

4/4/73

Memorandum 73-39

**Subject: Suggested New Topic**

The attached letter suggests a new topic. The staff believes that this can be readily disposed of by suggesting that the writer contact the Judicial Council which would be a more appropriate agency to study this matter. Since this appears to be a good solution, we are presenting the letter to you for disposition at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

John H. DeMouly  
Executive Secretary

Memo 73-39

EXHIBIT I

MILLER, GROEZINGER, PETTIT & EVERS

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

THE HARTFORD BUILDING  
TWENTIETH FLOOR

850 CALIFORNIA STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94108

WILLIAM H. KEESLING  
OF COUNSEL

TELEPHONE  
[415] 434-1331

CABLE ADDRESS:  
MILLMART

DUDLEY F. MILLER  
LELAND B. GROEZINGER  
WALTER F. PETTIT  
WILLIAM D. EVERS  
J. RONALD PENNILLY  
SHELDON H. WOLFE  
D. CAMERON BAKER  
JOHN E. PARRS IV  
ALLAN J. JOSEPH  
REVERDY JOHNSON  
THOMAS F. KOSTIC  
JOHN B. CLARK  
JAMES T. CALESHU  
EMMETT F. HARRINGTON  
RICHARD A. DUMKE  
RONALD A. COHAN  
ROBERT M. CASSEL  
ROBERT L. MAINES  
GUY D. KORNBUM  
KRIS HOFFMAN  
SIDNEY J. COHEN  
JAMES E. HARRINGTON, JR.  
MARTIN QUINN  
ROBERT A. THOMPSON  
THEODORE A. RUSSELL  
ROBERT L. IVEY  
PETER E. MICHAEL  
BRETT R. DICK  
LOUIS D. VICTORINO  
HARRY J. STEVENS III  
LINN K. COOMBS  
MICHAEL L. McMAHAN  
DIANE O. EAMES  
RANDAL B. SHORT  
MALCOLM E. McLORG  
MITCHELL L. FORSTER  
DONALD W. ENIGDIEL  
CHARLES S. LOUGHRAN  
ROBERT T. BURKE  
GREGORY O. LIPSCOMB

March 26, 1973

John H. DeMouilly,  
Executive Secretary  
California Law Revision Commission  
School of Law  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

Re: Use of Videotape by California Courts

Dear Mr. DeMouilly:

During the past several months, I have been involved extensively with the study of and experimentation with the use of video technology by our courts. Since last year, I have served on the Video Advisory Committee of the National Center for State Courts, which as you know, is directed by the Honorable Winslow S. Christian of our Courts of Appeal.

After considerable study, and discussion of this topic, and reflection of my own, I am convinced that audio-visual technology, particularly the videotape format, offers a highly efficient, reliable, effective and relatively inexpensive means of presenting and recording evidence.

My own personal research has resulted in three articles, copies of which are enclosed:

1. Videotape in Civil Cases, 24 Hastings Law Journal 9 (1972)
2. Television in the Courtroom and Classroom, 59 American Bar Association Journal (March, 1973)
3. Videotape in Legal Education, ALI-ABA CLE Review, February 2, 1973.

MILLER, GROEZINGER, PETTIT & EVERS

John H. DeMouilly  
March 26, 1973

Page Two


I also enclose some materials which I recently received at the Video Advisory Committee's meeting in New Orleans on Saturday, February 24, 1973. These materials include the new Superintendence Rules adopted in Ohio for videorecording depositions and trials, as well as rules for videorecording testimony drafted by Judge McCrystal of the Circuit Court of Ohio, who presided over the first trial presented entirely by videotape.

May I urge you to investigate the use of videotape recording in California. I am particularly hopeful that the Law Revision Commission will draft legislation for consideration by our legislature.

Once you explore this area, I am sure you will be convinced, as I am, that properly used, videotape technology can make a great and longstanding contribution to the efficient administration of justice.

Thank you for permitting me to pass on this information. Please do not hesitate to call on me if I can provide you with any additional information, or be of any service to you.

Very truly yours,

  
Guy O. Kornblum

GOK/md  
w/encls.