



1-1-2018

Note from the Editor-in-Chief

University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uoplawreview>

Recommended Citation

University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law, *Note from the Editor-in-Chief*, 49 U. PAC. L. REV. (2017).
Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uoplawreview/vol49/iss3/5>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals and Law Reviews at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of the Pacific Law Review by an authorized editor of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

Note from the Editor-in-Chief

Welcome to the third issue of *The University of the Pacific Law Review*, Volume 49. This issue largely focuses on the Brock Turner case, which has received extensive media attention since Turner's sentencing in June 2016. In short, Turner was a Stanford student on a swimming scholarship, and he was convicted of sexual assault on campus.

There has been much debate both in the legal community and in the public as to whether Turner's sentence was too lenient. The presiding judge, Aaron Persky, sentenced Turner to six months in county jail, three years of probation, and lifetime registration as a sex offender. Turner was released from jail after serving three months. On the one hand, Judge Persky stayed within the California judicial sentencing guidelines, and thus the sentence was technically within the law. Further, the California Commission on Judicial Performance investigated the case and declared that the sentence was appropriate and showed no misconduct on Judge Persky's part. On the other hand, critics claim that Judge Persky showed bias in favor of a college athlete who was white and male. Outrage over the sentence resulted in the presiding judge, Aaron Persky, to face a recall election this coming June 2018. The campaign to get Judge Persky recalled is led by Michelle Landis Dauber, a professor at Stanford Law School.

The articles in this issue explore the effects of the Turner case, and the issues it reveals with our legal system, particularly the arguably problematic response of attempting to recall Judge Persky. We attempted to secure articles for the issue in support of the recall, including from Professor Dauber, but were unable to do so. However, the articles that we do have in this issue still provide a thorough examination of the case from all sides, and will leave you well-informed about media's relationship with the law and judicial recall—and if you live in Santa Clara County, will hopefully help you decide how to vote in the upcoming judicial recall election.

Kendall Fisher
Editor-in-Chief
The University of the Pacific Law Review
Volume 49