

50 YEARS AFTER
**THE MIRANDA
DECISION**

*How Federal Courts Defined
the Rights of the Accused*



**2016 NINTH CIRCUIT
CIVICS CONTEST**

THE ORGANIZERS THANK THE FOLLOWING FOR THEIR
GENEROUS SUPPORT:

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
U.S. DISTRICT AND BANKRUPTCY COURTS FOR THE
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF GUAM
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

A Word About the Contest

The 2016 Ninth Circuit Civics Contest was a collaborative effort by the Ninth Circuit Courts and Community Committee and all of the federal courts in the Ninth Circuit. The theme of the contest was “50 Years After the Miranda Decision: How Federal Courts Defined the Rights of the Accused.” Students were challenged to write an essay or produce a brief video focusing on the history and importance of the landmark 1966 U.S. Supreme Court decision.



*District Judge
Janis L. Sammartino,
is the chair of the
Ninth Circuit Courts
and Community
Committee*

All told, more than 700 students from every corner of the Ninth Circuit entered the contest. Many districts held local competitions with winners advancing to the circuit-level contest.

In all, 36 essays and 25 videos were selected for final consideration by the Ninth Circuit Courts and Community Committee, which selected 1st, 2nd and 3rd place winners in both the writing and video competitions. The winners will receive generous cash prizes while all participating students will receive a commendation recognizing their efforts.

We are extremely pleased with the success of this effort to better inform young people about the Judicial Branch. We would like to thank the many judges, attorneys, court staff and educators from throughout the western states and Pacific Islands who contributed their time and efforts to organizing and promoting the contest and conducting preliminary judging. Without their help, the contest could not have succeeded.

July 2016

WINNING ESSAY CONTEST ENTRIES

1st
place

DANIELA MIRELL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

“THE RIGHT TO KNOW YOUR RIGHTS: THE LESSONS OF MIRANDA”

“You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to appointment of counsel. If you cannot afford a lawyer, one will be appointed for you.”

In the landmark case of *Miranda v. Arizona*, the Supreme Court ruled that police officers must advise suspects who are arrested of their constitutional rights before they are interrogated. This decision has had a dramatic impact on the public’s knowledge of our rights under the Fifth Amendment. While many people might not know other portions of the Constitution, *Miranda* etched in the public mind the meaning and importance of the privilege against self-incrimination.



Dani is a junior at Harvard-Westlake High School in Studio City, California, where she is captain of the girls’ JV basketball team, a member of the jazz ensemble, and an honor roll student. Dani is committed to community service. She coaches for a Special Olympics basketball team and volunteers with several teen service organizations. Dani is committed to equal rights for everyone, especially women. She loves to travel and looks forward to being a counselor this summer at Camp Ramah in

Ojai, California. Last summer, she participated in a seminar in Poland and Israel, where she volunteered to train with the Israeli Defense Forces and was named “Soldier of the Week.” Dani enjoys writing and has won the Milken Award for Outstanding Student Essay on civility and society’s values in 2012.

On March 13, 1963, Officer Carroll Cooley of the Phoenix Police Department arrested Ernesto Miranda for rape. Like the three other cases joined before the Supreme Court, Miranda had not been advised before he was interrogated that he had the right to remain silent and to have a lawyer with him at his interrogation. Instead, he was questioned for two hours and finally gave a written confession. Although he said in his confession that he was voluntarily admitting his crime, his lawyer later argued that the confession should be thrown out because Miranda was never advised that he had the right to remain silent.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, who had a background in law enforcement as a former District Attorney, Attorney General, and Governor of California, used Miranda's case to establish new rules for interrogating suspects. Writing for the majority, Warren held that "incommunicado interrogation of individuals in a police-dominated atmosphere" was inherently coercive. Warren noted the prevailing practice of police using psychological coercion. "The officers are told by the manuals that the 'principal psychological factor contributing to a successful interrogation is privacy' [and isolation]. Officers use 'Mutt and Jeff' tactics and even resort to deception. In such an atmosphere, it is important that a defendant have some means to 'dispel the compulsion inherent in custodial surroundings.'"

The Supreme Court decided that some kind of safeguard was necessary to prevent coerced confessions. Absent any other suitable alternative, the Court adopted the now-famous Miranda rights. Recitation of these rights would be a prophylactic measure to ensure that all suspects know their rights before questioning begins. Key to the Court's decision was making counsel available to suspects. Lawyers could level the playing field and "mitigate the dangers of untrustworthiness."

The Supreme Court embraced this approach because it gave police officers a clear rule to follow before interrogating a suspect. They could interrogate a suspect, but only after advising the suspect of his or her right to remain silent and to counsel.

In many ways, the decision was not as radical as many thought. The Federal Bureau of Investigation was already advising suspects of their

Fifth Amendment rights. Moreover, as Warren wrote, the “decision is not intended to hamper the traditional function of police officers in investigating crimes.” In fact, Warren emphasized, “Confessions remain a proper element in law enforcement.”

Nonetheless, four dissenters claimed the new ruling has created a roadblock for the police. They thought that the Due Process Clause only required that confessions be voluntary. They resented Warren’s “hazardous experimentation” in setting new prophylactic rules that the Constitution does not expressly require. “Nothing in the letter or the spirit of the Constitution ... squares with the heavy-handed and one-sided action so precipitously taken by the Court.” They also complained that a guilty person might go free simply because a police officer failed to recite the Miranda warning.

Miranda has always been a controversial decision. However, the Supreme Court has never overruled it and people still confess even after they have been advised of their rights. In fact, the Miranda decision did not even impede Miranda’s ultimate conviction. When he was re-tried without the confession, he was again convicted.

In the end, *Miranda* is a pivotal case for the American criminal justice system. Too often, people do not know their rights or only know their rights if they are rich and can afford a lawyer. But most everyone knows that they have the right to remain silent, even if they just learn of these rights from television. Miranda gave us the right to know our rights. That is an amazing constitutional lesson for all Americans.

2nd
place

RAIZEL YU TUMON, GUAM

“No person shall be... compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself...” This Fifth Amendment clause is upheld today in a famous decision by the United States Supreme Court that established the Miranda Rights.

Many are familiar with the warning given by police officers, “You have the right to remain silent, anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of justice. You have the right to an attorney. If you cannot afford an attorney, one will be appointed for you”¹ This warning was developed after the 1966 landmark decision by the United States Supreme Court in *Miranda v. Arizona*.² The *Miranda* decision required police to issue such a warning whenever a person was in police custody and about to be interrogated. If the Miranda warning is not given, any statements made by an arrestee during custodial interrogation are inadmissible against him in court.³

1 Morrow, Stephanie. “Know Your Rights: What Are Miranda Rights?” Legalzoom.com. N.p., 05 May 2010. Web. 10 Apr. 2016.-

2 “Miranda v. Arizona Podcast.” United States Courts. N.p., n.d. Web. 7 Apr. 2016.

3 ““Miranda” Rights and the Fifth Amendment.” Findlaw. N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Mar. 2016.



Raizel Yu is 16 years old and an incoming junior at St. John's School in Guam. The subjects she enjoys most are English, history, and foreign languages. In addition to English, Fukienese Chinese, and Tagalog, Raizel will be able to speak Japanese, and Mandarin Chinese fluently after graduating high school. She loves singing, competing in open water ocean swims, and she is the co-captain of her school's mock trial team. Raizel plans to double major in business economics and international relations at Yale University.

In *Miranda v. Arizona*, Ernesto Miranda was arrested and charged with robbery, kidnapping, and rape in March of 1963. The police interrogated him while he was in their custody, and after two hours of questioning Miranda allegedly confessed to his crimes in a written statement.⁴ Although police followed standard procedure at the time, they admitted they failed to inform Miranda of his right to an attorney before the interrogation.⁵ At his trial in the Superior Court of Maricopa County, Arizona, Miranda's written confession was admitted as evidence over the objection of his attorney. Miranda lost his trial and was sentenced to twenty to thirty years in prison.⁶

In 1966, with the assistance of the American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU"),⁷ Miranda appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. Miranda argued through his lawyer, John Flynn, that his rights were violated because he was not informed prior to police interrogation "that he had the right not to make any statement... to be free from further questioning by the police department... to be represented adequately by counsel... and that if he was... too poor to employ counsel, the state would furnish him counsel".⁸ The United States Supreme Court reversed the Arizona Supreme Court's affirmation of Miranda's conviction on the grounds that Miranda's Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights had been violated.⁹

The Supreme Court held that the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination applies in situations where a suspect is being interrogated in police custody.¹⁰ A defendant's statements during custodial interrogation may not be used against him in court unless the Miranda warning was given before the questioning began. The Supreme Court

4 McBride, Alex. "Miranda v. Arizona (1966)." PBS. PBS, n.d. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

5 Ibid.

6 "Facts and Case Summary - Miranda v. Arizona." United States Courts. N.p., n.d. Web. 2 Apr. 2016.

7 Kiefer, Michael. "Ways Arizona Changed the World: Miranda Ruling." Azcentral.com. N.p., n.d. Web. 5 Mar. 2016.

8 "Miranda v. Arizona, Oral Arguments." *Miranda v. Arizona, Oral Arguments*. University of Minnesota, n.d. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

9 McBride, Alex. "Miranda v. Arizona (1966)." PBS. PBS, n.d. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

10 "Self-incrimination." TheFreeDictionary.com. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

held further that the Sixth Amendment right to an attorney requires police to inform a defendant that she has the right to be represented by an attorney, and that if she requests one, police must stop the interrogation until defendant's attorney is present.¹¹

Additional rights have been established relating to Miranda. In *Escobedo v. Illinois* (1964), the Supreme Court held that before custodial interrogation occurred, the police were required to inform any person of her right to remain silent.¹² In *Gideon v. Wainwright* (1963), the Supreme Court held that the right to be represented by counsel is a fundamental right under the Sixth Amendment. Therefore, indigent defendants have the right to be provided counsel.¹³ In *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961), the Supreme Court established the exclusionary rule, upholding the Fourth Amendment right to be free of illegal searches and seizures. Under the exclusionary rule, any evidence obtained as a result of an illegal search or seizure could not be used in court against the accused.¹⁴ Furthermore, in *Wong Sun v. United States* (1963), the Supreme Court extended the applicability of the exclusionary rule to verbal statements as well.¹⁵ Thus, the *Miranda* decision built upon these earlier decisions, affirming these Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights guaranteed by our Constitution.

The Miranda Rights are important because they protect certain rights of individuals contained in the Constitution: the right against self-incrimination, the right to counsel and the right to be free from illegal searches and seizures. The existence of the Miranda Rights ensures that people are treated fairly each time they are arrested and charged with a crime; it prevents the government from overstepping its bounds and trampling on individual rights. In this way, the *Miranda* decision and the decisions it built upon were pivotal in developing the Miranda Rights, which safeguards fundamental rights at the heart of our Constitution.

11 "Miranda Warnings and Police Questioning - FindLaw." Findlaw. N.p., n.d. Web. 5 Mar. 2016.

12 "Escobedo v. Illinois." TheFreeDictionary.com. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

13 "Facts and Case Summary - Gideon v. Wainwright." United States Courts. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

14 "Mapp v. Ohio Podcast." United States Courts. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

15 "Wong Sun v. U.S." Ann Arbor Law. N.p., 26 June 2011. Web. 15 Apr. 2016.

3rd
place

CARLY FRIEDERS SAHUARITA, ARIZONA

MIRANDA : A LIVING LEGACY OF REFORM

An impoverished Mexican laborer from Phoenix, Ernesto Miranda seemed an unlikely character to trigger a constitutional revolution. In 1963, unaware of his rights to silence and an attorney during interrogation, he confessed to rape and was sent to prison, where he might have served his years unnoticed had it not been for some incredible timing. Fortunately for Miranda, he was arrested at the precipice of a watershed decade in law enforcement reforms, spearheaded by Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren. Warren's Court plucked Miranda's case from obscurity and made it a vehicle for its most adventurous ruling yet, proclaiming that police must warn suspects of their rights preinterrogation. With this declaration, the Court formed not only a broad protection of our constitutional rights, but also a legacy that sustained its justice-minded reforms in the public consciousness long after the 1960s had come and gone.



Carly is 18 years old and graduated this May from Walden Grove High School in Sahuarita, Arizona, where some of her favorite subjects were history, government, and Spanish. Next fall, Carly will attend Rice University in Houston, where she hopes to double major and get her degree in philosophy and policy studies before moving onto law school. Her ultimate goal is to practice public-service law with a government or non-profit organization that serves people who are traditionally underrepresented in the legal system. In high school, she was involved in several activities that deepened her interest in the law, especially volunteering at Pima County Teen Court, a juvenile diversion and peer sentencing program where she worked as a teen attorney. Carly enjoys dancing, playing the cello, and just spending time with her friends, family, and dog.

By now, Hollywood portrayals have normalized Miranda warnings to the point that many forget they emerged from a judicial philosophy known for pushing the constitutional envelop. While *Miranda* was still making its way through the lower courts, for example, the Supreme Court was broadening indigent defendants' Sixth Amendment right to representation in *Gideon v. Wainwright* (Veronica Majerol 19). The following year, it established in *Malloy v. Hogan* that Fifth Amendment self-incrimination protections belong in state courts as well as federal ones (Howard Roscoe and Lisa Rich 688). The *Miranda* decision shared much in common with these trailblazing predecessors. Like *Gideon*, it addressed flaws in the legal system that disproportionately burdened poor, uneducated citizens (Majerol 19). And like *Malloy*, it dealt with suspects' rights to remain silent.

Miranda, though, stood out in the controversy it stirred. After squeaking into existence 5-4, it was criticized by dissenting justices, legal scholars, and police officers alike. The crux of this criticism was that *Miranda* lacked an explicit constitutional foundation (Linda Greenhouse np). *Gideon* could be tied directly to the "right to a lawyer" promised in the Sixth Amendment, and *Malloy* could be tied directly to the right to avoid self-incrimination found in the Fifth. *Miranda* eschewed such easy constitutional categorization (Roscoe and Rich 703). It did not simply apply a single right to more diverse situations, nor did it simply ask that officers and courts passively accept rights as claimed by defendants. Rather, in the truest reflection of an activist court, it required that law enforcement take an active role in helping defendants understand protections scattered across the Constitution and case law.

To its opponents, this aggressively wide scope was *Miranda's* greatest weakness. Ironically though, some legal minds have come to recognize it as *Miranda's* greatest strength. In 2000, the Supreme Court reviewed a statute that Congress had passed to supersede *Miranda*. Once a staunch critic of the decision, Chief Justice William Rehnquist defended it from this statute in *Dickerson v. United States*, claiming that it "has become part of our national culture" (Greenhouse np). This cultural phenomenon was only possible because of *Miranda's* ambition. Drawing on many constitutional principles, the Supreme Court fashioned Miranda warnings that resonated with the citizenry's broad

understandings of fairness. One right from one amendment is a legal technicality. The several rights listed in *Miranda* together create a consistent and accessible symbol of justice.

Critics may continue to assert that this symbol is an empty one. After all, eighty percent of suspects waive their rights when confronted with them, possibly due to a lack of understanding (Majerol 19). While such problems do exist, however, so too do efforts by the courts to ameliorate them. Cases like *Seibert v. Missouri* (2004) have addressed *Miranda*-related police practices that confuse suspects (Interrogations and the 10). And ultimately, *Miranda* is remarkable because it does not center on suspects' actions. It places the impetus to protect the Constitution chiefly on police, with positive results. Criminal justice professor Samuel Walker asserts that post-*Miranda*, officers became more willing to report abuses of power (Jost 234). Perhaps this is because, when they constantly read rights, officers are reminded of their obligation to act with accountability.

Today, it is crucial that we continue using *Miranda* to promote such accountability. Hopefully reforms will enhance suspects' understanding of the warnings, but even now, even if the accused do not comprehend all they contain, the first four words, "you have the right," are powerful in and of themselves. With their absolutism, they make it clear that the protections created by the Constitution and expanded by the courts reside within each individual, and thus, cannot be stripped away.

Works Cited

- Greenhouse, Linda. "Justices Reaffirm Miranda Rule, 72; A Part of 'Culture.' (cover story)." *New York Times*, June 27, 2000. Accessed February 16, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/us/politics/28health.html>.
- Howard, Roscoe C. and Lisa A. Rich, "A History of Miranda and Why It Remains Vital Today," *Valparaiso University Law Review* 40, no. 3 (2006): 685706. Accessed March 3, 2016. <http://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1225&context=vulr>.
- "Interrogations and the Supreme Court." *Supreme Court Debates* 14, no. 5 (May 2011): 10. MasterFILE Complete, EBSCOhost (accessed February 16, 2016).
- Jost, Kenneth. "The Public Trust." *CQ Researcher* 10, no. 10 (2000): 234. Accessed February 20th, 2016. <http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/document.php?id=cqresre2000031700>.
- Majerol, Veronica. "You Have the Right to Remain Silent." *New York Times Upfront* 148, no. 7 (January 11, 2016): 18. *MasterFILE Complete*, EBSCOhost (accessed January 28, 2016).

WINNING VIDEO CONTEST ENTRIES

Winning video entries can be viewed by visiting the 2016 Civics Contest website: <http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/civicscontest>



IVAN SKVARIL
Asan, Guam



Ivan is a 16-year-old incoming junior at St. John's School in Guam. His favorite subjects to study in school are philosophy and history because he finds it interesting to study human behavior. In his free time, he is usually working on getting better at basketball or working on producing a video. In the future, he hopes to study film production and attend the University of Southern California.



DANIEL CONSIDINE

Benson, Arizona



Daniel is 15 years old and heading into his junior year of high school. When he's not in school, he watches a lot of movies and creates short fun videos that he shares with his friends and family. When he graduates from high school, he plans to go to Full Sail University in Winter Park, Florida, where he will study the art of film making, and what it means to be a great movie director.



MARIELA GANDARA
San Francisco, California



Mariela is an 18-year-old filmmaker with a love for politics and government. She attends an arts high school, so expression through art is essential in her life. She will attend City College of San Francisco and become a transfer student. Her major will be political science. She hopes to continue making art and one day work in the governments, and own a pug as well. Expressing politics and government through art is an exciting and new process for her, and she plans on continuing it!



DISTRICT OF MONTANA WINNERS

ESSAY WINNERS

1st Place

Kaitlynn Lindbo
Senior, Capital High School, Helena

2nd place

Trevor Canty
Senior, Billings West High School, Billings

3rd Place

Andrew Driscoll
Senior, Billings Senior High School, Billings

VIDEO WINNERS

1st Place

Jordan Christian and Patrick Brennan
Seniors, C.M. Russell High School, Great Falls

2nd Place

Andrew Driscoll
Senior, Billings Senior High School, Billings

3rd Place

Jamie Steers
Senior, Fort Benton High School, Fort Benton

OTHER ESSAY & VIDEO CONTEST FINALISTS

District of Alaska

Essay finalists are Anessa Feero, junior, West Anchorage High School; McKinley Brock, senior, Wasilla Lake Christian School; and Seth Machakos, sophomore, Juneau-Douglas High School.

Video finalists are the team of Ezra Geselle and Marlena Romanoff; the team of Andyn Mulgrew-Truitt, Morgan Balovich and Jacob Munce; and the team of Theo Houck and Isabella Bugayong. All are sophomores at Juneau Douglas High School.

District of Arizona

Essay finalists are Geneva Saupe, junior, BASIS Tucson North Charter School; Carly Frieders, senior, Walden Grove High School in Sahuarita; and Zhengdong Wang, junior, Hamilton High School in Chandler.

Video finalists are Daniel Considine, sophomore, San Pedro Valley High School in Benson; Bailey Bernal, senior, Perry High School in Gilbert, and the team of Jonathan Pacheco, Connor Allred and Alejandro Pino, seniors, Skyline High School in Mesa.

Central District of California

Essay finalists are Daniela Mirell, junior, Harvard-Westlake School in Studio City; Serena Davis, junior, Harvard-Westlake School; and Emily Ramirez, sophomore, Royal High School in Simi Valley.

Eastern District of California

Essay finalists are Austin Ibarra, senior, Jesse M. Bethel High School in Vallejo; Jelena Mae Tating, senior, Jesse M. Bethel High School; and Pilar Rabago, junior, Aspire Alexander Twilight Secondary Academy in Sacramento.

Video finalist is Alexander Antonucci, junior, Lassen High School in Susanville.

Northern District of California

Essay finalists are Emily Luong, junior, Evergreen Valley High School in San Jose; Joseph Rumelhart, sophomore, Palo Alto Senior High School in Palo Alto; and Shreyas Iyer, junior, Lynbrook High School in San Jose.

Video finalists are Sandra Duenas, junior, Richmond High School in Richmond; Arling Apaez, senior, Richmond High School; and Mariela Gandara, senior, Ruth Asawa School of the Arts in San Francisco.

Southern District of California

Essay finalists are Jerod Sun, junior, La Jolla County Day School in La Jolla; Emi Zeger, senior, University City High School in San Diego; and Gabriel Mateus, senior, Hilltop High School in Chula Vista.

Video finalists are: the team of Nahum Erigo, Adrian Maldonado and Jordan Eddings, seniors, San Diego High School in San Diego; the team of Ryan Tompkins, Victoria Fernandez and Kalalaelisa Toomalatai, seniors, Otay Ranch High School in Chula Vista; and the team of Paulina Aguilar, Paola Rubio and Alex Rios, seniors, Otay Ranch High School.

District of Guam

Essay finalists are Raizel Yu, sophomore, St. John's School in Tumon; Anne Wen, sophomore, St. John's School; and Marie Ellenor Bagana, senior, Academy of Our Lady of Guam in Hagatna.

Video finalists are Ivan Skvaril, sophomore, St. John's School in Tumon; Avery Fernandez, junior, Guam High School in Agana; and the team of Renee Julia Blancaflor, Mikaela Agtay and Mary Elizabeth Auxilian, seniors, Academy of Our Lady of Guam in Hagatna.

District of Hawaii

Essay finalist is Jenaiah Kamoku-Santos, a junior at Aiea High School in Aiea.

Video finalist is the team of senior Tomomi Suzuki and juniors Brian Lu and Andrew Yu from William McKinley High School in Honolulu.

District of Idaho

Essay finalists are Miles Maxcer, senior, Moscow High School in Moscow; Andrea Marotz, junior, Rigby High School in Rigby; and Michael Lejardi, senior, Homedale High School in Homedale.

District of Nevada

Essay finalists are Megan Flanagan, Hannah Morris, and Sanae Ishijima. All are seniors at the Las Vegas Academy of the Performing Arts in Las Vegas.

Video finalists are Joseph Trierweiler, sophomore, West Careera and Technical Academy in Las Vegas; Gavin Garcia, junior, Canyon Springs High School in North Las Vegas; and the team of Aldo Parra and Paloma Martinez, both juniors, from Canyon Springs High School.

District of the Northern Mariana Islands

Essay finalists are Terrence Blanca, senior, Saipan Southern High School; Gio Hur, sophomore, Saipan International School; and Mary Grace Tiglao, senior, Marianas High School.

Eastern District of Washington

Essay finalists are Justice Iseminger, a senior North Central High School in Spokane, and Peyton Ugolini, a senior at University High School in Spokane Valley.

Western District of Washington

Video finalists are Han Eckelberg, a junior at Cleveland High School in Seattle, and the team of Meili Acker and Nelda Angulo of Cascade High School in Everett.

2016 CIVICS CONTEST JUDGES

Essay Winner Selection:

Circuit Judge Jacqueline H. Nguyen, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
District Judge John A. Kronstadt, Central District of California
Bankruptcy Judge Sandra R. Klein, Central District of California
Sean McAvoy, District Clerk, Eastern District of Washington
Debra K. Kristensen, Esq., District of Idaho

Video Winner Selection:

District Judge Janis L. Sammartino, Southern District of California
Senior District Judge Ralph R. Beistline, District of Alaska
Magistrate Judge Michael J. Seng, Eastern District of California
Kathleen J. Campbell, Bankruptcy Clerk, Central District of California
David J. Madden, Assistant Circuit Executive, Ninth Circuit

SPECIAL THANKS to all of the judges, attorneys, court staff and educators from across the Ninth Circuit who contributed to the success of the contest.

We the People

insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common Defence and our Posterity, We ordain and establish this Constitution

Article I
Section 1. All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.
No Person shall be a Representative who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be admitted into or exist at the Time of the first Meeting of the Congress, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Year or more, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The actual Enumeration shall be made within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as the Congress shall direct: but the Enumeration in each State shall have a Ratio not less than one Representative for every thirty Thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative.
When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Massachusetts Bay three, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina seven, and New York six.

When vacancies happen in the Representation from any State, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue Writs of Election to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Massachusetts Bay three, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina seven, and New York six.
The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other Officers; and shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.
Section 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for a Term of six Years; and each Senator shall have one Vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in Consequence of the Election of the President, Senators and Representatives shall meet at such Place as they may by Law direct, until the next Meeting of the Legislature of the State wherein they shall be chosen, in which Case they shall assemble, unless the Legislature of the State in which they shall be chosen shall in such Manner direct that one third may chuse new Members in each Vacancy, in which Case they shall be chused on the next Election.

No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and seven Years, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.
The electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.
The President of the United States shall be President



Office of the Circuit Executive

Cathy A. Catterson, Circuit & Court of Appeals Executive

P.O. Box 193939, San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Ph: (415) 355-8800, Fax: (415) 355-8901

<http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov>