

George W. Bush Presidential Library

Collection: Counsel's Office, White House

Series: Kavanaugh, Brett – Subject Files

Folder Title: Judges - [Callahan, Connie]

Withdrawn/Redacted Material

The George W. Bush Library

DOCUMENT NO.	FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
001	Report	Connie M. Callahan	8	12/18/2002	P5;
002	Report	Connie M. Callahan	4	10/30/2002	P5;

COLLECTION TITLE:

Counsel's Office, White House

SERIES:

Kavanaugh, Brett - Subject Files

FOLDER TITLE:

Judges - [Callahan, Connie]

FRC ID:

9631

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

[opinions](#) | [forms](#) | [rules](#) | [recorders](#) | [publications](#) | [jobs](#) | [reference](#) | [search](#)

COURTS

Case Information

Courts: Courts of Appeal: 3rd District: Sacramento: Justices

Local Rules

Connie Callahan

Forms

Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Third District

FAQ

BAR ADMISSION: Admitted to California Bar in December 1975.

Justices

EDUCATION: J.D. McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific, 1975; B.A. Honors English, Stanford University, 1972.

About



PROFESSIONAL LEGAL BACKGROUND: Deputy District Attorney and Supervising District Attorney, focusing on major felony prosecutions in the areas of career criminal, homicide and child abuse/sexual assault, San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office, 1976-1986; Deputy City Attorney, City of Stockton, 1975-1976; Law Clerk (during law school), Sacramento County Public Defender's Office, 1974-1975.

JUDICIAL BACKGROUND: Nominated to the Third District Court of Appeal as Associate Justice in 1996 and subsequently confirmed by the Commission on Judicial Appointments to this position, served in this position from 1996 to present; appointed to the Superior Court of San Joaquin County in 1992, subsequently reelected to that position, and served until 1996; appointed Commissioner of the Municipal Court for Stockton Municipal Court, served from 1986-1992; appointed by Chief Justice to serve as Pro Tem Justice to the California Supreme Court, served on case heard in May of 1998.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES/ASSOCIATIONS/AFFILIATIONS: Board of Governors, San Joaquin County Bar Association, elected position held from 1983-1985; Treasurer and Board of Governors, Women Lawyers of San Joaquin County, elected position held 1980-1986; Stanford Women's Association; California Women Lawyers; Sacramento Women Lawyers; CJER Conference on Children as Victims and Witnesses; Planning Committee; Member of Civil Institute Planning Committee, California Center for Judicial Education and Research, 1994-1995; Chairperson for 1994 Northern California Civil Law and Procedure Workshop; Member of Executive Legislative Action Network, Judicial Council of California, 1994-1996; California Judges Association, 1986 to present; Member of Executive Board of California Judges Association, 1995-1996.

EDUCATIONAL/PROFESSIONAL HONORS AND AWARDS: Moot Court Finalist, 1973; Recognition by Governor Deukmejian for work in establishing Victim-Witness Mobile Unit; Susan B. Anthony award for legal services, 1987; Juvenile Justice Commission award for work in field of child abuse/sexual assault; Peacemaker of the Year Award, San Joaquin County Mediation Center, 1997.

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING/EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES: Instructor for California Judicial Education and Research; Instructor for Delta College Police Academy; Lecturer: University of the Pacific, UC Davis Law School, Humphreys College of the Law, and Delta College; Author: "Women in Law," 1973.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES: San Joaquin County Child Abuse Prevention Center,

past Board Member and President; Judge for "Red Ribbon Week" Competition, yearly campaign to prevent substance abuse; Master of the Bench, Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court; Judge for UC Davis Moot Court Orals, Texas Young Lawyers Association Regional Trial Competition, and Northern California High School Moot Court finals; Co-organizer of Government Day for Kids held May 15, 1998; Rotary International (Downtown Stockton); San Joaquin County Domestic Task Force.

[<< back](#)

©2001 Judicial Council of California

Of the 65 people Gov. Pete Wilson has appointed to judgeships since he took office in January, 1991, 17 had previously contributed to his political campaign, either individually or through their families or law firms. Here is a rundown of the contributions, including donations to other GOP campaigns.

Judge	Date Appointed	Contributions to Wilson	Date Contributed	To other GOP
Michael B. Dufficy Superior Court, Marin Co.	1/13/92	\$4,000	6/27/89- 11/5/91	\$1,785
Rebecca Ann Wiseman Superior Court, Kern Co.	7/24/91	\$3,999	5/9/89- 6/29/90	\$1,716
Kathryn Mickle Werdegar Court of Appeal	8/26/91	\$2,500	4/10/89- 10/30/90	\$500
Lee Phillip Felice Bakersfield Municipal Court	1/24/92	\$2,250	9/14/89- 12/18/90	\$676
J. Michael Bollman Superior Court, San Diego	1/16/92	\$1,650	11/22/89- 7/29/91	\$895
Roland Candee Sacramento Municipal Court	1/23/92	\$1,500*	11/13/89- 10/15/90	----
Robert Dondero San Francisco Municipal Court	1/23/92	\$1,000	6/4/90	----
Barbara Jean Ross Jones Superior Court, San Francisco	1/16/92	\$1,000	3/12/90	\$250
Shari Kreisler Silver Superior Court, Los Angeles Co.	1/21/92	\$450	6/12/90- 4/23/91	\$200
Edward Frederick Lee Santa Clara Co. Municipal Court	1/23/92	\$250	10/6/89	\$250
Connie M. Callahan Superior Court, San Joaquin Co.	1/23/92	\$250**	10/19/90	----
Craig Edward Robison Orange Co. Municipal Court	1/25/92	\$250	4/18/90- 8/19/91	----
Stephen Jahr Superior Court, Shasta Co.	9/30/91	\$250	5/10/89	----
Thomas M. Cecil Superior Court, Sacramento Co.	1/25/92	\$150	10/24/90	\$375
Stephen J. Kane Superior Court, Fresno County	1/21/92	\$100	6/14/90	\$1,231
Kenneth G. Peterson Superior Court, Sacramento Co.	1/21/92	\$100	1/25/90	\$850
Ronald M. George California Supreme Court	9/3/91	\$100	6/19/89	\$300

*Judge Candee donated no money to Wilson; his law firm, Kronick, Moskovitz, Tiedemann &

Girard donated \$1,500, followed by a \$5,000 gift for Wilson's inauguration.

**Judge Callahan also gave \$250 to Dianne Feinstein when she was running against Wilson.

SOURCE: Legitech and Capitol OnLine computer services based on data from Wilson campaign reports.

GRAPHIC: Table, Judicial Appointees and Contributors

Source: [All Sources](#) > [News](#) > [News Group File, All](#) 

Terms: **connie w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))

Select for FOCUS™ or Delivery



Metropolitan News-Enterprise, November 4, 1996

Copyright 1996 Metropolitan News Company
Metropolitan News-Enterprise; Capitol News Service

November 4, 1996, Monday

SECTION: Pg. 3

LENGTH: 183 words

HEADLINE: Confirmation Hearing Set for Dec. 5 on Stockton Jurist's Nomination to Third District Court of Appeal

BYLINE: By KENNETH OFGANG, Staff Writer/Appellate Courts

BODY: A Dec. 5 confirmation hearing has been set for San Joaquin Superior Court Judge Consuelo "**Connie**" **Callahan**, nominated by Gov. Pete Wilson to the Third District Court of Appeal to succeed Justice Janice Rogers Brown.

The 46-year-old Stockton jurist would fill a seat which has been vacant since Brown was elevated to the Supreme Court on May 2. Callahan, a judge since 1992 and a San Joaquin County Municipal Court commissioner for six years before that, must be confirmed by the Commission on Judicial Appointments.


When considering Third District nominations, the commission consists of Chief Justice Ronald George, Attorney General Dan Lungren, and Third District Presiding Justice Robert K. Puglia.

The hearing will begin at 1 p.m., the Administrative Office of the Courts said in a release.

Written comments on the nomination, or requests to speak at the hearing, must be received by 5 p.m. on Dec. 2, the AOC said, and should be addressed to:

Chief Justice Ronald George, Chairperson, Commission on Judicial Appointments, 303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, CA 94107.

LOAD-DATE: November 4, 1996


Source: [All Sources](#) > [News](#) > [News Group File, All](#) 

Terms: **connie w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))

View: Full

Date/Time: Monday, October 22, 2001 - 8:18 AM EDT

Copyright © 2001 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Source: [All Sources](#) > [News](#) > [News Group File, All](#) 

Terms: **connie w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))

Select for FOCUS™ or Delivery



Metropolitan News-Enterprise, December 9, 1996

Copyright 1996 Metropolitan News Company
Metropolitan News-Enterprise; Capitol News Service

December 9, 1996, Monday

SECTION: Pg. 1

LENGTH: 137 words

HEADLINE: Judicial Appointments Panel Confirms Stockton Jurist Consuelo Callahan to Third District Court of Appeal


BYLINE: By KENNETH OFGANG, Staff Writer/Appellate Courts

BODY: San Joaquin Superior Court Judge Consuelo "**Connie**" **Callahan** has been unanimously confirmed by the Commission on Judicial Appointments and sworn in as a justice of the Third District Court of Appeal.

Confirmation came late Thursday following a commission hearing in San Francisco, a spokesperson for the Administrative Office of the Courts said. Callahan succeeds Justice Janice Rogers Brown. The 46-year-old Stockton jurist fills a seat which has been vacant since Brown was elevated to the Supreme Court on May 2.

Callahan, a judge since 1992 and a San Joaquin County Municipal Court commissioner for six years before that, received votes of approval from all three members of the commission, Chief Justice Ronald George, Attorney General Dan Lungren, and Third District Presiding Justice Robert K. Puglia.

LOAD-DATE: December 10, 1996

Source: [All Sources](#) > [News](#) > [News Group File, All](#) 

Terms: **connie w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))

View: Full

Date/Time: Monday, October 22, 2001 - 8:17 AM EDT

[About LexisNexis](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#)

Copyright © 2001 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

CONSUELO CALLAHAN -- Third District Age: 48 Appointed: Oct. 5, 1996, by Wilson Previous work of note: San Joaquin County Superior Court judge 1992-96 (Wilson). Stockton Municipal Court commissioner 1986-92. Deputy district attorney, 1976-86. Law degree: McGeorge School of Law (1975) Notable recent opinions: Avalon Bay Foods v. Worker's Compensation Appeals Board, 57 Cal.App.4th 1284, In re Marriage of LaBass, 56 Cal.App.4th 1331, People v. Robinson, 56 Cal.App.4th 363 (dissent) Opinions published in last 18 months: 10 Majority opinions depublished: 0

In some ways, **Connie Callahan** fits in well on Third District. She's a tough, conservative former prosecutor -- she already has dissented from one ruling which reversed a criminal conviction, a ruling conservative PJ Robert Puglia signed onto.

In other ways, though, Callahan stands apart. She is the only female member of the Third District, and one of the few who comes from outside Sacramento. In fact, she's the first San Joaquin County jurist to get elevated to the Third District in some 70 years, according to a Stockton businessman.

Appointed two years ago, Callahan has issued 10 opinions and so has not yet developed a lengthy track record as an appellate justice.

Her nomination received broad support throughout the San Joaquin legal community; she was described by attorneys and judicial colleagues as hard-working, thorough and disciplined. Superior Court Judge Bob McNatt, who shared civil law-and-motion duties with Callahan, said he often turned to her for advice on "sticky issues." She was active in the effort to consolidate the county trial courts,

The Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation rated Callahan "well-qualified."

The Recorder 10/27/1998

Source: [All Sources](#) > [Secondary Legal](#) > [Legal Publications Group File](#) 

Terms: **consuela w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))

Select for FOCUS™ or Delivery



Cal-OSHA Reporter November 5, 1999

Copyright 1999 Providence Publications, LLC
Cal-OSHA Reporter

November 5, 1999

SECTION: Vol. 26, No. 43

LENGTH: 892 words

HEADLINE: APPEAL COURT EXPANDS THE SCOPE OF CALIFORNIA'S ERGONOMICS STANDARD

BODY:

The Cal-OSH Standards Board's regulation for ergonomics in the workplace was largely vindicated on Oct. 29 by a three-judge panel in the Third District Court of Appeal in Sacramento.

The opinion, written by justice **Consuela Callahan**, held that the board had exceeded its authority when it included the small-employer exemption in General Industry 5110. In other respects, it upheld 5110 as originally promulgated "following a protracted saga of rulemaking, comments and public hearings."

The standard is the result of the landmark workers' compensation reforms enacted by the state Legislature in 1993, which amended Labor Code 6357. Although the Legislature directed the board to "adopt standards for ergonomics in the workplace designed to minimize the instances of injury from repetitive motion" by Jan. 1, 1995, the Standards Board was not able to complete "the long and tedious" rulemaking process until late 1996, the court noted. As the court pointed out, no sooner had 5110 appeared in print than it was challenged by labor as too soft and by employer groups as "scientifically unsound and issued without substantial compliance" with the California Administrative Procedures Act (APA). The employer groups were spearheaded by the American Trucking Association and the California Trucking Association.

Section 5110 requires an employer to institute a program designed to minimize repetitive motion injuries (RMIs) in the workplace whenever two or more of its employees performing repetitive tasks have reported RMIs within a 12-month period. The "triggering" RMIs must be predominantly work-related and "objectively" diagnosed by a licensed physician.

Once the two-injury threshold is met, the employer must "establish and implement" a program designed to minimize the RMIs. The three components of the program are worksite evaluation, corrective control of exposure to RMIs and employee training.

However, the Standards Board completely exempted employers with nine or fewer employees and created a "safe harbor" for all employers in subsection (c).

The trucking associations argued in Sacramento Superior Court that all of 5110 should be invalidated because the board had ignored significant economic impact, lack of evidence in the record that the standard was necessary and compliance with the APA.

Labor attacked the small-employer exemption, the definition of "injury," the two-injury-in-12-months requirement and the safe harbor requirement.

The board defended the regulation as written.

The Sacramento Superior Court denied the relief sought by the associations, but granted most of what labor wanted, although the two-injury trigger was upheld.

Further appeals by all the parties followed. Meanwhile, Cal/OSHA compliance officers began responding to complaints as best they could. (Chief John Howard has termed the two-injury requirement particularly troublesome.)

One by one, the state appeal court took up the arguments made by the opposing sides. It dismissed the APA challenge, finding that the substance of the standard prevailed over any technical violations.

The board did not fail to assess the economic impact of 5110, the appellate panel said. And since the Legislature had recognized RMIs as an occupational problem requiring a regulatory response, "the board was bound to carry out its directive."

Both the Standards Board and the trucking associations had challenged the trial court's removal of key parts of the regulation. The Court of Appeal took up these challenges one by one.

It reinstated the "safe harbor" provision that the trial judge had struck, calling the removal "surplusage." The judge also erred in deleting the "predominant cause" requirement. "We do not read the statutory directive to 'minimize' RMIs as a mandate to overwhelm employers with regulations, regardless of how burdensome or costly corrective measures might be," the court said.

The trial court also erred by striking the requirement that RMIs be objectively identified by a physician, the appellate court said. The board's use of qualifying language was a "reasoned response to a vexing conundrum" - the lack of scientific consensus on proper definition of RMIs and identification of the cause-and-effect relationship.

The board wanted to make it clear that the standard was not triggered on just the description of symptoms, as was the case in a previous version of the standard.

The small-employer exemption is quite another matter. The appeal court agreed with the trial court that the board exceeded its statutory mandate by immunizing nearly four out of five employers from the regulation, and 25 percent of employees in the state.


In California, as far as worker safety and health is concerned, a "workplace" is any place where work is performed, the court said. The case was sent back to the trial court in Sacramento for a rewrite of the initial judgement.

(Pulaski et al v Cal. Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board; American Trucking Associations et al; American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; CO 28525, filed Oct. 29, 1999.)

Our Safety Aids section features a copy of the most recent version of 5110. It is Safety Aid 64-101 to 110. You can also find a copy of the decision and the regulation on our web site (www.cal-osh.com) under Resources.


-Anne Bell

LOAD-DATE: January 5, 2000

Source: [All Sources](#) > [Secondary Legal](#) > [Legal Publications Group File](#) 
Terms: **consuela w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))
View: Full
Date/Time: Monday, October 22, 2001 - 8:08 AM EDT

[About LexisNexis](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#)

Copyright © 2001 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Source: All Sources > Secondary Legal > Legal Publications Group File 

Terms: **consuela w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))

Select for FOCUS™ or Delivery



Cal-OSHA Reporter October 1, 1999

Copyright 1999 Providence Publications
Cal-OSHA Reporter

October 1, 1999

SECTION: Vol. 26, No. 38

LENGTH: 959 words

HEADLINE: ERGO LITIGANTS GET THEIR DAY IN COURT

DATELINE: SACRAMENTO

BODY:

The three sides in the long-running litigation over California's ergonomics standard made their cases before a three-judge panel of California's Third Court of Appeal Sept. 27. Unless one of the parties appeals the court's decision to the state Supreme Court, the case will be resolved within 90 days.

The California Trucking Association and its national counterpart contended that the Standards Board "did not comply with both the letter and the spirit" of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), according to attorney Pamela Hemminger. She also argued that the standard is "vacuous," because it is not supported by solid science and employers don't know what's required of them. The state, represented by Assistant Attorney General Timothy Laddish, said the case calls for the "clear recognition of the separation of powers." The standard can't be held invalid unless it is found arbitrary, capricious, or without reasonable basis.

Labor, for its part, argued that the law is inconsistent with its statutory requirements because of its "loopholes" and interpretation of the word "minimize."

The standard, General Industry Safety Order 5110, was the result of a mandate to the Standards Board from the 1993 workers' compensation reform package. Changes to Labor Code 6357 directed the board to "adopt standards for ergonomics in the workplace designed to minimize the instances of injury from repetitive motion."

In 1995, a Superior Court judge struck down what labor called "four huge loopholes" in the standard - a small-employer exemption, a cost-benefit provision that labor said gutted employers' compliance obligations and two limitations to the type of injuries that would trigger the regulation's requirements.

Hemminger told the court that the standard did not comply with the APA because the board did not list in its initial statement of reasons any scientific studies to back up the regulation. "This is a fundamental policy issue," she said - "an administrative agency dealing in the frontiers of science" and not relying on a single piece of scientific literature.

In addition, she said, the APA requires that a rule should be based on "adequate determination," including adverse impacts.

Presiding Justice Arthur Scotland pointed out that the board did rely on published articles

that supported the standard. Hemminger called them "puff pieces." Justice **Consuela Callahan** added that the board was required to adopt a standard. "I don't see how you can say they didn't do anything," she said.

In arguing that the standard is "vacuous," Hemminger stated that the employer community was not given adequate notice of what would be required under the regulation. "No one knows what to do," she asserted.

But Scotland countered, "It's almost become so common. People know about this (ergonomics). Why is this so vacuous?" He added that the ergonomics standard "isn't a matter of certainty, just attempting to minimize the problem" of repetitive motion injuries.

Laddish, defending the standard, admitted that the issue of ergonomics is filled with uncertainty and no scientific consensus. Nonetheless, the board fulfilled its statutory mandate by crafting the regulation, and it can't be overturned without specific findings.

Because of the uncertainty, what are employers supposed to do, he was asked. Laddish responded that the board was only doing the work delegated to it by the Legislature. If that's the case, another judge asked, how was the board complying with the intent of the Legislature when 5110's small-business provision exempts 75 percent of the businesses in the state?

Laddish replied that the board was exercising the powers delegated to it by the Legislature to "make up its own mind" on such issues. Because of the lack of scientific consensus, he explained, it was not an "abuse of discretion" to exempt small employers to procedural requirements. "The board wasn't ready to require all the multitude of small employers to be subject to this enforcement," he said.


He was also asked to respond to the charge that there was no basis for the regulation, since no scientific backup was provided. Laddish said that the board is only required to list scientific literature it relies on in crafting a standard. The board's burden is to produce "enforceable procedures" that can be worked out. He also charged that the trial court had violated the separation of powers by striking out the four provisions. The court "acted as if it had been delegated legislative powers," Laddish said.

Scott Kronland, representing AFL-CIO, argued that "the law is clear" - the Legislature intended the board to produce a standard that would minimize injuries. The ergonomics standard should be held to a strict interpretation of the word, he said. He also claimed that the Legislature did not delegate its powers to the Standards Board, an assertion that Laddish told the court was "outrageous."

The exceptions that the trial court judge threw out "were inconsistent with what the board was supposed to do," he said. And the regulation's "safe harbor" section could give some employers a competitive advantage if they can use it to avoid implementing an ergonomics program.

Scotland pressed Kronland on the need for safe harbor, given the lack of scientific consensus on repetitive motion injuries. Kronland replied that the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has concluded that repetitive motion clearly causes the type of injuries intended to be minimized by the standard. And the key word "feasible" in the safe harbor provision should be interpreted as "able to do" in implementing an ergonomics program. He added, "The AFL-CIO is not interested in imposing enormous costs on employers."

LOAD-DATE: October 4, 1999

Source: All Sources > Secondary Legal > Legal Publications Group File 
Terms: **consuela w/2 callahan** ([Edit Search](#))
View: Full
Date/Time: Monday, October 22, 2001 - 8:11 AM EDT

[About LexisNexis](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#)

Copyright © 2001 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

CALLAHAN, CONNIE M STOCKTON, CA 95212	STATE OF CA	8/18/2000	\$500	Republican Party of California
CALLAHAN, CONNIE M HON STOCKTON, CA 95212	SAN JUAQUIN COUNTY	8/27/1992	\$250	Bush

Connie M. Callahan, Associate Justice
Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Justice Callahan is a native Californian and received her undergraduate degree from Stanford University in Honors English and her law degree from McGeorge School of Law. She was admitted to the California Bar in December of 1975. She is currently enrolled in a L.L.M. program at the University of Virginia School of Law. She will receive her L.L.M. in Judicial Process in May of 2004.

Justice Callahan has served as an Associate Justice on the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, since 1996. Prior to serving on the Court of Appeal, Justice Callahan was a Superior Court Judge in San Joaquin County for four years. She also served as Commissioner of the Stockton Municipal Court for six years. Justice Callahan was the first woman and Hispanic to be appointed to the bench in San Joaquin County. She was also the first judge in 73 years to be appointed from San Joaquin County to the Court of Appeal.

Prior to serving on the bench, Justice Callahan served as a Deputy District Attorney and Supervising District Attorney for San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office from 1976-1986, a Deputy City Attorney for the City of Stockton from 1975-1976, and a Law Clerk for the Sacramento County Public Defender's Office from 1974-1975. As a prosecutor, Justice Callahan focused on major felony prosecutions in the areas of career criminal, homicide, and child abuse/sexual assault.

Justice Callahan has been recognized for her work in the areas of child abuse and sexual assault, victims' services, and mediation. In 1997, Justice Callahan was named Peacemaker of the Year by the San Joaquin County Mediation Center. In 1999, she was inducted into the Mexican-American Hall of Fame for her contributions to the Latino Community. In 2001, Justice Callahan received the Law Day Award from the San Joaquin County Bar Association. In 2002, she was honored by Action on Behalf of Children (ABC) with a Child Advocate Award. She is active as an instructor and lecturer in local schools and universities. She is currently the president of the Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court, an organization of judges, attorneys, and law students that is dedicated to promoting civility, ethics, and professionalism in the practice of law. As well, Justice Callahan has served as an elected member of the Executive Board of the California Judges Association for two terms and currently

serves as the Vice-President and President-Elect of the Alumni Board of McGeorge School of Law.

Justice Callahan is married; she and her husband, Randy, have two adult children, Erin and Anthony.

CONNIE M. CALLAHAN

Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, Third District

BAR ADMISSION: Admitted to California Bar in December 1975

EDUCATION: J.D. McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific, 1975; B.A. Honors English, Stanford University, 1972.

PROFESSIONAL LEGAL BACKGROUND: Deputy District Attorney and Supervising District Attorney, focusing on major felony prosecutions in the areas of career criminal, homicide and child abuse/sexual assault, San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office, 1976-1986; Deputy City Attorney, City of Stockton, 1975-1976; Law Clerk (during law school), Sacramento County Public Defender's Office, 1974-1975.

JUDICIAL BACKGROUND: Nominated to the Third District Court of Appeal as Associate Justice in 1996 and subsequently confirmed by the Commission on Judicial Appointments to this position, elected in 1998 for a twelve year term, served in this position from 1996 to present; appointed to the Superior Court of San Joaquin County in 1992, subsequently reelected to that position, and served until 1996; appointed Commissioner of the Municipal Court for Stockton Municipal Court, served from 1986-1992; appointed by Chief Justice to serve as Pro Tem Justice to the California Supreme Court, served on case heard in May of 1998.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES/ASSOCIATIONS/AFFILIATIONS: Board of Governors, San Joaquin County Bar Association, elected position held from 1983-1985; Treasurer and Board of Governors, Women Lawyers of San Joaquin County, elected position held 1980-1986; Stanford Women's Association; California Women Lawyers; Sacramento Women Lawyers; CJER Conference on Children as Victims and Witnesses, Planning Committee; Member of Civil Institute Planning Committee, California Center for Judicial Education and Research, 1994-1995; Chairperson for 1994 Northern California Civil Law and Procedure Workshop; Member of Executive Legislative Action Network, Judicial Council of California, 1994-1996; California Judges Association, 1986 to present; Elected member of Executive Board of California Judges Association for two terms, 1995-1996 (trial court

representative), 1999-2002 (appellate court representative).

EDUCATIONAL/PROFESSIONAL HONORS AND AWARDS: Moot Court Finalist, 1973; Recognition by Governor Deukmejian for work in establishing Victim-Witness Mobile Unit; Susan B. Anthony award for legal services, 1987; Juvenile Justice Commission award for work in field of child abuse/sexual assault; Peacemaker of the Year Award, San Joaquin County Mediation Center, 1997; Induction into the Mexican-American Hall of Fame, 1999; San Joaquin County Law Day Award Recipient, 2001; Child Advocate Award from Action on Behalf of Children (ABC), 2002.

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING/EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Instructor for California Judicial Education and Research and California Judges Association, Civil Law Update, Blair Writ Project, WWF Slapdown: Appellate v. Trial Court; Instructor for Delta College Police Academy; Lecturer: University of the Pacific, UC Davis Law School, University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law, Humphreys College of the Law, Delta College, and MCLE programs; Author: "Women in Law," 1973.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES: San Joaquin County Child Abuse Prevention Council, past Board Member and President; Judge for "Red Ribbon Week" Competition, yearly campaign to prevent substance abuse; Master of the Bench and President, Anthony M. Kennedy Inn of Court; Vice-President and President-Elect of the McGeorge Alumni Board; Judge for UC Davis Moot Court Orals, McGeorge Appellate Finals, Texas Young Lawyers Association Regional Trial Competition, and Northern California High School Moot Court finals; Co-organizer of Government Day for Kids held May 15, 1998; Rotary International (Downtown Stockton); San Joaquin County Domestic Task Force.

Withdrawal Marker

The George W. Bush Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Report	Connie M. Callahan	8	12/18/2002	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Counsel's Office, White House

SERIES:

Kavanaugh, Brett - Subject Files

FOLDER TITLE:

Judges - [Callahan, Connie]

FRC ID:

9631

OA Num.:

1823

NARA Num.:

1741

FOIA IDs and Segments:

2017-0345-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Withdrawal Marker

The George W. Bush Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Report	Connie M. Callahan	4	10/30/2002	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Counsel's Office, White House

SERIES:

Kavanaugh, Brett - Subject Files

FOLDER TITLE:

Judges - [Callahan, Connie]

FRC ID:

9631

FOIA IDs and Segments:

2017-0345-F

OA Num.:

1823

NARA Num.:

1741

RESTRICTION CODES**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.