

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

AB 3282 (Committee on Judiciary)

Version: June 10, 2024

Hearing Date: June 18, 2024

Fiscal: Yes

Urgency: Yes

AM

SUBJECT

Courts: sale of property

DIGEST

This bill authorizes the Judicial Council of California (Judicial Council) to sell certain court facilities. The bill requires the Judicial Council to identify and report any fees related to civil matters authorized by the Judicial Council or an individual superior court, but not specifically enumerated in statute or otherwise authorized by statute to the Legislature and relevant policy committees, as specified. Prohibits a court from charging a fee identified in the report on and after January 1, 2030. The bill authorizes a superior court, court of appeal, the Supreme Court, and the Judicial Council to participate in the Golden State Financial Marketplace Program.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This bill is the Assembly Judiciary Committee's court omnibus bill, which makes several changes to the statutes governing California's judicial branch. In 2021, the Legislature authorized the Judicial Council to sell specified court properties at fair market value and upon the terms and conditions and subject to the reservations the Judicial Council deems in the best interests of the state, specified that the net proceeds from the sale of the property are to be deposited into the State Court Facilities Construction Fund, and exempted the sale of these properties from the statutes governing surplus lands.¹ This bill seeks to do the same thing for certain specified properties in Plumas and Stanislaus Counties. The bill also requires Judicial Council to identify and report on all fees charged by the judiciary related to civil matters that are not authorized by statute. Lastly, the bill allows a superior court, court of appeal, the Supreme Court, and the Judicial Council to participate in the Golden State Financial Marketplace Program. The bill also contains an urgency statute. No timely support or opposition was received by the Committee.

¹ (AB 143 (Committee on Budget, Ch. 79, Stats. 2021.))

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that the Judicial Council, as the policymaking body for the judicial branch, has the following responsibilities and authorities with regard to court facilities:
 - a) Full responsibility, jurisdiction, control, and authority as an owner would have over trial court facilities, the title of which is held by the state, including, but not limited to, the acquisition and development of facilities;
 - b) The full range of policymaking authority over trial court facilities, including, but not limited to, planning, construction, acquisition, and operation, to the extent not expressly otherwise limited by law; and
 - c) Dispose of surplus court facilities, as specified. (§ 70391.)²

- 2) Requires the Judicial Council to consider the following factors regarding the potential new or planned use of a court facility prior to selling or transferring the facility:
 - a) if the use is compatible with the use of other adjacent public buildings;
 - b) if the use unreasonably departs from the historic or local character of the surrounding property or local community;
 - c) if the use has a negative impact on the local community;
 - d) if the use interferes with other governmental agencies that use or are located in or adjacent to the building containing the court facility; and
 - e) if the use is of sufficient benefit to outweigh the public good in maintaining it as a court facility or building. (§ 70391(c)(3).)

- 3) Permits the Judicial Council to sell specified court properties in Los Angeles, Fresno, and Kings Counties at fair market value and upon the terms and conditions and subject to the reservations the Judicial Council deems in the best interests of the state, if all of the following requirements are satisfied:
 - a) the sales comply with the provisions of 2), above;
 - b) the Judicial Council consults with the county where the property is located concerning the sale of the property; and
 - c) the Judicial Council offers the county in which the property is located the right to purchase the property at fair market value before otherwise offering the property for sale. (§ 70395 – 70397.)

- 4) Requires the Judicial Council, in consultation with the superior court of each county and the county government, to enter into agreements regarding the transfer of responsibility for court facilities from that county to the Judicial Council. (§ 70321.)

² All further references are to the Government Code unless stated otherwise.

- 5) Requires that proceeds from the sale of surplus state property are to be used to pay the principal and interest on bonds issued pursuant to the Economic Recovery Bond Act, and upon the payment of those bonds to be deposited into the Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties, as specified. (Cal. Const. art. III, sec. 9.)
- 6) Provides, pursuant to the California Constitution, that the people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies are required to be open to public scrutiny.
 - a) Requires a statute that limits the public's right of access to be adopted with findings demonstrating the interest protected by the limitation and the need for protecting that interest.
 - b) Requires a statute to be broadly construed if it furthers the people's right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access. (Cal. Const. art. I, Section 3(b)(1).)
- 7) Governs the disclosure of information collected and maintained by public agencies pursuant to the California Public Records Act (CPRA). (§ 7920.00 et seq.)
 - a) Provides that all public records are accessible to the public upon request, unless the record requested is exempt from public disclosure. (§7922.525.)
 - b) Defines "public records" as any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics. (§ 7920.530.)
 - c) Defines "public agency" as any state or local agency. (§ 7920.525.)
 - d) Defines "state agency" as every state office, officer, department, division, bureau, board, and commission or other state body or agency, except those agencies provided for in Article IV (legislative branch, except as provided in § 20) or Article VI (judicial branch) of the California Constitution). (§ 7920.540.)
 - e) Requires that the cost of duplication of an electronic record to be limited to the direct cost of producing a copy of a record in an electronic format. (§ 7922.575.)
 - f) Requires that, unless otherwise prohibited by law, any agency that has information that constitutes an identifiable public record not exempt from disclosure pursuant to this division that is in an electronic format shall make that information available in an electronic format when requested by any person. (Gov. Code § 7922.570.)
- a) Authorizes trial court records to be created, maintained, and preserved in any form or forms of communication or representation, including paper, optical, electronic, magnetic, micrographic, or photographic media or other technology pursuant to the rules adopted by the Judicial Council. (Gov. Code § 68150(a).)
 - a) Requires the Judicial Council to adopt rules to establish the standards or guidelines for the creation, maintenance, reproduction, or preservation of

- court records, including records that must be preserved permanently. The standards or guidelines shall reflect industry standards for each medium used, if those standards exist. The standards or guidelines shall ensure that court records are created and maintained in a manner that ensures accuracy and preserves the integrity of the records throughout their maintenance. (*Id.* at (c).)
- b) Requires these court records to be made reasonably accessible to all members of the public for viewing and duplication as the paper records would have been accessible, unless access is otherwise restricted by law. (*Id.* at (l).)
 - c) Requires reasonable provisions to be made for duplicating the records at cost. (*Ibid.*)
 - d) Cost shall consist of all costs associated with duplicating the records as determined by the court. (*Ibid.*)
- 8) Provides for courts to charge the following fees related to court records;
- a) fifty cents per page to cover the cost of preparing copies of any record, proceeding, or paper on file in the clerk's office;
 - b) one dollar per page, in addition to the fee for the certificate, for comparing with the original on file in the office of the clerk of any court, the copy of any paper, record, or proceeding prepared by another and presented for the clerk's certificate; and
 - c) fifteen dollars for each search of records or files conducted by a court employee that requires more than 10 minutes. (§ 70627.)
- 9) Defines "court record" as consisting of the following:
- a) All filed papers and documents in the case folder, but if no case folder is created by the court, all filed papers and documents that would have been in the case folder if one had been created;
 - b) Administrative records filed in an action or proceeding, depositions, transcripts, including preliminary hearing transcripts, and recordings of electronically recorded proceedings filed, lodged, or maintained in connection with the case, unless disposed of earlier in the case pursuant to law; or
 - c) Other records, as specified. (§ 68151(a).)
- 10) Provides that a judicial branch entity may impose on all requests a fee reasonably calculated to cover the judicial branch entity's direct costs of duplication of a record or of production of a record in an electronic format. The fee includes:
- a) a charge per page, per copy, or otherwise, as established and published by the Judicial Council, or as established by the judicial branch entity following a notice and comment procedure specified by the Judicial Council, representing the direct costs of equipment, supplies, and staff time required to duplicate or produce the requested record; and

- b) any other direct costs of duplication or production, including, but not limited to, the costs incurred by a judicial branch entity in retrieving the record from a remote storage facility or archive and the costs of mailing responsive records. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.500(e)(4)(B).)
- 11) Provides that in the case of requests for records for commercial use, a judicial branch entity may impose, in addition to the fee in 15), above, a fee reasonably calculated to cover the actual costs of staff search and review time, based on an hourly rate for salary and benefits of each employee involved. (*Id.* at (e)(4)(C).)
- 12) Defines for purposes of 11), above:
- a) "Commercial use" means a request for a use or purpose that furthers the commercial, trade, or profit interests of the requester or the person on whose behalf the request is being made. A request from a representative of the news media that supports its news-dissemination function is not a request for a commercial use. (*Id.* at (e)(4)(D)(i).)
 - b) "Representative of the news media" means a person who regularly gathers, prepares, collects, photographs, records, writes, edits, reports, or publishes news or information that concerns local, national, or international events or other matters of public interest for dissemination to the public for a substantial portion of the person's livelihood or for substantial financial gain. (*Id.* at (e)(4)(D)(ii).)
- 13) Authorizes the Department of General Services to structure, administer, and maintain the Golden State Financial Marketplace Program, which is a financing program that is available for use by state agencies, the definition of which does not include judicial branch entities, to finance certain goods and services, as provided. (§ 14930 et. seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Authorizes the Judicial Council to sell specified property in a fair market value transaction and upon the terms and conditions and subject to the reservations the Judicial Council deems in the best interests of the state, if all of the following requirements are satisfied:
 - a) the Judicial Council complies with the existing law regarding the considerations and actions that must be taken prior to the sale of surplus court property;
 - b) the Judicial Council consults with the county in which the property is located concerning the sale of the property; and
 - c) the Judicial Council offers the county in which the property is located the right to purchase the property in a fair market value transaction before otherwise offering the property for sale.

- 2) Provides the specified property in 1), above, is all of the following:
 - a) the Plumas/Sierra Regional Courthouse located at 600 South Gulling Street, City of Portola, County of Plumas, Assessor Parcel Number 126-050-046;
 - b) the Modesto Main Courthouse located at 800 11th Street, and the Hall of Records, located at 1100 I Street, City of Modesto, County of Stanislaus, collectively a portion of Assessor Parcel Number 105-025-001; and
 - c) the Ceres Superior Court located at 2744 Second Street, City of Ceres, County of Stanislaus, Assessor Parcel Number 127-016-014.
- 3) Provides that the sale of court properties in accordance with this bill does not constitute a sale or other disposition of surplus state property within the meaning of the California Constitution.
- 4) Requires the Judicial Council, on or before April 1, 2027, to identify and report to the Legislature and any relevant policy committees all fees related to civil matters, including, but not limited to, fees to access trial court filings and records, authorized by the Judicial Council or an individual superior court but not authorized by statute or otherwise authorized.
 - a) Requires the report to include the justification for all fees identified and the justification for the fees being set at a specific amount.
 - b) Prohibits, commencing January 1, 2030, a superior court from charging a civil fee, regardless of whether the fee is identified in the report that is not authorized by statute.
- 5) Authorizes the net proceeds from the sale of the properties in 2), above, to be used by the Judicial Council to offset any costs associated with the report, with all remaining proceeds required to be deposited into the State Court Facilities Construction Fund.
- 6) Includes superior court, court of appeal, the California Supreme Court, and the Judicial Council of California in the definition of state agencies under the Program.
- 7) States that this statute is an urgency statute.

COMMENTS

1. Stated need for the bill

The author writes:

The courts omnibus measure makes several changes to the laws governing California courts. First, this bill authorizes the sale of three obsolete court facilities. Secondly, this bill seeks to crack down on the questionable imposition of fees by California courts that have not been authorized or specifically enumerated by the Legislature.

Recognizing the ongoing budget difficulties, this bill would require the Judicial Council to identify and justify the need for these fees and enable the Legislature to codify them. Any fees the Legislature deems inappropriate would be eliminated in 2030.

2. The sale of state court facilities

Existing law generally requires state agencies to report to Department of General Services all property that can be deemed surplus. (Gov. Code § 11011.) The Department then submits a list of properties to the Legislature to be officially declared surplus by legislation and requests authorization to dispose of the land. Upon approval by the Legislature, the Department must determine whether the land could first be used by any other state agency, local agency, or nonprofit affordable housing organization. The property can only be sold to the public once the Department determines that the property cannot be utilized by one of the aforementioned entities. Proposition 60A enacted Section 9 of Article III of the California Constitution in 2004, and required that all surplus property be disposed of by the Department of General Services and that all sale proceeds be used to pay the principal and interest on bonds issued pursuant to the Economic Recovery Bond Act.

California overhauled its court system through a series of reforms over 20 years ago resulting in the existing superior court system where the Judicial Council has the responsibility, authority, and control over trial court facilities as an owner. Prior to the overhaul of the trial court system, individual counties managed California's trial courts and owned many of the trial court facilities. As a result of SB 1732 (Escutia, Ch. 1082, Stats. 2002), the Judicial Council took ownership of county court facilities. In 2021, the Legislature authorized the Judicial Council to sell specified court properties in Los Angeles, Fresno, and Kings Counties at fair market value and upon the terms and conditions and subject to the reservations the Judicial Council deems in the best interests of the state. (AB 143 (Committee on Budget, Ch. 79, Stats. 2021.)) AB 143 also specified that the net proceeds from the sale of the property are to be deposited into the State Court Facilities Construction Fund. The Legislature specifically exempted the sale of these properties from the statutes governing surplus lands.

This bill seeks to enact similar provisions for certain outdated or closed court facilities in Plumas and Stanislaus Counties. According to the Judicial Council:

The Ceres Superior Court was permanently closed in March 2009 and all former operations will be moving to the new courthouse in Modesto and the Modesto Main Courthouse/Hall of Records property will permanently close upon commencing occupancy in the new courthouse in December 2024. The Plumas/Sierra Regional Courthouse closed permanently in November 2014. In accordance with existing law and at the request of the affected courts, the council has determined the need to sell the identified properties.

The Judicial Council is committed to access to justice and serving all Californians in an efficient and effective manner. This bill meets that mandate by ensuring the council does not need to expend unnecessary funding, staff time, and mitigation measures for potential safety issues that are commonly associated with vacant buildings. By allowing the council to sell these buildings at fair market value and in alignment with existing law, state funding is appropriately expended where it is needed most – supporting court facilities that are actively in use to improve the court experience for the millions of Californians who access the courts each year.

These provisions are substantially similar to AB 959 (McCarty, 2023), which passed this Committee last year on a vote of 11 to 0, but was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

3. Fees charged by the courts

- a. *Access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state*

Access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state. (Gov. Code § 7921.000.) In 2004, the right of public access was enshrined in the California Constitution (*hereafter* Constitution) with the passage of Proposition 59 (Nov. 3, 2004, statewide gen. elec.),³ which amended the Constitution to specifically protect the right of the public to access and obtain government records: “The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business, and therefore the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny.” (Cal. Const., art. I, sec. 3 (b)(1).) The Constitution mandates that a statute, court rule, or other authority is to be broadly construed if it furthers the people’s right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access. (*Ibid.*) Additionally, it requires a statute that limits the public’s right of access to be adopted with findings demonstrating the interest protected by the limitation and the need for protecting that interest. (*Ibid.*) Under the CPRA, a public record is defined as any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business that is prepared, owned, used, or retained by any public agency regardless of its physical form or characteristics. (Gov. Code § 7920.530.) A “state agency” is defined as every state office, officer, department, division, bureau, board, and commission or other state body or agency, except those agencies provided for in Article IV (except Section 20 thereof) or Article VI

³ Prop. 59 was placed on the ballot by a unanimous vote of both houses of the Legislature. (SCA 1 (Burton, Ch. 1, Stats. 2004).

of the California Constitution.⁴ (Gov. Code § 7920.540.) The CPRA therefore specifically exempts its provisions from applying to the courts.

Even though the CPRA does not specifically apply to court records, the California Supreme Court has held that there is a common law right of access to court records in which there is a legitimate public interest, if not outweighed by strong countervailing reasons, and further noted that “the general principles regarding public access to the records of public entities established in the statutes and [applicable] case law [...] continue to apply in the context of court records.”⁵ (*Sander v. State Bar of California*, (2013) 58 Cal.4th 300, 318-323.) The court has found that the Constitutional provisions related to the people having the right of access to information regarding the people’s business and the mandate that limitation on access be narrowly construed also applies to court records. In *Savaglio v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, the court stated: “With the passage of Proposition 59 effective November 3, 2004, the people’s right of access to information in public settings now has state constitutional stature, grounding the presumption of openness in civil court proceedings with state constitutional roots.” ((2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 588, 597.) In *Sander v. State Bar of California*, the California Supreme Court recognized that Article I, § 3 of the California Constitution applies to records of the judicial branch and applied the narrow construction rule to certain State Bar records at issue in that case. (*Sander v. State Bar of California*, *supra* at 312-313.)

b. Some courts charge the public to access public court records posted online in an electronic format

Some courts in the state charge the public to access to their public court records which are posted online in an electronic format. The Judicial Council states the reason is to cover costs associated with the creation, maintenance, and management of their electronic systems that allow for public access to those electronic records. According to the Judicial Council, in 2021 almost \$30 million dollars was collected by various courts in fees for providing access to electronic records online. The exact number of courts that do this is unclear, as the Judicial Council is unable to provide details about how common the practice is. This issue was encountered first hand by staff of the Assembly Judiciary Committee, author of the bill, when they were searching for Sacramento County court records related to that Committee’s work. Staff were unable to even search for the records they were trying to obtain without paying an initial fee. Under the CPRA, public agencies are prohibited from charging the public more than the “direct cost of producing a copy of a record in an electronic format,” and generally cannot charge for the staff costs of searching for records, redacting nonpublic

⁴ The CPRA does specifically provide that an itemized statement of the total expenditures and disbursement of any agency provided for in Article VI of the California Constitution shall be open for inspection. (Gov. Code § 7928.720.)

⁵ See also *City of San Jose v. Superior Court*, (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 617; *American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California v. Superior Court*, (2017) 3 Cal.5th 1032, 1036-37.

information, or monitoring the public viewing of records, even though such costs can be substantial. (Gov. Code 7922.575.)

- c. This bill will provide the Legislature with information to assess the nonstatutory fees charged by the judicial branch*

The Assembly Judiciary Committee analysis of this bill provides a decent overview of the concerns this bill is seeking to address.⁶ Specifically, the Assembly Judiciary Committee notes that the Judicial Council could lose as much as \$20 million if its current collection fee practices are changed, noting:

According to the Judicial Council of California, in 2021, 16 counties in the state provided online access to electronic civil case records. Ten of those 16 courts received \$22.7 million in fees from individuals who accessed court records during that two-year period. The Judicial Council further informed this Committee that the reason why courts charge fees is to “cover costs associated with the creation, maintenance, and management of their electronic systems that allow for public access to those electronic records.” If all 58 trial courts were able to “recover costs” at this rate, the estimated statewide total would be approximately \$32 million per year. (*Id.* at 8.)

California overhauled its court system through a series of reforms (referred to as realignment) over 20 years ago resulting in the existing superior court system, which resulted in the Legislature having the authority to appropriate all trial court funding through the annual budget process. The Assembly Judiciary Committee notes that the fee money described above is outside of the state budget process and; therefore, there is little to no oversight on how this fee money is authorized or spent. This bill will give the Legislature a better understanding of what courts are charging these fees and in what amounts, in order to better inform its budgetary practices for the judicial branch and evaluate the merits of the reasons for charging the fees. Specifically, the bill requires the Judicial Council to identify and report all civil fees that are not authorized by statute by April of 2027, and the justification of the need for the fees. The bill would also prohibit any fees identified in the report that are not authorized in statute from continuing to be charged beginning on January 1, 2030.

4. This bill would allow superior courts, courts of appeal, the California Supreme Court, and the Judicial Council to participate in the Marketplace Program

The Marketplace Program is an “innovative acquisition finance program designed to facilitate State of California agencies and local governments with installment or lease

⁶ Asm. Judiciary Comm. analysis of AB 3282 (2023-24 reg. sess.) as amended Apr. 8, 2024 at p. 8.

purchases, while meeting all requirements of a competitively bid process.”⁷ The statutes governing the Marketplace Program defines state agencies, which is defined as every state office, officer, department, division, bureau, board, and commission and the California State University and the Regents of the University of California. This bill would expand the definition of state agencies to include a superior court, court of appeal, the California Supreme Court, and the Judicial Council of California.

5. Statements in support

The Consumer Attorneys of California write in support, stating:

Under the California Public Records Act (CPRA), *public agencies* are prohibited from charging the public a fee to copy a public record in an electronic format that is more than the “direct cost [to the agency] of producing a copy of a record in an electronic format.” (Gov. Code Sec. 7922.570.) Public agencies cannot charge for their costs of staff searching for records, redacting nonpublic information from records, or monitoring the public viewing of records, even though such costs may be substantial. (*North County Parents Organization v. Department of Education* (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 144, 146.) Although the CPRA does not explicitly apply to the judicial branch of state government (See Gov. Code Sec. 7920.540 (a)), courts must comply with the *spirit* of the CPRA by not creating obstacles for the public to access court records. (See *Sierra Club v. Superior Court* (2013) 57 Cal.4th 157, 175; *Sander v. State Bar of California* (2013) 58 Cal.4th 300, 309-310; *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 617; *American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 1032, 1036-37.) Furthermore, the California Constitution affirms, “The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny.” (Cal. Const., Art. I, § 3(b)(1).) Court proceedings are “the people’s business.”

Unfortunately, a number of courts in the state charge the public and attorneys representing their clients to access public court records that are posted online in an electronic format, charging fees to search for, download and copy records. They do so, according to the JCC, in order to cover their costs associated with the creation, maintenance, and management of their electronic systems that allow for public access to those electronic records. This seems to directly conflict with the CPRA, under which public agencies are prohibited from charging such fees and from passing on their administrative costs to the public.

⁷ Dept. of Gen. Serv., *Golden State Financial Marketplace (GS \$Mart) Guide* (2018), available at [https://www.dgs.ca.gov/PD/Resources/Page-Content/Procurement-Division-Resources-List-Folder/GS-\\$Mart-Frequently-Asked-Questions](https://www.dgs.ca.gov/PD/Resources/Page-Content/Procurement-Division-Resources-List-Folder/GS-$Mart-Frequently-Asked-Questions).

SUPPORT

None received

OPPOSITION

None received

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: AB 2988 (McCarty, 2024) authorizes the Judicial Council to sell the Gordon D. Schaber Sacramento County Courthouse if the sale complies with certain requirements, and requires the Judicial Council or the county to put the property out to competitive bid, as specified, and requires the bid process to favor an applicant that proposes a residential development with the greatest number of affordable housing units. AB 2988 is currently pending in this Committee.

Prior Legislation:

AB 959 (McCarty, 2023) was substantially similar to the provisions of this bill that authorize the sale of specified court properties in Plumas and Stanislaus Counties. AB 959 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1785 (Committee on Judiciary) would have required a court to provide remote access to all public court records about civil cases that are maintained by the court in an electronic format, as specified, and would have prohibited a court that provides the public with remote access to these records from charging a fee to access them. The bill would have authorized a court to charge a fee to a commercial user for viewing, searching, duplicating, downloading, or printing public court records in an electronic format. AB 1785 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 2962 (Committee on Judiciary, 2022), was substantially similar to AB 1785. AB 2962 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 143 (Committee on Budget, Ch. 79, Stats. 2021), among other things, authorized the Judicial Council to sell specified court properties in Los Angeles, Fresno, and Kings Counties at fair market value and upon the terms and conditions and subject to the reservations the Judicial Council deems in the best interests of the state, specified that the net proceeds from the sale of the property are to be deposited into the State Court Facilities Construction Fund, and exempted the sale of these properties from the statutes governing surplus lands.

PRIOR VOTES

Assembly Floor (Ayes 72, Noes 0)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 0)
Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 12, Noes 0)
