# lifetime_tenure_of_federal_judges.edited.docx

*by*

**Submission date:** 12-Nov-2021 04:56AM (UTC-0600)
**Submission ID:** 1700647476
**File name:** lifetime_tenure_of_federal_judges.edited.docx (16K)
**Word count:** 1070
**Character count:** 5936

# Life Tenure of Federal Judges

Name

Institution

Course

Instructor

Date

**Life Tenure of Federal Judges**

Life tenure was established by the Framers when individuals did not live long as they do now. A judge who has been shielded from the steady flows of life span for twenty-five or thirty years was unusual at the time but is now becoming more typical. Establishing a tenure of approximately 15 years would guarantee that federal juries will not lose trace with reality after years in the judicial systems. It would also give an extra consistent and higher level of rotation between the judges. Both changes, in my opinion, would become beneficial.

The directions governing the US Supreme Court must be modified to replicate modern-day living in America. Since the founding of the federal court of law in the 1700s, the typical tenure of a Supreme Court judge has dramatically increased, permitting oversized power to nine persons in methods that the founders of the Constitution would never have envisioned (George & Yoon, 2017). Because of this longevity, vacancies have become less frequent, adding to the unpredictability of the jurisdictive screening procedure. Subsequently, the Supreme Court's validation process has become highly politicized, with highly close votes and drama from the candidates themselves. This is unacceptable, and lawmakers must solve it by introducing laws to restrict Supreme Court justices' terms.

A constitutional amendment should be pushed to eliminate judges' lifelong stay on the bench because extended terms have occasioned into a more lobbied authorization procedure and a more probable court to be disengaged from ordinary people. The typical duration under which a Supreme Court judge is recruited has remained moderately persistent all through history, fluctuating from the early 50s, suggesting that as lifecycle expectation had improved, similar to Supreme Court justices' terms. In reality, the typical justice's tenure is currently lengthier than ever in US history. Moreover, because the occupation has become more accessible and the

affliction has diminished, the days of large dockets, circuit-riding, and operating short of secretaries have long vanished, judges are more motivated to stay on the bench for prolonged periods.

Also, term-limit ideas might increase the number of justices appointed by some presidents. It is critical to remember the enormous shifts that have happened in Supreme Court doctrine. As a result, each new judge on the court will influence how precedent is appraised and how unique legal challenges are resolved. However, whether the president serves one or two terms, the most recent heads of state have nominated two and four judges, with the most specific figure being two. 19 Term-limit ideas might raise the number of judges appointed by some presidents, but not extensively enough to cause profound doctrinal change. The process by which justices are nominated is crucial in determining how long they can serve on the Supreme Court. Since the president and Senate are charged with selecting and confirming federal judges under the Constitution, politics play an essential role. However, the Constitution makes no mention of additional requirements for office. Groups demanding allegiance to a specific judicial philosophy or doctrine have raced to fill the gap, leaving the procedure open to prioritizing applicants chosen for reasons apart from their judgment, manner, and intelligence.

In addition, term restrictions are unlikely to produce more corrupt judges. It is indeed important to mention that Supreme Court judges are by now permitted to take advantage of lavishly funded vacations and lecture prospects, own stock, and have several possible engagements of concern that might affect the opinions. For instance, the law court could not hear a case since it lacked the necessarily required number because many judges had financial conflicts. While the purpose of this transitory is not to debate the qualities of Supreme Court morals transformation proposals, the reality renders that with term limits in force, the severe

ethical difficulties that presently afflict the court are unlikely to increase. Given that, notwithstanding all of the amendments to the Supreme Court, the age range of nomination has remained constant all through the Federal Court's existence, it is safe to expect that judges of a comparable age bracket would be appointed even though term restrictions were established. For instance, in their 50s, the contemporary age range for freshly nominated judges served until their tenure expired in their seventies. For many, this may provide an opportunity to pursue a new job when their term has expired.

I also concur that we should push for a constitutional amendment to eliminate judges' lifelong stay on the bench because life tenure allows judges to intentionally plan their retirement plans so that an ideologically similar president may pick their replacement. This has increasingly become the norm. The founders never imagined such ideological control over a Supreme Court seat. Furthermore, some judges have remained on the court despite significant declines in their mental or physical capabilities with the expectation of serving until a president with similar institutional and legislative views takes office. The architects never imagined such philosophical control over a Supreme Court seat when they drafted the Constitution.

To conclude, lifetime appointments for judges result in progressively extended terms, with substantial ramifications for the court's politics. Establishing tenure limits for judges would ensure consistency in openings and assist in avoiding the acceleration of the bad results associated with justices' ever-lengthening lifetime tenancies. The Supreme Court's nine members have enormous sway over American life (Segall, 2018). It is consequently critical that Americans' allegiance decide the composition of that court for the officials entrusted with appointing and affirming federal judges rather than by chance. Therefore, given the Supreme Court's outsized role in the United States governing system, restricting justices to a

nonrenewable term of eighteen years as a procedure toward stabilizing the conflicting interests of expertise on the bench against the negative externalities for leaderships to nominate progressively partisan justices, would lower the stakes for every appointment. This method would decrease some of the existing gamesmanship in planning the retirement of judges or the wild scramble that follows the death of serving justice, both of which have contributed to a highly unequal number of nominations by presidents of one party during the last 60 years.

**References**

George, T. E., & Yoon, A. H. (2017). *Measuring Justice in State Courts: The Demographics of the State Judiciary*. Vand. L. Rev., 70, 1887.

Segall, E. J. (2018). *Eight Justices Are Enough: A Proposal To Improve The United States Supreme Court*. Pepp. L. Rev., 45, 547.

# lifetime_tenure_of_federal_judges.edited.docx

ORIGINALITY REPORT

| 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
|---|---|---|---|
| SIMILARITY INDEX | INTERNET SOURCES | PUBLICATIONS | STUDENT PAPERS |

PRIMARY SOURCES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Submitted to Bridgepoint Education<br>Student Paper | 1% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Exclude quotes | Off | Exclude matches | Off |
| Exclude bibliography | On | | |