

I write to address concerns expressed by your readers and clarify your understanding of the restraining orders issued against Mr. Broderick.

Judges do not capriciously sign restraining orders, nor as you opine in your Saturday endorsement editorial do they execute their judicial authority without first examining the facts. The legal standard or burden of proof is a “preponderance of the evidence.”

Two different judges signed the restraining orders against Mr. Broderick in file no. 982943, as Mr. Broderick signed a declaration under penalty of perjury that the first judge who issued it was prejudiced against him.

The restraining orders in that case were only vacated because Mr. Broderick stipulated and agreed to a third order in a companion family law case no. 983258. The vacating of the restraining order was a condition precedent to the agreement in the third matter. The language therein states “If this stipulation is made an order of the court in this family law action, the pending domestic violence action ... #982943 and the resulting TRO shall be dismissed...”

And a third judge approved that order as well.

So, is Mr. Broderick or this paper accusing three Sonoma County Judges of acting capriciously, without examining the facts, or without evidence? Three different judges signed conduct orders against Mr. Broderick, and Mr. Broderick agreed to the third in exchange for dismissal of the prior two.

These facts raise concerns which your paper, its readers, and the voters of Sonoma County should consider when electing a Superior Court Judge.

Now, addressing the circumstances extant. I took great care to block out the victim’s name on the order presented, and made no mention of her status as a victim. It was Mr. Broderick who “candidly” disclosed those facts. Persons with

mental health issues are equally entitled to the protections afforded by the legal process, and the three judges that signed the orders obviously agree.

Further, it was Mr. Broderick who “candidly” failed to mention the third restraining order as the reason for the dismissal of the first two. Unfortunately your paper took his word alone without verification, or examining the files, and instead accused me of not telling the whole story. Well, there it is.

Lastly, your editorial states that the matter was both mailed and inserted into the paper. It was not mailed to any voter. It was only inserted into your paper after your management scrutinized, verified, and required changes that were made prior to its insertion.

I think the voters have a right to know our public records of conduct.

Sincerely,

John LemMon