



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF GUAM

Suite 300 Guam Judicial Center
120 West O'Brien Drive
Hagåtña, Guam 96910-5174
Tel: (671) 475-3413 Fax: (671) 475-3140

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF GUAM
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022
Justice Monessa G. Lujan Appellate Courtroom
Guam Judicial Center
And via Videoconference**

★★★★

Hon. F. Philip Carbullido
Chairman

Hon. Katherine A. Maraman
Member

Hon. Robert J. Torres
Member

Hon. Alberto C. Lamorena, III
Member

Hon. Arthur R. Barcinas
Member

★★★★

Advisory Committee Members:

Hon. Vernon G. Perez

Hon. Maria T. Cenzon

Hon. Elyze M. Iriarte

Hon. Dana A. Gutierrez

Hon. Alberto E. Tolentino

Atty. Jacqueline T. Terlaje

Atty. Frederick J. Horecky

★★★★

Administrator of the Courts:
Kristina L. Baird

Judicial Council Secretary:
Petrina Ula

Judicial Council Asst. Secretary:
Shelterihna T. Alokpa

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Judicial Council was called to order by the Chairman, Chief Justice F. Philip Carbullido, at the hour of 12:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL*:

Chief Justice F. Philip Carbullido (calling in from the Judiciary)
Justice Robert J. Torres (calling in from Sinajana)
Justice Katherine A. Maraman (calling in from Sinajana)
Presiding Judge Alberto C. Lamorena III (calling in from the Judiciary)
Judge Arthur R. Barcinas (calling in from the Judiciary)

Advisory Committee Members:
Judge Elyze M. Iriarte
Judge Alberto C. Tolentino
Referee Linda L. Ingles
Jacqueline T. Terlaje, GBA President
Frederick J. Horecky**

Also, Present:
Ms. Kristina L. Baird, Administrator of the Courts (AOC)
Mr. Andrew Sergio Quenga, Deputy Administrator of the Courts
Mr. Daniel F. Mensching, Staff Attorney
Ms. Danielle T. Rosete, Clerk of Court, Superior Court
Ms. Hannah G. Arroyo, Clerk of Court, Supreme Court
Ms. Maria Erica R. Eschbach, Staff Attorney, Supreme Court
Ms. Barbara Jean T. Perez, Human Resources Administrator
Mr. Troy M. Pangelinan, Marshal of the Court
Ms. Rossanna Villagomez-Aguon, Chief Probation Officer
Ms. Trisha T. Suzuki, Deputy Chief Probation Officer
Ms. Ma. Dianne Ollet Gudmalin, FMD Administrator

Mr. Carl Dominguez, Procurement & Facilities Management Administrator
Ms. Marissa C. Antonio, Deputy Procurement & Facilities Management Administrator
Ms. Virginia W. Yasuhiro, Client Services and Family Counseling Division Administrator
Ms. Geraldine A. Cepeda, Compiler of Laws/Law Library Executive Director
Mr. Robert John S. Rabago, Management Information Systems Administrator
Mr. Michael M. Kilayko, Special Projects Coordinator (PIO)
Ms. Sophia Santos Diaz, Director of Policy, Planning, and Community Relations (DPPCR)
Ms. Marcelene C. Santos, Public Guardian
Ms. Jessica Perez-Jackson, Administrative Service Officer
Ms. Petrina M. Ula, Judicial Assistant, Judicial Council Executive Secretary
Public Access in the Atrium

*Note: All individuals listed above participated via video conference as per social distancing directives.

II. PROOF OF DUE NOTICE OF MEETING

Due publication of the five-day Notices of Meeting of the Judicial Council, as required under the Open Government Law, were published in the Guam Daily Post. Acknowledgments are on file.

III. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chief Justice Carbullido began the roll call. Chief Justice F. Philip Carbullido, Associate Justice Robert J. Torres, and Presiding Judge Alberto C. Lamorena III identified themselves and their location. This meeting determined a quorum with three (3) Judicial Council members present. Judge Arthur R. Barcinas joined the meeting at 12:06 p.m. Associate Justice Katherine A. Maraman later joined the meeting at 12:08 p.m.***

IV. READING AND DISPOSAL OF MINUTES: February 24, 2022 Regular Meeting

Justice Torres moved to approve the February 24, 2022 Regular Meeting minutes, subject to correction. Presiding Judge Lamorena seconded the motion. Chief Justice Carbullido called an oral vote. With no discussion, the three (3) Judicial Council members voted in favor; the minutes were approved, subject to correction.

***At 12:03 p.m., Chief Justice Carbullido asked the Council if one (1) item under Old Business could be discussed first. There was no objection. He began to discuss Agenda Item V. Old Business D. Executive Order No. 2022-01: Relative to Establishing a Law Enforcement Officer Pay Scale Within the Competitive Wage Act Plan.

Chief Justice Carbullido introduced the three (3) presenters from the Judiciary's management team: Director of Policy, Planning, and Community Relations (DPPCR) Ms. Sophia Diaz, Human Resources Administrator (HR) Ms. Barbara-Jean Perez, and Finance Administrator (FMD) Ms. Dianne Gudmalin. He stated Ms. Diaz would speak on the Judicial Council's legal authority to adjust Judiciary employees' salaries. Chief Justice said that Ms. Perez would present HR's compensation review and that Ms. Gudmalin would address the financial impact of the options for the Council's consideration. He asked that the Council keep in mind that it is subject to Legislative funding approval regardless of the decision reached.

Ms. Diaz presented her opinion, stating that the Council has requisite authority, under current statutory provisions, to adopt adjusted pay scales for Law Enforcement Officer Personnel (LEOP) and adjust employees on the Competitive Wage Act (CWA) scales, subject to certain conditions and limitations, and sufficient Legislative appropriation. She described the Council's particular authority in its enabling legislation at 7 GCA 5102 to adopt pay plans for the compensation of its employees. Ms. Diaz stated the Council, relying on its authority in 7 GCA 5102, has adopted the General Pay Plan, the Attorney Pay Plan, and the Executive Pay Plan and compensates those categories of its workforce accordingly. Ms. Diaz stated that provided scales continue to be administered according to the CWA implementation methodology, the Council has sufficient legal authority to adjust employees on the scales.

Ms. Diaz explained that the Judiciary pays its LEOP, which comprises approximately one-third of its workforce, according to the Unified Pay Scale as adjusted under 10 GCA 55102. She stated that in the past, the LEOP's base pay rate was increased by a 10% increase per year over four years. Ms. Diaz noted that after that incremental increase, LEOPs had realized an overall increase of 40% over the uniform pay. She further explained that 10 GCA 55102 authorized an initial study of Law Enforcement compensation and recommended that a review be conducted on a triennial basis. Ms. Diaz said that this study conducted by the DOA included Judiciary LEOP. She added that no recommendations were made relative to Judiciary LEOP in the December 2021 report to the Governor that supported the adjustments adopted in Executive Order No. 2022-01. Ms. Diaz concluded that the Judiciary is authorized to adopt policies relative to its personnel.

Lastly, Ms. Diaz reported that the overall compensation policy for the Government of Guam is set out in 4 GCA 6301 and requires that such compensation be based on internal equity and external competitiveness. Ms. Diaz stated that any adjustments adopted by the Council compensating Judiciary employees must consider these two factors. Ms. Diaz noted in summary that if adjustments are in keeping with applicable methodology and account for internal equity and external competitiveness concerns, the Council has sufficient legal authority to adjust pay for its employees.

******Chief Justice Carbullido acknowledged that Justice Maraman and Judge Barcinas joined the meeting.**

Ms. Perez started her presentation by stating that pay increases for LEOP began in 2010 with the Compensation of Personnel in Public Safety (Cops) Act, which authorized a 10% increase per year for four years, with full implementation of the increase by 2014. Ms. Perez said that in 2021, DOA Human Resources (HR) Department conducted a compensation review. She added that on July 28, 2021, the Judiciary's HR Department provided DOA HR with classification and compensation information, including position description questionnaires, related to the Judiciary's Deputy Marshals and Probation Officers. As stated previously, she said, Governor Leon Guerrero signed Executive Order 2022-01 Relative to the Adjustment of the LEOP pay scale by 18% on January 18, 2022. Ms. Perez noted that EO 2022-01 took effect on January 30, 2022. She emphasized that DOA HR did not provide any recommendations for the Judiciary's LEOP to the Governor.

Ms. Perez reported that the justification for the recommended 18% increase for the Executive Branch LEOP was due to several compensation issues: the current pay structure for base salaries is non-competitive with the local competition; current pay grades do not accurately reflect the job size of various law enforcement positions, and recruitment and retention difficulties. She stated that the Judiciary is not faced with the same challenges, but that HR agrees a review was warranted.

Ms. Perez explained that the Judiciary's challenges include long-term financial sustainability; morale issues regarding salary comparison; and pay disparity between job classifications.

Ms. Perez presented a comparison of salaries of LEOPs across the Government of Guam before implementing the 18% salary increase, which demonstrated that Judiciary Deputy Marshals and Judiciary Probation Officers are compensated at a higher pay grade and rate than LEOPs employed by the Executive Branch of the Government of Guam. She noted that the only exception is the Port Authority LEOP, as they are on a separate compensation system.

Ms. Perez stated the comparison shows that after implementing the Executive Branch 18% pay raise, Judiciary LEOP are not grossly underpaid compared to other LEOP employees in the Government of Guam.

Ms. Perez presented three (3) pay options for the Council to consider:

OPTION A: (Law Enforcement Officers only)

Increase Public Safety and Law Enforcement Pay Scales by 18%

OPTION B: (Law Enforcement and Non-Law Enforcement)

Increase Public Safety and Law Enforcement Pay Scale by 6% and

Non-Law Enforcement: slot closest to but not less than a 6% increase

OPTION C: (Law Enforcement and Non-Law Enforcement)

Increase Public Safety and Law Enforcement Pay Scale by 7%

and Non-Law Enforcement: slot closest to but not less than a 6% increase

She noted that salary increment due dates will remain status quo with all three (3) options presented.

Ms. Perez described each option provided in detail to the Council, including internal and external salary comparisons, the number of LEOPs affected by the proposed increases, and salary gaps. She added that increasing the LEOP salaries would cause a significant pay disparity compared to other Judiciary employees.

Ms. Perez explained relevant factors HR considered: CWA relies on 4 GCA 6301, national trends in compensation reviews to compensate for inflation, and the financial feasibility of salary increases.

Ms. Perez stated that HR recommends the Council adopt Option C: a 7% increase to the LEOP pay scale and for other non-law enforcement positions to be slotted closest to but not less than a 6% increase. She added that HR recommends selecting the option that provides equity for all employees. Ms. Perez said Option C provides parity due to a relatively modest increase and equity in the implementation between LEOP and non-law enforcement employees. Ms. Perez stated said pay similarity will allow the Judiciary to continue hiring and retaining quality staff in all key occupational areas.

Ms. Dianne Gudmalin described the potential impact of the Compensation Review and Analysis conducted by HR on the Judiciary's FY23 Budget submission. She added that proposals to adjust employee pay would result in an additional budgetary request to the Legislature. Ms. Gudmalin stated that should the Council adopt Option A proposed by HR, the Judiciary would request approximately \$1,863,867 in additional funding. She said if the Council adopted Option B proposed by HR, an additional \$1,875,600 would be included in the budget request. Finally, Ms. Gudmalin shared that the adoption of presented Option C by the Council would result in an additional request of \$1,979,148 on top of the Judiciary's status quo budget.

Chief Justice Carbullido asked for a motion to adopt the proposed Resolution Relative to Approving Pay Increases for Judiciary of Guam Employees Subject to Legislative Appropriation for discussion purposes. Judge Barcinas made the motion; Justice Torres seconded the motion. Chief Justice Carbullido opened the floor for questions and comments.

Justice Torres stated that he favors proposed Option C as it balances internal equity and external competitiveness and considers statutory mandates and budgetary restraints.

*******Presiding Judge Lamorena left the meeting early but noted in the Zoom meeting chat function that he would support the decision of the Council.**

Judge Barcinas asked if the Whereas Clause on the Resolution that cites to 10 GCA 55102 was included because although the burden of analysis was on the Director of the DOA, the Judiciary's HR department stepped up to provide an analysis. **Judge Barcinas proposed amending the Resolution to change the Whereas Clause to add language to clarify why the Judiciary's HR department undertook the analysis. Chief Justice Carbullido proposed the amendment's language "Whereas under 10 GCA 55102 in part,". Judge Barcinas agreed to the language. Chief Justice Carbullido asked if there was a second to the motion to amend the Resolution. Justice Torres seconded the amendment. Chief Justice Carbullido asked for a discussion of the amendment.**

Justice Maraman expressed concern that the studies anticipated by the provision in 10 GCA 55102 were not completed; therefore, she suggested removing any reference to the statute from the Resolution. **Justice Maraman proposed amending the Resolution to amend the Whereas Clause to omit the reference to 10 GCA 55102. Chief Justice Carbullido asked if Judge Barcinas objected to deleting the reference to the statute. Judge Barcinas had no objection.**

Chief Justice Carbullido asked if there was any objection to withdrawing Judge Barcinas' amendment to the Resolution and amending the Whereas Clause to delete the reference to 10 GCA 55102. He stated the Whereas Clause should read, "Whereas, under 7 GCA 5102 and 4 GCA 6301, the Judicial Council is authorized to adjust the pay scales of Judiciary employees". Judge Barcinas removed his amendment. Justice Torres withdrew his second to Judge Barcinas' amendment and seconded Justice Maraman's amendment. Chief Justice called for the vote. There was no objection. The Resolution was unanimously adopted by the four (4) Council members present.

Judge Barcinas asked for clarifying the definition of 'non-law enforcement employees' and if all Judiciary employees were included in the proposed 6% salary increase. Chief Justice Carbullido stated that 'non-law enforcement employees' include all non-law enforcement Judiciary employees except Judicial Officers. He asked Ms. Perez and Ms. Gudmalin for clarification. Ms. Gudmalin stated Judicial Officers were included in the budget estimates. **Chief Justice Carbullido suggested the Council amend (Option C in the third Whereas Clause of) the Resolution to state, "Increase Probation Officer and Deputy Marshal pay by 7% and all non-law enforcement employee pay, except Judicial Officers, to slot closest to, but not less than, a 6% increase, and,".** Judge Barcinas seconded the motion.

Justice Maraman asked for clarification on implementing the salary increases. She wondered if salaries were being adjusted or if the Council was changing pay scales. Ms. Perez stated the Law Enforcement pay scale is being adjusted; non-law enforcement employees would receive a 6% increase and then be slotted closest to or not less than the slot on the applicable scale. Justice Maraman stated she could not support the implementation and stated all pay scales, except for the Judicial Officers, should be adjusted so that there is equity in future hiring. Chief Justice Carbullido stated he supported Justice Maraman's suggestion. Chief Justice asked if Ms. Perez objected. She said she had no objection. Chief Justice Carbullido asked Ms. Diaz if she had any concerns over the legality of the Council adjusting the pay scale for non-law enforcement employees. Ms. Diaz expressed concern about the Council's authority relative to the CWA scales. She suggested the Council address Justice Maraman's concern by adopting a policy that hires employees at a higher step to accommodate the adjustment to the salaries of all Judiciary employees. Justice Maraman stated the Council adjusted the Attorney Pay Scale and Executive Pay Scale in the past. **Chief Justice suggested the Council consider adjusting the Law Enforcement pay scale by 7% and delete any reference to non-law enforcement employees' pay adjustments. He suggested deferring that action to the next Council meeting until the Council has had time to examine the matter further.** Chief Justice Carbullido asked if there was any objection to his suggestions. There was no objection from the Council. Justice Maraman motioned to amend the Resolution's title to read "Relative to Approving Pay Increases for Law Enforcement Employees of the Judiciary Subject to Legislative Appropriation." She added all references to non-law enforcement employees be removed from the Resolution and that a new Resolution regarding the same be introduced at the next Council meeting. Justice Torres seconded the amendment. Chief Justice Carbullido asked Ms. Diaz to work with legal to re-write the Resolution as amended and examine further pay increases for non-law enforcement employees to be discussed at the next Council meeting. He opened the floor to the meeting attendees for discussion; there was no discussion.

Chief Justice called for the oral vote on the Resolution as amended by Justice Maraman; all four (4) Council members in attendance voted in favor. Chief Justice Carbullido noted Presiding Judge Lamorena was excused from voting; he did not provide a written proxy to the chair of the Council. Justice Torres requested HR include an internal salary comparison of executive and mid-level positions as part of their salary analysis for non-law enforcement employees. Chief Justice asked HR to ensure Judicial Officers are excluded from the analysis.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Judiciary FY21 Remittances under PL 36-54

Ms. Dianne Gudmalin, the Financial Management Division (FMD) Administrator, reported that the Judiciary's scheduled bi-weekly allotment of \$1,257,204 for FY22 have been consistent and timely. She stated that from the \$32,687,295 appropriated to the Judiciary under PL 36-54, 46% or \$15,086,000 has been received. Ms. Gudmalin added that the last allotment was received on March 9, 2022; the next allotment is scheduled for March 22, 2022.

B. Update on the Judiciary's Response to COVID-19

The Administrator of the Courts (AOC) Ms. Kristina Baird reported that the Judiciary is still facing the third surge of COVID-19 cases, with 98 employees testing positive since January 1, 2022. She stated that the contact tracing teams are monitoring COVID-positive employees. Ms. Baird added that the Judiciary, consistent with the Executive Branch, through ADM2022-01 rescinded the mandatory vaccination and weekly testing requirements for employees. She stated that face masks and six-foot social distancing requirements are still in effect in the Judiciary.

Ms. Baird said the Judiciary's Response to COVID-19 focuses on the sanitization of facilities, support of virtual platforms, and continued operation of high-capacity courtrooms for in-person proceedings.

C. Update on Capital Improvement Projects

Ms. Baird (AOC) reported on three (3) ongoing Capital Improvement Projects (CIP): the 8th judge's courtroom, renovation of the third floor of the San Ramon Building (SRB), and the Guam Historic Courthouse Building.

Ms. Baird reported that the construction work on the 8th judge's courtroom continues; the targeted completion date is March 28, 2022.

Ms. Baird explained the construction work on the 3rd floor of the SRB is completed. Ms. Baird reported that the 3rd floor of the SRB would house Regulation Counsel and the Finance Management Division (FMD); the cashier's window will not be moved. She stated that the Regulation Counsel Division has started moving into their new office spaces. The workstations for FMD are expected to arrive the first week of April, Ms. Baird stated. She said that FMD would be relocated to SRB once the workstations are installed. Ms. Baird stated that once FMD is relocated, the space the division currently occupies in the Judiciary will be taken over by two sections of Probation. She added that the FMD space on the third floor of the SRB is presently being utilized for jury deliberations for trials held in the SRB High-Capacity courtroom.

Ms. Baird reported that the Judiciary worked with the contracted architect on the Guam Historic Courthouse Building blueprints and agreed on a layout of the building design. She added that the blueprints will soon be complete and put out for construction bids. Ms. Baird stated expected blueprint completion date is the end of March.

D. Executive Order No. 2022-01: Relative to Establishing a Law Enforcement Officer Pay Scale Within the Competitive Wage Act Plan

*****Please see page 3

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Judiciary FY23 Budget (for discussion purposes)

Chief Justice Carbullido reported that the FY23 Budget preparations are ongoing, and a draft budget will be submitted to the Council for review on April 18, 2022. He noted the Budget will be reviewed by Council in the April 21, 2022 Council meeting. Chief Justice Carbullido stated there will not be a meeting to discuss the Budget before the Council meeting in adherence with the Open Government Law. He added the proposed salary increases were not anticipated; they need to be factored into the budget proposal. Chief Justice Carbullido stated the salary increases are a priority and cuts will need to be made elsewhere to account for them.

B. JC Resolution Relative to Updating the Signature Card of Account Held by the Judiciary for the Purpose of Utilizing a Debit/Check Card

Ms. Gudmalin presented to Council the need to update the signature cards for the 'Judiciary's accounts held with First Hawaiian Bank, Bank of Guam, Bank of Hawaii, Bank Pacific, and ANZ Bank. She stated the update was needed due to recent changes in the 'Judiciary's management team. **Judge Barcinas moved to adopt the Resolution; Justice Torres seconded the motion. Chief Justice Carbullido called for an oral vote. All four (4) Council members voted in favor of adopting the Resolution Relative to Updating the Signature Card of Account Held by the Judiciary for the Purpose of Utilizing a Debit/Check Card.**

****Attorney Frederick Horecky left the meeting at 12:56 p.m. to attend another meeting.**

C. Common Areas Recording Policy

Mr. Daniel F. Mensching, Staff Attorney, introduced the need for a Common Areas Recording Policy (the Policy) for discussion purposes following an incident at the Judiciary. He stated the Policy, which will not apply to official ceremonies such as investitures, will prohibit all audio and video recording within the 'Judiciary's common areas unless prior permission is granted from a judicial officer or the AOC. Mr. Mensching explained that the Policy would not apply to the use of recording devices inside courtrooms. He stated such recordings would remain subject to the rules for electronic coverage of judicial proceedings as adopted by the Supreme Court in 2016.

He added that the media may still record audio and video in the areas immediately outside the Judiciary. Mr. Mensching explained that besides the maintenance of decorum and protection of Judiciary employees, the Policy would also help protect the privacy of specific individuals who conduct court business but whose identities are not public, such as juveniles, jurors, and parties in sealed proceedings.

Mr. Mensching stated other jurisdictions have similar policies in place. Mr. Mensching said the Policy is consistent with the ' 'Judiciary's Rules Governing Electronic Coverage of Judicial Proceedings, adopted by the Supreme Court in 2016. He said those rules, which mainly address recording within the courtrooms, also state that the Judiciary may institute reasonable restrictions on recording in the ' 'court's common areas to maintain safety, decorum, and order. Mr. Mensching stated that a form for individuals to submit has been prepared and posted on the Judiciary website if approved by Council.

Justice Maraman asked if the incident involved the media. Mr. Mensching stated that it did not. Justice Maraman suggested Judiciary management discuss the Policy with the media. She urged the PIO to warn the media there would be a change in Policy and allow comment. Chief Justice Carbullido asked the AOC to send the Policy to all media outlets, with a period to comment.

Judge Barcinas stated he agrees with the Policy in general. He asked for a little more clarity in Section IV Prohibitions regarding recording in the Atrium, where some trials are streamed for Public Access. He stated his concern is that a Judicial Officer may prohibit recording in the Atrium, but the person may request permission from the administration, causing a conflict. Ms. Baird stated the administration is briefed by the Clerk of Court, Ms. Rosette, on jury activities weekly, thereby informing of streamed trials. She understands that the Atrium is an extension of the courtroom, and that the administration would not contradict a ' 'judge's order regarding recording.

Guam Bar Association President Terlaje asked to have the Policy sent to the members of the Bar as well and that the Bar be allowed to comment. Chief Justice Carbullido stated the matter will be tabled until the May Judicial Council meeting to allow the members of the Bar and the media to provide feedback.

D. Notice of Next Meeting (April 21, 2022)

Chief Justice Carbullido announced the next Judicial Council regular meeting will be Thursday, April 21, 2022. He stated that the meeting would discuss the FY23 Budget and the remaining discussion on salary adjustment for non-law enforcement employees, excluding the judicial officers.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Guam Bar Association Board (GBA) – President's Report

President Terlaje announced that the Guam Bar Association (GBA) will hold their annual membership meeting on April 8, 2022. She explained the meeting will also celebrate Mes CHamorro and Law Month. President Terlaje extended an invitation to attend the meeting to the Judiciary.

President Terlaje asked if the Judiciary is interested in establishing a Senior Attorney Arbitration / Mediator panel or program for civil matters. She stated she has discussed the matter with Judge Barcinas. Chief Justice Carbullido requested a draft description of the proposal from President Terlaje. He stated it is a timely proposal, as the Pacific Judicial Council is conducting mediation training under the leadership of Magistrate Judge Heather Kennedy in October 24-26, 2022. Judge Barcinas stated that the proposal came from a discussion of settlement judges in a recent meeting. He added that retired attorneys could be tapped to serve as settlement judges.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Justice Torres moved to adjourn. Presiding Judge Lamorena seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted, and the meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted this 21st day of April 2022.



SHELTERIHNA T. ALOKOA
Assistant Secretary,
Judicial Council of Guam



PETRINA M. ULA.
Executive Secretary,
Judicial Council of Guam

The Minutes of the March 17, 2022 Regular Meeting as set out above were approved by the Judicial Council at the April 21, 2022 Regular meeting.



F. PHILIP CARBULLIDO
Chairman

Dated: 4/21/2022