

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2023-2024 Regular Session

AB 3049 (Bryan)
Version: April 17, 2024
Hearing Date: June 18, 2024
Fiscal: No
Urgency: No
AWM

SUBJECT

Dependency: court hearings

DIGEST

This bill clarifies that a nonminor dependent has the right to be present at a hearing on their case in the juvenile court, and imposes on a juvenile court the right to inquire about certain matters relating to a minor or nonminor dependent's appearance and contact with counsel.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Children who are at risk of abuse, neglect, or abandonment may be deemed dependents of the juvenile court and provided with services, supports and interventions aimed at protecting them and their health and safety. The system aims to preserve and strengthen families by maintaining or reuniting children with their parents whenever appropriate. To protect the interests of the child or nonminor dependent at the heart of the case, current law requires a juvenile court to appoint counsel for the minor or nonminor dependent. Current law provides a minor, but not a non-minor dependent, to be present at a juvenile court hearing about their case and provides that a minor, but not a non-minor dependent, has the right at a review hearing to address the court and participate in the hearing.

This bill corrects the apparent oversight in the law by extending to nonminor dependents the right to be present at, and participate in, a hearing on their case. The bill also, in response to concerns raised about the efficacy of minor's counsel in dependency cases, requires courts, at each hearing on a dependency matter, to ask the minor or nonminor dependent certain questions about their appearance and most recent opportunity to confer with counsel. The author has agreed to amend the bill to modify some of the inquiry requirements in response to concerns from stakeholders.

This bill is sponsored by Advokids and is supported by 17 organizations dedicated to children in foster care and over 200 individuals. This bill is opposed by the Judicial Council of California. If this Committee passes this bill, it will then be heard by the Senate Human Services Committee.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that it is the duty of an attorney to maintain inviolate the confidence, and at every peril to themselves to preserve the secrets, of their client. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6068(e)(1).)
 - a) An attorney may, but is not required to, reveal confidential information relating to the representation of a client to the extent that the attorney reasonably believes the disclosure is necessary to prevent a criminal act that the attorney reasonably believes is likely to result in the death of, or substantial bodily harm to, an individual. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6068(e)(2).)
- 2) Provides that the client, whether or not a party, has a privilege to refuse to disclose, and to prevent another from disclosing, a confidential communication between client and lawyer if the privilege is claimed by:
 - a) The holder of the privilege, as defined (usually the client);
 - b) A person who is authorized to claim the privilege by the holder of the privilege; or
 - c) The person who was the lawyer at the time of the confidential communication, unless there is no holder of the privilege in existence or they were otherwise instructed by a person authorized to permit disclosure. (Evid. Code, §§ 953, 954.)
- 3) Requires the lawyer who received or made a communication subject to the privilege shall claim the privilege whenever they are present when the communication is sought to be disclosed and is authorized to claim the privilege, subject to specified exceptions. (Evid. Code, §§ 955, 961.)
- 4) Establishes the juvenile court, which is intended to provide for the protection and safety of the public and minors falling under its jurisdiction. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 202, 245.)
- 5) Establishes that the juvenile court has jurisdiction over:
 - a) A child who is subject to abuse or neglect. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 300.)
 - b) A child, when that child has committed acts that trigger delinquency jurisdiction rendering the child a ward. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 601, 602.)
 - c) Any nonminor dependent, between the age of majority and 21 years, under specified conditions. A nonminor dependent under the jurisdiction of the

juvenile court retains their legal decision-making authority as an adult, except as specified. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 303, 388(e).)

- 6) Requires a juvenile court to appoint counsel for a child or nonminor dependent if they are not represented. A primary responsibility of the counsel is to represent a child or nonminor dependent and to advocate for the protection, safety, and physical and emotional well-being of the child or nonminor dependent. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317(c)(1), (2).)
- 7) Requires counsel appointed under 8) to have a caseload and training that ensures adequate representation of the child or nonminor dependent, which shall be set forth in rules of court promulgated by the Judicial Council. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317(c)(5).)
- 8) Provides that counsel appointed under 8) shall be charged in general with the representation of the child's interests, and to that end, counsel:
 - a) Shall make or cause to have made any further investigations that they deem in good faith to be reasonably necessary to ascertain the facts, including interviewing witnesses, and examine and cross-examine witnesses at the adjudicatory and dispositional hearings.
 - b) May introduce and examine their own witnesses, make recommendations to the court concerning the child's welfare, and participate further in the proceedings to the degree necessary to adequately represent the child.
 - c) When appointed to represent a nonminor dependent, must represent the interests of the nonminor dependent except when advocating for those wishes conflicts with the protection or safety of the nonminor dependent.
 - d) If the child is four years of age or older, must interview the child to determine the child's best interests and assess the child's well-being, and shall advise the court of the child's wishes. Counsel shall not advocate for the return of the child if, to their best knowledge, return of the child conflicts with the protection and safety of the child.
 - e) Shall investigate the interests of the child beyond the scope of the juvenile proceeding, and report to the court other interests of the child that may need to be protected by the institution of other administrative or judicial proceedings. Counsel representing a child in a dependency proceeding is not required to assume the responsibilities of a social worker, and is not expected to provide nonlegal services to the child. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317(e).)
- 9) Provides that a minor who is the subject of a juvenile court hearing is entitled to be present at the hearing, and may be represented by counsel at the hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 349(a), (b).)
- 10) Provides that, if a minor is present at the hearing, the court shall inform the minor that they have the right to address the court and participate in the hearing and the

court shall allow the minor, if they desire, to address the court and participate in the hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 349(c).)

- 11) Provides that, if a minor is 10 years of age or older and they are not present at the hearing, counsel shall determine whether the minor was properly notified of their right to attend the hearing and inquire whether they were given an opportunity to attend.
 - a) If that minor was not properly notified or if they wished to be present and were not given the opportunity to be present, the court shall continue the hearing to allow the minor to be present unless the court finds that it is in the best interest of the minor not to continue the hearing.
 - b) The court shall continue the hearing under 13)(a) only for that period of time necessary to provide notice and secure the presence of the child, and may issue any and all orders reasonably necessary to ensure that the minor has the opportunity to attend. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 349(d).)

Existing rules of court:

- 1) Provides that every party in a dependency proceeding who is represented by an attorney is entitled to competent counsel, which is defined as “an attorney who is a member in good standing of the State Bar of California, who has participated in training in the law of juvenile dependency, and who demonstrates adequate forensic skills, knowledge and comprehension of the statutory scheme, the purposes and goals of dependency proceedings, the specific statutes, rules of court, and cases relevant to such proceedings, and procedures for filing petitions for extraordinary writs.” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.660(d) & (d)(1).)
- 2) Requires the following from counsel representing a party in a dependency proceeding:
 - a) Attorneys or their agents are expected to meet regularly with clients, including clients who are children, regardless of the age of the child or the child's ability to communicate verbally, to contact social workers and other professionals associated with the client's case, to work with other counsel and the court to resolve disputed aspects of a case without contested hearing, and to adhere to the mandated timelines. The attorney for the child must have sufficient contact with the child to establish and maintain an adequate and professional attorney-client relationship. The attorney for the child is not required to assume the responsibilities of a social worker and is not expected to perform services for the child that are unrelated to the child's legal representation.
 - b) The attorney for a child for whom a dependency petition has been filed must provide their contact information to the child's caregiver no later than 10 days after receipt of the name, address, and telephone number of the child's caregiver. If the child is 10 years of age or older, the attorney must also

provide their contact information to the child for whom a dependency petition has been filed no later than 10 days after receipt of the caregiver's contact information. The attorney may give contact information to a child for whom a dependency petition has been filed who is under 10 years of age. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.660(d)(4) & (5).)

- 3) Requires the juvenile court to establish a process for the review and resolution of complaints or questions by a party regarding the performance of an appointed attorney. Each party must be informed of the procedure for logging the complaint. If it is determined that an appointed attorney has acted improperly or contrary to the rules of policies of the court, the court must take appropriate action. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.660(e).)

This bill:

- 1) Clarifies that existing provisions in the Welfare and Institutions Code relating to the right to be present at the hearing, the right that they are entitled to be represented by counsel, and the right to address the court and participate in the hearing, extend to nonminor dependents.
- 2) Provides that, if a minor or nonminor dependent participates in a hearing by virtual or telephonic means, the court shall inquire as to whether the minor or nonminor dependent wished to be physically present at the hearing; if the minor or nonminor dependent wished to be physically present, the court shall continue the hearing to allow them to attend, unless the court finds that the continuance would be contrary to the interest of the minor or nonminor dependent.
- 3) Provides that, at a hearing if the minor is attending in-person or virtually, the court shall ask the minor or nonminor dependent if they have had an opportunity to consult with their counsel; if the minor or nonminor dependent has not had an opportunity to consult with their counsel, the court shall allow the minor or nonminor dependent an opportunity to consult with their counsel prior to proceeding with the hearing.
- 4) Provides that, if the minor or nonminor dependent is not present at the hearing, the court shall determine whether the minor or nonminor dependent had an opportunity to consult with their counsel.
 - a) The court shall continue the hearing to allow counsel to personally contact the minor or nonminor dependent to assess their well-being and determine their wishes with respect to the issues presently before the court, unless the court finds that it is in the best interest of the minor or nonminor dependent not to continue the hearing, or that the minor or nonminor dependent waived their right to be physically present at the hearing.

- b) The court shall continue the hearing only for that period of time necessary to provide counsel with a reasonable amount of time to personally contact the minor or nonminor dependent.
 - c) Nothing in 4) shall be construed to permit counsel to violate a minor or nonminor dependent's attorney-client privilege.
- 5) Provides that counsel for a minor or nonminor dependent, or their agents, are expected to meet regularly with their client, regardless of the age of the client or the client's ability to communicate verbally; and that counsel for the minor or nonminor dependent shall have sufficient personal contact with the minor or nonminor dependent to establish and maintain an adequate and professional attorney-client relationship.
- 6) Provides that counsel shall not waive the appearance of their client who is 10 years of age or older unless counsel has received direction from the minor or nonminor dependent and counsel has interviewed the minor or nonminor dependent to determine their wishes and to assess their well-being.
- 7) Specifies that, if a local rule extends the rights granted to minors aged 10 years or older to minors under 10 years of age, the court shall apply the rights granted in 6) and in 13) of the "Existing law" section to a minor under 10 years of age.

COMMENTS

1. Author's comment

According to the author:

At any given moment, there are over 40,000 children in the foster care system in California. These children depend on their court-appointed counsel to help them navigate an often traumatic and confusing dependency process. But, in some counties across California, dependency attorneys are failing to meet with their clients before representing them in court and advocating for life-altering decisions that they claim are in the child's best interests. AB 3049 will expand existing judicial oversight over court-appointed dependency attorneys, requiring that a judge continue a hearing if they find that the child has not had an opportunity to consult their attorney. During periods of instability, a child's attorney should be a reliable constant and advocate for them. This bill will bring accountability to the dependency court system and ensure that when decisions are made about a child in the foster care system, that decision is informed by the child's own opinions and lived experiences.

2. Background on the dependency process and the minor or nonminor dependent's rights at dependency proceedings

The overarching goal of dependency proceedings is to safeguard the welfare of California's children.¹ Welfare and Institutions Code section 300 sets forth the circumstances that can bring a child within the jurisdiction of the juvenile dependency court. " 'Although the harm or risk of harm to the child [for jurisdictional purposes] must generally be the result of an act, omission or inability of one of the parents or guardians, the central focus of dependency jurisdiction is clearly on the child rather than the parent.' " ² California's dependency jurisdiction also extends to adults 18 years of age but younger than 21 years of age, if they were in the foster system at the time they turned 18 years and other criteria are met; these dependents are known as "nonminor dependents."³

When a child is found to be under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, the court is determined to be a dependent of that court and the court may begin proceedings to remove the child from the custody of their parent(s); if, after a series of hearings, a parent is found to be unfit, the court can terminate the parent's parental rights.⁴ The overarching inquiry is whether the child would suffer, or is likely to suffer, harm if they remain with their parent.

If a minor or nonminor dependent does not have counsel in a dependency proceeding, the court shall appoint counsel for them.⁵ Current law also extends several protections to minors relating to their appearance and representation at dependency proceedings, which include:

- The right to be present at a hearing at which they are the subject.
- The right to be given notice that they have the right to be represented by the counsel of their own choice.
- Being informed by the court, if the minor is present at the hearing, that they have the right to address the court and participate in the hearing; if the minor so desires, the court shall allow the minor to address the court and participate in the hearing.
- If the minor is 10 years of age or older and not present at the hearing, requiring the court to determine whether the court was properly notified of their right to attend and to inquire whether the minor was given that opportunity. If the minor was not properly notified or they wished to attend but were not given the opportunity, the court shall continue the hearing to allow the minor to be present unless the court finds it is in the best interest of the child not to continue the

¹ *In re Josiah Z.* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 664, 673.

² *In re R.T.*, 3 Cal.5th 622, 626.

³ Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 303, 388(e).

⁴ *See id.*, §§ 360, 361.3, 366.26.

⁵ *Id.*, § 317(c).

hearing; the continuance shall be only as long as necessary to provide notice and secure the presence of the child.⁶

Current law does not, however, expressly provide these rights to nonminor dependents.⁷

3. Questions about counsel representing dependent minors and nonminor dependents

In 2024, the sponsor of this bill, Advokids, released the result of a survey they conducted with the Western Center on Law and Poverty and Akin Gump regarding minor's counsel in dependency cases.⁸ The survey presented the responses of 879 caregivers and 190 former foster youth, which painted a concerning picture about the state of counsel representing foster children and youth in California. Over 43 percent of respondents stated that the counsel never provided their name and contact information to the foster child or caregiver;⁹ 65 percent reported that the appointed attorney never met with their client;¹⁰ and over 80 percent of respondents from the Counties of Butte, Fresno, Kern, Riverside, and Stanislaus reported that the appointed attorney never met with their clients.¹¹

Some organizations providing court-appointed counsel for minors have questioned the accuracy of the survey's numbers. They note, for example, that the survey responses were not proportional to the population of each county, and some counties had no responses at all.¹² They also note that participation in the survey was not randomized, but instead elicited by Advokids, including through posts on social media and from individuals who had contacted Advokids' hotline.¹³ It is therefore unclear to what extent the numbers in the survey are representative of the statewide experience.

Even if the numbers in the survey are not entirely accurate, however, the fact that some counsel are not adequately engaging with their minor clients presents a serious policy issue. While court-appointed counsel are not required to provide the same services as social workers,¹⁴ an attorney must, at a minimum, contact their client, interview them to

⁶ *Id.*, § 349.

⁷ *See ibid.*

⁸ *See*, Coyne, et al., *Out of Sight, Out of Mind: When Children in Foster Care in California Don't Meet Their Court-Appointed Attorneys* (2024).

⁹ *Id.* at p. 15.

¹⁰ *Id.* at p. 3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Id.* at p. 14.

¹³ *Id.* at p. 12.

¹⁴ Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317(3)(3).

determine their needs and their best interests, and be available for outreach if the client so desires.¹⁵

4. This bill is intended to strengthen minors' and nonminor dependents' rights with respect to hearing and increase court oversight of court-appointed counsel

This bill responds to the issues raised by the Advokids survey by imposing new requirements on courts and court-appointed counsel for minors and nonminor dependents.

First, the bill clarifies that nonminor dependents have the same rights as minors with respect to being present at and participating in their hearings. Committee staff are not aware of evidence suggesting that there was a deliberate policy choice to omit nonminor dependents from the statute in question, so this change appears to merely correct an oversight.

Second, the bill adds new inquiries a court must make at a dependency hearing, depending on whether and how the minor or nonminor is present:

- If the minor or nonminor dependent participates at the hearing through virtual means, the court must inquire as to whether the minor or nonminor dependent wished to be physically present; if so, the court shall continue the hearing to permit them to be physically present, unless the court finds the continuance would be contrary to their interest.
- If the minor or nonminor dependent is present at the hearing (virtually or in person), the court must ask them if they had the opportunity to consult with counsel; if they did not, the court shall allow them an opportunity to consult with counsel.
- If the minor or nonminor dependent is not present at the hearing, the court shall determine whether the minor or nonminor dependent had an opportunity to consult with counsel. The court shall continue the hearing to allow counsel to personally contact the minor or nonminor dependent to assess their well-being and determine their wishes to the issues presently before the court, unless the court finds it is in the best interest of the minor or nonminor dependent not to continue the hearing or that the minor or nonminor dependent waived their right to be physically present at the hearing. The court shall continue the hearing only for the period of time necessary to provide counsel with a reasonable amount of time to personally contact the minor or nonminor dependent. Nothing in this requirement permits counsel to violate the minor or nonminor dependent's attorney-client privilege.

¹⁵ *Id.*, § 317(e); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.660. Minor dependency counsel in Los Angeles uses a longstanding "agent" model, whereby agents for counsel conduct some portion of the face-to-face interactions with clients; this analysis does not call into question that model.

Third, the bill states that counsel for the minor or nonminor dependent or their agents are expected to meet with the client regularly, regardless of age or ability to communicate verbally, and that counsel should have sufficient personal contact with the client to establish and maintain an adequate and professional attorney-client relationship.

Fourth, the bill prohibits counsel from waiving the appearance of a minor who is 10 years of age or older, unless counsel has received direction from the client and has interviewed the client to determine their wishes and to assess their well-being.

Finally, the bill requires, in courts where local rules confer privileges relating to notice about the opportunity to attend or waiving the right to appear on minors under 10 years of age, that the court also apply the rights relating to notice and appearance set forth for minors aged 10 years or older to the minors covered by that local rule.

5. Concerns about the bill and amendments

This Committee has received concerns from stakeholders regarding the scope of the bill and individual provisions within it. At a high level, some, including the Judicial Council, argue that individual juvenile courts are not the appropriate institutions to engage in the kind of oversight sought by the author and sponsor. Judicial Council also argues that the bill unduly shifts counsel's responsibilities onto the court and interferes with the attorney-client relationship of the client. Others argue that particular provisions of the bill do not account for how minors, especially young ones, may react to direct questions to the court, and that portions of the bill do not allow attorneys to use agents in circumstances where doing so would be consistent with the counsel's duties to their client.

In response to concerns from stakeholders, the author has agreed to amend the bill as set forth below, subject to any nonsubstantive technical changes the Office of Legislative Counsel may make. Additions are in bold and underline, and deletions are in strikethrough:

Amendment 1

At page 3, in lines 15-23, modify paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) as follows:

(2) If the minor or nonminor dependent ~~participates at~~ **participates at** the hearing by ~~virtual or telephonic means~~, the court shall **inform** ~~inquire as to whether~~ the minor or nonminor dependent ~~that they have the right~~ **wished** to be physically present at the hearing. If the minor or nonminor dependent wished to be physically present at the hearing, the court shall **allow the minor or nonminor dependent an opportunity to consult with their counsel. If, after the consultation, counsel for the minor or nonminor dependent requests to** continue the hearing to allow the

minor or nonminor dependent to be physically present, **the court shall grant the request** unless the court finds that **it is in the best interest of the minor not to continue the hearing**~~the continuance would be contrary to the interest of the minor or nonminor dependent.~~

Amendment 2

At page 3, in lines 24-30, modify paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) as follows:

(3) ~~The court shall also~~ **If the minor or nonminor dependent is present at the hearing, the court shall** ask the minor or nonminor dependent, ~~whether they are present at the hearing or participating by virtual or telephonic means, if they have had an opportunity to consult with their counsel. If the minor or nonminor dependent has not had an opportunity to consult with their counsel, the court shall allow the minor or nonminor dependent an opportunity to consult with their counsel prior to proceeding with the hearing.~~

Amendment 3

At page 3, lines 31-35 and page 4, lines 1-15, modify paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) as follows:

(d) (1) If the minor or nonminor dependent is not present at the hearing **and has not waived their right to be present at the hearing, and the minor or nonminor dependent has not had**, ~~the court shall determine whether the minor or nonminor dependent had an opportunity to consult with their counsel, **the court may**.~~ ~~The court shall continue the hearing to~~ **provide** ~~allow counsel~~ **with a reasonable amount of time to contact the minor or nonminor dependent.** ~~to personally contact the minor or nonminor dependent to assess their well-being and determine their wishes with respect to the issues presently before the court, unless the court finds that it is in the best interest of the minor or nonminor dependent not to continue the hearing, or that the minor or nonminor dependent waived their right to be physically present at the hearing.~~ The court shall continue the hearing only for that period of time necessary to provide counsel **or their agent** with a reasonable amount of time to ~~personally~~ contact the minor or nonminor dependent. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to permit counsel to violate a minor's or nonminor dependent's attorney-client privilege.

Amendment 4

At page 4, in lines 17-22, modify the first sentence of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) as follows:

(2) (A) ~~If in the case of~~ a minor 10 years of age or older, or a nonminor dependent, ~~who is not present at the hearing, the court shall also determine~~ whether the minor or nonminor dependent was properly notified of their right to attend the hearing and inquire whether the minor or nonminor dependent was given an opportunity to attend.

Amendment 5

Move the new subdivision (e), set forth at page 4, lines 37-40, and page 5, lines 1-3, into a new subdivision in Welfare and Institutions Code section 317.

Amendment 6

At page 5, delete line 6 after “dependent” and delete lines 6-8, inclusive.

6. Arguments in support

According to Advokids, the bill’s sponsor:

Welfare and Institutions Code section 349 addresses the rights of children to be present and represented by counsel at hearings in their own dependency cases and in those of their siblings. It presently requires the court to inquire why a child age 10 or older is not present in court and to continue the matter to secure the child’s right to be present, unless the court finds that a continuance is not in the best interests of the child.

AB 3049 will amend Welfare and Institutions Code Section 349, to require the court to determine whether a child or youth who is not present at a hearing, had an opportunity to consult with counsel prior to the hearing and authorize a continuance when necessary to allow for counsel to meet with the child or youth, except when a continuance is not in the best interests of the child. This amendment will institute judicial oversight of the requirement that counsel have regular contact with their clients, which is essential to counsel’s ability to competently represent the child’s current wishes, needs, and circumstances.

7. Arguments in opposition

According to the Judicial Council of California:

AB 3049 is based on a flawed premise that court appointed counsel for children and youth in California are routinely failing to represent the interests of their clients. The sponsor of AB 3049, Advokids, conducted a nonrandom survey of caregivers and some former foster youth on this topic and issued a report that alleges that most children in foster care have had no in-person contact with their

attorneys based on the survey results. A group of attorneys who represent about 60 percent of foster children in California issued an open letter contesting the methodology and conclusions of the report. They characterize the report's findings as follows: "their sweeping claim about the lack of contact between children's attorneys and their clients is based on seriously flawed research and erroneous data. The conclusions drawn are irresponsible, misleading, and potentially damaging to the overall goals of high-quality representation, accountability, and adequate funding."

The council concurs with these attorneys that it is not accurate to assert that there is a systemic problem that requires a solution that would impact every juvenile dependency proceeding. Children and youth are represented because their interests are paramount, but it is not consistent with our model of representation for the court to be in the position of interrogating the child or youth without any indication that there is a problem. Judges engage with children in these cases routinely, but some children and youth are not comfortable being put on the spot by a judicial officer. California has provided representation for youth to ensure that their voices are heard regardless of their level of comfort with speaking directly to a judge...

If the Legislature wants to ensure that counsel for children have had an opportunity to consult with their clients prior to a hearing, then section 349 could direct counsel for the child to request these continuances or delays in the proceedings in those cases in which they need time to consult with their clients and require the court to allow for this unless doing so would not be in the best interests of the client.

SUPPORT

Advokids (sponsor)
Allies for Every Child
California Alliance of Caregivers
California Youth Connection
Children Now
Children's Advocacy Institute
Contra Costa Foster Friends
Extraordinary Families
FASD*Now!*
Koinonia Family Services
Koinonia Family Services, Gardena office
Legal Services for Children
Marin Foster Care Association
Mariposa County Resource Parent Support Network

National Center on Adoption and Permanency
Our Village Closet
Sierra Child and Family Services
Western Center on Law and Poverty
Over 200 individuals

OPPOSITION

Judicial Council

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: None known.

Prior Legislation: AB 217 (Maienschein, Ch. 36, Stats. 2015) required a juvenile court, in proceedings where the minor is present, to inform the minor that they have the right to address the court and be present at the hearing.

PRIOR VOTES:

Assembly Floor (Ayes 71, Noes 0)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 15, Noes 0)
Assembly Human Services Committee (Ayes 6, Noes 0)
Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 12, Noes 0)
