

To Whom it May Concern,

I write in support of the proposed legislation to remove age restrictions on Judges. I appear regularly in court and have an active trial practice that has a focus on family law cases. In my experience, my client's look to Judges that have not only judicial experience but also life experience to rely upon. This is most evident when conducting settlement conferences that by their nature are a little more candid and relaxed than an actual trial. It is a disservice to the litigants and quite frankly, an insult, to Judges who, because of an arbitrary number, cannot assist litigants in resolving their cases. The fact that a Judge reaches a certain age in life makes them no longer able to assist litigants is a logical fallacy. If that were the case, then the legislature should require that you must attain a certain age prior to being eligible to become a Judge. Likewise, this is not a logical indicator of a Judge's effectiveness as a jurist.

Finally, having a mandatory age limit for Judges excludes experienced attorneys from becoming a Judge because they will have to step down if they reach the magic age. Voters, litigators and litigants would not be served well based on this random standard. Voters should be allowed to choose the best candidate. Litigators should be allowed to rely on a Judges depth of knowledge and litigants from the Judge's life experience.

By the way, if the current state of the law in Oregon were applied to the Federal bench, four of the current sitting United States Supreme Court Justices would be in violation.

Thank you for your consideration,

David B. Herr, OSB# 89011