WHAT IS THE --

THE LEGAL PURPOSE

ADVANCEMENT OF SO THAT --

LEGAL SYSTEM THAT IS GOING

ON, BECAUSE ALL YOU, YOU GO,

AND YOU YOU KNOW, HAVE HORS

D'OEUVRES THOSE KINDS OF

THINGS, AND THEY GET ALL THE

LAW FIRMS, TO YOU KNOW --

GIVE MONEY WHAT IS THE

PURPOSE OF IT?

>> THE SPECIFIC -- BAR

FUNCTIONS\$\$

FUNCTIONS, BAR RELATED

FUNCTIONS\$\$

FUNCTIONS, VOLUNTEER BAR

ASSOCIATIONS\$\$

ASSOCIATIONS, WHERE THEY

HAVE RECEPTIONS FOR JUDICIAL

OFFICIALS\$\$

OFFICIALS.

>> EVEN IF THAT RECEPTION IS

A FUND-RAISER?

>> NO, MOST TIMES THEY ARE

NOT FUND TRACEERS IN FACT

ONE OF THE REASONS THAT WE

ARE HERE IS THAT LAWYERS,

DON'T WANT TO BECOME TARGETS

OF OPPORTUNITIES, FOR JUDGES

WHO ARE COMMITTED TO AN

ISSUE, AND WANT TO USE THEIR  
NAME TO RAISES MONIES FOR  
HILL THATTED LIKE TO  
RESERVE --

>> CERTAINLY.

>> CHIEF, LET ME THANK YOU  
ALSO, FOR YOUR FINE  
LEADERSHIP FOR THE CHAIR OF  
THE CHIEF JUDGES ACROSS THE  
FLORIDA AND FOR BEING HERE  
THIS MORNING, TO SPEAK WITH  
US ON AN ISSUE THAT YOU DEEM  
IMPORTANT, AND I DON'T BUY  
ANY MEANS SPEAKING, OF JUDGE  
THOMPSON AND HIS --  
CONTRIBUTIONS TO FLORIDA IN  
ANY WAY DEMEAN YOUR  
CONTRIBUTIONS\$\$  
CONTRIBUTIONS, SO BE INSURE  
THAT IS UNDERSTOOD, THANK  
YOU FOR WHAT YOU DO.

>> THANK YOU, CHIEF JUSTICE,  
MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, I'M  
KIM, CHIEF JUDGE OF THE  
FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT AND  
CHAIRMAN OF THE JUDICIAL  
ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE  
FORMER\$\$  
FORMERLY JAS NOW THE JAC, I  
SIT IN PENSACOLA -- WEST  
FLORIDA -- LAST YEAR, AND  
CURRENTLY UNIVERSITY OF WEST  
FLORIDA IS INVOLVED IN THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF A STATE OF  
THE ART MOCK TRIAL  
COURTROOM, THAT WILL BE USED  
BY STUDENTS AT THE  
UNIVERSITY, AS WELL AS HIGH  
SCHOOLERS WHO ARE ARE  
INVOLVED COURT COMPETITION,  
ALSO, CHILD ADVOCACY GROUPS  
WANT TO BRING A CHILD INTO  
ACQUAINT A CHILD WITH A  
COURTROOM, PREPARE THEM FOR  
TRIAL, ALSO, THE EVENT  
HURRICANE, AND COURTROOM  
COURTHOUSE, CUT DOWN LIKE IT  
WAS IN HURRICANE IVAN WE  
PERHAPS HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE  
SITE FOR, TRAILS, I WAS  
CONTACTED\$\$  
TRIALS I WAS CONTACTED BY  
UNIVERSITY ASKED IF I\$\$CON-OR  
DOES THAT HAD SKEPTIC

CERTAINLY DID TOILED THEM SO  
THEY WANTED TO INCLUDE THEY  
ENDORSEMENT IN A BROTHER  
CHUR, THAT WOULD BE  
DISSEMINATED\$\$

DISSEMINATED, WHICH HAD AS A  
PURPOSE FUND RAISING,  
BECAUSE OF THE NEED TO  
ACQUIRE, PRIVATE FUNDS, AS  
WELL AS PUBLIC FUNDS TO PUT  
THIS INTO FRUITION I HAD TO  
DENY THAT REQUEST.

THE PROPOSAL OF THE JAC  
WOULD ALLOW ME TO DO OR ANY  
OTHER JUDGE TO DO SOMETHING,  
ACT LAUDABLE GOAL ADVANCE  
THE LEGAL SYSTEM LAW AND  
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

>> WHERE JUDGE USING THE  
EXAMPLE THAT I SUGGESTED  
BEFORE WE HAVE THE  
UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA  
IN YOUR COMMUNITY  
JACKSONVILLE HAS A FOR  
PROFIT LAW SCHOOL, AND BY,  
ADVANCING THEIR PROGRAMS MAY  
BE ADVANCING ECONOMIC  
INTERESTS WOULD THERE BE A  
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO?

>> I CAN SEE THAT THAT WOULD  
BE NO DIFFERENCE.

>> SO YOU COULD THEN BE FUND  
RAISING FOR WHOMEVER THIS  
BENEFIT WOULD FLOW TO.

>> ADVANCES THE LEGAL  
SYSTEM, RIGHT.

>> OKAY.

>> AND THE MARX OF \$\$ADMINISTRATION OF  
OF JUSTICE I BELIEVE AT  
LEAST ONE LAW SCHOOL IN  
STATE OF FLORIDA FOR PROFIT  
THAT INDEED WOULD NOT BY AN  
EXCEPTION CARVED OUT ARE\$\$OR  
COULD BE POTENTIALLY EXCEPT\$\$  
EXCEPTION CARVE OUTSIDE.

>> I'M WONDERING IF WE GET  
INVOLVED COULD BE A  
LUCRATIVE FIELD FOR THOSE  
PROFIT MAKING USE A LAUDABLE  
GOAL AND END UP WITH A  
BOTTOM LINE, THAT IS GOING  
TO BE IN THE BLACK.

I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THAT, AS  
WELL\$\$

WELL.

>> I SHARE THE CONCERN CHIEF JUSTICE.

>> HOW WOULD WE DRAW THE LINES BETWEEN THESE TYPES OF THINGS?

>> AS THE CASE LAW DEVELOPS CASE LAW BUT AS -- OPINIONS DEVELOP IN THAT REGARD, OR AS THIS COURT EITHER GRANTS OR DENIES AMENDMENT, OR INDEED\$\$

INDEED, ADDSCON COMMENTARY TO CODE TO ENSURE THAT THE SITUATION LIKE THAT, FOR PROFIT ORGANIZATION DOES NOT BENEFIT, THE CHIEF JUDGES BELIEVE THAT THE SAFEGUARDS THAT ARE IN PLACE TO ENSURE THAT WHATEVER THE \$\$JUDGE'S DO, WILL NOT -- CAST DOUBT ON IMPARTIALITY OR DEI MEAN THEIR JUDICIAL OFFICE OR INTERFERE WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF THE DUTY, WOULD BE SUFFICIENT TO ENSURE THAT IT BENEFITS, SOCIETY IN GENERAL, THE LEGAL --

>> WELL, NOT GOING TO SUBMIT A SOCIETY IN GENERAL JUSTICE PARIENTE MENTIONED A WONDERFUL CAUSE AND THAT IS\$\$ ISES CAUSES FOR DISEASES, CASE FORCES CHILDREN, THOSE KINDS OF THINGS, SO --

>> CHIEF JUSTICE ALSO BROUGHT THAT CONCERN UP, AND I -- I DON'T INTERPRET OUR PROPOSAL TO ALLOW FOR AN A ORGANIZATION WHOSE MAIN GOAL IS TO ADVANCE THE LAW OF THE LEGAL SYSTEM THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE TO UNDER THAT TITLE, THROW A BENEFIT FOR AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, OR AMERICAN HART ASSOCIATION\$\$

ASSOCIATION, I DON'T INTERPRET THAT --

>> YOU KNOW, I SEE THIS AS -- AGAIN, IT IS ALWAYS A GREAT EXAMPLE AND AGAIN, FOR ME, IF COULD I OPEN THIS,

AND ALLOW JUDGES TO RAISES  
MONEY FOR LEGAL AID, WHICH  
THREE OUT OF FOUR, OF OUR  
CITIZENS ARE WITHOUT LEGAL  
SERVICES, THAT IS -- THE  
PLACE I START, ALL DO YOU  
REPUBLICAN TO UNIVERSITY OF  
FLORIDA \$\$ -- RESPECT TOUD OF  
FLORIDA I DON'T KNOW IN NEED  
OF OUR SPECIFIC HELP THE  
LEGAL AID IS, BUT, WE ALL  
HAVE SOMETHING YOU KNOW  
AGAIN WHEN I MENTIONED  
BREAST CANCER AT THAT TIME I  
FELT LIKE I CAN'T BELIEVE  
THAT I'M BREAST CANCER  
SURVIVOR PEOPLE WANT ME TO  
SPEAK AND IT MAYBE RAISING  
MONEY THEY ARE NOT COMING  
BECAUSE I'M JUSTICE PARIENTE  
I'M A SURVIVOR I CAN'T DO  
THAT.  
SO WE RUN INTO THIS IS SO  
GOOD\$\$  
GOOD, AND -- THEN WE END UP  
WHERE THERE COULD BE  
MISCHIEF, AND SOMEBODY IS  
LOOKING AT YOUR SITUATION  
AND SAYING YOU CAN'T RAISES  
MONEY BECAUSE ALL OF THE  
HOMES IN THE AREA FROM THE  
HURRICANE WERE DESTROYED  
BHUT YOU ARE GOING TO DO IS  
RAISES MONEY\$\$RAY OF MONEY\$\$\$\$\$\$  
RAISE MONEY FOR A MOCK TRIAL  
COURTROOM THAT IS RELATED TO  
THE LAW I GO BACK TO THIS  
ISSUE OF WHAT WE ARE DOING,  
IS NOT ONLY WHAT WE THINK IS  
THE BEST THING, BUT WHOA THE  
PUBLIC WOULD THINK, OF WHAT  
WE ARE CHOOSING TO RAISE  
MONEY FOR.  
>> WE THINK THAT PUBLIC  
RECOGNIZES THAT THE RULE OF  
THE JUDICIARY, AND PROMOTING  
THOSE THINGS THAT DO ADVANCE  
THE LEGAL SYSTEM ALONG THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE  
AND CAN ACCEPT JUNG DOING\$\$JUDGES DOING THAT  
EVEN IF NO ALLOWANCE FOR  
THINGS LIKE, AMERICAN CANCER  
SOCIETY, OR RAISING FUNDS  
FOR KATRINA VICTIMS, I THINK

THE PUBLIC WE THINK THE  
PUBLIC RECOGNIZES THAT THAT  
IS PART OF OUR ROLE AND THAT  
WE --

>> AGAIN COME BACK TO  
THINGS, I MEAN I'VE SEEN  
LISTED AS PUBLIC SERVICE,  
INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE WORKED  
FOR I THINK CALLED THE  
PACIFIC DEFENSE FUND  
LEGISLATE OR SOMETHING THAT  
HAVE NATURE, THAT IS REALLY  
JUST A -- AN IDEOLOGICAL  
APPROACH TO THE LAW BECAUSE  
THEY BELIEVE THAT THAT IS  
WHERE THE LAW OUGHT TO BE.  
WOULD THAT -- NOT THROW THAT  
OPEN FOR JUDGES TO -- SAY --  
I BELIEVE THAT WOULD HELP  
THE LAW.

SO IF WELL, I AGREE WITH  
JUSTICE PARIENTE, THAT IT IS  
IMPORTANT TO VACANT\$\$ADVOCATE FOR  
LEGAL AID SOCIETIES THERE  
TOO BENEFIT THE YIJ I  
DIDN'TENT TO THE EXTENT THAT  
-- YIJ DIGITENT TO THE  
EXTENT THE JUDICIARY IS  
SUPPORTING FUNDS FOR THAT  
PURPOSE WOULD NOT PARTICULAR  
CAUSES OTHER THAN TO ENSURE  
THAT YIJ\$\$INDIGENTS CAN OBJECTIVE  
LEGAL REPRESENTATION.

>> YOUR COMMENT FOR AMENDING  
FOUR D\$\$, WOULD SAY THAT IS  
PARTICIPATION -- IF WOULD  
CAST REASONABLE DOUBT ON  
JUDGE'S CAPACITY TO ACT IM\$\$  
IMPARTIALLY AS JUDGE TO MEAN  
A JURL OFF INTERFERE WITH  
PROPER PERFORM PERFORMANCE  
IF RAISES MONEY FOR ADVOCACY  
ORGANIZATION SEEMS THAT  
WOULD CROSS THE LINE MY  
CONCERN AGAIN THE ABA, WITH  
THE -- WITH INPUT FROM  
JUDGES ALL OVER THE COUNTRY,  
LOOKS AT THIS ISSUE LONG AND  
HARD, AND CAME UP WITH  
SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T  
INCLUDE THE --; IS THAT  
CORRECT?

YES THAT IS CORRECT.

>> I'M A LITTLE USUALLY,

FLORIDA HAS BEEN -- MORE  
CONSERVATIVE, IN WHAT WE  
ALLOW OUR JUDGES TO DO, THAN  
THE REST OF THE COUNTRY, AND  
WE HAVE BEEN PRETTY SAFE IN  
TERMS OF AVOIDING THOSE  
TYPES OF SITUATIONS  
ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU HEAR  
FUND RACE GOING ON FOR RACES  
AROUND THE COUNTRY FOR THE  
SUPREME COURT, SO ARE YOU  
CONCERNED AT ALL THAT WE  
WOULD BE, AHEAD OF THE  
CURVE, AS FAR AS OUT FRONT  
DOING SOMETHING ALLOWING  
JUDGES TO DO SOMETHING THAT  
REALLY ISN'T EVEN RECOGNIZED  
BY THE ABA, AND PER MISS I  
BELIEVE?

.  
>> YOU ARE RECOGNIZED, THAT  
GO BEYOND -- ABA  
RECOMMENDATIONS WE ALSO  
RECOGNIZE THE JEAC, SUGGESTS\$\$  
SUGGESTSES ONLY IN ADDITION  
TO COMMENTARY TO ALLOW A  
JUDGE TO SELL HOT DOG IN  
CONCESSION STAND, OR  
ACTUALLY NOT EVEN THAT, PASS  
THE PLATE IN CHURCH.

>> I THINK THAT CONCEDED THE  
HOT DOG ISSUE I THINK THAT  
IS IF WE WERE TO JUDGES,  
SAYS I THINK WE PROBABLY  
NEAT TO GO AHEAD COMMENTARY  
TO REALLY GET AROUND THIS  
ISSUE OF IF THEY ARE RAISING  
MONEY BUT NOT IN THAT IS NOT  
THEIR PRIMARY PURPOSE TO  
MAKE SURE THAT WE KNOW THAT  
IS NOT STEPPING OVER THE  
LINES, BUT GOING BACK, TO  
MAYBE JEAC HASN'T DONE  
ANYTHING, OTHER THAN, THAT  
COMMENTARY\$\$  
COMMENTARY, WHAT DO YOU  
THINK OF THEIR COMPROMISE  
POSITION ON BEING GHEEST OF  
HONOR DO YOU THINK THAT  
CONGEST OF HONOR WOULD THAT  
BE AT ALL HELPFUL OR DO YOU  
THINK THAT COULD CAUSE  
MISCHIEF.

>> I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE

THE CONSONGS THAT POINT I  
THINK YOUR CONCERN, AROUND  
CERTAINTY CONCERN OF A  
NUMBER OF THE JUSTICES IS  
MASS SOLICITATION THAT THE  
CHIEF JUDGES CAME UP WITH  
THE SOONIO I STARTED OUT  
WITH UNIVERSITY OF WEST  
FLORIDA, MOCK TRIAL  
COURTROOM, NO PROBLEM, THAT  
DOESN'T APPEAR THAT THERE  
WOULD BE A PROBLEM BUT THERE  
AS POTENTIAL FOR MISCHIEF, I  
AGREE WITH WHAT --

>> ONE OF THE -- THE THINGS,  
THAT IS SALUTARY PART OF THE  
PRESENT REGULATION IS IT  
SERVES AS A SHIELD FOR  
JUDGES\$\$

JUDGES, IN THAT YOU WOULD  
GET AS DO OTHERS, NUMEROUS  
CALLS UPON TO YOU  
PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS TYPES  
OF ACTIVITIES THAT ARE  
DESIGNED IN THEORY TO  
PROMOTE THE ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE.

BUT BECAUSE THEY COME IN ALL  
SHADES YOU CAN SAY AT THIS  
POINT I CAN'T DO IT, BECAUSE  
YOU GOT -- BECAUSE OF THE  
CODE.

AND I'M CONCERNED THAT YOU  
JUST OPEN IT UP TO ALLOW  
PRESSURE ON ESPECIALLY --  
JUDGES TO BE INVOLVED IN  
ACTIVITIES THAT -- THAT  
WOULD CAUSE THEM SOME  
PROBLEMS\$\$  
PROBLEMS.

>> YES, SIR YOU SEE MY TIME  
IS UP.

>> CERTAINLY\$\$IES, GO AHEAD  
FINISH YOUR THOUGHT CONCLUDE  
IF YOU HAVE CONCLUDING  
REMARKS SO THAT WE HAVEN'T  
FOCUSED ON THE CODE AS AN  
EXCUSE FOR NOT ASSISTING IN  
THE PROMOTION OF THE LAW, IN  
THE ADMINISTRATION OF  
JUSTICE I'M SURE SOME JUDGES  
TAKE COMFORT IN THE PICK THE  
SAY NO, I DON'T WANT TO GET  
INVOLVED BUT THE JUDGE THAT

WANTS TO GET INVOLVED,  
BECAUSE OF THEIR PRESH\$\$\$  
APPRECIATION FOR THE  
LOUDIBLE GOAL ONCE AGAIN,  
SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO DO  
THAT, NOW.

>> BUT THERE ARE  
OPPORTUNITIES!

OPPORTUNITIES, FOR JUDGES TO  
BE INVOLVED WITHOUT IT BEING  
A FUND-RAISER I MEAN, ALWAYS  
GO TO FUND-RAISER IS IN A  
OTHER ORDINARY CITIZEN CAN  
YOU CAN ALWAYS HELP OUT  
DOING THINGS AT  
ORGANIZATIONS, WITHOUT  
ACTUALLY PUTTING YOUR I AM  
OUT THERE, AND -- IMOUT  
THERE\$\$  
THERE, AND YOU KNOW, SOLICIT\$\$  
SOLICITING FUNDS FOR THE  
ORGANIZATION.

SO THERE SEEMS TO ME TO ME  
PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITIES IF  
YOU WANT TO BE INVOLVED TOLL  
ACTUALLY BE INVOLVED.

>> YES.

>> DO YOU HAVE ANY THOUGHTS  
I MEAN WE ARE NOT TRYING TO  
CUT YOU OFF, CHIEF, IF YOU  
HAVE A RESPONSE TO JUSTICE,  
PLEASE THEY RECOGNIZE THAT  
THOSE OPPORTUNITIES EXIST IN  
THE JEAC, AND THE RESPONSE  
CLEARLY POINT THOSE OUT LOTS  
OF JUDGES TAKE ADVANTAGE  
THAT HAVE BUT THERE ARE SOME  
AREAS WHERE A JUDGE COULD  
SERVE THAT ORGANIZATION THAT  
IS PROMOTING THOSE KIND OF  
LEGITIMATE TRRZ BY LENDING  
THEIR NAME GRANTED THERE IS  
CONCERN THIS ONCE AGAIN  
UTILIZATION OF THE \$\$JUDGE'S  
NAME, WELL, IT IS IMPORTANT  
FOR PEOPLE TO KNOW THAT  
IMPORTANT MEMBERS OF SOCIETY  
IN THE JUDICIARY CAN SUPPORT  
THINGS THAT ONCE AGAIN, IT  
REALLY CAN'T ARGUE AGAINST.  
IT IS DIFFICULT TO ARGUE  
AGAINST THE DEVELOPMENT OF A  
MOCK TRIAL COURTROOM, FOR  
STUDENTS TO USE, FOR THE

PUBLIC TO USE, FOR JUDGES TO  
USE IF NECESSARY.  
THAT IS THAT IS SOMETHING  
THAT I DON'T THINK IS -- IS  
SUBJECT TO LEGITIMATE  
ARGUMENT IF A JUDGE WANTS TO  
HELP IN ANY WAY POSSIBLE  
INCLUDING, THE -- OBTAINING  
FUNDS FOR THAT PURPOSE THEN  
THIS PROPOSAL WOULD ALLOW  
THAT, CURRENTLY, IT CAN'T BE  
DONE.

SO IF THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> BRIEFLY -- I AGREE WITH  
JUSTICE PARIENTE THERE HAS  
NOT BEEN MUCH DISCUSSION  
FROM GENERAL PUBLIC, PERHAPS  
THIS WOULD BE AN OPPORTUNITY  
TO ASK GROUPS AND LAWYERS TO  
MAKE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.

>> I WAS THINKING REMEMBER  
WHEN PRO BONO CAME UP FOR  
JUDGE EVERY JUDGE WAS COMING  
OUT SAYING NO, WE ARE NOT --  
DON'T IMPOSE THIS  
REQUIREMENT ON US, AND  
EVERYBODY -- THE FLORIDA  
BAR, THE BAR FOUNDATION, THE  
LEGAL AID, THE YOU KNOW, THE  
APPELLATE LFRNS, COUNTY  
CONFERENCE SO THAT THE FACT  
IS MAYBE IT IS NOT BROKE,  
YOU KNOW THAT TYPE OF THING.

>> I THINK FLVL\$\$PHILOSOPHICAL THE  
COURT HAS TO DIED WHITE  
WANTS JUDGES AND JUSTICES TO  
BE ABLE TO DO THE ISSUE CAME  
UP WITH PRO UPON OO PRO ONE\$\$O  
JUDGES DEFERRED FROM  
REPORTING PRO BONO REQUEST  
MADE ON JUSTICE THEN CHIEF  
JUSTICE TO DO AWAY WITH  
DEFERRAL\$\$  
DEFERRAL, ALL CONFERENCES  
TOOK A POSITION AGAINST IT  
THE CODE MODIFIED CANON FOUR  
TO LOU JUDGES TO PARTICIPATE  
IN THE COMMUNITY MORE  
ACTIVELY THAT BRIEF -- THREE  
CONCERNS ONE THE JUDGE ONCE  
HE SURRENDERS OR SHE  
SURRENDERS NAME AND IMAGE  
THE JUDGE WILL HAVE NO  
CONTROL HOW IT IS USED

PRIMARILY TO SOLICIT FROM  
LAWYERS\$\$  
LAWYERS, SPECIAL LAWYERS  
WITH MONEY WE HAVE MAY  
MATTERS PENDING BEFORE THE  
COURT THE THIRD THING IS  
THAT THERE IS APPEARANCE OF  
IMPROPRIETY THAT A LITIGANT  
PRATT YOU REPRESENT LEGAL  
AID AND THE POOR, OR ARE  
RATHER YOU REPRESENT THE  
LANDOWNER OF THE HOMEOWNER  
THAT IS RENTING, THEY  
DESERVE A FAIR IMPARTIAL  
JUDGE, AND IF A JUDGE HAS  
PREVIOUS -- BY SPORTING  
ADVOCATE, AND BECOMING AN  
VOTE ADVOCATE FOR  
ORGANIZATION BY FUND RACERS\$\$  
RACERSING\$\$  
RACERSING, THEN THE QUESTION  
-- COMES UP IS THE JUDGE  
GOING BE FAIR, WILL THEY  
CASE BE DECIDED ON MERITS OR  
PREDISPOSITION BY THE JUDGE  
I GREW UP JACKSONVILLE IN  
50s AND 60s ALTHOUGH JUDGES  
ARE HONEST, AND MOST ARE  
DILIGENT\$\$  
DILIGENT, THE JCC IS NOT  
DISBADDING BECAUSE OF LACK  
OF DUTIES MY CONCERN IS THAT  
SOME JUDGES BECAUSE OF  
PASSION, FOR AN ISSUE, MAY  
DECIDE TO ALLOW NAICHLZ USED  
IMPROPER\$\$  
IMPROPERLY FOR FUND RAISE\$\$ING  
FOR AN ISSUE THEY FEEL  
PASSIONATE ABOUT WE SUGGEST  
JAC RECOMMENDATION ADOPT NOD  
MODATIONICATIONS OTHER THAN  
MINOR TO ALLOW PARTICIPATION  
IN CHURCH PASSING PLAY IT  
RECOMMENDATION OF CIRCUIT  
JUDGES KERNS BE DISMISSED.  
>> THANK YOU FOR YOUR  
INVOLVEMENT IN THIS WHOLE  
PROCEED WE SEE YOU NAME ON  
JEAC OPINIONS THAT COME  
THROUGH THANK YOU FOR ALL  
THAT YOU DO FOR THE PEOPLE  
OF FLORIDA WE'LL TAKE THIS  
MATTER UNDER ADVISEMENT  
THANK ALL OF YOU FOR YOUR

ASSISTANCE COURT WILL STAND  
IN RECESS TILL 9:00 TOMORROW  
MORNING