

CRB* TODAY

COURT REPORTERS
BOARD NEWSLETTER

GUARDING THE RECORD
FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION



Message from the Chair *Toni O'Neill*

*CELEBRATING SIXTY YEARS
OF CONSUMER PROTECTION*

In 1951 the Legislature created the board that is now known as the Court Reporters Board of California (CRB). So began the task of protecting California's court system "consumers."

While most people consider judges and attorneys to be the CRB's consumers, in reality its scope is much broader. The record of the proceedings that the court reporter captures is the foundation of all appeal rights; thus, every litigant is a consumer. While direct contact might be with the attorneys, it is important to remember that they are acting on behalf of their clients.

Because of that intermediary relationship, the CRB has to remain especially vigilant in order to protect the unknowing consumer. Most people know their basic rights; however, the average citizen may not know about their rights in regard to court reporting. Since most people will likely be involved in a lawsuit of some kind only once or twice in their lifetime, if even that, they are especially vulnerable as they have had little or no exposure to the court system and the litigation process.

Thanks to the CRB's 60 years of hard work and dedication to ensuring high standards for the ethical, professional, and legal practices of all court reporters, Californians can rely on a court system that provides consumer protection through accurate record keeping. Please join me in thanking the Board members and staff of the CRB for their efforts.

Inside this issue...

Student Spotlight	2
2011/2012 School Compliance Reviews	2
School Curriculum Regulations Update	2
The CRB is 60!	3
CSRs Needed for Exam Workshops	4
Examination Statistics	4
Exam Development Nets New Pretest Questions	4
The Transcript Reimbursement Fund	5
TRF Pro Per Pilot Project	5
Frequently Asked Questions	6
CSR Spotlight.....	7
The Role of the CSR - An Attorney's Perspective	8
Gift-Giving Violation Goes to Court	8
Senate Bill 671	9
Metadata and Court Reporters	9
Disciplinary Actions	9
Disciplinary Actions Pending	9
Citations & Fines Issued.....	10

Board Members

TONI O'NEILL, CSR, *Chair*
GREGORY FINCH, *Vice Chair*
REAGAN EVANS, CSR
LORI GUALCO
ELIZABETH LASENSKY

YVONNE K. FENNER, *Executive Ofcer* KATIE PALMIERI, *Editor*
PAULA BRUNING, *Layout Designer*

COURT REPORTERS BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
2535 Capitol Oaks Dr., Suite 230
Sacramento, CA 95833

Toll Free: (877) 327-5272
Phone: (916) 263-3660
Fax: (916) 263-3664

Student Spotlight

Jennifer Sebring is a full-time student at Tri-Community College in Covina, CA. She enjoys school and is excited about gaining a skill that will allow her to work in a variety of settings while also providing her with a good income. She finds the hours of training to be the most challenging aspect of her schoolwork, but really enjoys the payoff when passing tests. “Each accomplished test is like successfully climbing a mountain. Conquering one gives me the perseverance to train harder and accomplish the next. I also owe thanks to my husband, family, and friends for all of their support,” she said.



Prior to attending Tri-Community College, she had tried traditional college, but couldn't find a major that interested her, so she took a break and was cashiering at a local grocery store. That is where she began talking to one of the regular customers who spoke highly of her career as a court reporter. The customer shared how much *she loved being a CSR* because of the independence it afforded her, allowing her to be home with her kids much of the time. One day she brought in a brochure for Jennifer, persuading her to go to an orientation. Jennifer took her advice and hasn't looked back since. “I left the orientation feeling I had finally found my career,” she said.

Jennifer has taken up running as a hobby since starting school, and she believes it is helping her stay focused on successfully completing her coursework. “When I first started running, I could not run a half mile. Now I can run 12 miles. I kept working at running and only succeeded because of my commitment to it. That experience has helped me to see my schooling and speed building in the same light. *I have learned that anything worth having is worth working hard for.*” she said.

Having started school in 2007, she plans on being prepared to take the CSR license exam in October 2011. After finishing school, Jennifer wants to become an official CSR for the courts. She enjoys the scheduled work environment it offers and likes the camaraderie that comes with working in a courtroom. “The predictable and social environment really appeals to me at this point in my life. I am really looking forward to starting my career,” she said.

School Curriculum Regulations Update

The public comment period for the proposed changes to the School Curriculum Regulations (featured in the Fall 2010 CRB Today newsletter) is now closed. Both written and oral responses were received regarding plans to update the number of hours required within academic areas, allow online delivery of qualifiers, and revise terminology. The final package will go before the Board one last time at their June meeting. If the Board has no changes to the package, it will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). OAL then has 30 working days to review the regulation, ensuring that it satisfies Administrative Procedure Act requirements. If approved, the regulation will be filed with the Secretary of State, where it will be printed in the California Code of Regulations and likely take effect in 30 days. If it is not approved, the regulation will return to the CRB for revisions and then be posted for public comment for 15 days. Resubmission to OAL is required within 120 days of receipt by the CRB.

2011/2012 School Compliance Reviews

Development of the 2011/2012 school compliance review is underway. Schools can expect to be contacted by September 2011 with review requirements.

The CRB is 60!

Since first named the Board of Examiners of Shorthand Reporters 60 years ago, the CRB has continued to uphold its mandate to protect consumers in the state of California from incompetent practitioners. It does so by administering a minimum level certified shorthand reporter (CSR) competency test to determine entry-level abilities, regulating the minimum curriculum requirements which court reporting schools and programs must offer, and disciplining licensees when necessary.

While much has stayed the same since the Board's inception, the following highlights from early meeting minutes provide an interesting glimpse into the process that established court reporters as professionals and the CRB as the overseeing body of that profession.

The first Board of Examiners of Shorthand Reporters meeting was held on January 31, 1952, in Sacramento and consisted of four board members. A fifth board member, unable to attend, sent a telegram of regret. At their second meeting, held March 8, 1952, the Board established the application deadline for submitting certification without examination (referred to as blanketing in) as March 22, 1952. Approximately one

month later at the third meeting, Franklin H. Roberts, Jr., was named the first Board executive secretary (making \$2,000 per annum, the statutory maximum), and 573 applicants were granted CSR certificates without examination, the first of which was Sidney Hotchner, one of the board members in attendance at the founding meeting.

The first CSR exam was offered on Memorial Day, 1952 in Los Angeles. Four people administered the test as a mock trial: a judge, a witness, and two attorneys. It was advertised as a one-hour examination with dictation speeds varying from approximately 140 wpm to 200 wpm. Following the simulated courtroom portion of the exam, applicants were required to read back a portion of the dictated material in a personal interview.

Finally, it was at the August 29, 1952 meeting that the Board of Examiners of Shorthand Reporters name was changed to the Certified Shorthand Reporters' Board. Interestingly enough, the minutes from this meeting noted that reporters using a transcriber had to dictate their notes into a recording machine and let the transcriber transcribe from the machine. The transcriber could not be in the same room as the examinee.

CSRs Needed for Exam Workshops

If you currently work as a CSR and your license is in good standing, *we need you*. The CSR exam development process involves a series of workshops that requires active CSR participation. Without valuable subject matter expert input, the workshops cannot take place, and without a good supply of test questions in the test bank, the CRB will not be able to continue to offer the written exam three times per year.

For the health and growth of the industry, please consider accessing the CRB calendar at www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov to see if any of the upcoming exam workshop dates might work for you. Each two-day workshop is held from Friday to Saturday in Sacramento. All travel accommodations are arranged by CRB staff. All workshop participants will be provided with a per diem rate of \$150 per day and travel expenses. Those living farther than 50 miles will also be reimbursed for hotel accommodations at the State approved rate.

Please pass this important message on to reporters you know. The future success of the CSR industry lies with you. For more information on participating in an exam workshop, contact Kim Kale at Kim.Kale@dca.ca.gov.

Examination Statistics

Written Exams				
November 1, 2010 - February 28, 2011		Total	Pass	Overall %
English	Overall	67	15	37.2%
	First Timers	30	14	46.7%
Professional Practice	Overall	62	45	72.6%
	First Timers	37	33	89.2%
July 1, 2010 - October 31, 2010				
English	Overall	80	41	51.3%
	First Timers	30	21	70.0%
Professional Practice	Overall	59	35	59.3%
	First Timers	30	21	70.0%

Dictation Exam			
March 2011*	Total	Pass	Overall %
Overall	120	33	18.3%
First Timers	37	17	45.9%
October 2010	Total	Pass	Overall %
Overall	102	27	26.5%
First Timers	28	11	39.3%

* Unofficial until appeals hearings

Exam Development Nets New Pretest Questions

Thanks to the hard work of the CSRs who have participated in our examination development workshops throughout the past year, we have been able to start adding “pre-test” questions to the written portions of the CSR license exam. Typically the English and Professional Practice written examinations each contain no fewer than 100 multiple-choice items or questions. These written examinations now may contain up to 25 additional items, included for the purpose of assessing questions for future use.

Pre-testing exam questions allows performance data to be gathered and evaluated before a question becomes scoreable in an examination. The “experimental” items are distributed throughout the test and do not count for or against the candidate, nor are they identified to the candidate in any way. Individuals who take written examinations that include pre-test items are given additional time, for a total of two hours per exam.

The Transcript Reimbursement Fund

Celebrating 30 Years of Increased Access to Justice for Low-Income Applicants

The Transcript Reimbursement Fund (TRF) was created by the Legislature in 1981 to assist low-income California litigants in pursuing and defending themselves in civil cases. Since its inception, approximately \$253,000 in annual assistance, totaling **\$7.6 million**, has been disbursed.

As stated in the CA Business & Professions Code 8030.2(a), the self-supporting TRF is “established by a transfer of funds from the Court Reporters’ Fund and shall be maintained in an amount no less than three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) for each fiscal year.” Funds are used to offset costs to court reporters and deposition agencies that otherwise would not be able to provide transcripts to individuals in need of their services at a reduced or free rate. They are also used to help defray costs for attorneys who represent clients on a pro bono basis as transcript expenses can be a significant factor in the decision to accept or decline a case.

Many of the clients benefitting from the TRF are single mothers with children. Others are elderly, unemployed, or disabled. To be eligible for assistance, a litigant’s income must be at least 125 percent of the current federal poverty threshold or be eligible for (or receiving) Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or services under the Older Americans or Developmentally Disabled Assistance Acts. With qualifying individuals among those most needing the assurances afforded by the judicial system, socially valuable and fiscally sound programs such as the TRF are cause for celebration and serve as a model for other programs.

TRF Pro Per Pilot Project

Senate Bill 1181 (Senator Cedillo), which set out to “authorize low-income persons appearing pro se to apply for funds from the Transcript Reimbursement Fund, subject to specified requirements and limitations,” passed on January 1, 2011, enacting the TRF Pro Per Pilot Project. Slated to run for 24 months, low-income pro per litigants now have access to TRF funds, a service not previously provided to those representing themselves.

Legislation to implement the pilot project was written as a result of the realization that there was a growing body of California’s court system consumers not being served, and the money to fund their needs was available. Typical cases involving requests for TRF assistance (for both litigants represented by legal counsel and those acting pro se) are dissolution of marriage/custody issues, evictions, unlawful terminations, and probate disputes. Without representation, individuals historically have been denied access to the funds, making the cost of transcripts unaffordable, and thereby forcing them to abandon efforts to pursue civil litigation or defend themselves in an action.

Qualification for assistance under the new program is based on the fee waiver granted by the court in which the case is pending. Requests for TRF funds for pro per litigants are being processed through a streamlined two-page application form. The application must provide the name and address of record for the court reporter(s) so that the CRB can contact them to provide provisional approval. Upon confirmation that the transcript has been produced and delivered to the applicant, reimbursement is authorized, and the court reporter should receive payment within six to eight weeks. To date, the CRB has processed nearly 30 applications from pro per litigants, and allocated over \$14,000 in reimbursement funds to reporters for transcripts that otherwise would not have been produced. The pilot project is restricted to a maximum of \$30,000 annually paid out for all pro per litigant transcripts, with a cap of \$1,500 per case.

To help ensure the full benefits of the pilot are realized, spread the word about this valuable program to colleagues and those in need of assistance. For more information, go to http://www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/lawsregs/tran_pro_per.shtml.

Frequently Asked Questions

Q I'm a CSR in Southern California. I'm being asked to report a deposition in which the defendant will be participating via videoconference from Delaware; however, the plaintiff and defense counsel will be present in Southern California for the deposition. I know that pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) Section 2025.310 (b), a party deponent has to appear at the deposition in person and be in the presence of the deposition officer, but since I can see them via the videoconference, is this permissible?

A Current law does not consider this acceptable. California Rule of Court 3.1010, specifically subdivision (c), states, "A party deponent must appear at his or her deposition in person and be in the presence of the deposition officer." This means in the physical presence of the court reporter. Further, subdivision (d) provides that, "A nonparty deponent may appear at his or her deposition by telephone, videoconference, or other remote electronic means with court approval upon a finding of good cause and no prejudice to any party. The deponent must be sworn in in the presence of the deposition officer or by any other means stipulated by the parties or ordered by the court. Any party may be personally present at the deposition." Consequently, subdivision (d) makes it clear that party deponents and nonparty deponents are treated differently. A nonparty deponent has the option to not be physically present at the deposition by either stipulation or court order, whereas the party deponent does not have such options.

Q Does the California Court Reporters Board consider a CSR's backup audio file in the event of a complaint about the accuracy of a transcript?

A The CRB takes all information into consideration when investigating a complaint. That being said, if a reporter is relying heavily on backup audio in order to produce a transcript, the reporter is open to a citation and fine based on incompetency. Reporters are issued a license to practice based on their ability to accurately write and transcribe stenographic notes, not on their ability to successfully use audio recording equipment. Anyone using backup audio in any manner should be familiar with

the "Best Practices for the Use of Backup Audio Media," which can be found on the CRB Web site at http://www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/formspubs/best_practice.pdf.

Q An attorney contacted me complaining about mistakes in a transcript I provided. My transcripts are always considerably correct, so I explained to him that the Court Reporters Board only requires me to be 97.5 percent accurate, meaning the transcript was within the allowable number of errors. He was unhappy and threatened to file a complaint with the CRB. The Board will back me up in this situation, won't they?

A The Board uses a 97.5 percent rate of accuracy as a measure for entry-level competency when grading the practical portion of the CSR license exam, not as an acceptable standard of professionalism. Business and Professions Code Section 8017 notes: "The practice of shorthand reporting is defined as the making, by means of written symbols or abbreviations in shorthand or machine shorthand writing, of a verbatim record of any oral court proceeding, deposition, or proceeding before any grand jury, referee, or court commissioner and the accurate transcription thereof." Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, defines "verbatim" as being in the exact words or word for word. Therefore, a "considerably correct" transcript is not supported by the CRB.

Q I have used the same transcript format since I got out of school 23 years ago and now am being told I have to change to the new format the CRB is promoting. Has there been an official change? If so, how was I supposed to know about it if I was never notified?

A The "new format" is not a promotion, but a regulation that went into effect in January of 2000. It is specifically found in Division 24 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2473, and sets forth the minimum transcript format standards to be used in California.

The CRB makes every effort to contact all licensees regarding

FAQs continued from page 6

changes to statutes, regulations, or enforcement practices. To ensure that you receive updates, including the CRB Today newsletter, provide the Board with your current email address by going to www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov, “What’s New.” There you can subscribe through the “Join CRB E-Mail Notification List.” There are also three state associations that provide updates to members. Links to the Web sites for those organizations can be found at www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/consumers/links.shtml.

Q A client attorney of mine has offered to pay me for an overview of how a deposition went from my perspective. Can you direct me to the statute that outlines whether or not this is permissible?

A The statute you are looking for is the California Code of Regulation, Title 16, Division 24, Article 8, Section 2474, which expressly prohibits the preparation of deposition summaries.

CSR Spotlight

Cynthia Dunbar first began her CSR career three years ago in Los Angeles County after three years of full-time schooling while holding down various jobs. Prior to that, she had a 10-year career in sports and entertainment, where she increasingly felt the unpredictable income and lifestyle were no longer for her. “I missed enjoying entertainment for entertainment’s sake and wanted to feel in control of my career. *I knew I needed a change.*” That was when my dad sent me an article about closed captioning work, thinking it might be the answer for me. That, coupled with my boyfriend having mentioned court reporting as a potential career, intrigued me enough to look into the field. I was immediately hooked,” said Cynthia.

Realizing a CSR career could offer flexible deposition work as well as reliable, structured courtroom or captioning work was what convinced Cynthia to make the move. “I couldn’t believe I had found *a career that would evolve with my life rather than dictate it,*” she continued. “At the end of the day, I could be my own boss and drive my own career. That made sense to me.” Used to a dynamic work environment from her previous career, Cynthia enjoys meeting diverse pools of people during depositions as well as learning a wide spectrum of information through testimony given by expert witnesses. As an organized



and responsible individual, she also appreciates the order and structure that comes with CSR work.

Active in the Deposition Reporters Association and National Court Reporters Association, Cynthia also assists the CRB with examinations. “As a small industry, we need to support each other and the CRB. It is our responsibility to engage in pertinent issues and to communicate with the Board as they represent us and rely on our feedback to successfully steer the industry and our future. “I appreciate the CRB and licensing for CSRs as quality control ensures the integrity of the record. I take great pride and responsibility in carefully and accurately interpreting testimony as I realize *the written record I produce will impact lives and possibly even life and death decisions,*” she concluded.

Although she is currently devoting her time to depositions, Cynthia is considering expanding her career to captioning, using her skills to get paid while watching the sporting events she loves. With distance between her and the entertainment world, she is once again able to tap into her more artistic side, studying jazz music and considering dabbling in acting and voiceovers; however, this time it’s simply for pleasure.

The Role of the CSR – An Attorney’s Perspective

Eric Ratinoff, a partner with the firm Kershaw, Cutter, and Ratinoff in Sacramento, has been a plaintiff attorney for 18 years, representing clients in personal injury, medical malpractice, insurance bad faith, and product liability cases. When asked what value he finds in hiring a CSR, he is quick to explain that having a court reporter present at depositions provides an official recording of every question and answer. With all of the testimony taken under oath and formally preserved, it is admissible as evidence in court. “Having official transcripts takes the guesswork out of cases. The questions you had prior to depositions are answered, and testimonies are preserved in the record, making it hard for witnesses to change statements. This helps us (lawyers) evaluate cases early so we can fairly advise clients about the case and the evidence that will be presented,” he said.

When choosing a CSR, Eric looks for someone with experience, integrity, and a good reputation. “My goal is to hire a reporter that will do an honest and credible job, accurately recording and completing the record and getting it out in a timely manner,” he continued. “The CSRs that I have met have all been professional, well-prepared, and have done a good job. In fact, some have

even gone above and beyond to ensure the delivery of a stellar product. In one instance, a partner in my firm had a case with out-of-state depositions that was on a short timeframe. Needing a court reporter he could trust to be quick and accurate, he hired Kathryn Davis, a local CSR we had used before from Kathryn Davis and Associates. Without a second thought she did what needed to be done. She put other clients and her family aside, traveled to cover numerous depositions, and worked long days to produce the necessary transcriptions.”

“Having worked with court reporters for years and having a friend that is a CSR, I know how hard they work. They still have a lot to do to complete the record after the rest of us have gone home. I’m not sure many people realize just how much work reporters put into doing a good job.”

Eric believes the future of court reporting will evolve with technology, but feels there will always be a need for a record taker to maintain neutrality in the official recording process. He said, “As technology becomes more sophisticated and reliable, I think the human role may be diminished, but certainly not eliminated. However, I’m sure the evolution of this process will be slow.”

Gift-Giving Violation Goes to Court

A complaint for declaratory relief by the Court Reporters Board (CRB) was served on US Legal Support, Inc. (US Legal), one of the largest companies in the court reporting business. The CRB had cited and fined US Legal \$2,500 for violating the Board’s professional standards of practice. Specifically, the citation alleged that US Legal violated a prohibition against giving more than an aggregate \$100 in gifts to a single entity in any calendar year. US Legal allegedly gave a \$200 gift certificate to a law firm. US Legal has refused to pay the fine, arguing that only licensees are subject to the laws governing court reporters and that because it is not a licensee, it is exempt from those laws and the CRB has no jurisdiction. The CRB is asking a Santa Clara County Superior Court to clarify its jurisdiction under Business and Professions Code Section 8046. A bill attempting to establish the CRB’s jurisdiction over firms like US Legal died in committee in 2009. US Legal lobbied extensively against the measure.

Senate Bill 671

Authored by Senator Curren Price, Senate Bill (SB) 671 calls for the California Court Reporters Board (CRB) to implement certified shorthand reporter (CSR) continuing education requirements for license renewal. It also requires the CRB to certify those providers offering the continuing education courses. If passed, the new license requirements would be effective July 1, 2012.

While SB 671 would be a shift in statewide requirements for all CSRs, the Administrative Office of the Courts has demanded that reporters working in courtrooms complete four hours of continuing education annually since January 1, 2008. As professional development and industry competence are issues of ongoing relevance, the CRB will continue to monitor and report on SB 671 developments.

Metadata and Court Reporters

We live in a digital age, heavily dependent upon the Internet for fast, efficient communication, as well as news and information. Consequently, electronic documents continue to be submitted for evidence, from e-mails to Excel spreadsheets, at an ever-increasing rate. With this new technology comes new scrutiny from attorneys and judges who are analyzing the metadata of such documents. As metadata is information that is embedded within electronic documents, such as how the data was created, when it was created, and who created it, such details may help or inhibit a given testimony, thereby impacting court outcomes and the record.

Will court reporters be asked to access electronic evidence metadata in the future, possibly even marking it for the record? Developments around this issue will definitely be worth watching!

Court Reporters Board of California - Disciplinary Actions October 2010 - April 2011

The disciplinary actions listed below cover the period of time from October 2010 to April 2011. To find out whether a licensee has had disciplinary action prior to October 2010, or to obtain further information on specific disciplinary action for a licensee listed below, please contact the Board office toll-free at 1-877-3-ASK-CRB (1-877-327-5272).

A disciplinary action is a formal proceeding that includes the basis for the action sought against the licensee. These disciplinary actions are held in front of an Administrative Law Judge and allow for attorney, testimony, and challenges as provided in the legal system. The Administrative Law Judge then issues a decision that the Board can accept, reject, or send back for additional information. Disciplinary cases can result in license suspension and/or a probationary status with conditions.

RESPONDENT NAME - CITY	LICENSE NO.	ACTION	EFFECTIVE DATE	CHARGES
Morris, Diana - Sanger, CA	12451	Default Decision and Order; license revocation.	04/27/2011	Failure to comply with conditions of probation.
Bruhl, Easteller - San Francisco, CA	3077	Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order: 4 years probation.	04/18/2011	Business & Professions Code Sections 8025(d): Incompetence; and (j) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2473: Improper transcript format.
Simonov, Dynele - Petaluma, CA	11211	Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order: 4 years probation.	04/18/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (a) and 490: Conviction of a crime; Section 8025 (b): Failure to notify Board of conviction.
Goehle, Paula - Irvine, CA	13616	Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order: 4 years probation.	03/18/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect; Section 8025(d): Dishonesty.
Ardon, Janet - Bakersfield, CA	13093	Stipulated Surrender of License	03/10/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025(a): Conviction of a crime; Section 8025(d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025(e): Repeated unexcused failure... to transcribe notes; Section 8025(j) and 125.9(e): Failure to pay Citation and Fine with an Order of Abatement.

Court Reporters Board Of California - Disciplinary Actions Pending October 2010 - April 2011

Chapa, Sandi - Hayward, CA	11031	Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation	04/06/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025(d): Gross negligence, incompetence, unprofessional conduct. Cause to Revoke Probation: Failure to comply with condition of probation.
Corona, Tanuya - Broomall, PA	12782	Accusation	02/11/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025(d): Gross negligence, incompetence, unprofessional conduct; Section 8025(e): Repeated unexcused failure... to transcribe notes; Section 8025(h): Failure to pay Citation and Fine with an Order of Abatement.
Campbell, Carol - Indio, CA	3646	Accusation	01/04/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025(d): Unprofessional conduct.
Costa, Cheryl - Martinez, CA	10913	Accusation	01/04/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025(d): Incompetence.

Court Reporters Board of California - Citations & Fines Issued October 2010 - April 2011

RESPONDENT NAME - CITY	LICENSE NO.	DATE ISSUED	VIOLATION	SATISFIED
O'Connell, Deborah - San Diego, CA	10563	04/26/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	No
Heinold, Cynthia - Santa Ana, CA	12150	04/22/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional Conduct (<i>failed to notify all pertinent parties of changes made to a transcript</i>), gross negligence, incompetence (<i>quality of stenographic notes</i>).	No
Ellington, Aaron - Hercules, CA	13449	04/21/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct... availability, delivery, execution and certification of transcripts... (<i>failed to produce transcript</i>).	No
Fox, Tracy - Newport Beach, CA	10449	04/18/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	No
Torres, Roberta - Felton, CA	7654	03/30/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	Yes
Cooksey, Dixie - Roseville, CA	4375	03/18/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	Yes
Papale, Valerie - Santa Rosa, CA	6899	03/18/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	Yes
Satterlee, Delia - Santa Ana, CA	9114	02/28/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	Yes
Heyward, Julie - Santa Ana, CA	7907	02/28/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	Yes
Williams, Melissa - San Jose, CA	12284	02/24/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure... to transcribe notes of cases on appeal (<i>failed to timely produce transcripts</i>).	No
Gallardo, Yvette - Salinas, CA	12889	02/24/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure... to transcribe notes of cases on appeal (<i>failed to timely produce transcripts</i>).	Yes
Lizarraga-Felix, Vanessa - Riverside, CA	12829	02/15/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	No
Greene, Virginia A. - Bakersfield, CA	12270	02/15/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	No
Fong, Thelma - Los Angeles, CA	7986	02/15/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	No
Giugni, Betsy - Fairfield, CA	6174	01/10/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Gross negligence (<i>certified inaccurately transcribed court proceeding</i>); and (j) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2473 (a)(2) Minimum Transcript Format Standards (<i>failure to comply with MTFs</i>).	Yes
Held-Biehl, Laurie - Rancho Santa Margarita, CA	6781	01/10/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Code of Civil Procedure Section 2025.520 (a) (<i>failure to provide deponent with opportunity to read, correct and sign depositions</i>).	Yes
Johnson, Jacquelyn - Carlsbad, CA	1592	10/27/2010	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect (<i>late renewal</i>).	Yes
U.S. Legal Support - Los Angeles, CA	N/A	10/26/2010	Business & Professions Code Section 8046, in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2475 (b)(8) Professional Standards of Practice.	No
Austin, Stephanie - Highland, CA	13119	10/20/2010	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Incompetence in practice of shorthand reporting (<i>quality of stenographic notes</i>).	Yes
Bushaw, Joanne - Monterey, CA	4334	10/05/2010	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional Conduct (<i>failed to provide court reporting services after receiving payment; failed to reimburse payment</i>).	Yes
Gardner, Michelle - Pomona, CA	11463	10/01/2010	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct... availability, delivery, execution and certification of transcripts... (<i>failed to timely produce transcript</i>).	Yes

The Citations and Fines remain posted for one year from the date initially issued. To find out whether a specific licensee has ever been issued a Citation and Fine prior to the date shown, or to obtain further information on a specific Citation and Fine, please contact the Board office toll-free at 1-877-3-ASK-CRB (1-877-327-5272).

The above respondents' Citation and Fines that reflect "Satisfied" have been satisfactorily resolved. Payment of a fine is not an admission to the violation.

