It’s always good to be reminded about the power of keeping things in perspective. For the past several years, the Court Reporters Board has been operating within the constrictions of an ever-tightening state budget. The Board’s response to those constrictions could have resulted in throwing our figurative hands up in the air and saying to the consumer: “Sorry. We have no money to help you. Blame the powers that be.” Instead, the Board took on the challenge of exploring ways of not only keeping the status quo of current programs intact but how to do even more with fewer resources.

The Board rose to the challenge on several fronts. We have reduced the number of our in-person meetings by increasing the length of the meetings to accomplish our full agenda. Among other things, we have partnered with sister offices within the Department of Consumer Affairs to take advantage of services for which the Board already pays a pro rata share. An example of this is our collaboration with the Office of Publications, Design & Editing, which helps us with this very newsletter. To cut down on meeting expenses, we have researched videoconferencing resources in order to activate mission-critical task forces that will allow the Board to provide requested guidance to the court reporting licensees.

While it can be frustrating to always have to discover new ways of accomplishing the mission of the Court Reporters Board without busting the budget, it’s exciting when we find a solution. What has been the most exciting of all is the newly created synergy resulting from the appointment of

Message continued on page 2
a full Board. For the first time in several years, we have a full five-member Board. Indeed, as the chair, I am enjoying working with a full Board that is staffed with bright, engaged minds from a variety of walks of life. The Board, as the policy-making body, is well-poised to take on the challenges being faced by today’s court reporting industry. I have learned, as a member of the Board for a cumulative seven years, that with the ever-changing dynamics of the reporting profession, the Board will always be presented with opportunities and challenges.

Yes, I have learned that thorn bushes do have roses, and I am more than confident that the California consumer of reporting services will be well-protected as the Board embraces future opportunities and challenges.

Board Staff Member Welcome: Melissa Davis

Having the opportunity to help others is something that Melissa Davis said she has always been drawn to. Her important role of Transcript Reimbursement Fund coordinator allows her to do that.

Ms. Davis reviews applications for the Pro Per Program, which provides cost assistance for transcripts to indigent persons representing themselves in civil matters. She ensures all the required information is there: applicant signature, court-approved fee waiver, court reporter information and estimates, and job dates. “If the application meets the criteria and we have funds, we can approve it and send out the provisional approval letters to the applicant and court reporters,” she explained. “Once we have final invoices and the payee data record, we can submit it for payment.”

Any missing information means legwork. “If the application is missing information, we reach out to the applicant and court reporters for assistance, and sometimes it takes months to get a response,” she said. “If the application is missing the fee waiver or is on the wrong form, it’s returned to the applicant for correction.” She also does invoice follow-up with court reporters from cases approved in previous years.

In addition to her Pro Per Program activities, she assists with the CSR exams.

An avid runner, she’s recently logged four half marathons and a 5K (3.1 miles). This year alone, she’s done four half marathons, two 10 mile races and a 10K (6.2 miles). “I have one more half marathon and a 5K to go,” she said. She trains with a local running group called Sacfit, a local running and walking team that provides individualized training programs for various distances. “I’ve done several seasons with them; they’re wonderful!” she said.

She also keeps busy outside of work with two young boys, one four and the other almost two.

She came to the Board from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, having been there for almost five years in the accounting and budget offices. She’s now been with the Board for almost six months, working Monday, Wednesday and Thursday. “Everyone is so knowledgeable, kind, and understanding,” she said. “They’re like family here, and I love that.”
Guarding the Record for Consumer Protection

New Board Member: John K. Liu

John Liu, a member of the California Bar since 1997, was appointed by Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. to the California Court Reporters Board on October 25, 2013.

He practices corporate and securities law in Silicon Valley and specializes in the representation of venture capital investors, startup companies, and other venture-backed clients in the area of technology. Mr. Liu has been counsel to the corporate department at Lowenstein Sandler LLP since 2012. He was of counsel in the corporate/startup group at Fenwick & West LLP from 2008 to 2012 and managing partner of the boutique corporate and securities law firm, Charter Law Group LLP from 2002 to 2008. Mr. Liu earned his Juris Doctor degree from the University of California, Davis, School of Law; bachelor's degrees in English and in electrical engineering from Stanford University; and a Master of Science degree in engineering economic systems, also from Stanford University. In his early career, he served as a judicial extern for the Honorable Ming Chen of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Before starting his legal career, Mr. Liu developed and customized software systems for the financial services and technology sectors. He is passionate about education and working with technology companies, and he volunteers his time as a venture mentor at U.C. Berkeley's startup accelerator SkyDeck and as a mentor at the Santa Clara University School of Law Entrepreneurs’ Law Clinic. He also serves as a board member of Five Branches University, California Graduate School of Traditional Chinese Medicine.

Mr. Liu is a Democrat. His term expires June 1, 2016.

Transcript Reimbursement Fund Update

Pertinent Business and Professions Code Sections Reinstated

As we reported in the fall 2013 CRB Today, three parts of the Business and Professions (B&P) Code (sections 8030.4, 8030.6 and 8030.8) that govern the Transcript Reimbursement Fund (TRF) were inadvertently repealed as of January 1, 2013. In response, the Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development added the TRF language into their urgency bill, SB 823, which was signed by the Governor and chaptered Tuesday, October 1, 2013. As a result, processing of the seven-month backlog of applications resumed, and the processing time for the fund has come into compliance with the 30-day mandate.

Processing times were also assisted by the addition of a new half-time analyst, Melissa Davis, who joined the Board in November 2013 on a limited-term basis and has taken full rein of the Pro Per Program. In addition to being able to respond to applications more quickly, her role has afforded Executive Analyst Paula Bruning the ability to resume helping accomplish strategic plan initiatives.

Please note, the language in B&P Code section 8030.4 was restructured to alphabetical order; therefore, the Pro Bono Program application form was revised to be consistent with the updated law.

Please begin using the new revision immediately. You may contact Ms. Bruning to obtain the new form if necessary. She may be reached at (916) 263-4690 or paula.bruning@dca.ca.gov.

www.CourtReportersBoard.ca.gov
School Closure Updates

It is unfortunate that we announce the imminent closure of two court reporting programs: Cerritos College and Bryan College (Sacramento).

We learned in March of 2013 that Cerritos College was no longer accepting new students into its court reporting program. The spring 2014 session was the final semester for the program. Cerritos worked closely with the 225 students and surrounding schools to make the transition into other court reporting programs as seamless as possible.

Additionally, we were recently notified that Bryan College (Sacramento) accepted its last group of new students in November 2012. According to the school, students currently enrolled at Bryan College (Sacramento) are in a hybrid program that allows them to be transferred to the online program hosted by Bryan University for the remainder of their classes.

Examination Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2013 - February 28, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Timers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Timers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| July 1, 2013 - October 31, 2013                                               | Total | Pass  | Overall % |
| English                                                                        |       |       |          |
| Overall                                                                       | 78    | 38    | 48.7%     |
| First Timers                                                                  | 45    | 32    | 71.1%     |
| Professional Practice                                                         |       |       |          |
| Overall                                                                       | 63    | 47    | 74.6%     |
| First Timers                                                                  | 40    | 33    | 82.5%     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictation Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Timers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Timers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unofficial until appeals hearing

Student Spotlight

Self-pride can be a strong motivator, and it is for Elizabeth Gonzalez.

As a full-time student and a full-time mom of seven, one of them with special needs, knowing she’s up to the challenge of both those jobs and that an exciting career is on the horizon keeps her going.

A student at Central California’s Taft College, she chose to pursue a career in court reporting because she always thought it looked very interesting. In fact, she enrolled in court reporting school before, but due to financial issues was unable to finish. “I always said if I was able to return to pursue it, I would,” she said.

And she did. She started stenotype theory in August of 2012. Currently, her favorite class is jury charge. “I get it, and it comes easily to me.”

She expects to graduate in the next 18 months, then she would like to work anywhere she can gain experience and knowledge. As for the juggling act that is her life at the moment, she said organization and lots of “notes to self” help her balance school, home, and kids.

“My children — and the fact that I will not give up —motivate me during difficult times,” she said. “I cannot put into words how proud I will be that I did it.”
Launching a Career as a Court Reporter

Board brochure explains how

Do you know anyone looking to change careers or someone who is specifically interested in becoming a certified shorthand reporter? The Court Reporters Board of California offers an award-winning brochure that outlines opportunities and benefits, explains how to choose a court reporting school and what it takes to graduate, and suggests ways to pay for the education.

Titled, Launching a Career as a Court Reporter, the publication also contains additional career resources including links to industry associations. You can access it here: www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/formspubs/student_career.pdf.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment for court reporters will grow by 18 percent between 2008 and 2018, and job opportunities should be excellent, reflecting the demand for real-time broadcast captioning and translating. This growth is faster than the average for all occupations between 2008 and 2018.

Demand for court reporter services will also be spurred by the continuing need for accurate transcription of proceedings in courts and in pretrial depositions, by the growing need to create captions for live television, and by the need to provide other real-time broadcast captioning and translating services for the deaf and the hard of hearing.

The career’s selling points are many: CSRs can be independent contractors or run their own firms. Work hours are usually flexible, and transcription is often performed at home. And the money’s good. In addition, the skills gained prepare students for other career options such as legal secretary, paralegal, medical transcribing, rapid data entry, and more. What’s not to love?

Legislative Update:

Board Opposes Assembly Bills 2006 and 2487

At the March 14, 2014, meeting in Los Angeles, the Board voted to oppose two bills in the interest of consumers.

The first is Assembly Bill 2006 (Wagner) which would allow the videotape of a deposition to be used interchangeably with the transcript of a videotaped deposition.

The main problem the Board found with AB 2006 was the total lack of consumer protection afforded to litigants if this bill were to be passed into law. Currently, if a litigant has a problem with the accuracy of a transcript, there are complaint processes in place through the Court Reporters Board with broad powers of investigation available. However, the video recording industry is completely unregulated. If a litigant were to allege that the recording had been altered in some way, consumers would have no recourse.

The second piece of legislation is Assembly Bill 2487 (Wagner) which deals with copies of transcripts in felony cases.

Existing law mandates that when a defendant is charged with a felony, the court reporter is required to transcribe his or her shorthand notes of the proceeding within ten days after the close of examination. This bill proposes to only have this automatic order in place when the defendant is charged with homicide. In all other felony matters, the transcript would have to be specially and specifically ordered. The Board decided to oppose the bill, determining that it would impede the flow of the judicial process and cost more in the end because many transcripts would likely be ordered on a more expensive, expedited basis later in the legal process.

The Board also believes the rights of all defendants should be protected with the production of a timely transcript, not just those accused of homicide, noting that the bill seems to add a sorting element, which conflicts with its consumer protection mandate.
Frequently Asked Questions

Q What is the code section that requires the jurors’ information to be redacted in the jury voir dire in a civil matter?

A There is no statutory requirement to redact juror information in civil proceedings. Be sure to check local Rules of Court for any requirements they may have.

Q I was recently on Facebook perusing what fellow CSRs have been up to. I saw a lengthy thread on another reporter’s Facebook page talking about a case and how emotional a depo was. Another reporter chimed in and said she was on the same case. Then one of them actually mentioned the case name as well as the location of the case and a few very detailed issues in the case. Is this any type of violation of court reporting laws?

A This could certainly be a violation of Business and Professions Code section 8025(d) for unprofessional conduct, which includes, but is not limited to, acts contrary to professional standards concerning, among other things, confidentiality and impartiality. California Code of Regulations Title 16, section 2475, Professional Standards of Practice, includes (b)(2), the requirement to maintain the confidentiality of information which is confidential as a result of rule, regulation, statute, court order, or deposition proceedings. Additionally, discussing the demeanor of an attorney or witness could show bias, which is prohibited by CCR section 2475 (b)(6), which requires that the court reporter act without bias toward, or prejudice against, any parties and/or their attorneys. The Board has previously agreed to a stipulated surrender of a court reporter’s license due to a public discussion regarding a court proceeding.

Q I have retired from court reporting and decided to not renew my license. I can still transcribe and certify any back orders from when I was working, right?

A California Government Code section 69955(h) indicates that the court reporter who took the notes shall be given the first opportunity to make the transcription. That being said, without a valid license, you may not sign any type of certification as to the accuracy of the transcript.

Q Is there a requirement to have line numbers on rough drafts? I had someone complain about the line numbering because they need to be able to cite, and I’m concerned that they are trying to use the rough instead of the final — although perhaps unintentionally. They were reminded that the line numbers will be different on the final transcript regardless. Any advice?

A There are no statutes governing the format of rough drafts. There are a number of reporters who do not use line numbers on rough drafts for the very reason it makes it impossible for attorneys to use it to cite. Another possibility is to have a different number of lines per page and widely different margins so that it bears little resemblance to a final transcript. The Board recommends in addition to a disclaimer at the beginning reminding the reader that it is a rough draft and may contain errors and a reminder that it may not be cited, that a header along the lines of “Rough draft – not for citation” be used. Additionally you may randomly insert “Rough draft – not for citation” throughout the transcript.

Q I was given the following instruction by counsel during a deposition:

“I’m objecting to the introduction of the exhibit, and for the record I advise the court reporter I’m bringing a motion to seal the document. So I ask the court reporter to indicate such; that until the court rules on that motion that the document should not be produced as part of the exhibits.”

After the depo opposing counsel told me he wanted the exhibit attached to the transcript and that he knows of no code saying I can’t attach it. That’s where my question comes in: Do I attach it or don’t I? Is there anything in the code that addresses this?

A Unfortunately the only thing in code regarding exhibits is that when an exhibit is marked or received, it must be so noted in the transcript. For everything else we rely on industry practice and our best judgment. Best practice in this case would be to seal the exhibit as if it were confidential and attach it to the transcript. This protects the privacy of the content while the attorney moves for a protective order, yet
doesn’t delay the production of the transcript and the flow of the litigation in case the protective order never appears.

Q I saw an ad recently for someone looking to hire a realtime court reporter who can write both English and Spanish. Are we allowed to do that?

A California Code of Civil Procedure section 185(a) states:

Every written proceeding in a court of justice in this state shall be in the English language, and judicial proceedings shall be conducted, preserved, and published in no other. Nothing in this section shall prohibit a court from providing an unofficial translation of a court order issued pursuant to section 527.6 or 527.8 of the Code of Civil Procedure, or Part 1 (commencing with section 6200) of Division 10 of the Family Code, or section 136.2 of the Penal Code, in a language other than English.

A court reporter in California reporting a deposition in both English and in Spanish would be in violation of the above-referenced code and subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code section 8025 (d). There is nothing inherently wrong with reporting in another language, however the reporter would not be allowed to certify the foreign language portion. The problem the Board sees is with the certification of a transcript in a language other than English as that is outside the scope of what the Board tests as far as competence to practice court reporting. When a reporter certifies that the entire transcript is correct, that would include the foreign language portion. It is misleading to the consumer as it implies the reporter has some type of state certification to report and transcribe the foreign language, when in fact there is no state certification for that.

Q I recently got married and changed my name. I received a backorder for a transcript that I reported under my previous name. Which name do I use on the cover and cert pages?

A If your maiden name were Mary Jones and your married name were Mary Smith, you might consider using Mary (Jones) Smith on the cover page so that you don’t create confusion among the parties by having a completely new name appear in the record of the proceedings. On the cert page, however, you should use the name you have associated with your license number, exactly as it appears in the CRB’s records. (Please see A Note from Jennifer’s Desk on page 10 for a reminder on the legal requirements associated with a name change.)

Regulations Update: Scope of Practice

The Court Reporters Board approved the proposed Scope of Practice regulations at its meeting on March 14, 2014, in Los Angeles. The regulation package will now be reviewed by the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency before going to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) by July 15, 2014. The OAL will review the package to ensure it meets the standards set in the Administrative Procedure Act regarding authority, reference, consistency, clarity, nonduplication and necessity. For the exact language of the proposed regulations change, visit our Web site at www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov or contact Paula Bruning at Paula.Bruning@dca.ca.gov.
CSR Spotlight

Jeri Cain

As soon as she laid eyes on a steno machine, Jeri Cain knew that her life’s work would be court reporting.

It was her senior year of high school when a speaker from the local business college presented her graduating class with a few career curriculums the school offered. “I saw this industry as a way to educate myself and become a better member of society,” she recalled. “I enjoy learning new words and learning about so many careers and facets of life, as well as talking with the clients and witnesses and meeting a stream of new people every week. I also enjoy learning from other reporters and how current technology can improve my skills.”

She completed stenotype theory at Valley College in San Bernardino, California, and attended Bryan College of Court Reporting in Los Angeles. Shortly after earning state certification in 1972, Ms. Cain received the Certificate of Merit through the National Court Reporters Association. In 1974, she established Jeri Cain, CSR, Inc., doing business as Merit Reporting. Later, the business name was changed to Merit Reporting and Video to reflect technological changes in the industry and the addition of video to the deposition process. In 2001, she added a video conference center; then in 2010, she opened another office in Santa Maria, California, offering business-quality videoconferencing and videography. Her full-service firm provides freelance court reporting, videography and video conferencing to the legal community as well as government offices and local school districts. It focuses on depositions, hearings for governmental agencies, school districts, governing boards, and reporting civil trials in the local courts.

Some of Ms. Cain’s additional accomplishments include acquiring the Certificate of Proficiency and the designations of Registered Professional Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter, and Certified LiveNote Reporter. She also holds a California Certificate in Realtime Reporting and placed second in the state speed contest given by the California Court Reporters Association.

It’s no secret that technology has had a significant effect on the industry over the years. “When I entered the field of reporting, the current method of producing a transcript was through dictation or what was referred to as note-reading, where the dictated word was typewritten onto onionskin paper with carefully-placed carbon paper, using an IBM Selectric and a Dictaphone with a foot pedal,” she recalled. “In the 1970s and 60s, the court process was much slower than today. It was common to take a month to six weeks to produce a transcript. I suppose you could say life seemed slower then. With the advent of technology, producing a final transcript has become a daily request in our industry. With the ability to use the benefits of technology and the current demand upon us for instant results, stress has become a reporter’s daily companion. Insurance companies have evolved to become our bosses and bankers,” she said.

What advice would she give someone considering this career? “Choose your reporting curriculum and CAT software wisely, and keep current on the new features of your CAT system,” she said. “Being affiliated with the best reporting school programs that teach solid realtime theory will enable you to rise to the top of your career quickly.”

She added that success in the field also requires patience, a pleasant disposition, good reading and vocabulary skills, and the ability to maintain composure during stressful situations.
The Board voted to establish four task forces at the November 19, 2013 meeting to address specific requests for guidance from the court reporting industry.

Board Chairperson Toni O’Neill volunteered to chair the Electronic Record/Signatures Task Force. She appointed Davina Hurt as the chairperson of the Best Practices Pointers Task Force, and she named Rosalie Kramm as the chairperson of the two remaining task forces — Exhibit Handling and Interpreted Depositions.

**Electronic Record/Signatures Task Force**

At the March 14, 2014 meeting, Ms. O’Neill reported that the National Court Reporters Association (NCRA) has in place a working group to review and analyze the issue of digital signatures at a national level. Because the CRB has been sucessful in the past building upon informaiton generated by NCRA committees, rather than reinventing the wheel, Ms. O’Neill decided to delay convening this task force until the NCRA report is released.

**Best Practices Pointers Task Force**

At the same meeting, Chairperson Hurt reported that she has selected her task force members and expects to convene in July. The initial meeting will be organizational in nature, with the task force compiling a potential list of topics as well as formulating a plan for developing each best practice pointer. She envisions relatively short presentations to be disseminated via a variety of methods, from inclusion in the renewal notices to possible video presentations on the Board’s Web site. This task force will help fulfill part of the Board’s strategic plan, improving communication to its licensees on ways to improve their practice.

**Exhibit Handling Task Force**

Chairperson Kramm also reported at the March meeting that she had selected her task force members. She expects to convene the group during the summer, with the mission of producing best practices for handling exhibits in one meeting.

**Interpreted Depositions Task Force**

Chairperson Kramm also selected most of her members for the Interpreted Depositions Task Force, but is still seeking an interpreter to join the group. This task force also plans to meet this summer.

The Exhibit Handling Task Force and the Interpreted Depositions Task Force were created in response to a request from subject matter experts who work in creating the Board’s written licensing exams. Each test question must be directly linked to a resource. There is little governing exhibits in the court reporting codes, so a best practices document was requested, which will improve the test and also be a useful resource to the licensing community.
Technology Update:
Creating a Strong Password

No one likes to think about having his or her computer hacked or the possibility of having private information stolen. The best defense against this type of violation is having really strong passwords in place. Here are some tips to consider when creating your password to protect yourself:

- The strongest password is at least eight characters long — the longer the password, the stronger it is.
- Avoid using a complete word, including your user name, real name, company name, family member’s name, pet, hometown, sports team or hobby.
- Include at least one of the following: uppercase letter, lowercase letter, number, symbol.

Have we just taken away all your inspiration for a new password? How about thinking of a phrase and adapting that. For instance, “I love to play hockey” could become iLuv2pL@yh0cK*y. Another technique is to use the first letter of each word in the phrase as the starting point. As an example, “Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country” could be adapted into “nItTf@gmtCtt@0tc.”

The longer the password, the stronger the password, but that can make it difficult to remember, especially with the addition of random capitalization or numbers and symbols. Feel free to write your password down, but don’t post it on your computer or leave it in the top of your desk drawer, and don’t label it “Password.”

If you’d like to see how strong your password is, check it out at Howsecureismypassword.net.

The final tip is to change your password often. Yes, it’s a chore, but ask yourself if it’s quicker to change all of your bank and identity information or a handful of passwords instead.
The Court Reporters Board of California is pleased to welcome the following people to the rolls of licensed California court reporters:

- Nichole Alexander, Reno, NV, CSR 13909
- Bailey Andrews, Reedley, CA, CSR 13892
- Ashley Balderama, Visalia, CA, CSR 13920
- Mary Banuelos, Santa Paula, CA, CSR 13933
- Carrie Campbell, St. Louis, MO, CSR 13921
- Steven Cardoso, San Leandro, CA, CSR 13908
- Joy Chiou, Hacienda Heights, CA, CSR 13899
- Cheryl Chiu, Saratoga, CA, CSR 13914
- Ronald Cook, Redmond, WA, CSR 13928
- Chere Davis, Murrieta, CA, CSR 13910
- Kelli Diaz, Fresno, CA, CSR 13930
- Pamela Dixon, Yucca Valley, CA, CSR 13915
- Danielle Dzioba, Lincoln, CA, CSR 13923
- Natchez Fowler, Los Angeles, CA, CSR 13913
- Amanda Johnson, Modesto, CA, CSR 13922
- Melinda Johnson, Murrieta, CA, CSR 13931
- Amanda Kallas, Lomita, CA, CSR 13901
- Kim Krueger, Carmichael, CA, CSR 13932
- Alicia Lindsey, Corona, CA, CSR 13895
- Kayla Lotstein, Buena Park, CA, CSR 13916
- Juliann McCance, Claremont, CA, CSR 13894
- Elizabeth Mesa, Menifee, CA, CSR 13903
- Michelle Murray, Rohnert Park, CA, CSR 13896
- Jamie Onuki, Orange, CA, CSR 13904
- Luis Orellana, San Diego, CA, CSR 13926
- Kristi Papenfus, Newbury Park, CA, CSR 13900
- Julie Park, Lakewood, CA, CSR 13925
- Michelle Perez, Victorville, CA, CSR 13891
- Ivy Reid, Anaheim Hills, CSR 13897
- Jacqueline Reitenbach, North Highlands, CA, CSR 13919
- Monique Reyes, Vacaville, CA, CSR 13927
- Shannon Riddell, Costa Mesa, CA, CSR 13893
- Erica Riddle, Murrieta, CA, CSR 13917
- Christine Sadorra Diep, Los Angeles, CA, CSR 13911
- Melissa Sarabia, Fresno, CA, CSR 13906
- Angela Sinclair, Stockton, CA, CSR 13902
- Nicholas Steckel, San Diego, CA, CSR 13912
- Lorena Tassi, Los Angeles, CA, CSR 13929
- Alissa Tinney, Sacramento, CA, CSR 13907
- Priscilla Velasco, Fresno, CA, CSR 13905
- Danielle Ware, Moreno Valley, CA, CSR 13918
- Vanessa Zaragoza, Palmdale, CA, CSR 13924
- Forrest Zoslocki, Fresno, CA, CSR 13898

Court Reporters Board of California - Citations and Fines Issued September 2013 - April 2014

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 following respondents’ Citation and Fines that reflect “Satisfied” have been satisfactorily resolved. Payment of a fine is not an admission to the violation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT NAME - CITY</th>
<th>LICENSE NO.</th>
<th>DATE ISSUED</th>
<th>VIOLATION</th>
<th>SATISFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tilden, Lisa - Sacramento County</td>
<td>11465</td>
<td>04/22/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONDENT NAME - CITY</td>
<td>LICENSE NO.</td>
<td>DATE ISSUED</td>
<td>VIOLATION</td>
<td>SATISFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valtierra-Zertuche, Maria - Solano County</td>
<td>12417</td>
<td>03/11/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (f): Loss or destruction of stenographic notes; Government Code Section 69955 (e): Time requirements for retention of stenographic notes. (failed to retain stenographic notes as required by Code and unable to produce transcript)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustamante, Christina - San Bernardino County</td>
<td>5529</td>
<td>02/20/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Code of Civil Procedure Section 2025.470: Suspension of deposition (failure to properly suspend the taking of testimony as required by Code)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papale, Valerie - Sonoma County</td>
<td>6899</td>
<td>02/19/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (f): Loss or destruction of stenographic notes; Government Code Section 69955 (e): Time requirements for retention of stenographic notes. (failed to retain stenographic notes as required by Code and unable to produce transcript)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedstrom, Leslie - San Diego County</td>
<td>8130</td>
<td>02/19/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Fraud, dishonesty... unprofessional conduct; Government Code Section 69950 (a) and (b), 69954 (b): Fees for transcription of court transcripts. (failed to comply with statutory rates as outlined in Code)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennelly, Yvonne - Contra Costa County</td>
<td>5495</td>
<td>01/17/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d) and (j) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2473 Minimum Transcript Format Standards (MTFS). (failed to comply with MTFS)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGarry, Lisa - Riverside County</td>
<td>13114</td>
<td>01/17/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d) and (e): Unprofessional conduct... availability, delivery, execution and certification of transcripts... (failed to produce transcript)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orsenico, Lynne - Humboldt County</td>
<td>9914</td>
<td>10/08/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applegate, Shelly - Fresno County</td>
<td>9675</td>
<td>09/17/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Court Reporters Board of California - Disciplinary Actions December 2013 - April 2014

The disciplinary actions listed below cover the period of time from December 2013 to April 2014. To find out whether a licensee has had disciplinary action prior to December 2013, 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 or revocation and/or a probationary status with conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT NAME - CITY</th>
<th>LICENSE NO.</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE DATE</th>
<th>CHARGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culy, Candyce - Fresno County</td>
<td>9065</td>
<td>Default Decision and Order; license revocation.</td>
<td>04/14/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure to transcribe notes; Section 8025 (h): Failure to pay civil penalties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez, Patricia - Yolo County</td>
<td>6875</td>
<td>Default Decision and Order; license revocation.</td>
<td>04/07/2014</td>
<td>Business and Professions Code Section 8025 (h) and CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2480 (e): Failure to comply with Citation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duran, Monet - Los Angeles County</td>
<td>12301</td>
<td>Default Decision and Order; license revocation.</td>
<td>02/28/2014</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (j) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2475 (a) and (b)(4): Violation of professional standards of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moen, Darla</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Decision and Order; license denied.</td>
<td>02/20/2014</td>
<td>Business and Professions Code Section 8025 (a): Conviction of a crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales, Edwina - San Diego County</td>
<td>11978</td>
<td>Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order; 2 years probation.</td>
<td>12/19/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (a) and 490: Conviction of a crime; Section 8025 (b): Failure to notify Board of conviction; Section 8025 (c): Fraud or misrepresentation to obtain license renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard, Patrick - King County, WA</td>
<td>11055</td>
<td>Stipulated Surrender of License</td>
<td>12/19/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure... to transcribe notes. Failure to obey all laws; Failure to comply with Board's probation program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Joan - Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>12912</td>
<td>Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order; 3 years probation; $2,490 cost recovery.</td>
<td>12/19/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (a) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2470: Conviction of a crime; Section 8025 (b): Failure to notify Board of conviction; Section 8025 (c): Fraud or misrepresentation to obtain license renewal; Section 8025(d): Unprofessional conduct/dishonest act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Melissa - Santa Clara County</td>
<td>12284</td>
<td>Default Decision and Order; license revocation.</td>
<td>12/19/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (j) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2475 (b)(4): Violation of professional standards of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONDENT NAME - CITY</td>
<td>LICENSE NO.</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>EFFECTIVE DATE</td>
<td>CHARGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Stephanie - Riverside County</td>
<td>12746</td>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>12/05/2013</td>
<td>Business and Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Incompetence in the practice of shorthand reporting; Section 8025 (j) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2473 (a): Violation of minimum transcript format standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohanesian, Susan - Alameda County</td>
<td>13528</td>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>11/25/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (a) and 490: Conviction of a crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pun, Wendy - San Francisco County</td>
<td>12891</td>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>11/25/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure to transcribe notes; Section 8025 (h): Failure to pay civil penalties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruihl, Easteller - San Francisco County</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>10/09/2013</td>
<td>Accusation: Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Fraud, dishonesty, and/or unprofessional conduct. Petition to Revoke Probation: First Cause – Failure to obey all laws; Second Cause – Failure to comply with Board's probation program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallardo, Yvette - Monterey County</td>
<td>12889</td>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>09/25/2013</td>
<td>Business &amp; Professions Code Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure to transcribe notes; Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (j) in conjunction with CA Code of Regulations, Title 16, Section 2475 (b)(4): Violation of professional standards of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roux, Jennifer - Sonoma County</td>
<td>11033</td>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>03/25/2013</td>
<td>Business and Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure to transcribe notes; Section 8025 (g): Failure to comply with court requests for transcripts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>