

Date: May 17, 2016

To: Ivette Peña, Los Angeles Superior Court Counsel

Re: LA Superior Court Civil Expansion and Reorganization  
Impacts of Understaffing on Interpreters, LEP Court Users and General Court Operations

---

In our recent meetings on the impacts of civil expansion and other court organizational changes, CFI identified a series of issues that deny, delay or otherwise impede access for LEP court users and negatively impact interpreters in their daily work, and court operations generally.

At our April 8, 2016 meeting, you asked whether interpreters have identified specific cases and examples of these problems. This memo provides specific examples of language access and coverage issues interpreters have reported, as well as information gathered in our survey of interpreters. Many of the issues we're asking the court to address have already been identified by the statewide Language Access Plan (LAP), the American Bar Association's (ABA) Standards for Language Access, and the Department of Justice's Title VI compliance investigation as problems to be addressed.

At a recent LAP Community Outreach meeting, you emphasized that supervising interpreters are able to deploy interpreters quickly to where they are needed and this, "[...] has allowed us, without a substantial enhancement to the workforce, to really deploy interpreters to almost all of our civil-- to meet our civil needs." According to the meeting minutes this has "led to a more efficient deployment of staff interpreters throughout the court, and they are now able to cover a larger portion of interpreting needs with the same staff."

We certainly agree that the wise use of resources is necessary throughout the court system. CFI has also long predicted that courts would be able to expand services significantly using existing staff, and that the need to increase staff (employees supplemented by contractors) would not be as great as some have feared. This is to a great extent because the court's Spanish-language interpreters were already covering a good deal of civil work before the expansion began. However, the success of efforts to efficiently deploy interpreters, as reported to the LAP ITF, is overstated. As we've discussed since we began meeting in January, it is of great concern to CFI that as the expansion proceeds, a major focus of Language Access Services (LAS) management and the assignment office has been on cutting corners and reducing assignments and staffing in the name of efficiency, but without adequate information about actual interpreter needs, without an understanding of the impacts of these decisions, and without adequate attention paid to whether language access is actually being expanded effectively and successfully.

In fact, the decisions by LAS management to limit staffing and reduce assignments are resulting in a dangerous lowering of professional standards, deteriorating working conditions, increased impediments to access in criminal proceedings, and a failure to provide adequate language access in civil matters. Interpreters' experience on the ground is that these "efficient deployment" efforts are not based on accurate or complete information about where interpreters are needed. Instead, this strategy is predicated on little more than a general determination to reduce assignments as much as possible (including not replacing interpreters who are out temporarily) and then hoping for the best.

Interpreters clearly cannot document every occasion when a party who needs an interpreter does not get one. Inevitably, this occurs most frequently when our members are not present and precisely because they aren't available. Moreover, interpreters report they are unable to document every problem they do observe when they are busy with their work, for example when a Spanish interpreter observes a lack of services for another language. It is clear based on our members' collective experience and documented examples, however, that these problems are widespread and increasing in frequency due to LAS management's and the assignment office's staffing decisions and practices. As a result, LASC is failing to provide consistent, meaningful language access services.

### **Language Access Issues Identified by Court Interpreters Working for LASC**

Reductions in staffing and in daily deployments to court locations over the past several years have gone too far, resulting in unreasonable interpreter workloads and long wait times for the public, attorneys and bench officers. A full eighty-five percent of Los Angeles court interpreters surveyed said they've had the experience of being unable to cover work effectively due to the volume of cases or number of courtrooms they are assigned to cover; twenty-five percent say this is a frequent problem. Eighty-four percent said they have been unable to provide coverage to courtrooms when unexpected work comes up that is not appropriately staffed (such as evidentiary hearings and needs for witness and victim interpreters).

These conditions negatively impact services to the public and court operations overall. Our survey of LA interpreters shows that a substantial majority of interpreters have personally experienced the following:

- Courtrooms do not receive timely services for LEP matters due to inadequate staffing; cases needing interpreters are delayed all morning, delayed to the afternoon or continued to another day.
- Court clerks, bailiffs, court attendants and interpreters are unable to reach the interpreter assignment office or interpreter supervisors to communicate language access needs. Requests for interpreters are not responded to in a timely manner.
- Interpreters are not consistently replaced when out sick or on vacation, exacerbating daily interpreter shortages. (Ninety-three percent of survey respondents say this is a problem).

- Family members, attorneys, and other non-interpreters are being used to “interpret” -- in direct violation of the unit work provisions in the MOU and in defiance of some of the most critical imperatives identified in the LAP, the ABA’s Standards for Language Access and case law on the protection of LEP parties’ rights to due process.
- The right to be linguistically present is being violated routinely and with increasing frequency, as LEP court users come to court and the court proceeds as if they were not present. Attorneys waive their LEP clients’ right to an interpreter, and bench officers accept those waivers, without the LEP court users ever providing a knowing and intelligent waiver themselves, the standard established in case law for a valid waiver.
- Standards for professional conduct and best practices are not followed in accordance with the MOU and other well established standards:
  - Interpreters are working alone in matters that require team interpreting -- leading to interpreter fatigue and, inevitably, significant drops in the accuracy and reliability of interpretation.
  - Defendants, litigants and witnesses share one interpreter when separate interpreters are required to protect accuracy, impartiality, and LEP rights.
  - Interpreters are pulled into cases without basic preparation such as a pre-appearance interview or other orientation necessary to ensure accurate interpretation.

Interpreter supervisors have told interpreters that failures in the delivery of language access (such as waivers of interpreters) are not the interpreter’s concern. This may be technically correct. It should, however, be a serious concern for the court and for LAS management.

LASC appears to be prioritizing perceived efficiencies in interpreter deployment with a narrow focus on limiting the number of interpreters hired, without considering adverse impacts on language access and due process, or taking into account the inefficiencies and costs to the court and court users that result from delays, continuances and the inability to efficiently resolve cases. Additionally, LAS management is not giving due consideration to the difficulties that these working conditions pose for interpreters to do their work competently or the requirement that interpreters report impediments to their performance. Interpreters struggle daily with working conditions that interfere with their duty to provide a complete and accurate interpretation, the fundamental requirement to ensure meaningful access.

### **Intended Efficiencies are Creating Inefficiency**

The LAS Office is not fulfilling its fundamental purpose of ensuring that LEP parties, judges and all participants in court proceedings receive timely and meaningful language access services.

Instead, LAS court management and supervisors have been experimenting with interpreter cutbacks based on unreliable information, or no information, about day-to-day language access needs. It appears that the court and LAS do not have an adequate system in place to consistently and reliably track cases that require interpreter services, and whether or not those cases are being provided the required level of language access services.

These issues have a negative ripple effect on court operations as they impact bench officers' ability to manage cases and get through their calendars, as well as attorneys' ability to attend to cases in other courtrooms. The resultant slow-downs and delays cost money.

LAS management is not taking into account the larger-scale inefficiencies and costs generated by its self-imposed daily interpreter shortages -- and, considering the demographics, size and high volume of language access needs in Los Angeles County, these costs are sure to be quite significant. But these impacts are certainly being felt by the LEP court users, interpreters, attorneys and bench officers who struggle to take care of court business.

Even more problematic, court users who need language access are going without services or are being unduly delayed, and are thereby receiving less timely and less meaningful access to the court than English speakers.

The most effective way to reliably ensure interpreter needs are met is to establish a staffing baseline that takes into account historic staffing practices, interpreter absences for vacation and sick leave, needs identified in advance, and the unpredictable nature of court language access needs. Unexpected needs invariably arise because interpreter service needs fluctuate, are difficult to predict, and often are not identified in advance. For these reasons, staffing with enough full day interpreters has traditionally been, and remains, a practical and efficient solution.

Based on the information received from interpreters overall, we are concerned that practices such as waiving interpreters, not waiting for interpreters, and not calling the assignment office to request interpreters may also be the product of an ongoing failure to replace interpreters and maintain an adequate baseline of staffing. This unacceptable situation becomes the "new normal" and bench officers and attorneys begin to accept and expect that language access services will not be available in a timely manner.

These working conditions also put undue and unacceptable strain on interpreter staff, and are having adverse consequences for recruitment and retention. Morale among many interpreters working in LASC is at a very low point as a result of these working conditions. LASC interpreters report that their work life has become increasingly difficult and stressful over the past two years. The reduced staffing and efforts to implement more efficient deployment have created uncertainty and an erratic and chaotic work environment for interpreters, and fail to respect LEP court users' needs and professional language access standards. Interpreters work within a system that, from their perspective, does not recognize or respect the considerable skills and dedication they apply in their daily work. There is a strong sense among many interpreters that the primary focus is on cutting corners, without rhyme or reason, and that the court's focus does not adequately prioritize providing meaningful, comprehensive language access services.

Most troubling of all is that this is a self-imposed shortage and these impacts are avoidable: The court has the means and flexibility to recruit and hire more interpreters on a daily or permanent basis, as needed. By making *modest* adjustments to staffing levels and consistently replacing interpreters who are out due to sick, vacation or other leave, the court can avoid these impacts, improve language access, and increase efficiencies for court operations overall.

### Specific Examples of Staffing and Language Access Issues Reported by Interpreters

Following are some examples that illustrate how the lack of timely access to interpreters impacts LEP court users, interpreters and court operations as a whole. As noted above, our survey of Los Angeles court interpreters indicates that these examples comprise only a fraction of the unmet needs that occur due to inadequate staffing at court locations around the county.

Date	Location	Notes
Oct 30, 2015	Long Beach	NJ28584 -- Waiver of Cambodian interpreter for mother in juvenile delinquency matter. Court informed by interpreter supervisor that a Cambodian interpreter would be available in the afternoon. Judge took waiver from the attorney. There was no knowing or intelligent waiver of an interpreter by the mother. Minor's sister was used to "explain" things to mother in the hallway, though sister was not present in court during the proceedings. Minor pled guilty and Judge explained conditions that minor should follow. Mother was without an interpreter. Minor said he did not have school that day and so did not need an excuse for school.
Dec 1-18, 2015 (approx.)	Torrance	Dept C, People Vs. Lopez-Quiñones (YA090806) The assignment office knew the trial would last two weeks, but before giving out the assignment each day, they waited for a call from the clerk to say that the trial was continuing the next day. As a result, lower seniority interpreters were assigned, or independents, to this serious high profile case with more than 10 serious felony charges, Spanish-speaking witnesses, and the defendant facing life without parole. The assignment office sent different interpreters everyday, many of them the less experienced interpreters, who would come in and interpret "cold" with know orientation, background or continuity.
December 14, 2015 through January 28, 2016	Alhambra	Small claims cases in Alhambra are regularly handled without court provided, certified interpreters for other than Spanish languages.. Summary: Cases were tracked over a six-week period in Department 2. On 29 of 29 work days there were cases that needed a Mandarin and/or Cantonese interpreter and proceeded without one (40 Mandarin and 9 Cantonese cases). Additionally, during these six weeks in Department 2, there were 13 Vietnamese, 6 Armenian, 1 Korean, 1 Khmei, and 1 Tagalog case that did not get interpreters. <i>See Attachment 1 for list of case names and numbers that needed interpreter but proceeded without one.</i>

Date	Location	Notes
Dec 29-30, 2016	Pasadena	Pasadena very short staffed. Two regularly assigned Pasadena interpreters sent to the Metropolitan Courthouse Dec. 28, 29 and 30. Half-day Pasadena interpreter sent to CJC. Clerks complained about the shortage saying the supervisor should have known better. According to a clerk supervisor, the interpreter supervisor was given the full schedule for the week of open courts. The supervisor misinformed interpreters about courts being closed (K and O) when they were open, leaving interpreters to scramble to cover. Supervisor did not get replacements when it was brought to her attention.
Dec 29, 2016	Pasadena	<p>Dept. S- Wait for an interpreter was so long that a party decided to withdraw TRO request and go home. Tired of waiting. Case: Díaz v Díaz. GQ013452</p> <p>Dept. O- Late in the morning, attorneys approached interpreter who was very busy covering another dept. and said they had 5 cases waiting for interpreter. Clerk asked the interpreter supervisor why there was no interpreter to cover Dept. O, a busy department. The supervisor said she was doing "what she was told by downtown." The supervisor then pulled an interpreter from Burbank to cover Pasadena while cases were still pending in Burbank, leaving only 1 interpreter in Burbank and a calendar in progress not covered. Redeployment was too late to help cover the morning work in Pasadena and avoid case delays.</p>
Dec. 30th, 2016	Pasadena	<p>Two interpreters left to cover 7 courtrooms; at least 13 calendars. Interpreter supervisor said a third interpreter was being sent from another location, but that interpreter called in sick and LAS/supervisor did not notify interpreters of this or replace that person.</p> <p>Dept. J (doing H's calendar), Felonies                      Osuna, María GA094271-01/Castro, Yolanda GA094271-02                      Reporter indicated there was a 90-minute delay in a two-defendant felony case that could not proceed because no interpreter was available.</p> <p>Dept. S –TROs; Ramirez v. Alvaro Guzman , GQ013385                      Three hour wait (until 11:30 am) for interpreter to cover a Temporary Restraining Order trial with child custody and visitation terms. Continued to 1:30 pm when case did not finish by noon.</p> <p>Dept. A – Unlawful Detainers; Woo, Helen vs Ozaeta, Juana. 15P07801. Clerk told interpreter in the afternoon that she "took care" of one of the Spanish cases in the morning; interpreter later learned a family member was used. Assigned interpreter was covering cases in other courtrooms.</p>

Date	Location	Notes
January 20, 2016	Airport	No replacement was sent for regularly assigned interpreter leaving the building with only 4 interpreters. Additionally, no back up was sent for a trial, so one of the four interpreters worked alone in a trial. Three interpreters were left to cover the building. No one was available to respond to courtrooms in need of interpreters between 8:55 and 10:47 in the morning; eight calls from courtrooms went unanswered.
January 20, 2016	Pasadena	Dept. J Case: Michael Chen, 5PS26173, Restitution Hearing Pre-proceeding interview w/Spanish-speaking victim was conducted with interpreter. City Attorney asked victim to provide proof of what she was owed from accident, and left interpreter and victim to share info with defense attorney. Interpreter completed interview and left to cover 3 other departments (assigned to cover four courtrooms in total) and was extremely busy in Juvenile Court (Dept 271). Meanwhile Dept. J called three times in 45 minutes. Interpreter texted three colleagues to help in either court, and was eventually replaced in Juvenile at about 11:30 am. Interpreter went to check on Restitution Hearing. The clerk told interpreter that it was already done "probably under 977a." This made no sense since victims have no attorneys. Interpreter had earlier crossed paths with the victim on the way to the bathroom, and victim asked interpreter several questions about how to get paid for the bills. Interpreter said she couldn't answer but would interpret for victim when case was called in the courtroom. Interpreter later understood why victim was left with so many questions; the court had proceeded to hear the case with no interpreter.
January 25, 2016	Pasadena	<p>Dept. G, Case: Cho, IPS02068 (possibly Korean) Asian-language Defendant was present. Public Defender Marlon Lewis went "977 due to no interpreter available" between 10 and 11am. No inquiries as to what language was needed or calls to LAS, nor ordering of an interpreter for the next date.</p> <p>Dept. F, Case: Munoz Gonzalez GA095345. 9:40 am Clerk called for interpreter. Certified interpreter arrived 10 minutes after request was made. The case was done 977(a) "because the attorney was in a hurry." It was a 211 p.c. case.</p> <p>Dept. G, Private attorney requested to appear 977a, even though client was present, because "no interpreter available." Certified interpreter was present in the courtroom. The attorney did not inquire if there was an interpreter; the interpreter who was present identified herself and the case was covered.</p>

Date	Location	Notes
January 26, 2016	Pasadena	<p>Department A, Case: Rector, James M. vs Velasquez, Miguel, 15P08539</p> <p>Family member used to interpret while regularly assigned interpreter was working on another case in a conference room near Dept A. When interpreter arrived, the bench officer was going over a stipulation signed by the parties. Normally, the interpreter would sight translate and then sign a stipulation so there's a record that the parties had language access when entering into stipulation. Certified interpreter took over from family member for a few sentences at the end of the proceeding. If record reflect that a certified interpreter was used in the proceeding this is not accurate.</p>
January 26, 2016	Airport	<p>W73: Escoto, Alfonso Mario (8BV01406) No interpreter available for PD interview related to proceeding.</p>
Feb 22, 2016	Criminal Justice Center (CJC)	<p>Case No. BA 434697</p> <p>Judge proceeded with the case after being unable to get a Cantonese interpreter. Clerk tried twice to get interpreter services to commit to providing an interpreter or at least give the court an ETA. When clerk was placed on hold, judge asked defendant &amp; his attorney to waive the interpreter, which they did.</p>
February 16 and 17, 2016	Stanley Mosk	<p>Interpreter covers Hague Convention hearings alone without team. BH010466, BH010434, BH010571</p>
February 24, 2016	Stanley Mosk	<p>Dept. 63</p> <p>BD489850 -Family law (Spanish)- request for order hearing runs long. Bailiff contacts office for backup. Office promises to send someone. No one arrives. After some time, bailiff calls again, can't reach office. Interpreter finishes 1hr 45min hearing alone.</p>
February 24, 2016	Stanley Mosk	<p>Dept. 15: Korean interpreter assigned to CJC in the morning was dispatched to Stanley Mosk and worked alone for nearly two hours without a team. Case: Michael Kim (BC594176)</p>
February 25, 2016	Stanley Mosk	<p>Inadequate staffing for overall building needs. Interpreters were pulled from regular calendars to cover Hague Convention hearings for parties and witnesses, however the calendar interpreters were not replaced. Workload unreasonable for three interpreters left covering short cause matters. One interpreter covered 18 matters in eight different departments.</p>

Date	Location	Notes
March 1, 2016	Stanley Mosk	Dept. 32, Case 15U14060- UD court trial. Interpreter assigned alone. After 20 min requested back up. Clerk either never reached the office or they never sent anybody. Supervisor/assignment office made no arrangement for replacement of interpreter who was working alone in the trial and had approved time off in the afternoon. Interpreter was relieved by another interpreter after 1.5 hrs. 2 <sup>nd</sup> interpreter did so voluntarily to assist colleague, but also was unable to reach assignment office or supervisor to be officially assigned.
March 3, 2016	Stanley Mosk	Dept. 25- UD Trial Spanish interpreter assigned alone for the whole morning. Office sent no back up.
March 7, 2016	CJC	Interpreter assigned to 127/128 was asked to also cover 125/126 and 131/132 because of call offs. The interpreters covering those assignments were not replaced. At one point an attorney from 133 (not one of the interpreters assigned courts) came to "walk" interpreter to that court which was also left with no interpreter assigned.
March 8, 2016	CJC	Interpreter was assigned to again cover 125/126 plus her own assignment. 126 had a Pitches motion and the PD waived the interpreter because of the wait time. The interpreter walked in halfway through the motion. Case: Martin Contreras; BA442855
March 14, 2015	Pasadena	Felony trial starting, plus 2 unlawful detainer trials and 1 family law trial. No additional interpreters assigned to cover trials; no team interpreting available. One interpreter was eventually pulled from Burbank, but did not arrive until 3:30 p.m.
March 15, 2015	Pasadena	One interpreter for trial- three needed (2 for team and 1 for witness starting in pm). Also had a 3 co-defendant prelim with a Spanish speaking witness. Interpreters were told no one available to send. However, an F floater reported to CFI that she called the office on March 15 and said she was available for Pasadena. She was told that there was nothing available in Pasadena. Two interpreters eventually pulled from other locations (Burbank and Van Nuys). Regularly assigned interpreter left early for pre-scheduled medical appointment and was not replaced.
March 16, 2016	Pasadena	Second interpreter sent for felony trial but no 3 <sup>rd</sup> interpreter for witness.

Date	Location	Notes
March 30, 2016	Downey	<p>An interpreter was asked to interpret between the public defender and the mother of a defendant who had been remanded. There was a question about why the defendant had arrived late and what the mother had to do with it. Defendant did not need an interpreter. When the case was called and the attorney was arguing for release of the defendant, the interpreter interpreted for the mother, who had an interest in the case and was a potential witness. The interpreter had no other pending cases at the moment. After the proceeding was over, the judge called the interpreter and attorneys to side bar and stated that based on a new court policy, interpreters can only interpret for defendants, implying that the interpreter should not have interpreted for the mother.</p> <p>The interpreter emailed her supervisor and the interpreter service manager about this seeking guidance but receive no reply for several weeks. Interpreter followed up and was told in a meeting that interpreters should not interpret for family members unless specifically requested to do so by the judge.</p>
April 1, 2016	CJC	<p>Div. 47- Case: Oliver Cruz, 3CA05210</p> <p>The calendar indicated the need for a Tagalog interpreter and court clerk alerted the public defender of the need to wait for the Tagalog interpreter. However attorney said she'd appear on Mr. Cruz's behalf 977(a) and informed him in English that this was so that he wouldn't have to wait. Div. 47 of the CJC deals with misdemeanor progress reports and welfare fraud cases. Our member reports a pattern of OTS waivers of interpreter services in Div. 47.</p>
April 7, 2016	Chatsworth	<p>Dept. 40 cases regularly take a very long time. Interpreter had 10 cases, 4 of which were on second call, and worked non-stop. Interpreter briefly left to go to the bathroom case was called in her absence. There was no time for a break. This courtroom needs two assigned interpreters for the volume and time that the cases take.</p>
April 12, 2016	CJC	<p>Div. 34, Case #BA445250, Uriel G. Domínguez</p> <p>10 of 10 case postponed because the attorney could not get a Spanish interpreter for an interview</p>

Date	Location	Notes
April 13, 2016	Compton	Severe shortage; not enough interpreters to cover building needs. Assignment office told an A floater in the morning that Compton didn't show as a need. She was later given a morning assignment in Compton and stayed for the afternoon because there was a request from mediation. The office telephone screen at the end of the morning session showed 54 unanswered calls (an interpreter took a picture of it). Several clerks told us the judges were furious because of delays in reaching interpreters. Judge Wallenstein (Department 10) told his clerk to call the head clerk and request their own interpreter "as they had before the new floating system was implemented." Although 54 unanswered calls was probably a record, it's not uncommon for interpreter needs to go unanswered because not enough interpreters are assigned.
April 18, 2016	Burbank	Regularly assigned Burbank interpreter had a pre-scheduled grievance meeting at the Metropolitan Courthouse with Raul Pilling-Riefkohl in the afternoon. He was not replaced for the afternoon. The second full day position (currently vacant due to transfer of Antonio Ortiz) was not covered with a full day interpreter. An F status interpreter was sent for AM only. This left Burbank without any Spanish interpreter for the afternoon. There was a jury trial in Dept. G that required a Spanish interpreter (People vs Manuel Martínez (GA07334) and several custody cases in arraignment courts 2 and 3. Several additional Spanish interpreters had been assigned for the trial the previous week since both the defendant and some witnesses needed an interpreter. Monday afternoon, the jury stopped deliberating, and wanted to communicate to the court and parties that they were deadlocked, but the case could not be called since no Spanish Interpreter was present. Judge Michael Carter had personally called the assignment office the week before to make sure there was a Spanish interpreter on standby in the building should something exactly like what happened occur. This was in addition to the fact that several custodies had to be put over until the next day and a couple of walk ins (accepted in Burbank until 3:30pm) had to be turned away.
April 18, 2016	Inglewood	
April 19, 2016	Airport	W93: Martinez, Emanuel (1SM00889) No interpreter available for attorney-client interview related to the proceeding. Friend of defendant was used to interpret.

Date	Location	Notes
April 18-19, 2016	Inglewood	<p>A regularly assigned interpreter was off (pre-approved RTO) Fri 4/15 through Fri 4/22. She was not replaced at all on Monday 4/18. Interpreters regularly assigned had to cover her assignment in addition to their own.</p> <p>On 4/19 the interpreter was replaced but there was inadequate coverage for workload. One interpreter covered Dept. 7 and O. Depts 7, a very busy court, had 10 misdemeanor cases (including pleas with Tahl waivers); 3 felony cases in Dept O, one was a jury trial, another case had multiple witnesses/victims to be interviewed. The jury trial in Dept O (Lopez YA090810) was ready to start at mid-morning, but interpreter was occupied in Dept 7; Tahl waivers and doing back-to-back pleas on the record for an hour and a half.</p> <p>Texted colleagues asking for help, but everyone was busy in their own courts. <i>“The Bailiff from Dept O came personally to find me in Dept 7, but I was on the record. The Clerk from Dept 0 came personally to find me in Dept 7, but I was on the record. Finally, Dept. O Judge Millington came himself to get me in Dept 7. I was still on the record.”</i></p> <p>Dept O Judge, attorneys and a jury panel of 60 (in the hallway) waited for the interpreter, unable to proceed for about an hour. Interpreter became available at about 11:35 am. Without so much as a bathroom break, interpreter started interpreting 402 motions immediately, before the Jury entered the courtroom. The Assignment Office had notice of the trial in Dept. O needing 2 interpreters. The Assignment Office assigned two interpreters for the trial in the afternoon, but the trial team also covered custody calendar matters still pending in Dept 7 because no one was assigned to cover them.</p>
April 26, 2016	Airport	<p>W93: Lopez, Diego Noe (6AR22285)                      Domestic Violence case. Interpreter needed for defendant and victim. Only one interpreter was available. Public defender appeared “977” leaving defendant without interpreter and not linguistically present to that the interpreter could interpret for the victim</p>
April 27, 2016	Inglewood	<p>Division 6- Restraining order hearing. Case: YQ024289                      Spanish interpreter worked alone for approximately 1.5 hours in a contentious matter interpreting for 2 parties who both needed interpreter. Two interpreters were needed but none available.</p>
April 28, 2016	Inglewood	<p>Division 8- Small Claims Case: 16S00219, Korean                      Son of litigant used to interpret for father. Clerk offers to Pro Tem that an interpreter can be provided. Pro Tem proceeds without interpreter. Son of litigant is not interpreting and Pro Tem tells him to interpret everything simultaneously. It becomes clear that the son cannot do this. Case is postponed until June 25.</p>

Date	Location	Notes
May 9, 2016	Inglewood	<p>Two interpreters were not replaced for the morning session. One was on approved, pre-scheduled time off. The other called in sick. As a result, departments 4 and 6 experienced unreasonably long wait time, and at least one of these called downtown to complain about lack of interpreter availability. It is our understanding that the assignment office was not aware that one of the interpreters had pre-scheduled time off. This was described as a "glitch" in the system, which interpreters are experiencing regularly. This reflects poorly on the interpreter staff, creating the perception that interpreters are neglecting courtroom needs.</p>
Ongoing	All	<p>Shortage of interpreters for team interpreting has been a longstanding issue for matters involving other than Spanish interpreters and for Japanese-speaking court users in particular.</p> <p>In 2015, the Interpreter Services Division made an agreement with 2 Japanese language independent contractors for special rates. Nevertheless, Orange County reportedly provides them with a better work environment (professionally courteous treatment in addition to competitive rates).</p> <p>Recently, this issue took a serious turn. A felony case (People vs. Zulu #BA437946) had conducted its preliminary hearing in the summer of 2015 at CJC. It became a disaster as Language Access Services had sent a non-certified interpreter who would not utter the word "vagina" in a rape case. In February, 2016- it went to a jury trial with the case's alleged victim from Japan on hand. The sole staff interpreter for Japanese interpreted for the alleged rape victim as the case's key witness for nearly three full days without a team. LAS finally flew in a certified Japanese interpreter from the Bay Area for the last day. The interpreter stated that LAS had refused to put her up the night before her appearance and she had get up at 4 A.M. in order to make it in time for the trial. This kind of treatment discourages potentially helpful resources from working with LA Superior Court.</p>

**Alhambra Courthouse, Department 2- Small Claims**  
December 14, 2015 through January 28, 2016

The following cases were handled without court provided interpreters:

12/14/15

15G06911	WONG, Kendra v. ZHAO, Jin Zhoong	Mandarin
15G06912	WONG, John v. ZHAO, Jin Zhong	Mandarin

12/15/15

15G06920	WEI, Ya Wei v. HAYASHI, Gyokyei	Mandarin
15G06850	WILLIS, Shirley v. STEPHAN PLUMBING	Armenian
15G06851	WILLIS, Arlene v. STEPHAN PLUMBING	Armenian

12/16/15

15G06829	DAZHONG, Li v. JE, Lijing	Mandarin
15G04498	YANG, Yandong v. SU, Aiqin	Mandarin
15G06985	CHEN, David v. TAN, Irene Brandi	Cantonese

12/17/15

15G07007	WILLIS, Zhengna v. EUGENIA, Alviso	Mandarin
15G07004	YANG, Wanna v. HEREDIA, Marco Antonio	Mandarin
15G05344	CHEN, Jie v. DU, Tao	Mandarin

12/18/15

15G07008	TAING, Michael v. ZHOUI, Jin	Cantonese
----------	------------------------------	-----------

12/21/15

15G07028	SHI, Jue v. Yu, Zhou Chun	Mandarin
15G05219	VO, Nhu v. WEI, Kaixuan	Vietnamese & Mandarin
15G07025	CHANG, Ih Heen Bess v. LEO, Jeffrey	Mandarin
15G07043	CHENG, Connie v. HARRIS, James Leroy	Mandarin

12/22/15

15G06075	SONG, Jiliang v. REYES, Sixto Valente	Mandarin
15G07077	KAWAI, Maki v. DENG, Weiqiang	Mandarin
15G07117	STEPANYAN, Emil v. NALBANDIAN, Iren	Armenian
15G07076	ZHAO, Tony Lee v. TRAN, That Mau	Vietnamese
15G07051	SHEN, John V. PLEASURES HOLIDAY TRAVEL	Mandarin

12/23/15

15G05474	SUN, Sensokha v. QUACH, Nancy	Khmei
----------	-------------------------------	-------

12/24/15

15G07202	PREMIUM RECEIVABLES v. CHEING, Yiu Leung	Cantonese
15G07204	TORRES, Edwin v. PLANCARTE, Juan Carlos	Tagalog
15G07221	SWEET, Grace v. HSU, Pa Ping	Mandarin

12/28/15

15G07275	CHIO, Fong-Ching v. TRAVELERS PROPERTY	Mandarin
----------	--	----------

*(continued: Small Claims cases handled without court provided interpreters)*

12/29/15

15G04369	GAO, Hao v. AARON'S TOWING	Mandarin
15G07297	GONG, Weixu v. ROBLES, Hugo	Mandarin
15G04617	CHIU, Wen Hua v. RONALD PROPERTIES	Mandarin

12/30/15

14G09431	WU, Guoki v. LEAO, Charles	Mandarin
15G04631	HE, Jianhua v. WANG, Xioaxia	Mandarin
15G06159	WAN, Shou Qiang v. PONG, Jaime	Mandarin
15G07323	GU, Jiarong v. CHEN, Jenny	Mandarin

12/31/15

15G07370	GAO, Hong v. ESQUIBEL, Luis	Mandarin
15G07447	CHEN, Cun Hui v. GUZMAN, Carlos Obed	Mandarin

01/04/16

15G07465	AGA-SARGSYANLY v. LY, Karen	Cantonese
----------	-----------------------------	-----------

01/05/16

15G07317	DINH, Em v. TE, Steven	Vietnamese
----------	------------------------	------------

01/11/16

15G06536	YANG, Jing v. ZHAO, Xue	Mandarin
15G06806	ZHENG, Xu Jing v. LI, Ringo	Mandarin
15G07416	CHEN, Zai v. LIU, Xiangdong	Mandarin
15G07596	YU, Kewei v. TOMURA, Ayako	Mandarin
15G07607	THAI, Kiet v. ACEVEDOZAVALA, Enrique	Vietnamese
15G07657	NIU, Xiao v. LI, Ying Cheng	Mandarin

01/12/16

12SMO492	ARBOR OAKS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION v. THAU, Don L.	Cantonese
15G04616	SUN YUAN SUPPLY v. QUACK, Nancy	Cantonese

01/13/16

15G06018	NGHE, Tuyet Phung v. YANG, Kai	Vietnamese
----------	--------------------------------	------------

01/14/16

15G07598	TROUNG, Kiet v. TRINH, Vivian	Vietnamese
15G07671	KUMAR, Parmanand v. TRAVELERS CASUALTY INSURANCE	Mandarin

01/15/16

15G07761	NGUYEN, Ha Thi Kim v. NGUYEN, Le Thi Ngoc	Vietnamese
15G07762	NGUYEN, Chuong v. SOLORZANO, Jessica	Vietnamese

01/16/16

15G08424	YU, Hua Ku v. Allstate Insurance	Mandarin
15G07583	YUFEN, Li v. RIVIVAL RX	Mandarin

*(continued: Small Claims cases handled without court provided interpreters)*

01/20/16

15G07928	MAYER, Roya v. NASI, Mehragiz	Armenian
15G04206	LAM, Samsoz v. FENG, Jing	Mandarin
15G04625	FENG, Jing v. CHEUNG, Xiu Bo	Mandarin
15G06186	MASIHI, Armond Ebrahimian v. LESAR INVESTMENT	Armenian

01/21/16

15G07751	HUA, Chau v. HUANG, Kai	Vietnamese
15G07752	HUA, Huong v. HUANG, Kai	Vietnamese
15G07753	LE, Tung v. HUANG, Kai	Vietnamese
15G07926	LE, Thuy Thi v. CASTILLOS, Jorge Andrad	Vietnamese
15G04452	WONG, Tony v. MUNOZ, Griselda	Cantonese
15G06391	LIN, Victor v. ZHANG, Ya Li	Mandarin
15G07912	GHARIBYAN, Gayane v. ISAKHANYAN, Ani	Armenian
15G07921	WANG, Xi v. KIM, Ashley	Mandarin

01/22/16

15G05976	VO, Johnson v. SMITH, Kelly Ann	Vietnamese
15G0827	GAO, Hong v. ROCKINGHAM PROPERTIES	Mandarin

01/26/16

15G07985	KUO, I Cheng v. TAIWAN NIGHT MARKET	Mandarin & Korean
15H01336	HUI, Edwin D. v. MUNGUIA, Jessica	Cantonese

01/27/16

15G06634	ZHU, Nan v. MENG, Xinli	Mandarin
----------	-------------------------	----------

01/28/16

15G07209	PARK, Kwon J. v. KIM, Jae S.	Korean
15G07998	LIN, Yueh Yin v. MACH, Tien Phing	Cantonese