SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF DEL NORTE

Standing Order 26-002
Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence by Judicial Officers and Court Personnel

I. AUTHORITY

This Order is issued pursuant to **California Rules of Court governing court administration and technology**, including rule 10.430.

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Order is to establish clear parameters for the use of **generative artificial intelligence (AI)** within the Superior Court of California, County of Del Norte in order to:

1. Preserve judicial independence and decision-making authority;
2. Protect confidential, sealed, and sensitive court information;
3. Ensure compliance with Judicial Council policies and California law; and
4. Maintain public confidence in the integrity, impartiality, and transparency of the judicial branch.

III. DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this Order, **generative artificial intelligence** means a computer-based system that uses machine learning or similar techniques to produce new content—such as text, images, audio, video, code, or data visualizations—in response to user inputs. Generative AI systems create content that is not pre-programmed or explicitly retrieved but synthesized based on underlying models trained on large datasets and may include integration with other sources, such as real-time access to proprietary databases.

IV. GOVERNING POLICY

1. **Judicial Council AI Model Policy as expressed in C.R.C. 10.430**
   The Court hereby adopts and incorporates the **Judicial Council of California's AI Model Policy** as the governing framework for the evaluation, procurement, implementation, and use of generative AI tools and services.
2. **Rule of Court Compliance**
   All acquisition, testing, and deployment of generative AI tools shall comply with **California Rule of Court 10.430** and all applicable Judicial Council technology, information security, privacy, and procurement policies.

V. PERMISSIBLE USES

Subject to approval and oversight consistent with Judicial Council policy, generative AI may be used by Court personnel for limited **administrative and support functions**, including but not limited to:

- Drafting non-dispositive internal documents;
- Summarizing publicly available information;
- Assisting with research or workflow efficiency; and
- Other functions expressly authorized by the Court Executive Officer or designee.

All such use must remain advisory and non-determinative.

VI. PROHIBITED USES

1. **Judicial Decision-Making**
   Generative AI shall not be used to make, draft, or determine judicial rulings, findings, orders, judgments, or sentencing decisions, nor to replace the independent legal analysis and judgment of a judicial officer.
2. **Confidential and Protected Information**
   No judicial officer or court employee shall input, upload, or disclose:
   - Confidential or sealed records;
   - Non-public case information;
   - Personally identifiable information; or
   - Any protected data into a generative AI system that is not expressly approved and secured in accordance with Judicial Council policy.
3. **Public-Facing Representations**
   Generative AI shall not be used to communicate with court users or the public in a manner that could reasonably be interpreted as legal advice, judicial guidance, or official court action, unless expressly authorized.

VII. OVERSIGHT AND DELEGATION

1. **Court Executive Officer**
   Consistent with California Rules of Court 10.430 and 10.610, oversight authority for generative AI tools is delegated to the **Court Executive Officer**, or the CEO's designee, who shall ensure compliance with this Order and applicable Judicial Council policies.
2. **Internal Controls**
   The Court Executive Officer may issue supplemental administrative directives governing training, approval, monitoring, auditing, or restriction of generative AI use.

VIII. ETHICAL AND PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS

Nothing in this Order alters or diminishes the ethical, professional, or legal obligations of judicial officers or court personnel under the California Code of Judicial Ethics, applicable statutes, or Rules of Court.

IX. PRIOR ORDERS

Any prior administrative or standing orders inconsistent with this Order are superseded to the extent of the inconsistency.

X. AFFIRMATIVE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT

1. **Disclosure Obligation**
   When generative artificial intelligence has been used to assist in the drafting of any court document, memorandum, report, or proposed order that is intended for filing, circulation to parties, or inclusion in the court record, the individual responsible for the document shall make an **affirmative disclosure** of such use.

2. **Scope of Disclosure**
   Disclosure is required when generative AI materially assisted in:
   - Drafting substantive text;
   - Summarizing legal authority or factual material;
   - Proposing legal analysis, conclusions, or recommendations; or
   - Producing language substantially incorporated into the final document.

   Disclosure is **not required** for de minimis or purely mechanical uses, such as formatting, spelling correction, or grammar checks, provided no substantive content was generated.

3. **Form of Disclosure**
   Disclosure shall be made in a manner appropriate to the document and context, which may include:
   - A footnote or notation in the document;
   - A statement in an internal memorandum; or
   - A separate internal record maintained by the Court Executive Officer or designee.

   The disclosure shall state that generative AI was used as an **assistive tool only** and that the final content was reviewed for accuracy.

4. **Judicial Officers**
   Nothing in this section requires disclosure of internal drafting tools or methods used exclusively by a judicial officer in chambers for personal research or drafting assistance, provided that:
   - The judicial officer independently reviews, verifies, and approves the final work product; and
   - The use of AI does not replace independent judicial judgment.

5. **No Delegation of Responsibility**

   Use of generative AI does not diminish or transfer responsibility for the accuracy, legality, or appropriateness of any court document. The individual signing, issuing, or approving the document remains fully accountable for its contents.

XI. ATTORNEYS/SELF REPRESENTING LITIGANTS

1. Recent passing of SB 574 will make statutory changes to BP 6068 and other statutes to include requirements of court users and practitioners to report the use of AI and responsibility of parties to ensure the accuracy of citations. The Court shall require adherence to all mandated reporting requirements per SB574.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

_____
Hon. D. Darren McElfresh, Presiding Judge

MAR 0 4 2026
_____
Date