

6/12/24 HB 5724

Most Judges are voted in by the public, there are rules and guidelines of where they can live in jurisdiction to the courts in which they serve.

They are no different than me or my neighbor in standing as public citizens. It is only while wearing the robe and in their positions that they are of an "official" status. Once they leave the court house they are a member of the public. Not a protected class of citizens. They do not wear the robe outside of their courtroom.

The President of the United States, our chief in Justice's information is public and not protected, so why should judges information be protected?

It is a separation of powers to have a federal judge using an isolated event to create undue influence on individual states to create fear and panic

Judges are no different that police, firemen, doctors, social workers, etc. Whom deal with the most mentally unstable members of the public. It is a risk they take with the job.

Judges, most often are voted in by the public, and paid by the public. If we are going to privatize their information, is the state going to privatize their pay?

I do not want to pay for a judge to be able to conceal, hide and privatize his information, financial status, criminal history, family members who may have a conflict of interest etc.

The public is entitled federally and constitutionally to transparency, to redress their government and by privatizing a judges information, limits the public's ability for remedy, redress and mechanisms of transparency, not to mention freedom of speech within our afforded opinions and self truths.

The members of the public should be allowed to know a judges history as in residence, past positions and offices, his marital status, if he has children. How many cases they have presided over, etc. How is the public to make a fair and sound decision when voting for a judge if their information is private.

Please know, while I feel badly about what has happened to Judge Salas, that was an isolated event and should be treated as such.

There are mechanisms in place and laws in place to hold people who break the laws and cause harm to others responsible.

Hearing testimony of someone stating "they did not answer the court phones for a month" because they were receiving threatening calls etc, is also highly concerning. why not hold those parties accountable instead of allowing its continuance and admitting to ignoring the rest of the public, does what exactly?" The public is entitled to freedom of speech, redress, and to protest, yet these reasons are being used as a reason to justify this bill?

I never thought as a citizen of Michigan, I would have to give my opinions and statements regarding our legislature trying to limit the freedoms of information to our public officials (whom are mostly voted in and paid for by the public body) and bend the laws already in place with our founding fathers to privatize a certain class of the public body. Which is NOT equal protections of the law.

Brandee Ritsema