

The Bar Association of San Francisco Releases Evaluations for Superior Court, Seat 7 Candidates

April 26, 2016 – San Francisco – The Judiciary Committee of The Bar Association of San Francisco (BASF) today released its findings of its evaluation of the three candidates for San Francisco Superior Court, Seat 7 for the upcoming June 7 General Election.

Following the Judiciary Committee’s investigation, interview of the candidates, and deliberations, the committee finds the candidates for Seat 7:

Victor Hwang — “Exceptionally Well-Qualified”

Paul Henderson — “Well-Qualified”

Sigrid Irias — “Well-Qualified”

Paul Henderson and Sigrid Irias are members of BASF; Victor Hwang is not a member of BASF.

The Judiciary Committee is charged with the task of evaluating candidates seeking appointment and election to the Superior Court for the State of California, in and for the City and County of San Francisco. The Judiciary Committee, chaired by Belinda Lee, a partner at Latham & Watkins, is composed of a diverse cross-section of the San Francisco legal community. Members come from large, medium and small law firms; government legal offices; and corporate legal departments.

Each candidate was asked to complete and submit the same questionnaire used by the Judicial Nominees Evaluation (JNE) Commission, in addition to appearing for a personal interview with the Committee. The committee also conducted its own investigation by interviewing judges, lawyers and others having knowledge of the candidate’s attributes. The committee’s investigation and deliberations are completely confidential.

The committee inquired into, among other matters, the following attributes: (i) integrity and character; (ii) judgment and intellectual capacity; (iii) professional experience; (iv) industry and diligence; (v) judicial temperament, including whether the candidate would be courteous and considerate of counsel, parties, witnesses, and jurors, and whether the candidate is even-tempered; (vi) decisiveness; (vii) ability to transcend personal biases; (viii) professional ability and knowledge of the law; (ix) health; (x) general reputation in the community; and (xi) civic activities.

In assessing the qualification of a candidate, the committee members assign one of following categories defined in the bylaws:

The Bar Association of San Francisco Releases Evaluations for Superior Court, Seat 7 Candidates (continued)

- (i) “Qualified” — meaning that the candidate possesses the attributes listed above so as to indicate the ability to satisfactorily perform the judicial function for which she or he is being considered.
- (ii) “Well-Qualified” — meaning that the candidate possesses all the attributes required for a rating of “Qualified” and possesses one or more of those positive attributes to such a high degree as to be indicative of superior fitness to perform the judicial function for which she or he is being considered.
- (iii) “Exceptionally Well-Qualified” — meaning that the candidate possesses the attributes of integrity and character, judgment and intellectual capacity, professional experience, industry and diligence, judicial temperament, decisiveness, ability to transcend personal biases, professional ability and knowledge of the law, health, general reputation in the community, and civic and community activities to such an extremely high degree to be indicative of exceptional fitness to perform the judicial function for which he is being considered.
- (iv) “Not Recommended for Appointment/Election At This Time” — meaning that the candidate lacks one or more of the attributes required for a rating of “Qualified” at the time of the evaluation, but the committee members consider the deficiency one which is capable of correction in the future based upon additional experience.
- (v) “Not Qualified” — meaning that the candidate lacks one or more of the attributes required for a rating of “Qualified” to such an extent that the Committee doubts the candidate’s fitness to perform satisfactorily the judicial function for which he or she is being considered.
- (vi) “No Action” — meaning that a majority of the Committee consisting of at least eight members has been unable to assign one of the other categories to the candidate.