North Carolina Courts 1987-88



Annual Report of the Administrative Office of the Courts

NORTH CAROLINA COURTS

 $\leq >$

11

0

1987-88



117927

U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

ANNUAL REPORT

of the

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS JUSTICE BUILDING RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

The Honorable James G. Exum, Jr., Chief Justice The Supreme Court of North Carolina Raleigh, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Chief Justice:

In accord with Section 7A-343 of the North Carolina General Statutes, I herewith transmit the Twenty-second Annual Report of the Administrative Office of the Courts, relating to the fiscal year, July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988.

Fiscal year 1987-88 marks the fourth consecutive year with significant increases in filings and dispositions in both the Superior and District Courts. During 1987-88, as compared to 1986-87, total case filings increased by 6.9% in Superior Court and by 8.1% in District Court; dispositions increased by 4.7% in Superior Court and by 9.0% in District Court. Because total filings were greater than total dispositions, more cases were pending at the end of the fiscal year than were pending at the beginning.

Appreciation is expressed to the many persons who participated in the data reporting, compilation, and writing required to produce this annual report. Within the Administrative Office of the Courts, principal responsibilities were shared by the Research and Planning Division and the Information Services Division. The principal burden of reporting the great mass of trial court data rested upon the offices of the clerks of superior court located in each of the one hundred counties of the State. The Clerk of the Supreme Court and the Clerk of the Court of Appeals provided the case data relating to our appellate courts.

Without the responsible work of many persons across the State this report would not have been possible.

Respectfully submitted,

raaman, //

Franklin Freeman, Jr. Director

May 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I

The 1987-88 Judicial Year in Review

in the second se	4662 00			1. mar. 1911					
T	1007.00	Indiaial	Vacuin				1 a 1		
I DP	1987-888	THUMBER	теясти						
T IIC	1701-00	Judioidi	Tour m		 	 	 	 	

Part II

Court System Organization and Operations in 1987-88

Historical Development of the North Carolina Court System	 . 7
The Present Court System	 10
Organization and Operations	
The Supreme Court	 14
The Court of Appeals	 25
The Superior Courts	 30
The District Courts	
District Attorneys	 38
Clerks of Superior Court	 42
Juvenile Services Division	 45
Office of Guardian Ad Litem Services	
Public Defenders	 49
Appellate Defender	 51
The N.C. Courts Commission	 52
The Judicial Standards Commission	 54

Part III

Court Resources in 1987-88

Judicial Department Finances	
Appropriations	59
Expenditures	62
Receipts	64
Distribution of Receipts	65
Cost and Case Data on Representation of Indigents	68
Judicial Department Personnel	

Part IV

Trial Courts Caseflow Data in 1987-88

Trial Courts Case Data	79
Superior Court Division Caseflow Data	
District Court Division Caseflow Data 1	43

Tables, Charts and Graphs

Part II

Court System Organization and Operations in 1987-88

Original Jurisdictions and Routes of Appeal in the
Present Court System
Principal Administrative Authorities for North Carolina
Trial Courts
The Supreme Court of North Carolina 14
Supreme Court, Caseload Inventory 16
Supreme Court, Appeals Filed 17
Supreme Court, Petitions Filed
Supreme Court, Caseload Types 18
Supreme Court, Submission of Cases to Decision Stage 19
Supreme Court, Disposition of Petitions and Other Proceedings
Supreme Court, Disposition of Appeals
Supreme Court, Manner of Disposition of Appeals
Supreme Court, Type of Disposition of Petitions
Supreme Court, Appeals Docketed and Disposed of,
1982-83—1987-88
Supreme Court, Petitions Docketed and Allowed,
1982-83-1987-88
Supreme Court, Processing Time for Disposed Cases
The Court of Appeals of North Carolina 25
Court of Appeals, Filings and Dispositions 27
Court of Appeals, Manner of Case Dispositions
Court of Appeals, Filings and Dispositions, 1982-83-1987-88
Map of Judicial Divisions and Districts
Judges of Superior Court
District Court Judges
District Attorneys
Clerks of Superior Court
Chief Court Counselors 46
Guardian Ad Litem Division Coordinators 48
Public Defenders
Appellate Defenders 51
The N.C. Courts Commission
The Judicial Standards Commission 54

Part III

Court Resources in 1987-88

General Fund Appropriations, All State Agencies	
and Judicial Department	59
General Fund Appropriations, All State Agencies	
and Judicial Department	60
General Fund Appropriations for Operating Expenses of All	
State Agencies and Judicial Department	61
General Fund Expenditures for Judicial Department Operations	62
Judicial Department Receipts	64
Distribution of Judicial Department Receipts	65

Tables, Charts and Graphs

Amounts of Fees, Fines, and Forfeitures Collected by the	÷
Courts and Distributed to Counties and Municipalities	66
Cost and Case Data on Representation of Indigents	69
Mental Hospital Commitment Hearings	70
Assigned Counsel, Cases and Expenditures	71
Judicial Department Personnel	75
이 가슴에 가지 않는 것 같아요. 이 가슴에 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 가지 않는 것이 같아요. 이 가지 않는 것이 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 같아요. 나는 것이 나는 것이	

Part IV

Trial Courts Caseflow Data in 1987-88

Superior Courts, Caseload Trends	84
Superior Courts, Caseload	85
Superior Courts, Median Ages of Cases	86
Superior Courts, Civil Cases Trends	87
Superior Courts, Civil Case Filings By Case-Type	88
Superior Courts, Civil Cases Inventory	
Superior Courts, Civil Cases, Manner of Disposition	93
Superior Courts, Civil Cases, Manner of Disposition, By County	94
Superior Courts, Ages of Civil Cases Pending	98
Superior Courts, Ages of Civil Cases Disposed 1	
Superior Courts, Trends in Estates and Special Proceedings 1	
Superior Courts, Filings and Dispositions For Estates and Special Proceedings	107
Superior Courts, Trends in Criminal Cases 1	
Superior Courts, Criminal Case Filings By Case-Type 1	112
Superior Courts, Inventory of Criminal Cases 1	113
Superior Courts, Manner of Disposition of Felonies 1	117
Superior Courts, Manner of Disposition of Felonies, By County 1	118
Superior Courts, Manner of Disposition of Misdemeanors 1	
Superior Courts, Manner of Disposition of Misdemeanors, By County 1	123
Superior Courts, Ages of Criminal Cases Pending	127
Superior Courts, Ages of Criminal Cases Disposed 1	134
District Courts, Filings and Dispositions	145
District Courts, Filing and Disposition Trends of All Cases	146
District Courts, Filing and Disposition Trends of Civil Cases 1	147
District Courts, Civil Non-Magistrate Cases	148
District Courts, Civil Non-Magistrate Filings By Case-Type	149
District Courts, Civil Caseload Inventory 1	150
District Courts, Manner of Disposition of Civil Cases	154
District Courts, Manner of Disposition of Civil Cases, By County	155
District Courts, Ages of Domestic Relations Cases Pending 1	162
District Courts, Ages of Domestic Relations Cases Disposed 1	166
District Courts, Ages of General Civil and Magistrate Appeal/Transfer Cases Pending	170
District Courts, Ages of General Civil and Magistrate Appeal/Transfer Cases Disposed 1	174
District Courts, Civil Magistrate Filings and Dispositions	
District Courts, Matters Alleged in Juvenile Petitions	180
District Courts, Adjudicatory Hearings For Juvenile Matters	184
District Courts, Trends of Criminal Cases	
District Courts, Motor Vehicle Criminal Case Filings and Dispositions 1	190
District Courts, Non-Motor Vehicle Criminal Cases, Caseload Inventory	194

Tables, Charts and Graphs

District Courts, Non-Motor Vehicle Criminal Cases, Manner of Disposition	198
District Courts, Non-Motor Vehicle Criminal Cases, Manner of Disposition, By County	199
District Courts, Ages of Non-Motor Vehicle Criminal Cases Pending	203
District Courts, Ages of Non-Motor Vehicle Criminal Cases Disposed	207
District Courts, Infraction Case Filings and Dispositions	211

PART I

9 0

ື້

 \overline{U}

68

h = 0

3 M 194

Ũ

THE 1987-1988 JUDICIAL YEAR IN REVIEW

THE 1987-88 JUDICIAL YEAR IN REVIEW

This Annual Report on the work of North Carolina's Judicial Department is for the fiscal year which began July 1, 1987 and ended June 30, 1988.

The Workload of the Courts

Case filings in the Supreme Court totaled 145 compared with 196 filed during 1986-87. A total of 635 petitions were filed in the Supreme Court, compared with 674 in 1986-87; and 67 petitions were allowed, compared with 99 in 1986-87.

For the Court of Appeals for 1987-88, case filings were 1,351 compared with 1,288 for the 1986-87 year. Petitions filed in 1987-88 totaled 446, compared with 458 during the 1986-87 year.

More detailed data on the appellate courts is included in Part II of this *Annual Report*.

In the superior courts, case filings (civil and criminal) increased by 6.9% to a total of 105,704 in 1987-88, compared with 99,886 cases in 1986-87. Superior court case dispositions also increased, to a total of 100,808, compared with 96,308 in 1986-87. As case filings during the year exceeded case dispositions, the total number of cases pending at the end of the year increased by 4,896.

Not including juvenile proceedings and mental hospital commitment hearings, the statewide total of district court filings (civil and criminal) during 1987-88 was 2,004,447, an increase of 135,462 (7.2%) from 1986-87 filings of 1,868,985 cases. During 1987-88, a total of 608,845 infraction cases were filed along with a total of 419,407 criminal motor vehicle cases, for a combined total of 1,028,252 cases. This combined total is an increase of 52,764 cases (5.4%) above the 975,488 cases filed during 1986-87. During 1987-88, filings of criminal non-motor vehicle cases in the district courts increased by 46,579 (9.9%) to 514,710, compared with 468,131 during 1986-87. Filings of civil magistrate cases in the district courts increased by 29,881 (12.1%), to 277,336 during 1987-88 compared with 247,455 during 1986-87.

Operations of the superior and district courts are summarized in Part II of this Report, and detailed information on the caseloads in the 100 counties and 34 judicial districts is presented in Part IV.

1988 Legislative Highlights

Judicial, Prosecutorial, and Public Defender Districts

Chapters 1037 and 1056 of the 1987 Session Laws (1988 Session) make numerous conforming amendments to the General Statutes, in light of the 1987 legislation on superior court redistricting.

As a result of superior court redistricting, geographic "districts" for the various components of the Judicial Department are no longer necessarily coterminous. References in the General Statutes to a "judicial district" are replaced by references to the "superior court district," "district court district," "prosecutorial district," and/or "public defender district" to which the particular statute applies.

Chapter 1056 divides present Judicial Districts 12 and 16 into new Districts 12, 16A, and 16B for the prosecutorial, district court, and public defender districts. As a result, these districts are coterminous with the corresponding whole-country districts (or "sets of districts") established in 1987 for the superior court division. The legislation allocates existing personnel among these three new districts; creates an additional district court judgeship effective July 1, 1989, allocated to district court District 16A; and effective January 1, 1989, establishes a district attorney's office for a new prosecutorial District 16A and establishes two new public defender offices, for public defender Districts 16A and 16B. In addition, effective January 1, 1989, the public defender office presently serving Pitt and Carteret Counties in Judicial District 3 is divided into two offices, for public defender districts 3A (Pitt) and 3B (Carteret).

Chapter 1037 clarifies certain provisions of the 1987 redistricting legislation. New section G.S. 7A-41.1 (Chapter 1037, Section 2) specifies that there shall be one and only one senior resident superior court judge for each superior court "district" or "set of [superior court] districts." A "set of districts" is defined to mean, in essence, a group of districts that individually do not comprise an entire county, but collectively are necessary to comprise the entire county. A superior court "district" is a district that does comprise one or more entire counties. Amendments to G.S. 7A-47.3 (in Chapter 1037, Section 9) specify that all sessions of superior court are for the entire county, regardless of how many superior court districts there may be for the county; and that superior court judges may be assigned under the rotation system to hold the courts of either one "district" or one "set of districts."

Sessions of Superior Court Outside County Seat

Chapter 1037, Section 2.1, amending G.S. 7A-42 effective January 1, 1989, authorizes the senior resident superior court judge of a county to order sessions of superior court at any location outside the county seat when exigent circumstances exist. The additional sessions must be approved by the Chief Justice, and an order may issue only after approval of the location and facilities by the Administrative Office of the Courts, and after consultation with the Clerk and county officials. (Present provisions of G.S. 7A-42, relating to sessions of Superior Court outside the county seat in cities with a population of 35,000 or more, remain unchanged.)

Additional Seat of District Court

1

Effective July 1, 1989, Chapter 1075 authorizes an additional seat of district court for district court District 3, in Havelock (Craven County).

Juvenile Code/Guardian ad Litem Revisions

Chapter 1090 amends several sections of the Juvenile Coide, with the overall aim of imposing stricter standards on removal of juveniles from the home and improving protection of juveniles' rights. Effective June 1, 1989, the services of the Guardian *ad Litem* Office within AOC are extended to include appointment of a guardian *ad litem*, in the discretion of the judge, in dependency cases. Effective immediately, the clerk's duties with regard to the summons in juvenile cases are amended to specify that the summons shall issue *immediately* after a petition is filed, and tht the summons is to be delivered to any person authorized to serve process (rather than to a law enforcement officer in all cases). Also effective immediately, specific findings are required before dispositional or other orders may remove a juvenile from the home.

DWI, Commercial Vehicles

Chapter 1112 creates a new misdemeanor offense, driving while impaired in a commercial vehicle. A blood alcohol content of 0.04 or more is sufficient to constitute this offense (compared to a blook alcohol content of 0.10 or more driving while impired in other than a commercial vehicle). The statutes for automatic, immediate ten-day civil license revocation are also amended, to extend to driving in a commercial vehicle with a blood alcohol content of 0.04 or more. (Chapter 1112 is effective June 1, 1989, and will expire June 30, 1989, in the absence of action by the 1989 Session of the General Assembly.)

Investigative Grand Juries

Chapter 1040 extends the authorization for investigative grand juries in drug trafficking cases to July 1, 1991. The authorization for these special grand juries would otherwise have expired October 1, 1988. In addition, an amendment to G.S. 15A-622(h), effective October 1, 1988, requires the concurrence of a committee of at least three members of the Conference oif District Attorneys (in addition to concurrence of the Attorneys General), before a district attorney may request the convening of an investigative grand jury.

Indigent Persons' Attorney Fee Fund

For fiscal 1988-89, the General Assembly directed AOC to allot portions of the funds in the Indigent Persons' Attorney Fee Fund (approximately \$13 million) to each county, or to each district where superior and district court districts are coterminous (Chapter 1086, Section 113, effective July 1, 1988). The allotment for each county or district is to be in proportion to the numbers of indigent persons in each county or district who were not represented by a public defender during 1987-88.

Determination of an Indigent's Attorney's Fee

Chapter 1086, Section 113, amends G.S. 7A-458 to specify that the fee of an attorney who represents an indigent person is to be fixed by the judge who heard the case, and deletes "the fee usually charged in similar cases" from the factors the judge should consider when determining the fee. The General Assembly requested AOC to establish a schedule for paying the fees of attorneys representing indigents on a per case basis, and report to the 1989 Session of the General Assembly.

Death Penalty Resource Center

For fiscal 1988-89, the Death Penalty Resource Center will be funded by AOC from the Indigent Persons' Attorney Fee Fund, to a maximum of \$191,505 (Chapter 1086, Section 109). The Center is a four-position section of the Appellate Defender's Office, previously funded from private sources.

Salaries, Longevity Pay, and Other Items

Funds were appropriated by the 1988 Session for a 4.5% pay raise for all officials and employees of the Judicial Department.

The travel allowance for superior court judges under G.S. 7A-44(a) was increased, effective January 1, 1989, from \$6,500 to \$7,000 annually (Chapter 1086, Section 30).

Effective July 1, 1988, the pay for emergency justices and judges is increased from \$100 to \$150 per day (Chapter 1086, Section 31).

Longevity pay was authorized for the Director of AOC at the rate of longevity pay for superior court judges, and longevity pay was authorized for the Assistant Director of AOC at the rate of longevity pay for district court judges (Chapter 1100, Section 15).

Longevity pay and salaries were increased for some clerks of superior court (Chapter 1100, Sections 16 and 17). The definition of "service" that is used to calculate a clerk's longevity pay was expanded to include "service" as an assistant clerk or as a superivsor of clerks within the AOC. In addition, the salaries of some clerks were raised by amending the population categories set forth in G.S. 7A-101(a), upon which clerks' salaries are based. As a result, clerks in counties with population of 30,000 to 49,999 will be paid at a higher pay-category.

No funding for merit increases was provided. However, Chapter 1086, Section 27, creates a 16-member Legislative Study Commission on a System of Merit Pay for State Employees. The Commission is directed to report to the 1989 Session of the General Assembly.

Employee Benefits

Retirement Benefits: Chapter 1110 increases the retirement benefits of state employees, by raising the accrual rate (in G.S. 128-27) for calculating retirement benefits from 1.58% to 1.60%; and allows accumulated sick leave to be included in the amount of "creditable service" earned for retirement or early retirement. Chapter 1103, amending G.S. 135-4, allows state employees to purchase service credit toward retirement for extended perids of leave without pay due to illness or injury.

Death Benefits: Chapter 1108 increases the death benefits payable for state employees. Death benefits remain based on one year's salary, but the General Assembly established a minimum benefit of \$25,000 regardless of salary, and raised the maximum benefit from \$20,000 to \$50,000. In addition, death benefits are now payable regardless of an employee's age; previously, the benefit was payable only if an employee died prior to age 70.

New Positions

The 1987 Session of the General Assembly appropriated funds for the following new positions effective during fiscal 1988-89: eleven new district court judge-ships, one each for Districts 3, 5, 7 10, 11, 16, 18, 19B, 21, 25, and 26, to be filled in the 1988 general election; one superior court judgeship for new District 16B, to be filled in the 1988 general election; five new assistant district attorneys, one each for districts 3A, 17A, 19A, 19B, and 21; three secretaries and ten victim-witness assistant positions for district attorney offices; five new magistrate positions to be allocated in accordance with G.S. 7A-171(c); 14 positions in the juvenile court counselor program; ten secretarial positions for the ten new senior resident superior court judgeships created effective Janu-

ary 1, 1989; one court reporter; one deputy clerk; and two secretaries in public defender offices.

The 1988 Session of the General Assembly appropriated or authorized the use of funds for the following additional positions: a second regular superior court judgeship for District 16B, to be appointed by the Governor; two new fully staffed public defender offices for new public defender districts 16A and 16B; a new district attorney's office effective January 1, 1989, for Prosecutorial District 16A, with the district attorney position to be filled in the 1988 general election; an additional district court judgeship for District 16A, effective July 1, 1989, to be filled pursuant to G.S. 7A-142; ten new deputy clerk positions, funded from existing funds, rather than any new appropriation; and four existing positions within the Appellate Defender's Office, previously funded by private sources, to be funded from the Indigent Persons' Attorney Fee Fund in 1988-89.

Total Appropriations

The 1988 Session of the General Assembly appropriated a total of \$177,774,981 to the Judicial Department for the 1988-89 fiscal year.

PART II

o" p

COURT SYSTEM ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS

• Historical Development of Court System

• Present Court System

C.Z

• Organization and Operations in 1987-88

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA COURT SYSTEM

From its early colonial period North Carolina's judicial system has been the focus of periodic attention and adjustment. Through the years, there has been a repeated sequence of critical examination, proposals for reform, and finally the enactment of some reform measures.

Colonial Period

Around 1700 the royal governor established a General (or Supreme) Court for the colony and a dispute developed over the appointment of associate justices. The Assembly conceded to the King the right to name the chief justice but unsuccessfully tried to win for itself the power to appoint the associate justices. Other controversies developed concerning the creation and jurisdiction of the courts and the tenure of judges. As for the latter, the Assembly's position was that judge appointments should be for good behavior as against the royal governor's decision for life appointment. State historians have noted that "the Assembly won its fight to establish courts and the judicial structure in the province was grounded on laws enacted by the legislature," which was more familiar with local conditions and needs (Lefler and Newsome, 142). Nevertheless, North Carolina alternated between periods under legislatively enacted reforms (like good behavior tenure and the Court Bill of 1746, which contained the seeds of the post-Revolutionary court system) and periods of stalemate and anarchy after such enactments were nullified by royal authority. A more elaborate system was framed by legislation in 1767 to last five years. It was not renewed because of persisting disagreement between local and royal partisans. As a result, North Carolina was without higher courts until after Independence (Battle, 847).

At the lower court level during the colonial period, judicial and county government administrative functions were combined in the authority of the justices of the peace, who were appointed by the royal governor.

After the Revolution

When North Carolina became a state in 1776, the colonial structure of the court system was retained largely intact. The Courts of Pleas and Quarter Sessions — the county court which continued in use from about 1670 to 1868 —were still held by the assembled justices of the peace in each county. The justices were appointed by the governor on the recommendation of the General Assembly, and they were paid out of fees charged litigants. On the lowest level of the judicial system, magistrate courts of limited jurisdiction were held by justices of the peace, singly or in pairs, while the county court was out of term.

The new Constitution of 1776 empowered the General Assembly to appoint judges of the Supreme Court of Law and Equity. A court law enacted a year later authorized three superior court judges and created judicial districts. Sessions were supposed to be held in the court towns of each district twice a year, under a system much like the one that had expired in 1772. Just as there had been little distinction in terminology between General Court and Supreme Court prior to the Revolution, the terms Supreme Court and Superior Court were also interchangeable during the period immediately following the Revolution.

One of the most vexing governmental problems confronting the new State of North Carolina was its judiciary. "From its inception in 1777 the state's judiciary caused complaint and demands for reform." (Lefler and Newsome, 291, 292). Infrequency of sessions, conflicting judge opinions, and insufficient number of judges, and lack of means for appeal were all cited as problems, although the greatest weakness was considered to be the lack of a real Supreme Court.

In 1779, the legislature required the Superior Court judges to meet together in Raleigh as a Court of Conference to resolve cases which were disagreed on in the districts. This court was continued and made permanent by subsequent laws. The justices were required to put their opinions in writing to be delivered orally in court. The Court of Conference was changed in name to the Supreme Court in 1805 and authorized to hear appeals in 1810. Because of the influence of the English legal system, however, there was still no conception of an alternative to judges sitting together to hear appeals from cases which they had themselves heard in the districts in panels of as few as two judges (Battle, 848). In 1818, though, an independent three-judge Supreme Court was created for review of cases decided at the Superior Court level.

Meanwhile, semi-annual superior court sessions in each county were made mandatory in 1806, and the State was divided into six circuits, or ridings, where the six judges were to sit in rotation, two judges constituting a quorum as before.

The County Court of justices of the peace continued during this period as the lowest court and as the agency of local government.

After the Civil War

Major changes to modernize the judiciary and make it more democratic were made in 1868. A primary holdover from the English legal arrangement — the distinction between law and equity proceedings - was abolished. The County Court's control of local government was abolished. Capital offenses were limited to murder, arson, burglary and rape, and the Constitution stated that the aim of punishment was "not only to satisfy justice, but also to reform the offender, and thus prevent crime". The membership of the Supreme Court was raised to five, and the selection of the justices (including the designation of the chief justice) and superior court judges (raised in number to 12) was taken from the legislature and given to the voters, although vacancies were to be filled by the governor until the next election. The Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions - The County Court of which three justices of the peace constituted a quorum - was eliminated. Its judicial responsibilities were divided between the Superior Courts and the individual justices of the peace, who were retained as separate judicial officers with limited jurisdiction.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA COURT SYSTEM

Conservatively oriented amendments to the 1868 Constitution in 1875 reduced the number of Supreme Court justices to three and the Superior Court judges to nine. The General Assembly was given the power to appoint justices of the peace, instead of the governor. Most of the modernizing changes in the post-Civil War Constitution, however, were left, and the judicial structure it had established continued without systematic modification through more than half of the 20th century. (A further constitutional amendment approved by the voters in November, 1888, returned the Supreme Court membership to five, and the number of superior court judges to twelve.)

Before Reorganization

A multitude of legislative enactments to meet rising demands and to respond to changing needs had heavily encumbered the 1868 judicial structure by the time systematic court reforms were proposed in the 1950's. This accrual of piecemeal change and addition to the court system was most evident at the lower, local court level, where hundreds of courts specially created by statute operated with widely dissimilar structure and jurisdiction.

By 1965, when the implementation of the most recent major reforms was begun, the court system in North Carolina consisted of four levels: (a) the Supreme Court, with appellate jurisdiction; (b) the superior court, with general trial jurisdiction; (c) the local statutory courts of limited jurisdiction, and (d) justices of the peace and mayor's courts, with petty jurisdiction.

At the superior court level, the State had been divided into 30 judicial districts and 21 solicitorial districts. The 38 superior court judges (who rotated among the counties) and the district solicitors were paid by the State. The clerk of superior court, who was judge of probate and often also a juvenile judge, was a county official. There were specialized branches of superior court in some counties for matters like domestic relations and juvenile offenses.

The lower two levels were local courts. At the higher of these local court levels were more than 180 recordertype courts. Among these were the county recorder's courts, municipal recorder's courts and township recorder's courts; the general county courts, county criminal courts and special county courts; the domestic relations courts and the juvenile courts. Some of these had been established individually by special legislative acts more than a half-century earlier. Others had been created by general law across the State since 1919. About half were county courts and half were city or township courts. Jurisdiction included misdemeanors (mostly traffic offenses), preliminary hearings and sometimes civil matters. The judges, who were usually part-time, were variously elected or appointed locally.

At the lowest level were about 90 mayor's courts and some 925 justices of the peace. These officers had similar criminal jurisdiction over minor cases with penalties up to a \$50 fine or 30 days in jail. The justices of the peace also had civil jurisdiction of minor cases. These court officials were compensated by the fees they exacted, and they provided their own facilities.

Court Reorganization

The need for a comprehensive evaluation and revision of the court system received the attention and support of Governor Luther H. Hodges in 1957, who encouraged the leadership of the North Carolina Bar Association to pursue the matter. A Court Study Committee was established as an agency of the North Carolina Bar Association, and that Committee issued its report, calling for reorganization, at the end of 1958. A legislative Constitutional Commission, which worked with the Court Study Committee, finished its report early the next year. Both groups called for the structuring of an all-inclusive court system which would be directly state-operated, uniform in its organization throughout the State and centralized in its administration. The plan was for a simplified, streamlined and unified structure. A particularly important part of the proposal was the elimination of the local satutory courts and their replacement by a single District Court; the office of justice of the peace was to be abolished, and the newly fashioned position of magistrate would function within the District Court as a subordinate judicial office.

Constitutional amendments were introduced in the legislature in 1959 but these failed to gain the required three-fifths vote of each house. The proposals were reintroduced and approved at the 1961 session. The Constitutional amendments were approved by popular vote in 1962, and three years later the General Assembly enacted statutes to put the system into effect by stages. By the end of 1970 all of the counties and their courts had been incorporated into the new system, whose unitary nature was symbolized by the name, General Court of Justice. The designation of the entire 20th century judicial system as a single, statewide "court," with components for various types and levels of caseload, was adapted from North Carolina's earlier General Court, whose full venue extended to all of the 17th century counties.

After Reorganization

Notwithstanding the comprehensive reorganization adopted in 1962, the impetus for changes has continued. In 1965, the Constitution was amended to provide for the creation of an intermediate Court of Appeals. It was amended again in 1972 to allow for the Supreme Court to censure or remove judges upon the recommendation of a Judicial Standards Commission. As for the selection of judges, persistent efforts were made in the 1970's to obtain legislative approval of amendments to the State Constitution, to appoint judges according to "merit" instead of electing them by popular, partisan vote. The proposed amendments received

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA COURT SYSTEM

the backing of a majority of the members of each house, but not the three-fifths required to submit constitutional amendments to a vote of the people. It seems likely that this significant issue will be before the General Assembly again for consideration.

Major Sources

Ð

- Battle, Kemp P., An Address on the History of the Supreme Court (Delivered in 1888). 1 North Carolina Reports 835-876.
- Hinsdale, C. E., County Government in North Carolina. 1965 Edition.
- Lefler, Hugh Talmage and Albert Ray Newsome, North Carolina: The History of a Southern State. 1963 Edition.
- Sanders, John L., Constitutional Revision and Court Reform: A Legislative History. 1959 Special Report of the N.C. Institute of Government.
- Stevenson, George and Ruby D. Arnold, North Carolina Courts of Law and Equity Prior to 1868. N.C. Archives Information Circular 1973.

Original Jurisdiction and Routes of Appeal



(1) Appeals from the Court of Appeals to the Supreme Court are by right in Utilities Commission general rate cases, cases involving comstitutional questions, and cases in which there has been dissent in the Court of Appeals. In its discretion, the Supreme Court may review Court of Appeals decisions in cases of significant public interest or cases involving legal principles of major significance.

(2) Appeals from these agencies lie directly to the Court of Appeals.

- 3) As a matter of right, appeals go directly to the Supreme Court in criminal cases in which the defendent has been sentenced to death or life imprisonment, and in civil cases involving the involuntary annexation of territory by a municipality of 5,000 or more population. In all other cases appeal as of right is to the Court of Appeals. In its discretion, the Supreme Court may hear appeals directly from the trial courts in cases where delay would cause substantial harm or the Court of Appeals docket is unusually full. (Under G.S. 7A-27, effective July 24, 1987, appeals in criminal cases as a matter of right are limited to first degree murder cases in which there is a sentence of death or life imprisonment.)
 - *The district and superior courts have concurrent original jurisdiction in civil actions (G.S. 7A-242). However, the district court division is the proper division for the trial of civil actions in which the amount in controversy is \$10,000 or less; and the superior court division is the proper division for the trial of civil actions in which the amount in controversy exceeds \$10,000 (G.S. 7A-243).
- **Magistrate jurisdiction in worthless check cases increased from \$500 to \$1,000 effective October 1, 1987 (G.S. 7A-273).

Article IV of the North Carolina Constitution establishes the General Court of Justice which "shall constitute a unified judicial system for purposes of jurisdiction, operation, and administration, and shall consist of an Appellate Division, a Superior Court Division, and a District Court Division."

The Appellate Division is comprised of the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals.

The Superior Court Division is comprised of the superior courts which hold sessions in the county seats of the 100 counties of the State. The counties are grouped into judicial districts (34 at the present time), and one or more superior court judges are elected for each of the judicial districts. A clerk of the superior court for each county is elected by the voters of the county.

The District Court Division is comprised of the district courts. The General Assembly is authorized to divide the State into a convenient number of local court districts and prescribe where the district courts shall sit, but district court must sit in at least one place in each county. The General Assembly has provided that districts for purposes of the district court are coterminous with superior court judicial districts. The Constitution also provides for one or more magistrates to be appointed in each county "who shall be officers of the district court."

The State Constitution (Art. IV, Sec. 1) also contains the term, "judicial department," stating that "The General Assembly shall have no power to deprive the judicial department of any power or jurisdiction that rightfully pertains to it as a co-ordinate department of the government, nor shall it establish or authorize any courts other than as permitted by this Article." The terms, "General Court of Justice" and "Judicial Department" are almost, but not quite, synonymous. It may be said that the Judicial Department encompasses all of the levels of court designated as the General Court of Justice plus all administrative and ancillary services within the Judicial Department.

The original jurisdictions and routes of appeal between the several levels of court in North Carolina's system of courts are illustrated in the chart on the opposite page.

Criminal Cases

Trial of misdemeanor cases is within the original jurisdiction of the district courts. Some misdemeanor offenses are tried by magistrates, who are also empowered to accept pleas of guilty to certain offenses and impose fines in accordance with a schedule set by the Conference of Chief District Court Judges. Most trials of misdemeanors are by district court judges, who also hold preliminary, "probable cause" hearings in felony cases. Trial of felony cases is within the jurisdiction of the superior courts.

Decisions of magistrates may be appealed to the district court judge. In criminal cases there is no trial by jury available at the district court level; appeal from the district courts' judgments in criminal cases is to the superior courts for trial *de novo* before a jury. Except in lifeimprisonment or death sentence cases (which are appealed to the Supreme Court), appeal from the superior courts is to the Court of Appeals.

Civil Cases

The 100 clerks of superior court are *ex officio* judges of probate and have original jurisdiction in probate and estates matters. The clerks also have jurisdiction over such special proceedings as adoptions, partitions, condemnations under the authority of eminent domain, and foreclosures. Rulings of the clerk may be appealed to the superior court.

The district courts have original jurisdiction in juvenile proceedings, domestic relations cases, petitions for involuntary commitment to a mental hospital, and are the "proper" courts for general civil cases where the amount in controversy is \$10,000 or less. If the amount in controversy is \$1,500 or less and the plaintiff in the case so requests, the chief district court judge may assign the case for initial hearing by a magistrate. Magistrates' decisions may be appealed to the district court. Trial by jury for civil cases is available in the district courts; appeal from the judgment of a district court in a civil case is to the North Carolina Court of Appeals.

The superior courts are the proper courts for trial of general civil cases where the amount in controversy is more than \$10,000. Appeals from decisions of most administrative agencies are first within the jurisdiction of the superior courts. Appeal from the superior courts in civil cases is to the Court of Appeals.

Administration

The North Carolina Supreme Court has the "general power to supervise and control the proceedings of any of the other courts of the General Court of Justice." (G.S. 7A-32(b)).

In addition to this grant of general supervisory power, the North Carolina General Statutes provide certain Judicial Department officials with specific powers and responsibilities for the operation of the court system. The Supreme Court has the responsibility for prescribing rules of practice and procedures for the appellate courts and for prescribing rules for the trial courts to supplement those prescribed by statute. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court designates one of the judges of the Court of Appeals to be its Chief Judge, who in turn is responsible for scheduling the sessions of the Court of Appeals.

The chart on page 11 illustrates specific responsibilities for administration of the trial courts vested in Judicial Department officials by statute. The Chief Justice appoints the Director and an Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts; this Assistant Director also serves as the Chief Justice's administrative assistant. The schedule of sessions of superior court in the 100 counties is set by the Supreme Court; assignment of the State's rotating superior court judges is the responsibility of the Chief Justice. Finally, the Chief Justice designates a chief district court judge for each of the State's 34 judicial

districts from among the elected district court judges of the respective districts. These judges have responsibilities for the scheduling of the district courts and magistrates' courts within their respective districts, along with other administrative responsibilities.

The Administrative Office of the Courts is responsible for direction of non-judicial, administrative and business affairs of the Judicial Department. Included among its functions are fiscal management, personnel services, information and statistical services, supervision of record keeping in the trial court clerks' offices, liaison with the legislative and executive departments of government, court facility evaluation, purchase and contract, education and training, coordination of the program for provision of legal counsel to indigent persons, juvenile probation and after-care, trial court administrator services, planning, and general administrative services.

The clerk of superior court in each county acts as clerk for both the superior and district courts. Until 1980, the clerk also served as chairman of the county's calendar committee, which set the civil case calendars. Effective July 1, 1980, these committees were eliminated; day-today calendaring of civil cases is now done by the clerk of superior court or by a "trial court administrator" in some districts, under the supervision of the senior resident superior court judge and chief district court judge. The criminal case calendars in both superior and district courts are set by the district attorney of the respective district.





¹The Supreme Court has general supervisory authority over the operations of the superior courts (as well as other trial courts). The schedule of superior courts is approved by the Supreme Court; assignments of superior court judges, who rotate from district to district, are the responsibility of the Chief Justice.

²The Director and an Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Chief Justice.

³The Supreme Court has general supervisory authority over the operations of the district courts (as well as other trial courts). The Chief Justice appoints a chief district court judge in each of the 34 judicial districts from the judges elected in the respective districts.

⁴The Administrative Office of the Courts is empowered to prescribe a variety of rules governing the operation of the offices of the 100 clerks of superior court, and to obtain statistical data and other information from officials in the Judicial Department.

⁵The district attorney sets the criminal-case trial calendars. In each district, the senior resident superior court judge and the chief district court judge are empowered to supervise the calendaring procedures for civil cases in their respective courts.

⁶In addition to certain judicial functions, the clerk of superior court performs administrative, fiscal and record-keeping functions for both the superior court and district court of his county. Magistrates, who serve under the supervision of the chief district court judge, are appointed by the senior resident superior court judge from nominees submitted by the clerk of superior court.

THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA (As of June 30, 1988)

Chief Justice JAMES G. EXUM, JR.

Associate Justices

LOUIS B. MEYER BURLEY B. MITCHELL, JR. HARRY C. MARTIN HENRY E. FRYE JOHN WEBB WILLIS P. WHICHARD

 P_{1}^{*}

Retired Chief Justices WILLIAM H. BOBBITT SUSIE SHARP JOSEPH BRANCH

I. BEVERLY LAKE J. FRANK HUSKINS **Retired** Justices

DAVID M. BRITT

Clerk J. Gregory Wallace

Librarian Frances H. Hall



Chief Justice Exum

The Supreme Court

At the apex of the North Carolina court system is the seven-member Supreme Court, which sits in Raleigh to consider and decide questions of law presented in civil and criminal cases on appeal. The Chief Justice and six associate justices are elected to eight-year terms by the voters of the State. There are two terms of the Supreme Court each year: a Spring Term commencing on the first Tuesday in February and a Fall Term commencing on the first Tuesday in September. The Court does not sit in panels. It sits only *en banc*, that is, all members sitting on each case.

Jurisdiction

The only original case jurisdiction exercised by the Supreme Court is in the censure and removal of judges upon the (non-binding) recommendations of the Judicial Standards Commission. The Court's appellate jurisdiction includes:

- cases on appeal by right from the Court of Appeals (cases involving substantial constitutional questions and cases in which there has been dissent in the Court of Appeals);
- cases on appeal by right from the Utilities Commission (cases involving final order or decision in a general rate matter);
- criminal cases on appeal by right from the superior courts (cases in which the defendant has been sentenced to death or life imprisonment); and
- cases in which review has been granted in the Supreme Court's discretion.

Discretionary review by the Supreme Court directly from the trial courts may be granted when delay would likely cause subsantial harm or when the workload of the Appellate Division is such that the expeditious administration of justice requires it. However, most appeals are heard only after review by the Court of Appeals.

Administration

The Supreme Court has general power to supervise and control the proceedings of the other courts of the General Court of Justice. The Court has specific power to prescribe the rules of practice and procedure for the trial court divisions, consistent with any rules enacted by the General Assembly. The schedule of superior court sessions in the 100 counties is approved yearly, by the Supreme Court. The Clerk of the Supreme Court, the Librarian of the Supreme Court Library, and the Appellate Division Reporter are appointed by the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court appoints the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts and an Assistant Director, who serve at the pleasure of the Chief Justice. He also designates a Chief Judge from among the judges of the Court of Appeals and a Chief District Court Judge from among the district judges in each of the State's 34 judicial districts. He assigns superior court judges, who regularly rotate from district to district, to the scheduled sessions of superior court in the 100 counties, and he is also empowered to transfer district court judges to other districts for temporary or specialized duty. The Chief Justice appoints three of the seven members of the Judicial Standards Commission-a judge of the Court of Appeals who serves as the Commission's chairman, one superior court judge and one district court judge. The Chief Justice also appoints six of the 24 voting members of the N.C. Courts Commission: one associate justice of the Supreme Court; one Court of Appeals judge; two superior court judges; and two district court judges. The Chief Justice also appoints the Appellate Defender, and the Chief Hearing Officer of the Office of Administrative Hearings.

Expenses of the Court, 1987-88

Operating expenses of the Supreme Court during the 1987-88 fiscal year amounted to \$2,352,654, an increase of 3.1% over total 1986-87 expenditures of \$2,281,161. Expenditures for the Supreme Court during 1987-8² constituted 1.4% of all General Fund expenditures for the operation of the entire Judicial Department during the fiscal year.

Case Data, 1987-88

A total of 309 appealed cases were before the Supreme Court during the fiscal year, 164 that were pending on July 1, 1987 plus 145 cases filed through June 30, 1988. A total of 216 of these cases were disposed of, leaving 93 cases pending on June 30, 1988.

A total of 801 petitions (requests to appeal) were before the Court during the 1987-88 year, with 726 disposed during the year and 76 pending as of June 30, 1988. The Court granted 67 petitions for review during 1987-88 compared to 99 for 1986-87.

More detailed data on the Court's workload is presented on the following pages.

Supreme Court Caseload Inventory

July 1, 1987-June 30, 1988

	Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Disposed	Pending 6/30/88
Petitions for Review				
Civil domestic	5	5	8	2
Juvenile	1	2	3	0
Other civil	63	292	313	42
Criminal	78	298	351	25
Postconviction remedy	10	35	39	6
Administrative agency decision	9	3	12	0
Total Petitions for Review	166	635	726	75
Appeals				
Civil domestic	0	3	3	0
Petitions for review granted that became civil domestic appeals	2	3	4	1
Juvenile	0	0	0	0
Petitions for review granted that became juvenile appeals	0	0	0	0
Other civil	22	15	29	8
Petitions for review granted that became other civil appeals	22	41	40	23
Criminal, defendant sentenced to death	24	11	14	21
Criminal, defendant sentenced to life imprisonment	69	47	93	23
Other criminal	5	11	11	5
Petitions for review granted that became other criminal appeals	11	9	11	9
Petitions for review granted that became postconviction				
remedy cases	0	0	0	0
Administrative agency decision	6	2	5	3
Petitions for review granted that became appeals of				
administrative agency decision	3	3	6	0
Total Appeals	164	145	216	93
Other Proceedings				
Rule 16(b) additional issues re dissent	0	8	8	0
Extraordinary writs	0	58	58	0
Requests for advisory opinion	0	1	1	0
Rule amendments	0	17	17	0
Motions	0	589	589	0
Rule 31 Petitions to Rehear	1	18	15	4
Total Other Proceedings	1	691	688	4

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS IN FISCAL YEAR 1987-88

é

APPEALS FILED IN THE SUPREME COURT JULY 1, 1987 — JUNE 30, 1988



Supreme Court Caseload Types by Judicial District and Division

July 1, 1987-June 30, 1988

Judicial Division	Judicial District	Total Cases	Death Cases	Life Cases	Other Criminal	Civil Cases	Other Cases	Cases Disposed
I	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	2
	2	7	0	5	1	1	C	4
	3A	4	1	2	0	1	0	3
	3B	3	0	1	0	2	0	3
	4	12	2	5	1	4	0	8
	5	13	1	11	0	1	0	7
	6	9	3	4	2	0	0	5
	7	6	1	2	0	3	0	5
OXIDEORAT	8	8	0	6	0	2	0	6
SUBTOTAL		65	8	39	4	14	0	43
II	9	6	1	2	2	1	0	4
	10	48	3	5	5	19	16	35
	11	6	0	2	1	3	0	4
	12	19	1	13	4	1	0	12
	13	2	1	1	0	0	0	1
	14	14	0	7	4	3	0	n
	15A	7	1	3	1	2	0	6
	15B	11	0	5	0	6	0	6
	16	11	0	4	0	0	0	6
SUBTOTAL	16A	1 125	1	0	0	0	0	0
SUBIUIAL		125	15	42	17	35	16	85
III	17A	2	2	0	0	0	0	1
	17B	3	1	0	1	1	0	3
	18	20	1	4	2	13	0	15
	19A	6	1	4	0	1	0	3
	19B	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
	20	90	1	4	0	4	0	4
	21	21	0	15	0	6	0	8
	22	16	5	6	1	4	0	12
	23	71	0	5	0	2	0	б
SUBTOTAL		85	11	38	4	32		52
IV	24	3	0	0	2	1	0	2
	25	10	3	3	- 1 I .	3	0	2 3
	26	14	0	2	4	8	0	6
	27A	10	1	6	. 1 -	2	0	7
	27B	2	0	1	0	1	0	7 2
	28	11	1	4	1	6	0	6
	29	12	3	81	1	0	0	5
	30	6	1	4 81 3	1	1	0	4
SUBTOTAL		68	9	27	10	22	0	35
TOTALS		343	43	146	35	103	16	216

NOTE: Includes life and death sentence cases awaiting Record on Appeal and not yet formally docketed.

a

Ø

U

Submission of Cases Reaching Decision Stage in Supreme Court

July 1, 1987-June 30, 1988

Cases Argued	- 91 - 21
Civil	70
Criminal	119
Total cases argued Submissions Without Argument	189
By motion of the parties (Appellate Rule 30 (d)) By order of the Court (Appellate Rule 30 (f))	7 0
Total submissions without argument	7
Total Cases Reaching Decision Stage	196

Disposition of Petitions and Other Proceedings by the Supreme Court

July 1, 1987-June 30, 1988

			Dismissed/	Total
Petitions for Review	Granted*	Denied	Withdrawn	Disposed
Civil Domestic	3	20	2	25
Juvenile	0	5	2	7
Other Civil	48	189	8	245
Criminal	13	244	10	267
Postconviction Remedy	0	12	27	39
Administrative Agency Decision	3	3	0	6
Total Petitions for Review	67	473	49	589
Other Proceedings				
Rule 16(b) — Additional Issues				8

Extraordinary Writs					58
Advisory Opinion					1
Rule Amendments					17
Motions					489
Total Other Proceedings					573

*"GRANTED" includes orders allowing relief without accepting the case as a full appeal.

4

ase Types	Affirmed	Modified	Reversed	Reversed Remanded	Remanded	Total Disposed
Civil domestic	1	1	2	2	0	6
Juvenile	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil	16	5	5	28	0	54
Criminal (death sentence)	6	0	0	4	4	14
Criminal (life sentence)	71	0	0	13	6	90
Other criminal	5	0	4	6	0	15
Postconviction remedy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative agency decision	2	0	0	7	0	9
Totals	101	6	11	60	10	188

Disposition of Supreme Court Appeals With Signed Opinions

Disposition of Supreme Court Appeals with Per Curiam Decision

				Reversed		Total
Case Types	Affirmed	Modified	Reversed	Remanded	Remanded	Disposed
Civil domestic	1	0	0	0	0	1
Juvenile	0 1	0	0	0	0	0
Other civil	12	0	0	1	0	13
Criminal (death sentence)	0	0	0	. .	0	0
Criminal (life sentence)	0	0	0	0.	0	1
Other criminal	5	0	0	0	0	5
Postconviction remedy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative agency decision	1	0	0	1	0	2
Totals	20	0	0	2	0	22

Disposition of Supreme Court Appeals by Dismissal or Withdrawal

Case Types	Dismissed or Withdrawn
	•
Civil domestic	. U
Juvenile	0
Other civil	2
Criminal (death sentence)	0
Criminal (life sentence)	2
Other criminal	2
Post-conviction remedy	0
Administrative agency decision	0
Totals	6

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS IN FISCAL YEAR 1987-88

25

0

11

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF APPEALS IN THE SUPREME COURT JULY 1, 1987-JUNE 30, 1988



TYPE OF DISPOSITION OF PETITIONS FOR REVIEW IN THE SUPREME COURT JULY 1, 1987-JUNE 30, 1988



21

NORTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT





NORTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT



Petitions Docketed and Allowed During the Years, 1982-83-1987-88

c

Supreme Court Processing Time for Disposed Cases (Total time in days from docketing to decision) July 1, 1987-June 30, 1988

	Number of Cases	(Days) Median	(Days) Mean
Civil domestic	3	190	197.3
Petitions for review granted that became civil domestic appeals	4	271	238.0
Juvenile	0	0	0
Petitions for review granted that became juvenile appeals	0	0	0
Other civil	29	184	222.4
Petitions for review granted that became other civil appeals	40	186	200.9
Criminal, defendant sentenced to death	14	462	475.4
Criminal, defendant sentenced to life imprisonment	93	282	495.2
Other criminal	11	188	236.0
Petitions for review granted that became other criminal appeals	11	337	325.6
Petitions for review granted that became postconviction remedy cases	0	0	0
Administrative agency decision	5	273	363.4
Petitions for review granted that became appeals of administrative agency decision	6	154	219.0
Total appeals	216	256	361.0

THE COURT OF APPEALS OF NORTH CAROLINA*

Chief Judge R.A. HEDRICK

Judges

GERALD ARNOLD HUGH A. WELLS CHARLES L. BECTON CLIFTON E. JOHNSON EUGENE H. PHILLIPS SIDNEY S. EAGLES, JR.

2

SARAH PARKER JACK COZORT ROBERT F. ORR K. EDWARD GREENE DONALD L. SMITH

Retired Judges

HUGH B. CAMPBELL FRANK M. PARKER EDWARD B. CLARK ROBERT M. MARTIN CECIL J. HILL E. MAURICE BRASWELL

Clerk FRANCIS E. DAIL

*As of 30 June 1988

The Court of Appeals

The 12-judge Court of Appeals is North Carolina's intermediate appellate court; it hears a majority of the appeals originating from the State's trial courts. The Court regularly sits in Raleigh, and it may sit in other locations in the State as authorized by the Supreme Court. Sessions outside of Raleigh have not been regular or frequent. Judges of the Court of Appeals are elected by popular vote for eight-year terms. A Chief Judge for the Court is designated by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and serves in that capacity at the pleasure of the Chief Justice.

Cases are heard by panels of three judges, with the Chief Judge responsible for assigning members of the Court to the four panels. Insofar as practicable, each judge is to be assigned to sit a substantially equal number of times with each other judge. The Chief Judge presides over the panel of which he or she is a member and designates a presiding judge for the other panels.

One member of the Court of Appeals, designated by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, serves as chairman of the Judicial Standards Commission.

Jurisdiction

The bulk of the caseload of the Court of Appeals consists of cases appealed from the trial courts. The Court also hears appeals directly from the Industrial Commission; certain final orders or decisions of the North Carolina State Bar; and the Commissioner of Insurance; the State Board of Contract Appeals; and appeals from certain final orders or decisions of the Property Tax Commission. (Appeals from the decisions of other administrative agencies lie first within the jurisdiction of the superior courts.)

In the event of a recommendation from the Judicial Standards Commission to censure or remove from office a justice of the Supreme Court, the (non-binding) recommendation would be considered by the Chief Judge and the six judges next senior in service on the Court of Appeals (excluding the judge who serves as the Commission's chairman). Such seven-member panel would have sole jurisdiction to act upon the Commission's recommendation.

Expenses of the Court, 1987-88

Operating expenses of the Court of Appeals during the 1987-88 fiscal year totalled \$3,158,383, an increase of 7.2% over 1986-87 expenditures of \$2,947,010. Expenditures for the Court of Appeals during 1987-88 amounted to 1.9% of all General Fund expenditures for operation of the entire Judicial Department during the fiscal year.

Case Data, 1987-88

A total of 1,351 appealed cases were filed before the Court of Appeals during the period July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988. A total of 1,272 cases were disposed of during the same period. During 1987-88, a total of 446 petitions and 1,391 motions were filed before the Court of Appeals.

Further detail on the workload of the Court of Appeals is shown in the tables and graphs on the following pages.

FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

July 1, 1987-June 30, 1988

17

0

Cases on Appeal	Filings	Dispositions
Civil cases appealed from district courts Civil cases appealed from superior courts Civil cases appealed from administrative agencies	309 515 44	
Criminal cases appealed from superior courts	483	
Total	1,351	1,272
Petitions		
Allowed Denied Remanded		71 375 0
Total	446	446
Motions		
Allowed Denied Remanded		961 430 0
Total	1,391	1,391
Total Cases on Appeal, Petitions and Motions	3,188	3,109

MANNER OF CASE DISPOSITIONS COURT OF APPEALS

July 1, 1987-June 30, 1988

Cases 1	Disposed by Written	Opinion		
Cases Affirmed	Cases Reversed	Cases A'/firmed In Part, Reversed In Part	Other Cases Disposed	Total Cases Disposed
833	252	85	102	1,272

FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

33

0



Fiscal Years 1982-83 Through 1987-88

Filings and dispositions in this graph include appealed cases and petitions (not motions) in the Court of Appeals.

North Carolina Judicial Districts and Divisions



JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT*

(As of June 30, 1988)

District

FIRST DIVISION

District

- 1 J. Herbert Small, Elizabeth City Thomas S. Watts, Elizabeth City
- 2 William C. Griffin, Jr., Williamston
- 3 David E. Reid, Jr., Greenville Herbert O. Phillips, III, Morehead City
- 4 Henry L. Stevens, III, Kenansville James R. Strickland, Jacksonville
- 5 Bradford Tillery, Wilmington Napoleon B. Barefoot, Wilmington
- 6 Richard B. Allsbrook, Roanoke Rapids
- 7 Franklin R. Brown, Tarboro Charles B. Winberry, Rocky Mount
- 8 James D. Llewellyn, Kinston Paul M. Wright, Goldsboro

SECOND DIVISION

- 9 Robert H. Hobgood, Louisburg Henry W. Hight, Jr., Henderson
- 10 Robert L. Farmer, Raleigh Henry V. Barnette, Jr., Raleigh Donald W. Stephens, Raleigh Howard E. Manning, Jr., Raleigh
- 11 Wiley F. Bowen, Dunn
- 12 Darius B. Herring, Jr., Fayetteville Coy E. Brewer, Jr., Fayetteville Edwin L. Johnson, Fayetteville
- 13 Giles R. Clark, Elizabethtown
- 14 Thomas H. Lee, Durham Anthony M. Brannon, Durham James M. Read, Durham
- 15A Jasper B. Allen, Jr., Burlington
- 15B F. Gordon Battle, Hillsboro
- 16 B. Craig Ellis, Laurinburg

THIRD DIVISION

- 17A Melzer A. Morgan, Jr., Wentworth
- 17B James M. Long, Pilot Mountain
- 18 W. Douglas Albright, Greensboro Thomas W. Ross, Greensboro Joseph John, Greensboro Ralph A. Walker, Greensboro
- 19A Thomas W. Seay, Jr., Spencer James C. Davis, Concord
- 19B Russell G. Walker, Jr., Asheboro
- 20 F. Fetzer Mills, Wadesboro William H. Helms, Wingate
- 21 William Z. Wood, Winston-Salem Judson D. DeRamus, Jr., Winston-Salem William H. Freeman, Winston-Salem
- 22 Robert A. Collier, Jr., Statesville C. Preston Cornelius, Morresville
- 23 Julius A. Rousseau, Jr., North Wilkesboro

FOURTH DIVISION

- 24 Charles C. Lamm, Jr., Boone
- 25 Forrest A. Ferrell, Hickory Claude S. Sitton, Morganton
- 26 Frank W. Snepp, Jr., Charlotte Robert M. Burroughs, Charlotte Kenneth A. Griffin, Charlotte Chase B. Saunders, Charlotte W. Terry Sherrill, Charlotte
- 27A Robert W. Kirby, Cherryville Robert E. Gaines, Gastonia
- 27B John M. Gardner, Shelby
- 28 Robert D. Lewis, Asheville C. Walter Allen, Asheville
- 29 Hollis M. Owens, Jr., Rutherfordton
- 30 James U. Downs, Franklin Janet M. Hyatt, Waynesville

*In districts with more than one resident judge, the senior resident judge is listed first.
SPECIAL JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT

James A. Beaty, Jr., Winston-Salem John B. Lewis, Jr., Farmville Richard D. Boner, Charlotte Bruce B. Briggs, Mars Hill Jack B. Crawley, Jr., Raleigh Marvin K. Gray, Charlotte Lamar Gudger, Asheville I. Beverly Lake, Jr., Raleigh Carlton E. Fellers, Raleigh Samuel T. Currin, Raleigh

EMERGENCY JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT

Henry A. McKinnon, Jr., Lumberton Samuel E. Britt, Lumberton James H. Pou Bailey, Raleigh

The Conference of Superior Court Judges (Officers as of June 30, 1988)

James M. Long, Pilot Mountain, President Robert D. Lewis, Asheville, President-Elect William Z. Wood, Winston-Salem, Vice President Edwin L. Johnson, Fayetteville, Secretary-Treasurer D. B. Herring, Jr., Fayetteville and James R. Strickland, Jacksonville, Additional Executive Committe Member



Judge James M. Long

The Superior Courts

North Carolina's superior courts are the general jurisdiction trial courts for the state. In 1987-88, there were 64 "resident" superior court judges elected to office in the 34 judicial districts for eight-year terms by Statewide ballot. In addition, ten "special" superior court judges are appointed by the Governor.

Jurisdiction

The superior court has original jurisdiction in all felony cases and in those misdemeanor cases which originate by grand jury indictment. (Most misdemeanors are tried first in the district court, from which conviction may be appealed to the superior court for trial de novo by a jury. No trial by jury is available for criminal cases in district court.) The superior court is the proper court for the trial of civil cases where the amount in controversy exceeds \$10,000, and it has jurisdiction over appeals from administrative agencies except the Industrial Commission, certain rulings of the Commissioner of Insurance, the Board of Bar Examiners of the North Carolina State Bar, the Board of State Contract Appeals, and the Property Tax Commission. Appeals from these agencies lie directly to the North Carolina Court of Appeals. Regardless of the amount in controversy, the original civil jurisdiction of the superior court does not include domestic relations cases, which are heard in the district courts, or probate and estates matters and certain special proceedings heard first by the clerk of superior court. Rulings of the clerk are within the appellate jurisdiction of the superior court.

Administration

The 100 counties of North Carolina were grouped into 34 judicial districts during 1986-87. Each district has at least one resident superior court judge who has certain administrative responsibilities for his home district, such as providing for civil case calendaring procedures. (Criminal case calendars are prepared by the district attorneys.) In districts with more than one resident superior court judge, the judge senior in service on the superior court bench exercises these supervisory powers. The judicial districts are grouped into four divisions for the rotation of superior court judges, as shown on the map on Page 31. Within the division, a resident superior court judge is required to rotate among the judicial districts, holding court for at least six months in each, then moving on to his next assignment. A special superior court judge may be assigned to hold court in any of the 100 counties. Assignments of all superior court judges are made by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Under the Constitution of North Carolina, at least two sessions (a week each) of superior court are held annually in each of the 100 counties. The vast majority of counties have more than the constitutional minimum of two weeks of superior court annually. Many larger counties have superior court in session about every week in the year.

Expenditures

A total of \$15,978,747 was expended on the operations of the superior courts during the 1987-88 fiscal year. This included the salaries and travel expenses for the 74 superior court judges, and salaries and expenses for court reporters and secretarial staff for superior court judges. The 1987-88 expenditures for the superior courts amounted to 9.65% of total General Fund expenditures for the operations of the entire Judicial Department during the 1987-88 fiscal year.

Caseload

Including both civil and criminal cases, a total of 105,704 cases were filed in the superior courts during 1987-88, an increase of 6,818 cases (6.9%) from the total of 98,886 cases that were filed in 1986-87. There were increases in filings in all case categories: civil cases, felonies, and misdemeanor appeals.

Superior court case dispositions increased from 96,308 in 1986-87 to 100,808 in 1987-88. Dispositions of civil and felony cases increased, while dispositions of misdemeanor appeals decreased.

More detailed information on the flow of cases through the superior courts is included in Part IV of this Report.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGES*

(As of June 30, 1988)

District

- 1 John T. Chaffin, Elizabeth City Grafton G. Beaman, Elizabeth City John R. Parker, Manteo
- 2 Hallett S. Ward, Washington Samuel G. Grimes, Washington James W. Hardison, Wiliamston

Ō

- 3 E. Burt Aycock, Jr., Greenville
 J. Randal Hunter, New Bern
 Willie L. Lumpkin, III, Morehead City
 James E. Martin, Bethel
 James E. Ragan, Oriental
 H. Horton Rountree, Greenville
- 4 Kenneth W. Turner, Rose Hill William M. Cameron, Jr., Jacksonville Wayne G. Kimble, Jr., Jacksonville Leonard W. Thagard, Clinton Stephen M. Williamson, Kenansville
- 5 Gilbert H. Burnett, Wilmington Jacqueline Morris-Goodson, Wilmington Charles E. Rice, III, Wilmington Elton Glenn Tucker, Wilmington
- 6 Nicholas Long, Roanoke Rapids Harold P. McCoy, Scotland Neck Robert E. Williford, Lewiston
- 7 George Britt, Tarboro Allen W. Harrell, Wilson Quentin T. Sumner, Rocky Mount Albert S. Thomas, Jr., Wilson
- 8 J. Patrick Exum, Kinston Kenneth R. Ellis, Fremont Rodney R. Goodman, Kinston Arnold O. Jones, Goldsboro Joseph E. Setzer, Jr., Goldsboro
- 9 Claude W. Allen, Jr., Oxford Ben U. Allen, Jr., Henderson J. Larry Senter, Franklinton Charles W. Wilkinson, Oxford
- 10 George F. Bason, Raleigh Stafford G. Bullock, Raleigh William A. Creech, Raleigh George R. Greene, Raleigh Joyce A. Hamilton, Raleigh Jerry W. Leonard, Raleigh Fred M. Morelock, Raleigh Louis W. Payne, Jr., Raleigh Russell G. Sherrill, III, Raleigh

*The Chief District Court Judge for each district is listed first.

District

- 11 Elton C. Pridgen, Smithfield William Christian, Sanford Edward H. McCormick, Lillington Owen H. Willis, Jr., Dunn
- 12 Sol. G. Cherry, Fayetteville John S. Hair, Jr., Fayetteville Lacy S. Hair, Fayetteville Anna E. Keever, Fayetteville Warren L. Pate, Raeford Patricia Timmons-Goodson, Fayetteville
- 13 William C. Gore, Jr., Whiteville Dewey J. Hooks, Jr., Whiteville Jerry A. Jolly, Tabor City David G. Wall, Elizabethtown
- 14 David Q. LaBarre, Durham Richard Chaney, Durham Orlando F. Hudson, Jr., Durham Carolyn D. Johnson, Durham Kenneth C. Titus, Durham
- 15A W. S. Harris, Jr., Graham Spencer B. Ennis, Burlington James K. Washburn, Burlington
- 15B Stanley Peele, Chapel Hill Lowry M. Betts, Pittsboro Patricia S. Hunt, Chapel Hill
- 16 John S. Gardner, Lumberton Adelaide G. Behan, Lumberton Charles G. McLean, Lumberton Herbert L. Richardson, Lumberton
- 17A Peter M. McHugh, Reidsville Robert R. Blackwell, Reidsville Philip W. Allen, Yanceyville
- 17B Jerry Cash Martin, Mount Airy Clarence W. Carter, King
- 18 Paul T. Williams, Greensboro Sherry F. Alloway, Greensboro Robert E. Bencini, Jr., High Point William L. Daisy, Greensboro Edmund Lowe, High Point Lawrence C. McSwain, Greensboro J. Bruce Morton, Greensboro William A. Vaden, Greensboro
- 19A Frank M. Montgomery, Salibury Robert M. Davis, Salisbury Adam C. Grant, Jr., Concord Clarence E. Horton, Jr., Kannapolis

DISTRICT COURT JUDGES*

(As of June 30, 1988)

District

 $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{C}}$

Ø

- 19B William M. Neely, Asheboro Richard M. Toomes, Asheboro
- 20 Donald R. Huffman, Wadesboro Michael E. Beale, Southern Pines Ronald W. Burris, Albemarle Kenneth W. Honneycutt, Monroe Tanya T. Wallace, Carthage
- 21 Abner Alexander, Winston-Salem Lorretta C. Biggs, Clemmons James A. Harrill, Jr., Winston-Salem Roland H. Hayes, Winston-Salem Robert Kason Keiger, Winston-Salem William B. Reingold, Winston-Salem
- 22 Lester P. Martin, Jr., Mocksville Samuel A. Cathey, Statesville George T. Fuller, Lexington Kimberly T.Harbinson, Taylorsville Robert W. Johnson, Statesville
- 23 Samuel L. Osborne, Wilkesboro Edgar B. Gregory, Wilkesboro Michael E. Helms, Wilkesboro
- 24 Robert H. Lacey, Newland
 Charles P. Ginn, Boone
 R. Alexander Lyerly, Banner Elk
- 25 L. Oliver Noble, Jr., Hickory Ronald E. Bogle, Hickory Stewart L. Cloer, Hickory Jonathan L. Jones, Hickory Timothy S. Kincaid, Newton

*The Chief District Court Judge for each district is listed first.

District

- 26 James E. Lanning, Charlotte Marilyn R. Bissell, Charlotte L. Stanley Brown, Charlotte Daphene L. Cantrell, Charlotte Richard A. Elkins, Charlotte Shirley L. Fulton, Charlotte Resa L. Harris, Charlotte Robert P. Johnston, Charlotte William G. Jones, Charlotte Theodore P. Matus, II, Charlotte William H. Scarborough, Charlotte
- 27A Lawrence B. Langson, Gastonia Berlin H. Carpenter, Jr., Gastonia Harley B. Gaston, Jr., Belmont Timothy L. Patti, Gastonia Catherine C. Stevens, Gastonia
- 27B George W. Hamrick, Shelby James T. Bowen, Lincolnton John K. Fonvielle, Shelby
- 28 Earl J. Fowler, Jr., Arden Gary S. Cash, Fletcher Robert L. Harrell, Asheville Peter L. Roda, Asheville
- 29 Robert T. Gash, Brevard Loto J. Greenlee, Marion Zoro J. Guice, Jr., Hendersonville Thomas N. Hix, Hendersonville
- 30 John J. Snow, Jr., Murphy Steven J. Bryant, Bryson City Danny E. Davis, Waynesville

DISTRICT COURT JUDGES*

x

cγ

Ó

Ġ

0

The Association of District Court Judges (Officers as of June 30, 1988)

Sol G. Cherry, Fayetteville, President Frank M. Montgomery, Salisbury, Vice President Rodney R. Goodman, Kinston, Secretary-Treasurer George M. Britt, Tarboro Samuel A. Cathey, Statesville W.S. Harris, Jr., Graham Charles P. Ginn, Boone Additional Executive Committee Members



Judge Sol. G. Cherry

The District Courts

North Carolina's district courts are trial courts with original jurisdiction of the overwhelming majority of the cases handled by the State's court system. There were 151 district court judges serving in 34 judicial districts during 1987-88. These judges are elected to four-year terms by the voters of their respective districts.

A total of 640 magistrate positions were authorized as of June 30, 1988. Of this number, about 100 positions were specified as part-time. Magistrates are appointed by the senior resident superior court judge from nominations submitted by the clerk of superior court of their county, and they are supervised by the chief district court judge of their district.

Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of the district court extends to virtually all misdemeanor cases, probable cause hearings in most felony cases, all juvenile proceedings, involuntary commitments and recommitments to mental hospitals, and domestic relations cases. Effective September 1, 1986, the General Assembly decriminalized many minor traffic offenses. Such offenses, previously charged as misdemeanors, are now "infractions," defined as non-criminal violations of law not punishable by imprisonment. The district court division has original jurisdiction for all infraction cases. The district courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the superior courts in general civil cases, but the district courts are the proper courts for the trial of civil cases where the amount in controversy is \$10,000 or less. Upon the plaintiff's request, a civil case in which the amount in controversy is \$1,500 or less, may be designated a "small claims" case and assigned by the chief district court judge to a magistrate for hearing. Magistrates are empowered to try worthless check criminal cases when the value of the check does not exceed \$500. In addition, they may accept written appearances, waivers of trial, and pleas of guilty in such worthless check cases when the amount of the check is \$500 or less, the offender has made restitution, and the offender has fewer than four previous worthless check convictions. Magistrates may accept waviers of appearance and pleas of guilty in misdemeanor or infraction cases involving traffic, alcohol, boating, hunting and fishing violation cases, for which a uniform schedule of fines has been adopted by the Conference of Chief District Judges. Magistrates also conduct initial hearings to fix conditions of release for arrested defendants, and they are empowered to issue arrest and search warrants.

Administration

A chief district judge is appointed for each judicial district by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from

among the elected judges in the respective districts. Subject to the Chief Justice's general supervision, each chief judge exercises administrative supervision and authority over the operation of the district courts and magistrates in his district. Each chief judge is responsible for scheduling sessions of district court and assigning judges; supervising the calendaring of noncriminal cases; assigning matters to magistrates; making arrangements for court reporting and jury trials in civil cases; and supervising the discharge of clerical functions in the district courts.

The chief district court judges meet in conference at least once a year upon the call of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Among other matters, this annual conference adopts a uniform schedule of traffic offenses and fines for their violation for use by magistrates and clerks of court in accepting defendants' waivers of appearance and guilty pleas.

Expenditures

Total expenditures for the operation of the district courts in 1987-88 amounted to \$29,939,853. This is an increase of 11.3% over 1986-87 expenditures of \$26,908,723. Included in this total are the personnel costs of court reporters and secretaries as well as the personnel costs of the 151 district court judges and approximately 640 magistrates. The 1987-88 total is 18.1% of the General Fund expenditures for the operation of the entire Judicial Department, about the same percentage share of total Judicial Department expenditures that the district courts took for the 1986-87 fiscal year.

Caseload

During 1987-88 the statewide total number of district court filings (civil and criminal) increased 135,462 (7.2%) over the total number reported for 1986-87. Not including juvenile proceedings and mental hospital commitment hearings, the filing total in 1987-88 was 2,004,447. Much of this increase is attributable to increases in criminal motor vehicle and infraction filings. Considering criminal motor vehicle and infraction cases together there was an increase of 52,764 cases (5.4%) above the number of such cases filed in 1986-87. Filings of criminal non-motor vehicle cases increased by 46,579 (9.9%), and filings of civil magistrate cases increased by 29,881 (12.1%) above the numbers of cases filed in these categories in 1986-87.

More detailed information on district court civil and criminal caseloads and on juvenile case activity is contained in Part IV of this Report.

The District Courts

Ű.

41

42

The Conference of Chief District Court Judges (Officers as of June 30, 1988)

Robert H. Lacey, Newland, President Frank M. Montgomery, Salisbury, Vice President John S. Gardner, Lumberton, Secretary-Treasurer



Judge Robert H. Lacey

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS (As of June 30, 1988)

Distric		Distric	al de la companya de En la companya de la c
1	H. P. WILLIAMS, JR., Elizabeth City	17A	THURMAN B. HAMPTON, Wentworth
2	MITCHELL D. NORTON, Washington	17B	HAROLD D. BOWMAN, Dobson
3A	THOMAS D. HAIGWOOD, Greenville	18	HORACE M. KIMEL, JR., Greensboro
3B	WILLIAM D. McFADYEN, New Bern	19A	JAMES E. ROBERTS, Concord
4	WILLIAM H. ANDREWS, Jacksonville	19B	GARLAND N. YATES, Asheboro
5	JERRY L. SPIVEY, Wilmington	20	CARROLL LOWDER, Monroe
6	DAVID H. BEARD, JR., Murfreesboro	21	W. WARREN SPARROW, Winston-Salem
7	HOWARD S. BONEY, JR., Tarboro	22	H. W. ZIMMERMAN, JR., Lexington
8	DONALD JACOBS, Goldsboro	23	MICHAEL A. ASHBURN, North Wilkesboro
9	DAVID R. WATERS, Oxford	24	JAMES THOMAS RUSHER, Marshall
10	C. COLON WILLOUGHBY, JR., Raleigh	25	ROBERT E. THOMAS, Newton
11	JOHN W. TWISDALE, Smithfield	26	PETER S. GILCHRIST, Charlotte
12	EDWARD W. GRANNIS, JR., Fayetteville	27A	CALVIN B. HAMRICK, Gastonia
13	MICHAEL F. EASLEY, Whiteville	27B	WILLIAM C. YOUNG, Shelby
14	RONALD L. STEPHENS, Durham	28	ROBERT W. FISHER, Asheville
15A	STEVE A. BALOG, Graham	29	ALAN C. LEONARD, Rutherfordton
15B	CARL R. FOX, Chapel Hill	30	ROY H. PATTON, JR., Waynesville
16	JOE FREEMAN BRITT, Lumberton		

The District Attorneys

The Conference of District Attorneys (Executive Committee as of June 30, 1987)

Michael F. Easley, Presdient Ronald L. Stephens, President-Elect H.P. Williams, Vice President Edward W. Grannis, Jr.. Thomas D. Haigwood Roy H. Patton, Jr. C. Colon Willoughby, Jr. H.W. Zimmerman, Jr. The District Attorneys Association (Officers as of June 30, 1987)

Michael F. Easley, Bolivia, President H.P. Williams, Elizabeth City, Vice President Ronald L. Stephens, Durham, Vice President for Legislative Affairs Napoleon B. Barefoot, Jr., Bolivia, Secretary-Treasurer



District Attorney Michael F. Easley

The District Attorneys

The State is divided into 35 prosecutorial districts which, with one exception, correspond to the 34 judicial districts. By act of the 1981 Session of the General Assembly, the 3rd Judicial District is divided into two separate prosecutorial districts, Prosecutorial Districts 3A and 3B, effective October 1, 1981. Prosecutorial District 3A consists of Pitt County, and Prosecutorial District 3B is comprised of Craven, Carteret, and Pamlico (G.S. 7A-60). A district attorney is elected by the voters in each of the 35 districts for four-year terms.

Duties

The district attorney represents the State in all criminal actions brought in the superior and district courts in his district, and is responsible for ensuring that infraction cases are prosecuted efficiently. In addition to his prosecutorial functions, the district attorney is responsible for calendaring criminal cases for trial.

Resources

Each district attorney may employ on a full-time basis the number of assistant district attorneys authorized by statute for his district. As of June 30, 1988, a total of 225 assistant district attorneys were authorized for the 35 prosecutorial districts. The district attorney of District 26 (Mecklenburg County) had the largest staff (19 assistants) and the district attorney of seven judicial districts (15A, 15B, 17A, 17B, 19B, 23, 24) had the smallest staff (three assistants).

Each district attorney is authorized to employ an administrative assistant to aid in preparing cases for trial and to expedite the criminal court docket. The district attorney in 18 of the 35 districts is authorized to employ an investigatorial assistant who aids in the investigation of cases prior to trial. All district attorneys are authorized to employ a victim and witness coordinator.

Expenditures

A total of \$19,014,218 was expended in 1987-88 for the 35 offices of district attorney. In addition, a total of \$100,943 was expended for the District Attorney's Conference and its staff.

1987-1988 Caseload

A total of 88,948 criminal cases were filed in the superior courts during 1987-88, consisting of 55,284 felony cases and 33,664 misdemeanor appeals from the district courts. The total number of criminal filings in the superior courts in the previous year was 83,478. The increase of 5,470 cases in 1987-88 represents a 6.6% increase over the 1986-87 total.

Total criminal cases disposed of by the superior courts in 1987-88 amounted to 85,123. There were 53,420 felony dispositions; the number of misdemeanor cases disposed of was 31,703. Compared with 1986-87, total criminal case dispositions increased by 3,987 over the 81,136 cases disposed of in that fiscal year.

The median ages of 1987-88 criminal cases at disposition in the superior courts were 86 days for felony cases and 70 days for misdemeaor appeals. In 1986-87, the median age of felony cases at disposition was 91 days, and the median age at disposition for misdemeanor appeals was 71 days.

The number of criminal cases disposed of by jury trial in the superior courts increased slightly from 3,072 in 1986-87 to 3,111 in 1987-88, an increase of 1.3%. As in past years, the proportion of total criminal cases disposed by jury was small—3.8% in 1986-87 compared to 3.7% in 1987-88. This small number of cases, however, requires the great proportion of superior court time and resources devoted to handling the criminal caseload.

By contrast, in 1987-88 a majority (45,600 or 53.6%) of criminal case dispositions in superior courts were processed on submission of guilty pleas, not requiring a trial. This percentage represents a slight increase over the proportion of guilty plea dispositions reported for 1986-87 (52.1%).

"Dismissal by district attorney" accounted for a significant percentage of all criminal case dispotions during 1987-88—a total of 23,657 cases, or 27.8% of all dispositions. This proportion is comparable to that recorded for prior years. Many of the dismissals involved the situations of two or more cases pending against the same defendant, resulting in a plea bargain agreement where the defendant pleads guilty to some charges in exchange for a dismissal of others.

There was an increase in the number of "Speedy Trial Act" dismissals in superior courts, from 48 in 1986-87 to 52 in 1987-88.

The total number of criminal cases *disposed* of in the superior courts was 3,825 cases less than the total number of case *filed* in 1987-88. Consequently, the number of criminal cases pending in suprioer court increased from 27,229 at the beginning of the fiscal year to a total at year's end of 31,054, an increase of 14.0%.

The median age of pending felony cases in the superior courts decreased from 88 days on June 30, 1987 to 79 days on June 30, 1988. The median age of pending misdemeanor appeals also decreased—from 83 days on June 30, 1987 to 78 days on June 30, 1988.

Consideration of district court criminal caseloads is affected by the existence of a new case category in the district courts, "infractions." Effective September 1, 1986, many minor traffic offenses were decriminalized and thereafter charged as infractions, defined as non-criminal violations of law not punishable by imprisonment. Although non-criminal, district attorneys are responsible for the prosecution of these cases.

Nearly all infraction cases were criminal motor vehicle cases in prior years. Therefore, for purposes of comparing

current to prior year criminal caseloads, motor vehicle filings and dispositions in prior years are compared to filings and dispositions of motor vehicle cases plus infractions in 1987-88.

In the district courts, a total of 1,542,962 criminal cases and infractions were filed during 1987-88. This total consisted of 419,407 criminal motor vehicle cases, 608,845 infraction cases, and 514,710 criminal non-motor vehicle cases. A comparison of total filings in 1987-88 with total filings in 1986-87 (1,443,619) reveals an increase in district court criminal and infraction filings of 99,343 cases, or 6.9%. Filings of non-motor vehicle cases rose by 46,579 cases (9.9%), from 468,131 cases in 1986-87 to 514,710 cases in 1987-88. Filings of motor vehicle plus infraction cases increased by 52,764 cases (5.4%), from 975,488 in 1986-87 to 1,028,252 in 1987-88.

Total dispositions of motor vehicle and infraction cases in the district courts amounted to 994,387 cases during 1987-88 (401,855 motor vehicle dispositions and 592,532 infraction dispositions). As in prior years, a substantial portion of such cases are disposed by waiver of appearance and entry of pleas of guilty (or "responsibility" in infraction cases) before a clerk or magistrate. During 1987-88, 506,999 (51.0%) of motor vehicle and infraction cases were disposed by waiver. This substantial number of cases did not, of course, require action by the district attorneys' offices and should not be regarded as having been a part of the district attorneys' caseload. The remaining 487,388 infraction and motor vehicle cases (186,022 infraction and 301,332 motor vehicle cases) were disposed by means other than waiver. This balance was 59,022 cases (or 13.8%) more than the 428,366 non-waiver motor vehicle dispositions in 1986-87. (The clerks of court do not report motor vehicle criminal cases or infractions by case file number to the Administrative Office of the Courts. Only summary total number of filings and dispositions are reported. Therefore, it is not possible by computer-processing to obtain pending case data for the motor vehicle criminal case or infraction case categories.)

With respect to non-motor vehicle criminal case dispositions, a total of 500,529 such cases were disposed of in district courts in 1987-88. As with superior court criminal cases, the most frequent method of disposition was by entry of guilty plea; the next most frequent was dismissal by the district attorney. Some 177,010 cases, or 35.4% of the dispositions were by guilty pleas. An additional 138,798 cases, or 27.7% of the total were disposed of by prosecutor dismissal. The remaining cases were disposed of by waiver (11.3%), trial (8.2%), as a felony probable cause matter (9.1%), or by other means (8.3%).

During 1987-88, the median age at disposition of nonmotor vehicle criminal cases was 30 days, compared with 28 days at disposition for 1986-87.

Total non-motor vehicle criminal dispositions were 14,181 cases less than the total of such filings during 1987-88. The number of non-motor vehicle criminal cases pending at year's end was 97,866, compared with a total of 83,685 at the beginning of the year, an increase of 14,181 (16.9%) in the number of pending cases. The median age for pending non-motor vehicle cases rose from 54 days on June 30, 1987 to 57 days on June 30, 1988.

Additional information on the criminal caseloads in superior and district courts is included in Part IV of this Report.

CLERKS OF SUPERIOR COURT

(As of June 30, 1988)

COUNTY Alamance Alexander Alleghany Anson Ashe Avery Beaufort Bertie Bladen Brunswick Buncombe Burke Cabarrus Caldwell Camden Carteret Caswell Catawba Chatham Cherokee Chowan Clay Cleveland Columbus Craven Cumberland Currituck Dare Davidson Davie Duplin Durham Edgecombe Forsyth Franklin Gaston Gates Graham Granville Greene Guilford Halifax Harnett Haywood Henderson Hertford Hoke Hyde Iredell Jackson

Ņ

CLERK OF COURT Louise B. Wilson Seth Chapman Rebecca J. Gambill **R**. Frank Hightower Jerry L. Roten Robert F. Taylor Thomas S. Payne, III John Tyler Hilda H. Coleman Diana R. Morgan J. Ray Elingburg Major A. Joines Estus B. White Jeanette Turner Catherine W. McCoy Darlene Leonard Janet H. Cobb Phyllis B. Hicks Janice Oldham Rose Mary Crooke Marjorie H. Hollowell James H. McClure Ruth S. Dedmon Lacy R. Thompson **Dorothy Pate** George T. Griffin Sheila R. Doxey Betty Mann Martha S. Nicholson Delores C. Jordan John A. Johnson James Leo Carr Curtis Weaver Frances P. Storey Ralph S. Knott Betty B. Jenkins Terry L. Riddick O.W. Hooper, Jr. Mary Ruth C. Nelms Jovce L. Harrell Barbara G. Washington Ellen C. Neathery Georgia Lee Brown William G. Henry Thomas H. Thompson Richard T. Vann Juanita Edmund Lenora R. Bright Angelia T. Roberts Frank Watson, Jr.

COUNTY Johnston Jones Lee Lenoir Limoln Micon Madison Martin McDowell Mecklenburg Mitchell Montgomery Moore Nash New Hanover Northampton Onslow Orange Pamlico Pasquotank Pender Perquimans Person Pitt Polk Randolph Richmond Robeson Rockingham Rowan Rutherford Sampson Scotland Stanly Stokes Surry Swain Transylvania Tyrrell Union Vance Wake Warren Washington Watauga Wayne Wilkes Wilson Yadkin Yancey

CLERK OF COURT Will R. Crocker Ronald H. Metts Lucille H. York Claude C. Davis Pamela C. Huskey Anna I. Carson James W. Cody Phyllis G. Pearson Ruth B. Williams Robert M. Blackburn Linda D. Woody Charles M. Johnson Rachel H. Comer Rachel M. Joyner Louise D. Rehder R. Jennings White, Jr. **Everitte Barbee** Shirley L. James Mary Jo Potter Frances W. Thompson Frances D. Basden Walter W. White W. Thomas Humphries Sandra Gaskins Judy P. Arledge Lynda B. Skeen Catherine S. Wilson Dixie I. Barrington Frankie C. Williams Francis Glover Keith H. Melton Charlie T. McCullen C. Whitfield Gibson, Jr. David R. Fisher Pauline Kirkman David J. Beal Sara Robinson Marian M. McMahon Nathan T. Everett Nola H. McCollum Lucy Longmire John M. Kennedy Richard E. Hunter, Jr. Timothy L. Spear John T. Bingham David B. Brantly Wayne Roope Nora H. Hargrove Harold J. Long F. Warren Hughes

04

3ŝ

The Clerks of Superior Court

Association of Clerks of Superior Court (Officers as of June 30, 1988)

- Frances W. Thompson, Pasquotank County, President
- James L. Carr, Durham County First Vice President
- Ray Elingburg, Buncombe County Second Vice President
- Judy Arledge, Polk County Secretary

ತ್ರು

C. Whitfield Gibson, Jr., Scotland County Treasurer



Frances W. Thompson

The Clerks of Superior Court

A Clerk of Superior Court is elected for a four-year term by the voters in each of North Carolina's 100 counties. The Clerk has jurisdiction to hear and decide special proceedings and is, *ex officio*, judge of probate, in addition to performing record-keeping and administrative functions for both the superior and district courts of his county.

Jurisdiction

The original jurisdiction of the clerk of superior court includes the probate of wills and administration of decedents' estates. It also includes such "special proceedings" as adoptions, condemnations of private property under the public's right of eminent domain, proceedings to establish boundaries, foreclosures, and certain proceedings to administer the estates of minors and incompetent adults. The right of appeal from the clerks' judgments in such cases lies to the superior court.

The clerk of superior court is also empowered to issue search warrants and arrest warrants, subpoenas, and other process necessary to execute the judgments entered in the superior and district courts of his county. For certain misdemeanor criminal offenses, the clerk is authorized to accept defendants' waiver of appearance and plea of guilty and to impose a fine in accordance with a schedule established by the Conference of Chief District Court Judges.

Administration

The clerk of superior court performs administrative duties for both the superior and district courts of his county. Among these duties are the maintenance of court records and indexes, the control and accounting of funds, and the furnishing of information to the Administrative Office of the Courts.

In most counties, the clerk continues to perform certain functions related to preparation of civil case calendars, and in many counties, the clerk's staff assists the district attorney in preparing criminal case calendars as well. Policy and oversight responsibility for civil case calendaring is vested in the State's senior resident superior court judges and chief district court judges. However, day-today civil calendar preparation is the clerk's responsibility in all districts except those served by trial court administrators.

Expenditures

A total of \$50,954,569 was expended in 1987-88 for the operation of the 100 clerk of superior court offices. In addition to the salaries and other expenses of the clerks and their staffs, this total includes expenditures for jurors' fees, and witness expenses.

Total expenditures for clerks' offices in 1987-88 amounted to 30.8% of the General Fund expenditures for the operations of the entire Judicial Department.

1987-88 Caseload

During 1987-88, estate case filings totalled 45,013 which represents a 4.0% increase over the 43,285 case filed in 1986-87. Estate case dispositions totalled 43,288 cases in 19876-88, or 2.9% more than the previous year's total of 42,070.

A total of 41,881 special proceedings was filed before the 100 clerks of superior courts in 1987-88. This is an increase of 2,595 cases (6.6%) from the 39,286 filings in the previous fiscal years. Special proceedings dispositions totalled 37,951 cases, or 17.5% more than the previous year's total of 32,309.

The clerks of superior court are also responsible for handling the records of all case filings and dispositions in the superior and district courts. The total number of superior court case filings during the 1987-88 year was 105,704 and the total number of district court filings, not including juvenile proceedings and mental hospital commitment hearings, was 2,004,447.

More detailed information on the estates and special proceedings caseloads is included in Part IV of this Report.

Juvenile Services Division

The Juvenile Services Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts provides intake, probation and aftercare services to juveniles who are before the District Courts for delinquent matters, *i.e.*, violations of the criminal code, including motor vehicle violations; and for undisciplined matters, such as running away from home, being truant, and being beyond the parents' disciplinary control.

Intake is the screening of complaints alleging delinquent or undisciplined behavior by children, to determine whether petitions should be filed. During the 1987-88 year a total of 28,906 complaints were brought to the attention of intake counselors. Of this number, 19,002 (66%) were approved for filing, and 9,904 (34%) were not approved for filing.

Probation and aftercare refer to supervision of children in their own communities. Probation is authorized by judicial order. Aftercare service is provided for juveniles after their release from a training school. (Protective supervision is also a form of court-ordered supervision within the community; and this service is combined with probation and aftercare.)

In 1987-88 a total of 17,086 juveniles were supervised in the probation and aftercare program.

Expenditures

The Juvenile Services Division is State-funded. The expenditures for fiscal year 1987-88 totalled \$11,334,027. This was an increase of 7.8% over the 1986-87 expenditures. The 1987-88 expenditures amounted to 6.8% of all General Fund expenditures for the operation of the entire Judicial Department, close to the same percentage share of total Judicial Department expenditures for the Division as in the previous fiscal year.

Administration

The Administrator of the Juvenile Services Division is appointed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts. A chief court counselor is appointed for each judicial district by the Administrator of the Juvenile Services Division, with the approval of the Chief District Court Judge and the Administrative Officer of the Courts. Subject to the Administrator's general supervision, each chief court counselor exercises administrative supervision over the operation of the court counseling services in the respective districts.

Juvenile Services Division Staff (As of June 30, 1988)

Thomas A. Danek, Administrator Nancy C. Patteson, Area Administrator Edward F. Taylor, Area Administrator John T. Wilson, Area Administrator Rex B. Yates, Area Administrator M. Harold Rogerson, Jr., Program Specialist Arlene J. Kincaid, Administrative Officer

Judicial District	Chief Court Counselors	Judicial District	Chief Court Counselors
1	Donald Alexander	16	Robert H. Hughes
2	Joseph A. Paul	17A and 17B	Martha M. Lauten
3	Eve C. Rogers	18	J. Manley Dodson
4	Ida Ray Miles	19A and 19B	James C. Queen
5	Phyllis Roebuck	20	Jimmy L. Craig
6	John R. Brady	21	James J. Weakland
7	Pam Honeycutt	22	Carl T. Duncan
8	Lynn C. Sasser	23	C. Wayne Dixon
9	Cecil T. Lewis, Jr.	24	Lynn Hughes
10	Larry C. Dix	25	Lee Cox
11	Henry C. Cox	26	James A. Yancey
12	Phil T. Utley	27A	Charles Reeves
13	Jimmy E. Godwin	27B	Gloria Newman
14	Fred Elkins	28	Louis Parrish
15A	Harry L. Derr	29	Kenneth E. Lanning
15B	Donald Hargrove	30	Betty G. Alley

Juvenile Service Division (As of June 30, 1988)

THE COURT COUNSELORS ASSOCIATION (Officers for 1987-88)

Executive Committee Members

Carey Collins President

Carl Duncan, President-Elect

Pat Wolfe, Seretary

Đ.

Dennis Cotten, Treasurer

Amie Haith, Parliamentarian

Board Members

1985-88	1986-89	1987-90		
Jane Clare Bruce Stanback	Richard Alligood Marion Brewer Anne Loy	Gloria Newman Blake Belcher Charles Reeves		



ð.

Carey Collins

Office of Guardian Ad Litem Services

Program Services

When a peition alleging abuse or neglect of a juvenile is filed in district court, the judge appoints a trained volunteer guardian ad litem and an attorney advocate to work together to represent the child's best interests. The attorney protects the child's legal rights while ensuring that the volunteer guardian has appropriate access to the court process. The trained volunteer investigates the child's situation and works with the attorney to report the child's needs to the court and to make recommendations for case disposition and any necessary continuing supervision until court intervention is no longer required. During 1987-88, a total of 989 volunteers were active in the North Carolina program and represented a total of 5,011 abused and neglected children. These volunteers participated in 5,434 court hearings and gave approximately 75,000 volunteer hours to casework and training in the State's guardian ad litem program.

Expenditures

During 1987-88, total expenditures for the guardian ad litem program amounted to \$1,332,851. Of this amount, \$514,257 was for program attorney fees and \$818,594 was for program administration. The total included reimbursement of volunteers' expense of \$41,158 (covering 64,752 casework hours for 5,011 abused and neglected children). This compares with 1986-87 total expenditure of \$1,117,720, with 755 volunteers representing, 3,837 children and providing 37,444 casework hours with reimbursement expenses of \$28,778.

Administration

The Office of Guardian Ad Litem Services, established by the General Assembly in 1983, is a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts appoints the Administrator of the Office of Guardian Ad Litem Service and appoints members of a Guardian Ad Litem Advisory Committee to work with the Administrator, who is responsible for planning and directing the guardian ad litem services program through the State.

The Administrator is assisted by two regional managers, each of whom supervises the development and implementation of services for a segment of judicial districts, directing the local program, providing assistance in training programs for volunteers, and resolving operational problems in the districts.

A coordinator is employed for 30 of the State's 34 judicial districts to recruit, screen, train and supervise volunteers. Seven of these coordinators were added in fiscal year 1987-88. Program coordinators contact community groups, local agencies, the courts, and the media in order to develop volunteer participation, solicit support from key officials, provide public education about the program, and cultivate services for children. The coordinators plan an initial sixteen-hour training course for new veolunteers, match children (who are before the courts) with volunteers, implement continued training for experienced guardians, and provide supervision of, and consultation and support to, volunteers. Other coordinator responsibilities are to assure that in each case the attorney receives information from the volunteer assigned to the case and that the court receives timely oral or written reports each time a child's case is heard. (Coordinators were not employed during 1987-88 for four judicial districts in which the case load was too small to justify a coordinator position. In those counties, the contract attorney served as the volunteer coordinator.)

Guardian Ad Litem Staff (As of June 30, 1988)

Virginia C. Weisz, Administrator Cindy Mays, Regional Manager Marilyn Stevens, Regional Manager

Guardian ad Litem Division (As of June 30, 1988)

Judicial District	Coordinator	Judicial District	Coordinator
1	Veola Spivey	15A	Eleanor Ketcham
2	Jennifer Leggett	15B & 19B	Floyd Wicker
3	Carol Mattocks	16	Gladys Pierce
4	Jean Hawley	18	Sam Parrish
5	Jane Brister	19A	Amy Collins
6	Patsey Moseley-Moss	20	Martha Sue Hall
7	Sandra Pittman	21	Linda Garrou
8	Claudia Kadis	22	Pam Ashmore
9	Sarah Sponenberg	25	Anglea Phillips
10	Lloyd Inman	$\frac{1}{26}$	Judi Strause
12	Brownie Smathers	27A & B	Sindy Waggoner
13	Pam Ward &	28	Jean Moore
	Betty Buck	29	Barbara King
14	Cy Gurney Elkins	30	Celia Larson

Public Defenders

During 1987-88, there were seven public defender offices in North Carolina, serving Judicial Districts 3,* 12, 15B, 18, 26, 27A, and 28. The public defender for each district is appointed by the senior resident superior court judge of that district from a list of not less than two and not more than three names nominated by written ballot of the attorneys resident in the district who are licensed to practice law in North Carolina. Their terms are four years. Each public defender is by statute provided a minimum of one full-time assistant public defender and additional full-time or part-time assistants as may be authorized by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Entitlement of Indigents to Counsel

A person is determined to be indigent if he is found "financially unable to secure legal representation." He is entitled to State-paid legal representation in: any proceeding which may result in (or which seeks relief from) confinement; a fine of \$500 or more; or extradition to another State; a proceeding alleging mental illness or incapacity which may result in hospitalization, sterilization, or the loss of certain property rights; and juvenile proceedings which may result in confinement, transfer to superior court for a felony trial, or termination of parental rights.

Most of the cases of State-paid representation of indigents in the districts with public defenders are handled by the public defender's office. However, the court may in certain circumstances—such as existence of a potential conflict of interest—assign private counsel to represent an indigent defendant. In the other 28 districts, the assigned private counsel system was the only one used.

Expenditures

A total of \$4,087,252 was expended for the operation of the seven public defenders' offices during 1987-88. This

*The public defender serves only two counties of the four in District 3: Pitt and Carteret. was an increase of \$467,041 (12.9%) over the 1986-87 total of \$3,620,211.

1987-88 Caseload

The seven public defender offices disposed of cases involving a total of 24,956 defendents during 1987-88. This was an increase of 1,669 defendants, or 7.2%, over the 23,287 defendants represented during 1986-87.

Additional information concerning the operation of these offices is found in Part III of this Annual Report.

PUBLIC DEFENDERS (As of June 30, 1988)

*District 3 Robert L. Shoffner, Greenville

District 12 Mary Ann Tally, Fayetteville

District 15B John Kirk Osborn, Chapel Hill

District 18 Wallace G. Harrelson, Greensboro

District 26 Isabel S. Day, Charlotte

District 27A Rowell C. Cloninger, Jr., Gastonia

District 28 J. Robert Hufstader, Asheville

Public Defenders

The Association of Public Defenders (Officers as of June 30, 1988)

Marc D. Towler, President James Williams, Vice President Frederick Lind, Secretary-Treasurer



Marc D. Towler

The Office of the Appellate Defender

(Staff as of June 30, 1988)

Malcolm Ray Hunter, Jr., Appellate Defender

Assistant Appellate Defenders

Louis D. Bilionis David W. Dorey Staples S. Hughes Teresa McHugh Mark D. Montgomery Daniel R. Pollitt M. Gordon Widenhouse

The Appellate Defender Office began operation as a State-funded program on October 1, 1981. (Prior to that date, appellate defender services were funded by a oneyear federal grant.) The 1985 General Assembly made permanent The Appellate Defender Office by repealing its expiration provision. In accord with the assignments made by trial court judges, it is the responsibility of the Appellate Defender and his staff to provide criminal defense appellate services to indigent persons who are appealing their convictions to the N. C. Supreme Court, the N. C. Court of Appeals, or to Federal courts.

The Appellate Defender is appointed by, and carries out his duties under the general supervision of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice may, consistent with the resources available to the Appellate Defender and to insure quality criminal defense services, authorize certain appeals to be assigned to a local public defender office or to private assigned counsel instead of to the Appellate Defender.

1987-88 Caseload

As of July 1, 1987, the Appellate Defender had 82 cases pending in the Supreme Court of North Carolina. During the 1987-88 year, a total of 52 additional appeals to the Supreme Court were assigned to the Appellate Defender's Office, and during that year a total of 51 cases were disposed of. This left 83 cases pending as of June 30, 1988. During the 1987-88 year, the Appellate Defender and his staff filed a total of 48 briefs in the Supreme Court.

As of July 1, 1987, the Appellate Defender had 113 cases pending in the North Carolina Court of Appeals. During the 1987-88 year, a total of 79 additional appeals to the Court of Appeals were assigned to the Appellate Defender's Office, and during that year, a total of 111 cases were disposed of. This left 81 cases pending as of June 30, 1988. The Appellate Defender and his staff filed a total of 68 briefs in the Court of Appeals during the 1987-88 year.

S

The North Carolina Courts Commission

(Members as of June 30, 1988)

Appointed by the Governor

Jonathan L. Rhyne, Jr., Lincolnton, Chairman Member, N.C. House of Representatives

Clyde M. Roberts, Marshall

Garland N. Yates, Asheboro District Attorney

Warren Owen, Charlotte

Harold J. Long, Yadkinville Clerk of Court

Dan R. Simpson, Morganton Member, N. C. State Senate

Appointed by President of the Senate (Lieutenant Governor)

Anthony E. Rand, Fayetteville Member, N.C. Senate

Russell J. Hollers Troy

Henson P. Barnes, Goldsboro Member, N.C. Senate

Alfred M. Goodwin, Louisburg

R.C. Soles, Jr., Tabor City Member, N. C. Senate

Lillian O. Briant, Asheboro

Ex-Officio (Non-Voting)

O. William Faison, Raleigh N.C. Bar Association Representative

Z. Creighton Brinson, Tarboro N.C. State Bar Representative

Franklin E. Freeman, Jr., Raleigh Administrative Officer of the Courts Appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives

Daniel T. Blue, Jr., Raleigh Member, N.C. House of Representatives

Robert C. Hunter, Marion Member, N.C. House of Representatives

Ralph S. Knott, Louisburg Clerk of Court

Roy A. Cooper, III, Rocky Mount Member, N.C. House of Representatives

Robert C. Hunter, Marion Member, N.C. House of Representatives

Dennis A. Wicker, Sanford Member, N.C. House of Representatives

Appointed by the Chief Justice of the N.C. Supreme Court

Burley B. Mitchell, Jr., Raleigh Associate Justice, N.C. Supreme Court

Clifton E. Johnson, Charlotte Judge, N.C. Court of Appeals

J. Milton Reed, Jr., Durham Superior Court Judge

Forrest A. Ferrell, Hickory Superior Court Judge

Nicholas Long, Roanoke Rapids District Court Judge

Samuel McD. Tate, Morganton District Court Judge

52

The North Carolina Courts Commission

The North Carolina Courts Commission was reestablished by the 1979 General Assembly "to make continuing studies of the structure, organization, jurisdiction, procedures and personnel of the Judicial Department and of the General Court of Justice and to make recommendations to the General Assembly for such changes therein as will facilitate the administration of justice". Initially, the Commission was comprised of 15 voting members, with five each appointed by the Governor, the President of the Senate (Lieutenant Governor), and the Speaker of the House. The Commission also had three *ex officio* members as shown above.

The 1981 General Assembly amended the statutes pertaining to the Courts Commission, to increase the number of voting members from 15 to 23, with the Governor to appoint seven voting members, the President of the Senate to appoint eight voting members, and the Speaker of the House to appoint eight voting members. The nonvoting *ex officio* members remained the same: a representative of the North Carolina Bar Association, a representative of the North Carolina State Bar, and the Administrative Officer of the Courts.

The 1983 Session of the General Assembly further amended G.S. 7A-506, to revise the voting membership of the Commission. Effective July 1, 1983, the Commission consists of 24 voting members, six to be appointed by the Governor; six to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; six to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and six to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court. The Governor continues to appoint the Chairman of the Commission, from among its legislative members. The non-voting *ex officio* membership of three persons remains the same.

Of the six appointees of the Chief Justice, one is to be a Justice of the Supreme Court, one is to be a Judge of the Court of Appeals, two are to be judges of superior court, and two are to be judges of district court.

Of the six appointees of the Governor, one is to be a district attorney, one a practicing attorney, one a clerk of

superior court, and three are to be members or former members of the Geaseral Assembly and at least one of these shall not be an attorney.

Of the six appointees of the Speaker of the House, at least three are to be practicing attorneys, and three are to be members or formers members of the General Assembly, and at least one of these three is not to be an attorney.

Of the six appointees of the President of the Senate, at least three are to be practicing attorneys, three are to be members or former members of the General Assembly, and at least one is to be a magistrate.

During the 1987-88 year the Courts Commission had a total of five meetings: October 30, 1987; February 26, March 25, April 22, and May 6, 1988. All meetings were held in Raleigh. Topics considered during the year were:

(1) alternative resolution programs, including mediation, arbitration, and summary jury trials; (2) securing competent legal counsel for all indigent defendants in criminal cases and providing adequate compensation for counsel for indigents; (3) the infractions law: (4) proposed legislation to delete obsoltet language from the statutes on cross-indexing of judgments and lis pendens: (5) proposed legislation to clarify magistrates' guilty plea jurisdiction; (6) proposed legislation to secure reimbursement of expenses of counsel for indigent defendants.

The Commission unanimously voted to endorse the proposed legislation relating to cross-indexing of judgments and lis pendens and relating to magistrates' guilty plea jurisdiction, for consideration at the 1988 short legislative session (if the proposals could, under regular legislative rules, be taken up at the 1988 session). In addition, at its May 6, 1988 meeting the Commission approved two resolutions to be submitted to Legislative officials at the 1988 Session. One resolution endorsed and recommended adequate funding of the indigent defense fund and the other resolution recommended expansion of the indigent screening program.

The Judicial Standards Commission

(Members as of June 30, 1988)

Appointed by the Chief Justice

- Court of Appeals Judge Gerald Arnold, Fuquay-Varina, Chairman
- Superior Court Judge James M. Long, Pilot Mountain
- District Court Judge W. S. Harris, Jr., Graham

Appointed by the Governor

Pamela S. Gaither, Charlotte, Secretary

Albert E. Partridge, Jr., Concord

Elected by the Council of the N.C. State Bar Rivers D. Johnson, Jr., Warsaw, Vice Chairman Louis J. Fisher, Jr., High Point

Deborah R. Carrington, Executive Secretary



Judge Gerald Arnold

THE JUDICIAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

The Judicial Standards Commission was established by the General Assembly pursuant to a constitutional amendment approved by the voters at the general election in November 1972.

Upon recommendation of the Commission, the Supreme Court may censure or remove any judge for willful misconduct in office, willful and persistent failure to perform his duties, habitual intemperance, conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, or conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that brings the judicial office into disrepute. In addition, upon recommendation of the Commission, the Supreme Court may remove any judge for mental or physical incapacity interfering with the performance of his duties, which is, or is likely to become, permanent.

Where a recommendation for censure or removal involves a justice of the Supreme Court, the recommendation and supporting record is filed with the Court of Appeals which has and proceeds under the same authority for censure or removal of a judge. Such a proceeding would be heard by the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals and the six judges senior in service, excluding the Court of Appeals judge who by law serves as the Chairman of the Judicial Standards Commission.

In addition to a recommendation of censure or removal, the Commission also utilizes a disciplinary measure known as a reprimand. The reprimand is a mechanism administratively developed for dealing with inquiries where the conduct does not warrant censure or removal, but where some action is justified. Since the establishment of the Judicial Standards Commission in 1973, reprimands have been issued in fifteen instances covering 21 inquiries.

During the July 1, 1987 - Jjne 30, 1988 fiscal year, the Judicial Standards Commission met on July 10, October 16, December 18, March 25, and June 10.

A complaint or other information against a judge, whether filed with the Commission or initiated by the Commission on its own motion, is designated as an "Inquiry Concerning a Judge." Thirty such inquiries were pending as of July 1, 1987, and 98 inquiries were filed during the fiscal year, giving the Commission a total workload of 128 inquiries.

During the fiscal year, the Commission disposed of 113 inquiries, and 15 inquiries remained pending at the end of the fiscal year.

The determinations of the Commission regarding the 113 inquiries disposed of during the fiscal year were as follows:

- (1) 93 inquiries were determined to involve evidentiary rulings, length of sentences, or other matters not within the Commission's jurisdiction rather than questions of judicial misconduct;
- (2) two inquiries were determined to involve allegations of conduct which did not rise to such a level as would warrant investigation by the Commission;
- (3) three inquiries were consolidated with two other matters in which investigations had been ordered;
- (4) 14 inquiries were determined to warrant no further action following completion of preliminary investigations; and
- (5) one inquiry resulted in a recommendation of censure.

Of the 15 inquiries pending at the end of the fiscal year:

- (1) five inquiries were awaiting initial review by the Commission; and
- (2) ten inquiries were awaiting completion of a preliminary investigation or were subject to other action by the Commission.

PART III

ஞ் ை

þ

COURT RESOURCES

- Financial
- Personnel

3.-

Under the State Constitution the operating expenses of the Judicial Department (all North Carolina courts) "other than compensation to process servers and other locally paid non-judicial officers" are required to be paid from State funds. It is customary legislative practice for the General Assembly to include appropriations for the operating expenses of all three branches of State government in a single budget bill, for a two-year period ending on June 30 of the odd-numbered years. The budget for the second year of the biennium is generally modified during the even-year legislative session.

Building facilities for the appellate courts are provided by State funds, but, by statute, the county governments are required to provide from county funds for adequate facilities for the trial courts within each of the 100 counties. Appropriations from the State's General Fund for operating expenses for all departments and agencies of State government, including the Judicial Department, totalled \$5,715,172,032 for the 1987-88 fiscal year. (Appropriations from the Highway Fund and appropriations from the General Fund for capital improvements and debt servicing are not included in this total.)

The appropriation from the General Fund for the operating expenses of the Judicial Department for 1987-88 was \$161,128,433. (This included \$2,532,298 for accrued attorney fees for indigent defendants paid in July 1988.) As illustrated in the chart below, this General Fund appropriation for the Judicial Department comprised 2.8% of the General Fund appropriations for the operating expenses of all State agencies and departments.

TOTAL GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES \$5,715,172,032 JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION \$162,128,433 2.8%

Appropriation from the State's general fund for operating expenses of the Judicial Department over the past seven fiscal years are shown in the table below and in the graph at the top of the following page. For comparative purposes, appropriations from the general fund for operating expenses of all State agencies and departments (including the Judicial Department) for the last seven fiscal years are also shown in the table below and in the second graph on the following page.

APPROPRIATIONS FROM GENERAL FUND FOR OPERATING EXPENSES

	Judicial I	Department	All State	State Agencies	
Fiscal Year	Appropriation	% Increase over previous year Appropriatio		% Increase over previous year	
1981-1982	89,631,765	8.08	3,327,829,978	7.94	
1982-1983	93,927,824	4.79	3,477,547,375	4.50	
1983-1984	106,182,188	13.05	3,686,800,774	6.02	
1984-1985	121,035,791	13.99	4,237,230,681	14.93	
1985-1986	134,145,813	10.83	4,780,073,721	12.81	
1986-1987	146,394,689	9.13	5,153,322,580	7.81	
1987-1988	161,128,433	10.06	5,715,172,032	10.90	
AVERAGE ANNUAL INCREASE, 1982-1988		9.99%		9.27%	

General Fund Appropriations for Operating Expenses Of the Judicial Department, 1981-82 — 1987-88



General Fund Appropriations for Operating Expenses Of All State Agencies and Departments, 1981-82 – 1987-88



JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT FINANCES Expenditures July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

General Fund expenditures for operating expenses of the Judicial Department during the 1987-88 fiscal year

totalled \$165,637,346, divided among the major budget classifications as shown below.

	Amount	% of Total
Supreme Court	그는 그는 것이 가지 않는 것이 많이 많이 했다.	
Court of Appeals	\$ 2,352,654	1.42
Superior Courts	3.159.393	1.91
District Courts	15,978,747	9.65
Clerks of Superior Court	29,939,853	18.08
Juvenile Probation and Aftercare	50,954,569	30.76
Juvenile Probation and Aftercare \$11,326,022	11,334,027	6.84
Model Juvenile Court Project \$8,005		
Representation for Indigents	22,626,046	13.66
Assigned private counsel \$15,158,686	22,020,040	15.00
Guardian <i>ad litem</i> for juveniles \$105,210		
Guardian ad litem—volunteer and contract program \$1,332,851		
Public defenders \$4,087,252		
Special counsel at mental hospitals \$237,471		
Support services (expert witness fees, professional examinations, transcripts) \$706,953		
Appellate Defender Services \$521,177		
Indigency Screening \$353,380		
N.C. death Penalty Resources Center \$97,900		
Permanent Families Task Force \$23,311		
Reasonable Efforts Program \$1,855		
District Attorney Offices	19,249,255	11.62
Office-District Attorney \$19,014,218		
District Attorneys' Conference \$100,943		
Prosecution Management System \$23,166		
Victim Assistance, \$51,519		
Narcotics Prosecution Program \$59,409		
Administrative Office of the Courts	9,538,734	5.76
General Administration \$4,061,052		
Information Services \$5,135,768		
Warehouse & Printing \$341,914		
Judicial Standards Commission	72,144	.04
Pilot Programs	432,934	.26
Custody Mediation Pilot \$98,370		
Dispute Settlement Center \$248,961		
Arbitration Pilot Program \$85,603		
TOTAL	\$165,637,346*	100.0
	+	AUV+V

*General Fund expenditures exceeded General Fund appropriations by \$4,508,913. This amount included operating receipts of \$4,109,310 plus operating cash balances of \$399,603.

Expenditures, July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988



CLERKS OF SUPERIOR COURT 30.76%

As the above chart illustrates, most (70.11%) of Judicial Department expenditures goes for operation of the State's trial courts: operation of superior courts took 9.7% of total expenditures; operation of the district courts (including magistrates, judges and court reporters) took 18.08% of the total; the clerks' office, 30.76% of the total; and district attorneys programs, 11.62% of total Judicial Department expenditures.

The total General Fund expenditures of \$165,637,346 for 1987-88 represents a 10.06% increase over expenditures of \$148,328,555 in 1986-87.

General Fund Expenditures For The Judicial Department Fiscal Year 1981-82 — 1987-88



Department Receipts July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

Receipts for the Judicial Department in the 1987-88 fiscal year totalled \$98,217,285. The several sources of these receipts are shown in the table below. As in the

į,

n

previous years, the major source of receipts were General Court of Justice Fees paid by litigants in superior and district court.

	% of
Amount	Total
\$ 8,176	.01
33,570	.04
128,562	.13
268,509	.27
	.30
	.44
	.71
	.85
	1.12
	1.03
	2.25
	2.40
	5.45
	7.60
	7.95
	28.76
39,968,813	40.69
\$ 98,217,285	100.00%

This total of \$98,217,285 is an increase of 10.2% over total 1986-87 receipts of \$89,104,646. The graph below has been restated to reflect all Judicial Department receipts.



Judicial Department Receipts, 1981-82 - 1987-88

Distribution of Judicial Department Receipts (July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988)

As required by the State Constitution, fines, penalties and forfeitures collected by the courts in criminal cases are distributed to the respective counties in which the cases are tried. These funds must be used by the counties for the support of the public schools.

A uniform schedule of court costs for civil and criminal cases, comprising of a variety of fees, is set by statute for cases filed in the superior and district courts. Statutes prescribe the distribution of these fees and provide that certain fees shall be devoted to specific uses. For example, a facilities fee is included in court costs when costs are assessed, and this fee is paid over to the respective county or municipality which provided the facility used in the case. These fees must be utilized by the counties and municipalities to provide and maintain courtrooms and related judicial facilities.

Officer fees (for arrest or service of process) are included, where applicable, in the cost of each case filed in the trial courts. If a municipal officer performed these services in a case, the fee is paid over to the respective municipality. Otherwise, all officer fees are paid to the respective counties in which the cases are filed.

A jail fee is included in the costs of each case where applicable; these fees are distributed to the respective county or municipality whose facilities were used. Most jail facilities in the State are provided by the counties.

A fee for the Law Enforcement Officers Benefit and Retirement Fund is included as a part of court costs when costs are assessed in a criminal case. As required by statute, the Judicial Department remits these fees to the State Treasurer, for deposit in the Law Enforcement Officers Benefit and Retirement Fund.

Except as indicated, all superior and district court costs collected by the Judicial Department are paid into the State's General Fund, as are appellate court fees and proceeds from the sales of appellate division reports.

When private counsel or a public defender is assigned to represent an indigent defendant in a criminal case, the trial judge sets the money value for the services rendered. If the defendant is convicted, a judgment lien is entered against him for such amount. Collections on these judgments are paid into and retained by the department to defray the costs of legal representation of indigents.

Proceeds from the ten-day driver license revocation fee, which driving-while-impaired offenders must pay to recover their driver licenses, are distributed to the counties.

Starting this fiscal year, the Federal Government funds a portion of child support enforcement costs.

indinoipanty whose racinities were used. West	Amount	% of Total
Remitted to State Treasurer		
Supreme Court Fees	\$ 8,176	.01
Court of Appeals Fees	33,570	.04
Sales of Appellate Division Reports	268,509	.27
LEOB Fees	7,466,250	7.60
General Court of Justice Fees	39,968,813	40.69
Federal-Child Support Enforcement	2,009,591	2.05
Total to State Treasurer	49,754,909	50.66
Distributed to Counties		
Fines and Forfeitures	28,251,540	28.76
Judicial Facilities Fees	7,432,973	7.57
Officer Fees	3,389,248	3.45
Jail Fees	832,025	.85
Ten-Day License Revocation Fees	1,094,900	1.12
Total to Counties	41,000,686	41.75
Distributed to Counties and Beneficiaries		
Interest on Checking Accounts	1,014,178	1.03
Distributed to Municipalities		
Judicial Facilities Fees	371,704	.38
Officer Fees	1,962,500	2.00
Jail Fees	3,998	<u> </u>
Total to Municipalities	2,338,202	2.38
Operating Receipts		
Collection on Indigent Representation Judgments	2,354,741	2.40
1986-87 Equipment Obligation Carryover	696,991	.71
Department of Crime Control	434,834	.44
Grants	294,182	.30
Federal-Child Supoport Enforcement	200,000	.20
Miscellaneous	128,562	.13
Total to Municipalities	4,109,310	4.18
GRAND TOTAL	\$98,217,285	100.00%

Amounts of Fees, Fines and Forfeitures Collected by the Courts and Distributed to Counties and Municipalities* July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

		Distributed	to Counties		Distrib	uted to Munici	palities	
County	Facility Fees	Officer Fees	Jail Fees	Fines and Forfeitures	Facility Fees	Officer Fees	Jail Fees	- Totai
Alamance	117,043	56,322	26,067	536,738	-0-	28,944	-0-	765,114
Alexander	24,524	10,023	5,952	121,592	-0-	568	-0-	162,659
Alleghany	9,773	5,670	3,610	48,503	-0	558	-0-	68,114
Anson	37,580	23,031	1,537	218,276	-0-	1,490	-0-	281,914
Ashe	16,700	12,938	2,275	70,070	-0-	685	-0-	102,668
Avery	16,577	10,601	369	68,320	-0-	1,016	-0-	96,883
Beaufort	64,515	50,107	22,493	242,689	-0-	10,903	-0-	390,707
Bertie	23,852	19,405	1,517	82,318	-0-	596	-Õ-	127,688
Bladen	40,807	30,558	630	151,067	1,015	1,520	-0-	225,597
Brunswick	50,429	28,884	5,858	171,876	1,955	2,001	-0-	261,003
Buncombe	202,610	124,899	2,962	778,288	-0-	39,568	- Ŏ -	1,148,327
Burke	82,106	38,671	8,661	315,402	-0-	8,984	-Õ-	453,824
Cabarrus	99,254	53,669	30,411	466,903	8,529	39,453	-0-	698,219
Caldwell	74,187	29,380	3,328	308,808	-0-	14,106	-0-	429,809
Camden	6,718	5,236	1,056	34,770	-0-	14,100	-0-	429,809
Carteret	71,584	35,224	1,557	223,497	-0-	17,245	-0-	349,107
					-0- -0-	17,245	-0-	
Caswell	23,430	19,122	2,347	117,689		24.250		162,588
Catawba	70,197	50,450	10,579	580,108	66,583	34,259	-0-	812,176
Chatham	41,861	39,238	5,989	214,536	11,262	2,025	175	315,086
Cherokee	23,193	20,081	5,112	122,148	-0-	2,356	10	172,900
Chowan	15,469	11,224	537	44,071	-0-	2,380	-0-	73,681
Clay	6,313	4,700	2,357	33,688	-0-		-0-	47,058
Cleveland	87,524	37,495	23,550	336,563	-0-	9,694	-0-	494,826
Columbus	48,829	47,017	4,154	206,892	3,190	2,749	25	312,856
Craven	95,527	41,800	14,942	324,054	3,945	18,025	-0-	498,293
Cumberland	317,545	96,670	42,583	810,842	-0-	83,833	-0-	1,351,473
Currituck	20,189	15,771	2,933	112,016	-0-	-0-	-0-	150,909
Dare	64,228	30,170	8,702	407,724	-0-	20,092	-0-	530,916
Davidson	92,301	68,348	12,525	563,717	12,979	11,615	-0-	761,485
Davie	26,075	19,087	1,402	95,309	-0-	246	-0-	142,119
Duplin	44,590	23,298	8,826	187,517	-0-	828	280	265,339
Durham	277,285	87,887	13,908	977,418	-0-	94,155	-0-	1,450,653
Edgecombe	53,132	60,327	13,221	209,544	39,889	23,622	400	400,135
Forsyth	317,433	21,109	32,773	996,283	3,595	131,655	-0-	1,502,848
Franklin	34,384	22,301	4,972	146,286	-0-	623	-0-	208,566
Gaston	167,094	98,105	4,811	510,033	-0-	25,215	-0-	805,258
Gates	11,087	7,952	642	56,420	-0-	-0-	-0-	76,101
Graham	5,895	4,965	2,808	48,371	-0-	36	-0-	62,075
Granville	37,113	17,983	5,649	123,924	87	280	244	185,280
Greene	15,549	11,248	883	55,116	-0-	-0-	-0-	82,796
Guilford	429,295	51,555	7,541	978,604	-0-	155,900	-0-	1,622,895
Halifax	73,221	55,679	11,956	298,138	5,789	12,907	56	457,746
Harnett	53,692	40,638	12,164	282,146	10,063	4,174	170	403,047
Haywood	48,495	35,862	24,672	294,679	619	2,745	-0-	403,047
Henderson	63,215	34,607	12,041	259,031	130	3,252	-0-	372,276
Hertford								
	30,324	20,789	5,541	104,219	-0-	1,496	-0-	162,369
Hoke	33,515	22,475	15,167	202,665	-0-	1,956	-0-	275,778
Hyde	9,690	7,548	2,183	54,764	-0-	10.044	-0-	74,185
Iredell	90,514	43,989	12,829	424,297	14,314	18,344	254	604,541
Jackson	23,382	17,279	5,883	114,736	-0-		-0-	161,280

Amounts of Fees, Fines and Forfeitures Collected by the Courts and Distributed to Counties and Municipalities* July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

		Distributed	to Counties		Distrib	uted to Municip	alities	
County	Facility Fees	Officer Fees	Jail Fees	Fines and Forfeitures	Facility Fees	Officer Fees	Jail Fees	- Total
Johnston	33,483	57,375	27,572	415,248	19,086	13,081	328	566,173
Jones	12,256	· 7,130	110	36,790	-0-	1,400	-0-	57,686
Lee	51,758	29,147	23,250	218,845	-0-	8,776	-0-	331,776
Lenoir	75,808	33,508	11,597	283,008	-0-	14,201	-0-	418,122
Lincoln	45,955	29,633	2,966	173,672	-0-	4,265	-0-	256,491
Macon	19,967	14,137	590	88,849	-0-	828	-0-	124,371
Madison	13,457	10,606	518	56,850	-0-	308	-0-	81,739
Martin	34,934	25,502	1,472	135,743	-0-	1,884	-0-	199,535
McDowell	34,618	20,995	1,245	186,699	-0-	4,224	-0-	247,781
Mecklenburg	686,967	76,383	8	1,965,699	-0-	428,668	-0-	3,157,725
Mitchell	9,649	6,056	1,624	39,515	-0-	828	-0-	57,672
Montgomery	36,446	26,513	5,675	143,070	-0-	3,308	-0-	215,012
Moore	61,630	41,232	4,331	337,157	4,225	9,144	-0-	457,719
Nash	60,187	68,078	9,132	312,572	54,264	25,792	1,014	531,039
New Hanover	175,913	40,813	4,524	525,609	-0-	46,448	-0-	793,307
Northampton	33,810	28,864	2,129	183,748	1,195	1,866	-0-	251,612
Onslow	153,711	73,232	22,619	519,180	-0-	61,518	-0-	830,260
Orange	52,427	42,635	8,195	273,554	27,813	15,339	254	420,217
Pamlico	10,120	8,168	740	148,043	-0-	-0-	-0-	167,071
Pasquotank	36,377	17,870	9,846	168,212	-0-	9,935	-0-	242,240
Pender	28,421	21,104	2,833	121,558	-0	456	-0-	174,372
Perquimans	13,120	8,825	335	43,145	-0-	1,006	-0-	66,431
Person	28,708	20,790	2,708	122,365	-0-	3,561	-0-	178,132
Pitt	128,869	52,169	17,879	470,974	11,671	38,931	634	721,127
Polk	14,105	10,256	625	80,287	-0-	392	-0	105,665
Randolph	89,752	76,730	5,590	392,899	2;825	11,624	-0-	579,420
Richmond	51,538	31,482	7,792	229,400	-0-	2,067	-0-	322,279
Robeson	98,228	80,380	15,231	551,114	35,386	29,005	145	809,489
Rockingham	75,978	38,836	6,017	525,944	20,702	20,171	-0-	687,648
Rowan	94,612	57,590	28,450	399,083	-0-	29,814	-0-	609,549
Rutherford	57,250	34,560	7,519	260,024	-0-	7,590	-0-	366,943
Sampson	63,824	44,690	8,339	267,228	-0-	4,396	-0-	388,477
Scotland	43,602	28,319	3,044	154,883	-0-	6,403	-0-	236,251
Stanly	40,981	14,643	3,806	228,548	-0-	8,928	-0-	296,906
Stokes	27,688	16,112	5,087	135,707	-0-	1,108	-0-	185,702
Surry	67,838	45,579	2,931	287,881	1,635	9,354	-0-	415,238
Swain	14,592	10,725	4,287	67,871	-0-	124	-0-	97,599
Transylvania	18,518	15,417	4,687	77,705	-0-	2,016	-0-	118,343
Tyrrell	13,770	11,092	1,365	43,216	-0-	-0-	-0-	69,443
Union	87,023	67,244	15,957	418,770	-0-	17,563	-0-	606,557
Vance	56,391	20,196	6,606	172,469	-0-	7,906	-0-	263,568
Wake	642,757	88,218	39,995	1,583,881	7,515	222,335	5	2,584,706
Warren	21,160	17,336	2,892	73,139	-0-	180	-0-	114,707
Washington	15,394	10,543	2,927	47,039	-0-	1,982	-0-	77,885
Watauga	31,610	19,117	3,174	107,677	-0-	4,576	-0-	166,154
Wayne	96,423	55,058	9,804	324,316	1,443	21,445	4	508,493
Wilkes	59,731	33,529	3,723	294,971	-0-	2,298	-0-	394,252
Wilson	80,393	51,089	7,202	212,500	-0-	21,608	-0	372,792
Yadkin	30,952	20,735	18,345	168,711	-0-	1,472	-0-	240,215
Yancey	10,409	7,620	270	43,511	-0-	276	-0-	62,086
State Totals	\$7,432,973	\$3,389,248	\$832,025	\$28,251,540	\$371,704	\$1,962,500	\$3,998	\$42,243,988

*Facility and jail fees are distributed to the respective counties and municipalities which furnished the facilities. If the officer who made the arrest or served the process was employed by a municipality, the officer fee is distributed to the municipality; otherwise all officer fees are distributed to the respective counties. By provision of the State Constitution, fines and forfeitures collected by the courts within a county are distributed to that county for support of the public schools.

Cost and Case Data on Representation of Indigents July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

The State provides legal counsel for indigent persons in a variety of actions and proceedings, as specified in the North Carolina General Statutes, Sections 7A-450 *et seq*. These include criminal proceedings, judicial hospitalization proceedings, juvenile proceedings which may result in commitment to an institution or transfer to superior court for trial as an adult. Legal representation for indigents may be by assignment of private counsel, by assignment of special public counsel (involving mental hospital commitments), or by assignment of a public defender.

Seven of North Carolina's judicial districts have an office of public defender: Districts 3, 12, 15B, 18, 26, 27A, and 28. The other 27 districts utilize only assignments of private counsel. Private counsel may also be assigned in the seven districts which have a public defender in the event of a conflict of interest involving the public defender's office and the indigent and in the event of unusual circumstances when, in the opinion of the court, the proper administration of justice requires the assignment of private counsel rather than the public defender in those cases.

The Appellate Defender Office began operation as a State-funded program on October 1, 1981. (Prior to October 1, 1981, appellate defender services were funded by a one-year federal grant.) Pursuant to assignments made by trial court judges, it is the responsibility of the Appellate Defender and his staff to provide criminal defense appellate services to indigent persons who are appealing their convictions to either the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeals. The Appellate Defender is under the general supervision of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice may, consistent with the resources available to the Appellate Defender and to insure quality criminal defense services, authorize certain appeals to be assigned to a local public defender office or to private assigned counsel instead of to the Appellate Defender. The cost data reported reflects the activity of this office in both the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1988.

In addition, the State provides a full-time special counsel at each of the State's four mental hospitals, to represent patients in commitment or recommitment hearings before a district court judge. Under North Carolina law, each patient committed to a mental hospital is entitled to a judicial hearing (before a district court judge) within 90 days after the initial commitment, a further hearing within 180 days after the initial commitment, and thereafter a hearing once each year during the continuance of an involuntary commitment.

A juvenile alleged to be within the jurisdiction of the court has the right to be represented by counsel in all proceedings; and juveniles are conclusively presumed to be indigent and entitled to State-appointed and State-paid counsel (G.S. 7A-584). When a petition alleges that a juvenile is abused or neglected, the judge is required to appoint a guardian *ad litem*. If the guardian *ad litem* is not an attorney, the judge in addition is to appoint an attorney to represent the juvenile's interests (G.S. 7A-586). And where a juvenile petition alleges that a juvenile is abused, neglected or dependent, the parent has a right to appointed counsel in cases of indigency (G.S. 7A-587).

The cost of all programs of indigent representation, rounded to the nearest dollar, was \$22,626,046 in the 1987-88 fiscal year, compared to \$18,392,136 in the 1986-87 fiscal year, an increase of 23%. The total amount expended for these activities was 13.7% of total Judicial Department expenditures in the 1987-88 fiscal year.

Following is a summary of case and cost data for representation of indigents for the fiscal year, July 1, 1987 through June 30, 1988.
40

Cost and Case Data on Representation of Indigents July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

	Number of Cases	Total Cost	Average Per Case
Assigned Private Counsel			
Capital offense cases	647	\$ 2,303,323	\$ 3,560
Adult cases (other than capital)	48,419	11,887,697	245
Juvenile cases	6,976	967,666	139
Totals	56,042	15,158,686	270
Guardian ad litem for juveniles	691	105,210	152
Guardian ad litem volunteer and			
contract program		1,332,851	
Public Defender Offices**			
*District 3	1,783	364,080	204
District 12	2,732	663,601	243
District 15B	1,051	221,061	210
District 18	3,149	798,594	254
District 26	11,785	1,225,733	104
District 27A	2,335	431,278	185
District 28	2,121	382,905	181
Totals	24,956	4,087,252	164
Appellate Defender Office		521,177	
Special Counsel at mental hospitals		237,471	
Support Services			
Transcripts, records and briefs		531,119	
Professional examinations		22,954	
Expert witness fees		152,880	
Total		706,953	
Indigency Screening		353,380	
N.C. Death Penalty Resource Center		97,900	
Permanent Family Task Force		23,311	
Reasonable Efforts Program		1,855	
GRAND TOTAL		\$22,626,046	

*The Public Defender's Office serves only Pitt and Carteret Counties in Judicial District 3.

**The number of "cases" shown is the number of defendants in cases disposed of by public defenders during the 1987-88 year.

Special Counsel at Mental Hospitals July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

The total cost of providing special counsel at each of the State's four mental hospitals, to represent patients in commitment or recommitment hearings, was \$237,471 for the 1987-88 fiscal year. There was a total of 11,236 hearings held during the year, for an average cost per hearing of \$21.13 for the special counsel service. The following table presents data on the hearings held at each of the mental hospitals in 1987-88. There were 492 more hearings held in 1987-88 than in 1986-87, an increase of 4.6% in total nearings.

	Broughton	Cherry	Dorothea Dix	John Umstead	Totals
Initial Hearings resulting in:					
Commitment to hospital	865	1,463	724	1,235	4,287
Commitment to outpatient clinic	512	199	99	478	1,288
Discharge	697	431	491	607	2,226
Total	2,074	2,093	1,314	2,320	7,801
First Rehearings resulting in:					
Commitment to hospital	131	334	183	309	957
Commitment to outpatient clinic	38	16	38	17	109
Discharge	26	123	31	79	259
Total	195	473	252	405	1,325
Second or Subsequent Rehearings resulting in:					
Commitment to hospital	271	428	358	684	1,741
Commitment to outpatient clinic	8	0	9	2	19
Discharge	12	2	20	87	121
Total	291	430	387	773	1,881
Modification of Prior Order Hearings resulting in:					
Commitment to hospital	16	5	12	2	35
Commitment to outpatient clinic	20	20	31	95	166
Discharge	6	15	7	0	28
Total	42	40	50	97	229
Total Hearings or Rehearings resulting in:					
Commitment to hospital	1,283	2,230	1,277	2,230	7,020
Commitment to outpatient clinic	578	235	177	592	1,582
Discharge	741	571	549	773	2,634
Grand Totals	2,602	3,036	2,003	3,595	11,236

	Assigne	d Counsel	Guardian Ad Litem			
	Number of Cases	Expenditures	Number of Cases	Expenditures		
District 1						
Camden	30	12,002	5 5	499		
Chowan	61	12,873		250		
Currituck	74	20,452	10	1,060		
Dare	186	61,493	3 2	475		
Gates	61	15,466		429		
Pasquotank	346 66	89,687	46	2,678		
Perquimans District Totals	824	<u>13,842</u> 225,814	$\frac{1}{72}$	<u> </u>		
Distinct Totals	024	443,017	1 / 1	5,572		
District 2						
Beaufort	391	104,715	9	600		
Hyde	41	10,376	2	250		
Martin	200	53,596	0	0		
Tyrrell	39	28,954	0	0		
Washington	$\frac{117}{117}$	29,850	$\frac{3}{14}$			
District Totals	788	227,490	14	1,150		
District 3						
Carteret	102	30,196	7	553		
Craven	809	219,856	4	900		
Pamlico	65	16,785	0	0		
Pitt	444	172,016	<u>8</u>	645		
District Totals	1,420	438,853	<u>8</u> 19	2,098		
District 4						
Duplin	317	108,631	6	1,015		
Jones	35	10,515	Ő	1,015		
Onslow	1,313	339,007	33	3,170		
Sampson	323	102,323	<u>1</u>	200		
District Totals	1,988	560,476	40	4,385		
District 5						
District 5	1 000	100.011	•	•		
New Hanover	1,393	429,244	0	0		
Pender	147	40,625	<u>_0</u>	0		
District Totals	1,540	469,869	0	0		
District 6						
Bertie	144	34,171	2	300		
Halifax	454	140,514	6	525		
Hertford	260	60,715	10	1,150		
Northampton	<u>166</u>	111,153	<u>11</u>	1,475		
District Totals	1,024	346,553	29	3,450		
District 7						
Edgecombe	705	210,664	2	600		
Nash	705	217,759	11	1,500		
Wilson	876	312,763	<u>3</u>	450		
District Totals	2,291	741,186	16	2,550		
APAGUIGE A ULGIG	20 g dd / 3.	/ 71,100	**	2 3000		

θ

	Assigned	l Counsel	Guardian Ad Litem			
District 9	Number of Cases	Expenditures	Number of Cases	Expenditures		
District 8	ta da anti-a gui anti-a ĝi anti-					
Greene	106	28,286	0	0		
Lenoir	702	168,310	0	Ò		
Wayne	1, <u>076</u>	284,295		200		
District Totals	1,884	480,892	1	200		
District 9						
Franklin	344	88,901	2	200		
Granville	431	123,594	4	470 470		
Person	371	132,876	12	2,020		
Vance	530	162,809	2	1,350		
Warren	154	46,503	$\overline{2}$	300		
District Totals	1,830	554,683	2 22	4,340		
District 10						
Wake	4,916	1,352,264	5	1,441		
District Totals	4,916	1,352,264	<u>5</u> 5	<u>1,441</u> 1,441		
District 11				-,		
Harnett	649	105,586		~~~		
Johnston	1,074	136,257	1	75		
Lee	598	92,315	0	0		
District Totals	2,321	334,159	$\frac{1}{2}$	<u> </u>		
District 12				150		
Cumberland	721	325,291	Ó	1.0/0		
Hcke	32	28,389	9	1,868		
District Totals	$\frac{52}{753}$	353,680	$\frac{1}{10}$	<u> </u>		
District 13				~~~~~		
Bladen	493	100 551		na an Arland Arlanda an Arlanda. An Arlanda an Arlanda an Arlanda		
Brunswick	493 527	190,551	3	1,450		
Columbus	598	165,970	3	400		
		140,834	<u>19</u>	2,510		
District Totals	1,618	497,355	25	4,360		
District 14	in de la servicie de La servicie de la serv					
Durham	3, <u>176</u>	727,444	17	2,636		
District Totals	3,176	727,444	17	2,636		
District 15A						
Alamance	1, <u>056</u>	278,841	3	175		
District Totals	1,056	278,841	<u>3</u>	175		
District 15B						
Chatham	82	17,804	3	1,125		
Orange	<u>324</u>	94,479	10			
District Totals	406	112,283	$\frac{10}{13}$	<u>1,105</u> 2,230		
District 16			~	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		
Robeson	1,569	462 070	1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 - 1940 -			
Scotland	554	463,079	42	3,755		
District Totals		99,002	$\frac{15}{57}$	790		
DISTRICT LOTAIS	2,123	562,081	57	4,545		

	Assigne	ed Counsel	Guardian Ad Litem			
	Number of Cases	Expenditures	Number of Cases	Expenditures		
District 17A						
Caswell	146 .	40,407	6	500		
Rockingham	1, <u>003</u>	261,281	<u> </u>	675		
District Totals	1,149	301,688	12	1,175		
District 17B				an Antonio de Carlos de Carlos Antonio de Carlos de Ca		
Stokes	242	69,939	1	150		
Surry	<u>601</u>	151,719	<u> </u>	0		
District Totals	843	221,657	1	150		
District 18						
Guilford	<u>723</u>	243,803	<u>19</u>	2,940		
District Totals	723	243,803	19	2,940		
District 19A						
Cabarrus	852	245,266	12	1,560		
Rowan	1, <u>196</u>	254,587	<u>19</u>	2,410		
District Totals	2,048	499,853	31	3,970		
District 19B						
Montgomery	216	52,109	5	930		
Randolph	<u>758</u>	189,109	<u>21</u>	2,225		
District Totals	974	241,218	26	3,155		
District 20						
Anson	362	80,965	10	1		
Moore Richmond	671 808	149,013	12	1,550		
Stanly	398	236,461 89,453	3	400 550		
Union	973	207,218	4	400		
District Totals	3,212	763,110	23	2,900		
District 21						
Forsyth	3, <u>341</u>	672,769	15	1,450		
District Totals	3,341	672,769	15	1,450		
District 22						
Alexander	262	91,128				
Davidson	1,454	392,650	22	2,800		
Davie	196	48,936	2	550		
Iredell	1, <u>224</u>	278,126		300		
District Totals	3,136	810,839	26	3,650		
District 23						
Alleghany	64	9,719	4	350		
Ashe	145	28,681	1	50		
Wilkes	575	88,631	31	1,840		
Yadkin	<u>201</u>	38,118	4	400		
District Totals	985	165,150	40	2,640		

	Assigne	d Counsel	Guardian Ad Litem		
	Number of Cases	Expenditures	Number of Cases	Expenditures	
District 24					
Avery	189	47,274	8	3,638	
Madison	138	36,069		1,000	
Mitchell	112	28,925	10	2,100	
Watauga	315	99,860	4	1,300	
Yancey	<u>_73</u>	23,578	4	1,062	
District Totals	827	235,704	27	9,100	
District 25					
Burke	643	152,780	4	425	
Caldwell	817	208,358		60	
Catawba	1, <u>315</u>	319,948	5	650	
District Totals	2,775	681,086	10	1,135	
District 26					
Mecklenburg	1, <u>902</u>	885,791	58	_20,003	
District Totals	1,902	885,791	58	20,003	
District 27A					
Gaston	222	55,607	6	475	
District Totals	222	55,607	6	475	
District 27B					
Cleveland	463	94,942	10	985	
Lincoln	174	46,275	2	450	
District Totals	637	141,217	12	1,435	
District 28					
Buncombe	429	108,461	8	1,025	
District Totals	429	108,461	<u>-</u> 8	1,025	
District 29					
Henderson	556	157,192	2	1,240	
McDowell	339	108,667	2	370	
Polk	67	20,929	1	100	
Rutherford	457	121,965	$\hat{2}$	225	
Transylvania	187	62,395	$\overline{2}$	1,455	
District Totals	1,606	471,148	9	3,390	
District 30					
Cherokee	202	89,202	2	200	
Clay	28	9,235	. O	0	
Graham	72	23,398	2	150	
Haywood	422	154,095	10	2,805	
Jackson	145	39,866	4	185	
Macon	314	43,603	3	985	
Swain	<u>_92</u>	36,260	2	893	
District Totals	1,275	395,659	23	5,218	

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL (Positions and salaries authorized as of June 30, 1988)

1

Positions Authorized		Salary Ranges
	SUPREME COURT	
7	Justices	76,236-77,844*
28	Staff personnel (Clerk's and Reporter's offices,	12,235-57,356
7	law clerks, library staff)\$ Secretarial personnel\$	24,520-25,656
	COURT OF APPEALS	
12	Judges\$	72,180-73,800*
39	Staff personnel (Clerk's office, prehearing staff,	
12	Judicial Standards Commission staff, law clerks) \$ Secretarial personnel	14,654-49,960 23,474-24,520
14	SUPERIOR COURT	23,777-27,320
74	Judges \$	64,092-66,204*
74 84	Staff personnel	20,832-48,108
67	Secretariz personnel	
	DISTRICT COURT	
151	Judges\$	54,372-56,532*
640	Magistrates	
29	Staff personnel \$	14,952-31,692
25	Secretarial personnel \$	14,352-26,412
	DISTRICT ATTORNEYS	
35	District Attorneys \$	
277	Staff personnel \$	
125	Secretarial personnel\$	14,352-24,252
	CLERKS OF SUPERIOR COURT	
100	Clerks of Superior Court	34,728-51,516*
1,635	Staff personnel	13,812-29,580
	INDIGENT REPRESENTATION	70 /00
1	Appellate Defender	
6 3	Assistant Appellate Defenders	
	Public Defenders	
7 73	Staff personnel	
22	Secretarial personnel	
4	Special counsel at mental hospitals\$	
4	Secretarial personnel	
1	Guardian ad Litem, Program Administrator\$	39,464
21	Program Coordinators	10,315-24,255
2	Program Analyst \$	12,128-21,735
13	Secretarial personnel \$	6,642-16,582
	JUVENILE PROBATION AND AFTERCARE	
286	Court counselors	19,102-43,823
47	Secretarial personnel	14,352-23,100
	ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS	1000
1	Administrative Officer of the Courts	
153	Staff personnel	
		· ·

*In addition to the salaries given here, these categories are entitled to a longevity allowance for years of service.

PART IV

N.

TRIAL COURTS CASEFLOW DATA

- Superior Court Division
- District Court Division

TRIAL COURTS CASE DATA

This part of the Annual Report presents pertinent data on a district-by-district and county-by-county basis. For ease of reference, this part is divided into a superior court division section and a district court division section.

The data within the two sections generally parallel each other in terms of organization, with each section subdivided into civil and criminal case categories. With some exceptions, there are three basic data tables for each case category: a caseload inventory (filings, dispositions and pending) table; a table on the manner of dispositions; and a table on ages of cases disposed of during the year and ages of cases pending at the end of the year. Pending and age data are not provided for district court motor vehicle criminal cases, for civil cases (small claims) referred to magistrates, and for juvenile cases, inasmuch as these categories of cases are not reported by case file number.

The caseload inventory tables provide a statistical picture of caseflow during the 1987-88 year. Items recorded in this table include the number of cases pending at the beginning of the year, the number of new cases filed, the number of cases disposed of during the year, and the number of cases left pending at the end of the year. The caseload inventory also shows the total caseload (the number pending at the beginning of the year plus the number filed during the year) and the percentage of the caseload which was disposed of during the year.

The aging tables show the ages of the cases pending on June 30, 1988 as well as the ages of the cases disposed of during 1987-88. These tables also show both mean (average) and median ages for each set of cases—those pending at the end of the year and those that were disposed of during the year. The median age of a group of cases is, by definition, the age of a hypothetical case which is older than 50% of the total set of cases and younger than the other 50%.

Unlike the median, the mean age can be substantially raised (or lowered) if even a small number of very old (or very young) cases are included. For example, if only a single two-year old case was included among ten cases aged three months, the median age would be 90 days and the mean (average) age would be 148.2 days. A substantial difference between the median and average ages, therefore, indicates the presence of a number of rather long-pending, or short-pending, cases.

The bulk of caseload statistics is now handled by automated processing rather than manual processing. As of June 30, 1988, 60 of the 100 counties were operational on the criminal and infractions modules of the Administrative Office of the Court's Court Information System (CIS). These counties handled nearly 82% of the total criminal and infractions case filings in the state. (Not included in these figures is Mecklenburg County, which has its own county-based processing system and accounts for an additional 8% of the state's total criminal and infactions caseload.) By the end of the fiscal year, there were also fourteen counties automated on the civil indexing module of CIS. These counties accounted for 52% of the total civil filings in FY 87-88.

The case statistics in Part IV have been summarized from the automated filing and disposition case data, as well as from manually reported case data from those counties not yet automated. Pending case information is calculated from the filing and disposition data. The accuracy of the pending case figures is, of course, dependent upon timely and accurate data on filing and dispositions.

Periodic comparisons by clerk personnel of their actual pending case files against the Administrative Office of the Court's (AOC's) computer-produced pending case lists, followed by indicated corrections, is necessary to maintain completely accurate data in the AOC computer file. Yet, staff resource in the clerks' offices is not sufficient to make such physical inventory checks as frequently and as completely as would be necessary to maintain full accuracy in the AOC's computer files. Thus, it is recognized that some of the figures published in the following tables have errors of some degree.

Another accuracy-related problem inherent in the AOC's reporting system is the lack of absolute consistency in the published year-end and year-beginning pending figures. The number of cases pending at the end of a reporting year should ideally be identical to the number of published pending cases at the beginning of the next reporting year. In reality, this is rarely the case. Experience has shown that inevitably some filings and dispositions that occurred in the preceding year do not get reported until the subsequent year. The later-reported data are regarded as being more complete and are used in the current year's tables, thereby producing some differences between the prior year's endpending figures and the current year's beginning-pending figures.

Notwithstanding the indicated limitations in the data reporting and data-processing system, it is believed that the published figures are sufficiently adequate to fully justify their use. In any event, the published figures are the best and most accurate data currently available.

PART IV, Section 1

Superior Court Division

Caseflow Data

This section centains data tables and accompanying charts depicting the 1987-88 caseflow of cases pending, filed, and disposed of in the State's superior courts before superior court judges. Data are also presented on cases filed and disposed of before the 100 clerks of superior court, who have original jurisdiction over estate cases and special proceedings.

There are, for statistical reporting purposes, three categories of cases filed in the superior courts: civil cases (excluding estates and special proceedings), felony cases that are within the original jurisdiction of the superior courts, and misdemeanor appeals from the district courts to superior courts for trial de novo.

During 1987-88, as in previous years, the greatest proportion of superior court filings were felonies (52.3%), followed by misdemeanor appeals (31.8%) and civil cases (15.9%). Following the general trend over the past decade, the total number of case filings increased significantly. During 1987-88, total case filings in superior courts increased by 6.9% from the preceding fiscal year (from 98,886 total cases to 105,704). Filings of civil cases increased by 8.7%, felony filings increased by 8.0%, and misdemeanor appeal filings increased by 4.3%.

Superior court civil cases generally take much longer to dispose of than do criminal cases. During 1987-88, the median age at disposition of civil cases was 293 days, compared to a median age at disposition of 86 days for felonies and 70 days for misdemeanors. A similar pattern exists for the ages of pending cases. The median ages of superior court cases pending at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1988, was 219 days for civil cases, 79 days for felonies, and 78 days for misdemeanors.

These differences in the median ages of civil versus criminal cases in superior courts can be attributed in part to the priority given criminal cases. In criminal cases, a defendant has a right to a "speedy trial" guaranteed by both the United States and North Carolina Constitutions and by the North Carolina Speedy Trial Act (G.S. 15A-701 *et seq.*). The Speedy Trial Act requires cases to go to trial within 120 days of filing unless there has been justifiable delay for one or more of the reasons set out in the statute. During 1987-88, 52 criminal cases were dismissed under the Speedy Trial Act, an increase of 8.3% as compared to the 48 cases dismissed under the Act during 1986-87.

There is no comparable *statutory* standard for speedy disposition of civil cases in North Carolina, although the North Carolina Constitution does provide that "right and

justice shall be administered without favor, denial, or delay" (Article I, Section 18, N.C. Constitution).

From 1986-87 to 1987-88, the median ages of pending cases and of cases at disposition in the superior courts have decreased for both civil and criminal cases. For cases at disposition, the median ages decreased from 299 days to 293 days for civil cases, from 91 days to 86 days for felony cases, and from 71 days to 70 days for misdemeanor cases. Compared to ages of cases pending on June 30, 1988, the median ages of cases pending on June 30, 1988, the median ages of cases pending on June 30, 1988, the median ages of cases, and from 83 days to 78 days to 79 days for felony cases, and from 83 days to 78 days for misdemeanor cases.

The three major case categories (civil, felonies, and misdemeanors) may be broken down into more specific case types. In the civil category, negligence cases comprised 45.6% of total civil findings in superior courts (7,639 of 16,756 total civil filings). Contract cases comprised the next largest category of civil case filings, at 23.7% (3,969 filings). Felony case filings were dominated by the following types of cases: burglary and breaking or entering, 21.4% (11,823 of 55,284 total filings); controlled substances violations, 20.4% (11,283 filings); forgery and uttering, 12.1% (6,691 filings); and larceny, 11.7% (6,454 filings). Non-motor vehicle appeals comprised 54.1% of misdemeanor filings in superior courts (18,209 of 33,664 total filings).

Case dispositions in 1987-88 increased by 4.7% over last fiscal year (from 96,308 to 100,808 superior court dispositions). Jury trials continued to account for a low percentage of case dispositions: 5.7% of civil cases (896 of 15,685 civil dispositions); 3.8% of felonies (2,010 of 53,420 felony dispositions); and 3.5% of misdemeanors (1,101 of 31,703 misdemeanor dispositions). Over half (55.5%) of all civil dispositions were by voluntary dismissal (8,702 of 15,685 civil dispositions). As in previous years, most criminal cases were disposed of by guilty plea; 63.4% of all felony dispositions (33,882 of 53,420), and 37.0% of all misdemenaor dispositions (11,718 of 31,703) were by guilty plea, with over 80% of these being to the offense as charged.

The total number of cases disposed of in superior courts in 1987-88 was 4,896 cases less than the total number of cases filed. Consequently, the total number of pending cases in superior courts increased from 42,326 at the beginning of the fiscal year to a total at year's end of 47,222, an increase of 11.6%.

CASELOAD TRENDS IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS

1978-79-1987-88



Following a slower rate of increase in the early 1980's, filings and dispositions in superior court appear to have resumed the earlier pattern of significant annual increases. The 11.6% rise in the number of cases pending as of June

30, 1988 resulted from a 6.9% increase in filings during 1987-88 coupled with a comparatively smaller 4.7% increase in dispositions.

SUPERIOR COURT CASELOAD



A comparison with last year's figures indicates that superior court filings increased in all categories during fiscal year 1987-88—felony filings by 8.0%, misdemeanor filings by 4.3%, and civil filings 8.7%. Dispositions of civil cases and felonies also increased, by 3.4% and 9.3% respectively, but dispositions of misdemeanors declined by 1.7%, leaving 47,222 cases pending in superior court on June 30, 1988, an 11.6% increase over the number pending at the beginning of the fiscal year.

MEDIAN AGES OF SUPERIOR COURT CASES









The median age is the age with respect to which half of the cases in the category are younger and half are older; it is the 50th percentile of ages of all cases in the category. As shown in the above graphs, the median ages of all civil superior court cases pending and disposed during fiscal

year 1987-88 are greater than the corresponding median ages of criminal superior court cases pending and disposed. In general, civil cases take longer to process than do criminal cases.

CASELOAD TRENDS OF CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS



During 1987-88, civil filings in the superior courts increased by 8.7% while dispositions increased only 3.4%. As the graph above shows, these figures are in direct contrast with those for 1986-87, when the growth in filings temporarily slowed while dispositions sharply increased.

ic.

T H O U S A N D S

O F

C A S E

S

The rapid growth in filings during 1987-88, accompanied by the slower growth in dispositions, resulted in a 7.1% increase in the number of cases pending on June 30, 1988 as compared to the number pending on July 1, 1987.

(f

1978-79 - 1987-88



As was the case in recent years, almost half (45.6%) of the civil cases filed statewide during 1987-88 were negligence sases (7,639 of 16,756 total filings). The "other category

includes non-negligent torts such as conversion of property, civil fraud, and civil assault.

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

	July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988						
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	
				anposed	Disposed	0/20/08	
District 1		10			10.00		
Camden Chowan	13 31	12 22	25 53	12	48.0%	13	
Currituck	40	72	55 112	25 33	47.2% 29.5%	28 79	
Dare	104	119	223	110	49.3%	113	
Gates	14	ĩĩ	25	15	60.0%	115	
Pasquotank	58	65	123	63	51.2%	60	
Perquimans	15	30	45	21	46.7%	24	
District Totals	275	331	606	279	46.0%	327	
District 2							
Beaufort	83	60	143	75	52.4%	68	
Hyde Martin	18 53	17 45	35 98	14	40.0%	21	
Tyrrell	8	45	98	53 2	54.1% 25.0%	45 6	
Washington	31	26	57	29	50.9%	28	
District Totals	193	148	341	173	50.7%	168	
District 3							
Carteret	209	209	418	200	47.8%	218	
Craven	210	246	456	221	48.5%	235	
Pamlico	15	21	36	20	55.6%	16	
Pitt	282	279	561	325	57.9%	236	
District Totals	716	755	1,471	766	52.1%	705	
District 4							
Duplin	101	86	187	93	49.7%	94	
Jones	20	22	42	14	33.3%	28	
Onslow	335	326	661	234	35.4%	427	
Sampson	70	56	126	75	59.5%	51	
District Totals	526	490	1,016	416	40.9%	600	
District 5							
New Hanover	435	419	854	385	45.1%	469	
Pender	49	57	106	44	41.5%	62	
District Totals	484	476	960	429	44.7%	531	
District 6							
Bertie	30	32	62	37	59.7%	25	
Halifax	80	118	198	91	46.0%	107	
Hertford	33	51	84	51	60.7%	33	
Northampton	39	22	61	36	59.0%	25	
District Totals	182	223	405	215	53.1%	190	
District 7						n an an Anna Anna An Anna Anna Anna	
Edgecombe	117	120	237	139	58.6%	98	
Nash Wilson	149 121	165 101	314 222	169 107	53.8% 48.2%	145 115	
District Totals	387	386	773	415	53.7%	358	
District 8					1. 		
Greene	40	27	67	34	50.7%	33	
Lenoir	205	186	391	232	59.3%	159	
Wayne	214	232	446	217	48.7%	229	
District Totals	459	445	904	483	53.4%	421	

89

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

같은 물건을 물건을 받는 것		July 1, 1	907 — June 30	, 1988		
	Begin					End
	Pending		Total		% Caseload	Pending
	7/1/87	Filed	Caseload	Disposed	Disposed	6/30/88
District 9						
Franklin	76	62	138	67	48.6%	71
Granville	46	50	96	45	46.9%	51
Person	56	59	115	61	53.0%	54
Vance	63	88	151	67	44.4%	84
Warren	36	33	69	31	44.9%	38
						50
District Totals	277	292	569	271	47.6%	298
District 10						
Wake	1,453	1,632	3,085	1,457	47.2%	1,628
District 11	100					
Harnett	123	150	273	155	56.8%	118
Joanston	188	205	393	192	48.9%	201
Lee	75	71	146	77	52.7%	69
District Totals	386	426	812	424	50 19	900
WIDELLE LULALD	200	440	012	424	52.2%	388
District 12						
Cumberland	486	482	968	483	49.9%	485
Hoke	19	16	35	485		
		10		±4	48.6%	18
District Totals	505	498	1,003	500	49.9%	503
District 13			and the second			
Bladen	22	57	79	37	46.8%	42
Brunswick	126	98	224	79	35.3%	145
Columbus	160	106	266	108	40.6%	158
District Totals	308	261	569	224	20 1.8	
District Iotais	000	201	203	224	39.4%	345
District 14						n de la transference f
Durham	590	626	1,216	595	10 04	101
Duzinum	570	020	1,210	797	48.9%	621
District 15A						÷.,∮
Alamance	196	131	327	172	50 <i>C</i> V	155
	170	131	527	1/2	52.6%	155
District 15B						
Chatham	37	62	99	65	65.7%	34
Orange	170	206	376	208	55.3%	168
	1.0	200	570	208	JJ • 3%	100
District Totals	207	268	475	273	57.5%	202
			-113		J1 • JA	202
District 16						
Robeson	179	290	469	226	48.2%	243
Scotland	41	72	113	52	46.0%	61
					10.00	
District Totals	220	362	582	278	47.8%	304
District 17A						
Caswell	11	22	33	14	42.4%	19
Rockingham	88	115	203	101	49.8%	102
District Totals	99	137	236	115	48.7%	121
District 17B						
Stokes	20	22	42	28	66.7%	14
Surry	71	116	187	114	61.0%	73
ni	01		·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
District Totals	91	138	229	142	62.0%	87

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
<u>District 18</u> Guilford	829	1,178	2,007	1,022	50.9%	985
GUIILULU						
District 19A						
Cabarrus	130	157	287	139	48.4%	148
Rowan	152	176	328	186	56.7%	142
District Totals	282	333	615	325	52.8%	290
District 19B						
Montgomery	16	29	45	12	26.7%	33
Randolph	92	169	261	126	48.3%	135
District Totals	108	198	306	138	45.1%	168
District 20						
Anson	66	47	113	67	59.3%	46
Moore	100	109	209	101	48.3%	108
Richmond	91	83	174	96	55.2%	78
Stanly	80	78	158	61	38.6%	97
Union	163	143	306	130	42.5%	176
District Totals	500	460	960	455	47.4%	505
District 21						
Forsyth	525	722	1,247	652	52.3%	595
District 22						
Alexander	35	27	62	39	62.9%	23
Davidson	126	169	295	157	53.2%	138
Davie	28	45	73	35	47.9%	38
Iredell	162	200	362	211	58.3%	151
District Totals	351	441	792	442	55.8%	350
District 23						
Alleghany	15	14	29	16	55.2%	13
Ashe	13	27	40	18	45.0%	22
Wilkes	125	157	282	140	49.6%	142
Yadkin	40	43	83	49	59.0%	34
District Totals	193	241	434	223	51.4%	211
District 24						
Avery	52	55	107	71	66.4%	36
Madison	74	25	99	60	60.6%	39
Mitchell	22	27	49	20	40.8%	29
Watauga	96	103	199	109	54.8%	90
Yancey	26	22	48	29	60.4%	19
District Totals	270	232	502	289	57.6%	213
District 25						
Burke	145	140	285	167	58.6%	118
Caldwell	173	155	328	162	49.4%	166
Catawba	222	264	486	275	56.6%	211
District Totals	540	559	1,099	604	55.0%	495
District 26						n an
Mecklenburg	2,335	2,422	4,757	2,157	45.3%	2,600

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
<u>District 27A</u> Gaston	388	583	971	528	54.4%	443
District 27B						
Cleveland Lincoln	117 58	134 72	251 130	124 69	49.4% 53.1%	127 61
District Totals	175	206	381	193	50.7%	188
<u>District 28</u> Buncombe	338	520	858	466	54.3%	392
District 29						
Henderson	142	179	321	110	34.3%	211
McDowell	64	40	104	46	44.2%	58
Polk	12	22	34	19	55.9%	15
Rutherford	88	71	159	83	52.2%	76
Transylvania	71	53	124	60	48.4%	64
District Totals	377	365	742	318	42.9%	424
District 30						
Cherokee	29	21	50	24	48.0%	26
Clay	10	8	18	8	44.4%	10
Graham	23	8	31	16	51.6%	15
Haywood	116	113	229	95	41.5%	134
Jackson	49	58	107	40	37.4%	67
Macon	81	44	125	47	37.6%	78
Swain	24	19	43	16	37.2%	27
District Totals	332	271	603	246	40.8%	357
State Totals	15,097	16,756	31,853	15,685	49.2%	16,168

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988



As in previous years, voluntary dismissals account for the largest number of civil case dispositions in superior courts. The next largest category, final order or judgment without trial, includes summary and consent judgments, and orders changing venue. The "other" category includes miscellaneous dispositions such as discontinuance for lack of service of process under Civil Rule 4(e), dismissal on motion of the court, and removal to federal court.

....

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

Judge's

Ð

	Trial by			Judge's Final Order				
	Jury	Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	or Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Dispositions	
District 1								
Camden	0	1	3	5	1	2	12	
Chowan	1	6	6	1	4	7	25	
Currituck Dare	3 0	5	16 67	9 21	0 4	0 11	33 110	
Gates	2	2	4	3	2	2	15	
Pasquotank	1	8	37	6	7	4	63	
Perquimans	1	2	12	2	3	1.	21	
District Totals % of Total	8 2.9%	31 11.1%	145 52.0%	47 16.8%	21 7.5%	27 9.7%	279 100.0%	
District 2								
Beaufort	4	8	37	21	0	5	75	
Hyde	0	0	5	7	1	1	14	
Martin	2	5	35	10	1	0	53	
Tyrrell Nochdoston	0	0 4	0 17	2 8	0	0 0	2 29	
Washington								
District Totals		17	94	48	2	6	17,3	
% of Total	3.5%	9.8%	54.3%	27.7%	1.2%	3.5%	100.9%	
District 3								
Carteret	14	37	114	22	10	3	20/)	
Craven Pamlico	9	20 2	121 9	42 4	19 1	10 4	221 20	
Pitt	22	71	198	20	14	ō	325	
District Totals % of Total	5.9%	130 17.0%	442 57.7%	88 11.5%	44 5,7%	17 2.2%	766 100.0%	
District 4				на стана стана 				
Duplin Jones	10 0	14 2	49 6	12 2	3 1	5	93 14	
Onslow	13	2	8 140	47	24	3 1	234	
Sampson	8	16	35	4	6	6	75	
District Totals	31	41	230	65	34	15	416	
% of Total	7.5%	9.9%	55.3%	15.6%	8.2%	3.6%	100.0%	
District 5								
New Hanover	24	73	218	41	23	6	385	
Pender	2	5	29	5	2	1	44	
District Totals		78	247	46	25	7	429	
% of Total	6.1%	18.2%	57.6%	10.7%	5.8%	1.6%	100.0%	
District 6			~					
Bertie	3	1	18	9	5	1 0	37	
Halifax Hertford	3	23 3	52 22	9 9 14	4 9	3	91 51	
Northampton	1	13	17	14	3	1	36	
District Totals % of Total	37 3.3%	40 18.6%	109 50.7%	33 15.3%	21 9.8%	5 2.3%	215 100.0%	
District 7 Edgecombe	10	16	72	32	5	4	139	
Nash	8	10	91	44	12	4	169	
Vilson	9	26	41	21	10	0	107	
District Totals		52	204	97	27	8	415	
% of Total	3 27 6.5%	12.5%	49.2%	23.4%	6.5%	1.9%	100.0%	

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

	T	rial by		Judge's Final Order			
1	Jury	Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	or Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Dispositions
District 8							
Greene	0	0	15	14	0	5	34
Lenoir Wayne	12 12	12 29	137 133	55 33	16 10	0 0	232 217
wayne	14	27	100		10	V	417
District Total % of Total	s 24 5.0%	41 8.5%	285 59,0%	102 21,1%	26 5.4%	5 1.0%	483 100.0%
District 9							
Franklin	8	12	32	7	0	8	67
Granville Person	2 2	5 18	24 35	4	0 2	10 3	45 61
Vance	3	18	42	1	2	3 0	67
Warren	1	6	17	7.1	ō	Ó	31
				의 김 영화 관계 관계			
District Total		60	150	20	4	21	271
% of Total	5.9%	22.1%	55.4%	7.4%	1.5%	7.7%	100.0%
District 10							
Wake	71	186	716	304	134	46	1,457
% of Total	4.9%	12.8%	49.1%	20.9%	9.2%	3.2%	100.0%
District 11							
Harnett	9	20	89	28	6	3	155
Johnston	11	32	90	48	10	ĩ	192
Lee	11	5	46	11	4	0	77
Distantian manad	- 01	F7	oor	50	00		101
District Total % of Total	s 31 7.3%	57 13.4%	225 53.1%	87 20.5%	20 4.7%	4 0.9%	424 100.0%
» OI LOCAL	1.5%	13.4%	33.1%	20.5%		0.7%	100.00
District 12				ter en			
Cumberland	16	72	305	51	19	20	483
Hoke	1	3	10	0	2	1	17
District Total	s 17	75	315	51	21	21	500
% of Total	3.4%	15.0%	63.0%	10.2%	4.2%	4.2%	100.0%
District 13		0	00	-			27
Bladen Brunswick	4	2 18	20 33	7 13	1 4	3 0	37 79
Columbus	11	19	67	6	0	5	108
District Total		39	120	26	5	8	224
% of Total	11.6%	17.4%	53.6%	11.6%	2.2%	3.6%	100.0%
District 14			· · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Durham	32	35	341	110	33	44	595
% of Total	5.4%	5.9%	57.3%	18.5%	5.5%	7.4%	100.0%
N							
<u>District 15A</u> Alamance	5	18	99	44	5	. 1	172
% of Total	2.9%	10.5%	57.6%	25.6%	2,9%	0.6%	100.0%
				23100		010/0	10010/
District 15B							
Chatham	3	7	40	9	4	2 7	65
Orange	17	45	107	16	16	. /	208
District Total	s 20	52	147	25	20	9	273
% of Total	7.3%	19.0%	53.8%	9.2%	7.3%	3.3%	100.0%
<u>District 16</u> Robeson	18	61	139	2	4	n	226
Scotland	3	7	34	7	0	2 1	52
District Total		68	173	9	4	3	278
% of Total	7.6%	24.5%	62.2%	3.2%	1.4%	1.1%	100.0%

95

. 9

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988 Judge's

	al by	Voluntarii	Judge's Final Order				
	Jury	Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	or Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Dispositions
<u>District 17A</u> Caewell Rockingham	0 5	0 9	5 63	8 17	1 5	0 2	14 101
District Tota % of Total	ls 5 4.3%	9 7.8%	68 59.1%	25 21.7%	6 5.2%	2 1.7%	115 100.0%
<u>District 17B</u> Stokes Surry	0 6	3 8	11 61	6 32	0 7	8 0	28 114
District Tota % of Total	1s 6 4.2%	11 7.7%	72 50.7%	38 26.8%	7 4.9%	8 5.6%	142 100.0%
District 18 Guilford % of Total	38 3.7%	223 21.8%	545 53.3%	114 11.2%	47 4.6%	55 5.4%	1,022 100.0%
District 19A Cabarrus Rowan	3 23	18 5	91 104	19 4î	3 4	5 9	139 186
District Tota % of Total	ls 26 8.0%	23 7.1%	195 60.0%	60 18.5%	7 2.2%	14 4.3%	325 100.0%
District 19B Montgomery Randolph	1 7	4 16	7 63	0 24	0 9	0 7	12 126
District Tota % of Total	ls 8 5.8%	20 14.5%	70 50.7%	24 17.4%	9 6.5%	7 5.1%	138 100.0%
District 20 Anson Moore Richmond Stanly Union	11 4 2 0 8	10 32 21 9 24	36 58 62 38 88	6 3 6 13 4	3 4 4 0 6	1 0 1 1 0	67 101 96 61 130
District Tota % of Total	1s 25 5.5%	96 21.1%	282 62.0%	32 7.0%	17 3.7%	3 0.7%	455 100.0%
District 21 Forsyth % of Total	46 7,1%	70 10.7%	329 50.5%	113 17.3%	57 8.7%	37 5.7%	652 100.0%
<u>District 22</u> Alexander Davidson Davie Iredell	1 13 3 15	2 19 11 39	20 76 17 100	11 40 1 20	2 8 3 23	3 1 0 14	39 157 35 211
District Tota % of Total	ls 32 7.2%	71 16,1%	213 48.2%	72 16.3%	36 8,1%	18 4.1%	442 100.0%
<u>District 23</u> Alleghary Ashe Wilkes Yadkin	1 0 5 4	3 3 10 1	8 12 83 26	4 1 27 13	0 1 14 2	0 1 1 3	16 18 140 49
District Tota % of Total	1s 10 4.5%	17 7.6%	129 57.8%	45 20,2%	17 7.6%	5 2.2%	223 100.0%

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988 Judge's

έø

	Ĩ	frial by	Voluntary	Judge's Final Order or Judgment			
	Jury	Judge	Dismissal	without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Dispositions
District 24							
Avery	0	2	32	22	4	11	71
Madison Mitchell	3	2 2	25 15	20 3	0	10	60 20
Watauga	0	8	60	24	6	0	109
Yancey	1	5	13	9	Ö	1	29
District Totals % of Fotal	4 1.4%	19 6.6%	145 50.2%	78 27.0%	10 3.5%	33 11.47	289 100.0%
District 25							
Burke Caldwell	16 16	26 2	101 97	15 37	4 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5 2	167 162
Catawba	12	22	172	38	29	2	275
District Totals	44	50	370	90	41	9	604
% of Total	7.3%	8.3%	61.3%	14.9%	6.8%	1.5%	100.02
District 26							
Mecklenburg % of Total	97 4.5%	368 17.1%	1,308 60.6%	172 8.0%	173 8.0%	39 1.8%	2,157
# 01 10La1	4104			0.04	0104	1.0%	100104
District 27A	40	110	210	-	10		600
Gaston % of Total	40 7.6%	110 20.8%	319 60.4%	7 1.3%	18 3.4%	34 6.4%	528 100.0%
District 27B Cleveland	8	18	60	20	9	9	124
Lincoln	4	10	35	17	3	Ó	69
District Totals	12	28	95	37	12	9	193
% of Total	6.2%	14.5%	49.2%	19.2%	6.2%	4.7%	100.0%
District 28							
Buncombe	41	61	232	91	29	12	466
% of Total	8.8%	13.1%	49.8%	19.5%	6.2%	2.6%	100.0%
District 29							
Henderson	10	17	61	16	3	3	110
McDowell	5	2	24	11	3	1	46
Polk Rutherford	2	0 18	13 37	2 13	0 4	26	19 83
Transylvania	1	10	27	13	4	5	60
District Totals % of Total	23	47 14.8%	162 50.9%	55 17.3%	14 4.4%	17 5.3%	318 100.0%
% OL 10LAL	1.2%	14.04	JU. 5%	L/ • J/•	4.4%	5.5%	100.0%
District 30	•		15	•	0	•	04
Cherokee Clay	2	б 1	15 2	1 1	0	1	24 8
Graham	2	î.	9	3	ō	ĩ	16
Haywood	7	18	43	14	9	4	95 .
Jackson	5	1	25	4	4	1	40
Macon Swain	6 3	5 3	24 8	4 2	2	6 0	47 16
District Totals		35	126	29	16	14	246
% of Total	10.6%	14.2%	51.2%	11.8%	6.5%	5.7%	100.0%
State Totals	896	2,278	8,702	2,284	962	563	15,685
% of Total	5.7%	14.5%	55.5%	14.6%	6.1%	3.6%	100.0%

AGES OF CIVIL CASES PENDING IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS

		Ages	of Pending	Cases (N	fonths)	June 20, 1	.,		
	<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Total Pending	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 1								ABC (Dajs)	ALC (Days)
Camden	8	61.5%	4	30.8%	. 1	7.7%	13	335.4	288.0
Chowan	17	60.7%	6	21.4%	5	17.9%	28	365.9	322.0
Currituck	64	81.0%	11	13.9%	4	5.1%	79	240.2	140.0
Dare	76	67.3%	29	25.7%	8	7.1%	113	300.0	209.0
Gates	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	10	269.8	128.0
Pasquotank	42	70.0%	10	16.7%	8	13.3%	60	361.5	244.5
Perquimans	21	87.5%	2	8.3%	1	4.2%	24	178.8	36.5
District Totals	237	72.5%	62	19.0%	28	8.6%	327	294.1	199.0
District 2									
Beaufort	40	58,8%	11	16.2%	17	25.0%	68	475.1	292.5
Ryde	13	61.9%	3	14.3%	5	23.8%	21	546.0	300.0
Martin	28	62.2%	7	15.6%	10	22.2%	45	477.5	281.0
Tyrrell	ō	0.0%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	6	1,018.3	1,031.5
Washington	17	60.7%	4	14.3%	7	25.0%	28	383.1	259.0
District Totals	98	58.3%	27	16.1%	43	25.6%	168	488.7	295.0
District 3									
<u>District 3</u> Carteret	148	67.9%	51	23.4%	19	8.7%	218	316.4	260.0
Craven	148	70.6%	52	22.1%	17	7.2%	235	288.9	218.0
Pamlico	12	75.0%	.4	25.0%	0	0.0%	16	256.2	251.5
Pitt	154	65.3%	57	24.2%	25	10.6%	236	354.9	225.0
					1				
District Totals	480	68.1%	164	23.3%	61	8.7%	705	318.8	237.0
District 4	56	50 69	24	25 57	14	14 0%	94	365.1	273.5
Duplin	17	59.6%	24	25.5% 14.3%	7	14.9% 25.0%			
Jones Onslow	256	60.7% 60.0%	4	26.0%	60	14.1%	28 427	685.5 394.6	264.0 275.0
Sampson	33	64.7%	111 12	23.5%	6	11.8%	51	354.5	246.0
Sampson	55	04.7/6	12	23.3%	U.	11.0%	51	5.4.5	240.0
District Totals	362	60.3%	151	25.2%	87	14.5%	600	400.1	266.0
District 5									
New Hanover	310	66.1%	120	25.6%	39	8.3%	469	311.8	259.0
Pender	39	62.9%	18	29.0%	5	8.1%	62	294.9	250.0
District Totals	349	65.7%	138	26.0%	44	8.3%	531	309.8	259.0
Dt-Lut-L C									
District 6	14	64 04		20.08	. .	0 07	0.5	217 6	C20 0
Bertie Halifax	16 86	64.0%	7	28.0%	2	8.0%	25 107	347.6 251.3	288.0
Hertford	29	80.4% 87.9%	15 0	14.0%	6	5.6% 12.1%	33	262.1	182.0 108.0
Northampton	10	40.0%	. 8	0.0% 32.0%	7	28.0%	25	547.8	415.0
			1						
District Totals	141	74.2%	30	15.8%	19	10.0%	190	304.9	195.5
District 7	70	71 / 8		0.0 EW		E 1.27	00	060.0	204.0
Edgecombe	70	71.4%	23	23.5%	5	5.1%	98 145	268.8	204.0
Nash	97	66.9%	32	22.1%	16	11.0%	145	350.3	268.0
Wilson	73	63.5%	25	21.7%	17	14.8%	115	311.7	209.0
District Totals	240	67.0%	80	22.3%	38	10.6%	358	315.6	219.5
District 8									
Greene	18	54.5%	6	18.2%	9	27.3%	39	469.6	328.0
Lénoir	106	66.7%	41	25.8%	12	7.5%	159	321.6	234.0
Wayne	159	69.4%	49	21.4%	21	9.2%	229	294.5	223.0
District Totals	283	67.2%	96	22.8%	42	10.0%	421	318.5	237.0

Ages of Cases Pending June 30, 1988

AGES OF CIVIL CASES PENDING IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Pending June 30, 1988

-12 % 12.24 % 1000000000000000000000000000000000000		Ages of Pending Cases (Months)						(T) = 4 = 1	Meun	Median
Franklin 47 66.22 20 28.22 4 5.62 71 290.0 244.0 Granville 35 68.65 13 25.53 3 5.92 3 5.62 54 304.0 215.5 Waree 62 73.82 22 24.82 22.42 84 270.8 231.0 Wareen 27 71.11 5 13.221 6 6.03 298 295.1 230.0 District 10 10 68.53 422 25.92 91 5.63 1.628 294.9 227.0 District 11 89 75.42 27 22.92 2 1.73 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.27 136 27.33 11 2.83 388 260.5 207.5 District 12 71 69.83 134 47.63 38 7.83 388 221.0 255.0 District 70tals 312 64.52		<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Total Pending		
Granville 35 68.6X 13 25.5X 3 5.9X 51 271.4 160.0 Vance 62 73.8X 20 23.8X 2 2.4X 84 270.8 231.0 Varcen 27 71.1X 5 13.2X 6 15.8X 38 377.5 236.0 District Totals 208 69.8X 72 24.2X 18 6.0X 298 295.1 230.0 District 10 1.115 68.5X 422 25.9X 91 5.6X 1,628 294.9 227.0 District 11 89 75.4X 27 72.9X 2 1.7X 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.2X 61 30.3X 7 3.5X 201 294.9 227.0 District 121 89 71.0X 11 2.8X 298 7.8X 201 295.0 District 13 91 56.5X 12 2.9X <td< td=""><td></td><td>47</td><td>66 24</td><td>20</td><td>28 29</td><td>4</td><td>5 64</td><td>71</td><td>290.0</td><td>244 0</td></td<>		47	66 24	20	28 29	4	5 64	71	290.0	244 0
Person Vance 37 66,5X 14 25,9Z 3 5.6X 54 204,0 215,5 Warren 27 71.1X 5 13.2Z 6 15.6Z 38 377.5 236.0 District Totals 208 69.8X 72 24.2X 18 6.0X 298 295.1 230.0 District Ion 1,115 68.5X 422 25.9X 91 5.6X 1,628 294.9 227.0 District In 89 75,4X 27 20.9X 2 1.7X 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.2X 106 27.3X 11 2.8X 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 271 69.8X 106 27.3X 11 2.8X 388 280.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.5X 134 27.6X 39 7.8X 455 310.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4X										
Vance 62 73.82 20 23.82 2 2.42 84 270.8 231.0 District Totals 208 69.87 72 24.22 18 6.03 298 295.1 230.0 District Totals 208 69.87 72 24.22 18 6.03 298 294.9 227.0 District Totals 89 75.42 27 22.92 2 1.72 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.22 61 30.32 7 3.53 201 27.4 252.0 Lee 49 71.03 18 26.12 2 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 271 69.82 106 27.33 11 2.63 388 221.0 255.0 District Totals 211 69.82 13.3 64.53 13.3 21.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.44 140 27.82 39 <										
Harren 27 71.1X 5 13.2X 6 15.6X 38 377.5 236.0 District Totals 208 69.8X 72 24.2X 18 6.0X 298 295.1 230.0 District Totals 208 69.8X 422 25.9X 91 5.6X 1,628 294.9 227.0 District 11 5 68.5X 422 25.9X 91 5.6X 1,628 294.9 227.0 District 11 5 68.5X 422 25.9X 2 1,7X 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.5X 134 2 2.9X 288 260.5 207.5 District Totals 211 69.8X 106 27.3X 11 2.8X 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.5X 134 27.6X 38 7.8X 485 321.0 235.0 District 12 313 64.4X 140										
District Totals 208 69.8% 72 24.2% 18 6.0% 298 295.1 230.0 District 10 Wake 1,115 68.5% 422 25.9% 91 5.6% 1,628 294.3 227.0 District 11 Harmet 39 75.4% 27 22.9% 2 1.7% 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 13 66.2% 61 30.3% 7 2.9% 69 269.6 220.0 District Totals 271 69.8% 106 27.3% 11 2.8% 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.5% 134 77.6% 38 7.8% 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 455 386.6 293.0 Columbus 59 56.6% 2 4.8% 0 0.2% 148.8 120.5 District Totals 201 58.3%	Vance	62	73.8%	20	23.8%	2	2.4%	84	270.8	251.0
District 10 Wake 1,115 68.52 422 25.92 91 5.62 1,628 294.9 227.0 District 11 Harmet Johnston 39 33 75.42 66.22 27 22.92 2.93 2 1,72 3.52 118 201 231.5 201 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 231.5 226.0 226.0	Warren	27	71.1%	5	13.2%	6	15.8%	38	377.5	236.0
Take 1,115 68.5% 422 25.9% 91 5.6% 1,628 294.9 227.0 District 11 Harnett 139 75.4% 27 22.9% 2 1.7% 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.2% 61 30.3% 7 3.5% 201 274.4 252.0 Lee 49 71.0% 18 26.1% 2 2.9% 69 269.6 206.0 District Totals 271 69.8% 106 27.3% 11 2.8% 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.5% 134 27.6% 38 7.8% 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 304 45.35.5% 0 0.0% 42 148.8 120.5 Brunsuick 82 56.6% 41 28.35	District Totals	208	69.8%	72	24.2%	18	6.0%	298	295.1	230.0
District 11 Harnett Johnston 89 133 75.4% 66.2X 27 61 22.9% 26.1X 2 1.7% 15.5% 118 201 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.2X 61 20.3X 7 3.5% 201 274.4 252.0 District Totals 271 69.8% 106 27.3% 11 2.8% 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 271 69.8% 106 27.3% 38 7.8% 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 31.3 206.0 District Totals					1. J.					
Barnett Johnston 89 49 75.4% 75.4% 27 27 22.9% 2 2 1.7% 118 231.5 231.5 24.4 194.0 252.0 Johnston 49 71.0% 18 26.1% 2 2.9% 69 269.6 206.0 District Totals 271 69.8% 106 27.3% 11 2.8% 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.5% 134 27.6% 38 7.8% 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 321 56.6% 41 28.3% 22 15.2% 148.8 120.5 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 <	Wake	1,115	68.5%	422	25.9%	91	5.6%	1,628	294.9	227.0
Harnett 89 75.4% 27 22.9% 2 1.7% 118 231.5 194.0 Johnston 133 66.2% 61 30.3% 7 3.5% 201 274.4 252.0 124.4 22.9% 69 269.6 206.0 District Totals 271 69.8% 106 27.3% 11 2.8% 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.5% 134 27.6% 38 7.8% 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 201 58.7% 2 4.8% 0.00% 42 148.8 120.5 Biaden 30 95.2% 2 0.7% 34 13.3 266.0 District Totals <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>· · · ·</td> <td></td> <td></td>								· · · ·		
Johnston Lee 133 49 66,22 71,0X 61 8 26,12 26,12 7 2 2,9X 2,9X 69 274,4 269,6 226,0 206,0 District Totals 271 69.8X 106 27.3X 11 2.8X 388 260,5 207.5 District Totals 213 64.5X 134 27.6X 38 7.8X 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4X 140 27.8X 39 7.8X 503 322.6 234.0 District Totals 324 64.4X 140 27.8X 39 7.8X 503 322.6 235.0 District Totals 30 95.2X 2 4.8Z 0 0.0X 42 148.8 120.5 Brunswick 82 56.6X 41 28.3X 22 15.2X 135 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3X 96 27.8X 48 13.9X 363.5 368.6 293.0 District Tot		00	75 1.9	07					001 5	104.0
Lee 49 71.0X 18 26.1X 2 2.9X 69 269.6 206.0 District Totals 271 69.8X 106 27.3X 11 2.8X 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.5X 134 27.6X 38 7.8X 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4X 140 27.8Z 39 7.8Z 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4X 140 27.8Z 39 7.8Z 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4X 140 27.8Z 39 7.8Z 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 201 58.3X 96 27.8Z 48 13.9X 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3X 96 27.8Z 48 11.0X 621 331.3 206.0 District Totals 201										
District Totals 271 69.87 106 27.37 11 2.87 388 260.5 207.5 District Totals 313 64.57 134 27.67 38 7.87 485 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.87 39 7.87 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.87 39 7.87 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.87 39 7.87 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 201 58.37 2 15.57 158 399.1 318.0 Oclumbus 79 50.07 33 35.57 2 15.57 158 390.0 31.3 266.0 District Totals 201 58.77 55 35.57 9 5.82 155 314.1 289.0 District Totals 169 83.77	Johnston	133	66.2%	61	30.3%	7		201	274.4	252.0
District 12 Gumberland Hoke 313 11 64.5% 61.11 134 6 27.6% 33.3% 38 1 7.8% 5.6% 485 18 321.0 365.0 234.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 40 95.2% 2 4.8% 0 0.0% 42 148.8 120.5 Brunewick 82 56.6% 41 28.3% 22 15.2% 145 398.9 363.5 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District 14 117 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District 15A 31 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District	Lee	49	71.0%	18	26.1%	2	2.9%	69	269.6	206.0
District 12 Gumberland Hoke 313 11 64.5% 61.12 134 6 27.6% 33.3% 38 1 7.8% 5.6% 485 18 321.0 365.0 234.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 40 95.2% 2 4.8% 0 0.0% 42 148.8 120.5 Binden 40 95.2% 2 4.8% 0 0.0% 42 148.8 120.5 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District 15A 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 5.8% 155 31.4 289.0 District 15A 9	District Totals	271	69 8%	106	97 3¥	11	2 87	388	260 5	207 5
Cumber land Hoke 313 11 64.5% 61.1% 134 6 27.6% 33.3% 38 1 7.8% 5.6% 485 18 321.0 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District Totals 82 56.6% 41 28.3% 22 15.2% 145 399.9 363.5 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District 15A 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District 15A 31 55.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B 32 94.1%		-1-	03.04	100	21.54		2.04	500	200.5	207.5
Hoke 11 61.17 6 33.37 1 5.67 18 365.0 234.0 District Totals 324 64.47 140 27.87 39 7.87 503 322.6 255.0 District 13 Bladen 40 95.27 2 4.87 0 0.07 42 148.8 120.5 Bladen 50 79 50.07 53 33.57 26 16.57 158 399.1 318.0 Columbus 79 50.07 53 33.57 26 16.57 158 398.9 363.5 District Totals 201 58.37 96 27.82 48 13.97 345 368.6 293.0 District 14 417 67.17 136 21.97 68 11.02 621 331.3 206.0 District 15A 91 58.72 55 35.52 9 5.82 155 314.1 289.0 District Totals 169 83.77 32 15.82 1 0.52 202 203.3 187.5 <td></td> <td></td> <td>a</td> <td>·</td> <td><u>.</u></td> <td>1</td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td>1. <u>1</u></td> <td>and the state</td>			a	·	<u>.</u>	1	_		1. <u>1</u>	and the state
District Totals 324 64.4% 140 27.8% 39 7.8% 503 322.6 255.0 District 13 Bladen Brunswick 40 95.2% 2 4.8% 0 0.0% 42 148.8 120.5 District Totals 201 58.5% 41 323.3% 22 15.2% 145 399.1 318.0 Oclumbus 79 50.3 33.5% 22 15.2% 145 399.1 318.0 Oclumbus 79 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District 14 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District 158 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 158 137 81.5%	Cumberland	313	64.5%	134	27.6%	38	7.8%	485	321.0	255.0
District 13 Bladen Brunswick 40 82 95.22 56.62 2 41 4.82 28.32 0 22 0.02 15.22 42 15.22 145 15.82 138.99.1 398.1 120.5 398.1 District Totals 201 58.33 96 27.83 48 13.93 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.33 96 27.83 48 13.93 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.73 96 27.83 48 13.93 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.73 55 35.53 9 5.83 155 314.1 289.0 District 155 31 53 1.97 0 0.07 34 163.5 154.5 Orange 137 81.53 32 15.83 1 0.53 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.77 32 15.83 1 0.53 202 203.3 187.5	Hoke	11	61.1%	6	33.3%	1	5.6%	18	365.0	234.0
Bladen 40 95,2% 2 4,8% 0 0.0% 42 148,8 120,5 Brunswick 82 56.6% 41 28.3% 22 15.2% 148 399.1 318.0 Oldentias 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 95 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 31.3 206.0 District 158 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5	District Totals	324	64.4%	140	27.8%	39	7.8%	503	322.6	255.0
Brunswick Columbus 82 56.6% 41 28.3% 22 15.2% 145 399.1 318.0 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District I4 Durham 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District I5A Alamance 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Orange 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8	District 13									
Columbus 79 50.0% 53 33.5% 26 16.5% 158 398.9 363.5 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District I4 Durham 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District 15A Alamance 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 District 15B Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 199.0 District Totals 248 </td <td>Bladen</td> <td>40</td> <td>95.2%</td> <td>2</td> <td>4.8%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>42</td> <td>148.8</td> <td>120.5</td>	Bladen	40	95.2%	2	4.8%	0	0.0%	42	148.8	120.5
Columbus 79 50.0% 53 33.5% 26 16.5% 158 398.9 363.5 District Totals 201 58.3% 96 27.8% 48 13.9% 345 368.6 293.0 District I4 Durham 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District 15A Alamance 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 243 227.8 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 <td>Brunswick</td> <td>82</td> <td>56.6%</td> <td>41</td> <td>28.3%</td> <td>22</td> <td>15.2%</td> <td>145</td> <td>399.1</td> <td>318.0</td>	Brunswick	82	56.6%	41	28.3%	22	15.2%	145	399.1	318.0
District 14 Durham 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District 15A Alamance 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Orange 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 District 15B Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Kobeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8	Columbus	79								
Durham 417 67.1% 136 21.9% 68 11.0% 621 331.3 206.0 District 15A Alamance 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Robeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 29 16.1% 7 2.3% 102 227.4 199.5 <	District Totals	201	58.3%	96	27.8%	48	13.9%	345	368.6	293.0
District 15A Alamance 91 58.72 55 35.52 9 5.82 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Chatham 32 94.12 2 5.92 0 0.02 34 163.5 154.5 District 15B Orange 137 81.52 30 17.92 1 0.662 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.72 32 15.82 1 0.52 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Robeson 200 82.32 39 16.02 4 1.62 243 227.8 192.0 District 16 Robeson 200 82.32 39 16.02 4 1.62 243 227.8 199.0 District Totals 248 81.62 49 16.12 7 2.32 304 235.8 195.5 District 17A Caswell 16 84.22 2 10.52 1 5.32 19 229.9 224.0 Rockingham <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>										
Alamance 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Robeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Caswel1	Durham	417	67.1%	136	21.9%	68	11.0%	621	331.3	206.0
Alamance 91 58.7% 55 35.5% 9 5.8% 155 314.1 289.0 District 15B Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Robeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Caswel1										
District 15B Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Robeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 102 229.9 224.0 Rockingham 83 81.4%	District 15A									
Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Iotals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Iotals 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.4%	Alamance	91	58.7%	55	35.5%	9	5.8%	155	314.1	289.0
Chatham 32 94.1% 2 5.9% 0 0.0% 34 163.5 154.5 Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Iotals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District Iotals 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District Totals 248 81.4%										
Orange 137 81.5% 30 17.9% 1 0.6% 168 211.4 199.5 District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Robeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District 17A Caswel1 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Rockingham 83 81.4% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0							<u>.</u>			
District Totals 169 83.7% 32 15.8% 1 0.5% 202 203.3 187.5 District 16 Robeson Scotland 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 District 16 Robeson Scotland 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District 17A Caswell Rockingham 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry <td>Chatham</td> <td>32</td> <td>94.1%</td> <td>2</td> <td>5.9%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>34</td> <td>163.5</td> <td>154.5</td>	Chatham	32	94.1%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	34	163.5	154.5
District 16 Robeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District 17A Caswell 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Rockingham 83 81.4% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	Orange	137	81.5%	30	17.9%	. 1	0.6%	168	211.4	199.5
Robeson 200 82.3% 39 16.0% 4 1.6% 243 227.8 192.0 Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District 17A Caswell 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Rockingham 83 81.4% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	District Totals	169	83.7%	32	15.8%	1	0.5%	202	203.3	187.5
Scotland 48 78.7% 10 16.4% 3 4.9% 61 267.4 199.0 District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District 17A Caswell 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 District 17A Caswell 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	District 16									
District Totals 248 81.6% 49 16.1% 7 2.3% 304 235.8 195.5 District 17A Caswell Rockingham 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 District Totals 99 81.8% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0										
District 17A 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Rockingham 83 81.4% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B 5 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	Scotland	48	78.7%	10	16.4%	3	4.9%	61	267.4	199.0
Caswell 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Rockingham 83 81.4% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Stokes 13 92.9% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	District Totals	248	81.6%	49	16.1%	7	2.3%	304	235.8	195.5
Caswell 16 84.2% 2 10.5% 1 5.3% 19 229.9 224.0 Rockingham 83 81.4% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Stokes 13 92.9% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	District 17A									
Rockingham 83 81.4% 15 14.7% 4 3.9% 102 227.4 199.5 District Totals 99 81.8% 17 14.0% 5 4.1% 121 227.8 220.0 District 17B Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0		16	84.2%	2	10.5%	1	5.3%	19	229.9	224.0
District 17BStokes1392.9%17.1%00.0%14185.8145.0Surry6589.0%811.0%00.0%73171.3146.0	Rockingham									
Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	District Totals	99	81.8%	17	14.0%	5	4.1%	121	227.8	220.0
Stokes 13 92.9% 1 7.1% 0 0.0% 14 185.8 145.0 Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0	District 17B					· .				
Surry 65 89.0% 8 11.0% 0 0.0% 73 171.3 146.0		13	92.9%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	14	185.8	145.0
District Totals 78 89.7% 9 10.3% 0 0.0% 87 173.6 146.0										
	District Totals	78	89.7%	9	10.3%	0	0.0%	87	173.6	146.0

99

		Ages	of Pendin	g Cases (M	lonths)		Total	Mean	Median
District 18	<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Pending	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
Guilford	837	85.0%	127	12.9%	21	2.1%	985	209.2	155.0
Dianatan 104									
District 19A	114	77 0%	20	10 07	6	6 19	140	000 0	100.0
Cabarrus	114	77.0%	28	18.9%	6	4.1%	148	228.3	192.0
Rowan	122	85,9%	18	12.7%	2	1.4%	142	193.1	153.0
District Totals	236	81,4%	46	15.9%	8	2.8%	290	211.1	160.5
District 198									
Montgomery	26	78.8%	6	18.2%	1	3,0%	33	210.8	129.0
Randolph	121	89.6%	. 11 .	8.1%	3	2.2%	135	197.3	162.0
District Totals	147	87.5%	17	10.1%	4	2.4%	168	199.9	160.0
District 20									
Anson	30	65.2%	15	32.6%	1	2.2%	46	274.2	235.5
Moore	76	70.4%	19	17.6%	13	12.0%	108	322,0	237.5
Richmond	57	73.1%	17	21.8%	4	5.1%	78	304.3	233.5
Stanly	55	56.7%	20	20.6%	22	22.7%	97	569.0	289.0
Union	110	62.5%	53	30.1%	13	7.4%	176	337.0	244.5
01101	110	02.5%	23	50.1%	13	1.4%	170	557.0	244.J
District Totals	328	65.0%	124	24.6%	53	10.5%	505	367.6	241.0
District 21									
Forsyth	490	82.4%	102	17.1%	3	0.5%	595	220.6	168.0
District 22					•				
Alexander	20	87.0%	3	13.0%	0	0.0%	23	171.9	156.0
Davidson	120	87.0%	14	10.1%	- 4	2.9%	138	215.5	168.5
Davie	32	84.2%	5	13.2%	1	2.6%	38	210.5	136.5
Iredell	125	82.8%	23	15.2%	. 3	2.0%	151	223.4	167.0
District Totals	297	84.9%	45	12.9%	8	2.3%	350	215.5	165.0
District 22									
District 23		61 54		20 54	•	0.0%	10	006.0	106 0
Alleghany	8	61.5%	5	38.5%	0	0.0%	13	236.2	184.0
Ashe	18	81.8%	4	18.2%	0	0.0%	22	255.4	257.5
Wilkes	108	76.1%	31	21.8%	3	2.1%	142	234.6	184.0
Yadkin	23	67.6%	11	32.4%	0	0.0%	34	270.8	207.0
District Totals	157	74.4%	51	24.2%	3	1.4%	211	242.7	197.0
District 24									
Avery	29	80.6%	6	16.7%	1	2.8%	36	229.1	166.5
Madison	. 18	46.2%	11	28.2%	10	25.6%	39	468.6	407.0
Mitchell	22	75.9%	4	13.8%	3	10.3%	29	297.4	254.0
Watauga	75	83.3%	15	16.7%	0	0.0%	90	215.4	189.5
Yancey	13	68.4%	6	31.6%	ŏ	0.0%	19	261.5	195.0
District Totals	157	73.7%	42	19.7%	14	6.6%	213	279.4	246.0
District 25									
Burke	86	72.9%	29	24.6%	3	2.5%	118	244.2	212.0
Caldwell	118	71.1%	41	24.7%	7	4.2%	166	290.1	238.0
Catawba	165	78.2%	35	16.6%	11	5.2%	211	227.3	150.0
District Totals	369	74.5%	105	21.2%	21	4.2%	495	252.4	190.0
District 26					1.1.1				
Mecklenburg	1,763	67.8%	668	25.7%	169	6.5%	2,600	323.5	259.0

AGES OF CIVIL CASES PENDING IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Pending June 30, 1988

100

AGES OF CIVIL CASES PENDING IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Pending June 30, 1988

		Ages	of Pending	g Cases (l	Months)	Total Mean Median				
	<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Pending	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)	
District 27A										
Gaston	368	83.1%	65	14.7%	10	2.3%	443	209.3	147.0	
District 27B				÷						
Cleveland	94	74.0%	25	19,7%	8	6.3%	127	263,3	192.0	
Lincoln	51	83.6%	7	11,5%	3	4.9%	61	206.5	155.0	
District Totals	145	77.1%	32	17.0%	11	5.9%	188	244.8	169,0	
District 28										
Buncombe	330	84.2%	45	11.5%	17	4.32	392	216.8	147.0	
D4										
District 29	150	71.1%	15	01.04				001.1	171 8	
Henderson McDowell	150	60.3%	45 16	21.3%	16	7.67	211 58	291.1	141.0	
Polk	10	66.7%	3	20.0%	2	13.3%	15	330.7 341.6	253.0 240.0	
Rutherford	43	56.6%	23	30.3%	10	13.2%	76	367.6	315.5	
Transylvania	38	59.4%	17	26,6%	9	14.1%	64	371.8	283.0	
District Totals	276	65.1%	104	24.5%	44	10.4%	424	324.2	228.0	
District 30										
Cherokee	15	57.7%	7	26.9%	4	15.4%	26	410.2	204.5	
Clay	6	60.0%	4	40.07	0	0.0%	10	350.2	364.0	
Graham	. 5	33.3%	7	46.7%	3	20.0%	15	486.7	559.0	
Haywood	87	64.9%	24	17.9%	23	17.2%	134	383.0	244.0	
Jackson	40	59.7%	19	28.4%	8	11.9%	67	354.5	246.0	
Macon	34	43.6%	22	28.2%	22	28.2%	78	583,0	453.5	
Swain	16	59.3%	8	29.6%	3	11.1%	27	393.1	304.0	
District Totals	203	56.9%	91	25.5%	63	17.6%	357	427.5	304.0	
State Totals	11,514	71.2%	3546	21.9%	1108	6.9%	16168	294.7	219.0	

AGES OF CIVIL CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 to June 30, 1988

		Ages	of Dispose	d Cases (?	Months)		Total	Maan	X dadtan
	<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Disposed	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 1									
Camden	6	50.0%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	12	366.0	362.5
Chowan	6	24.0%	11	44.0%	8	32.0%	25	644.1	572.0
Currituck	20	60.6%	9	27.3%	4	12.1%	33	388.4	265.0
Dare	69	62.7%	23	20.9%	18	16.4%	110	387.1	230.5
Gates	7	46.7%	5	33.3%	3	20.0%	15	524.1	377.0
Pasquotank	37	58.7%	15	23.8%	11	17.5%	63	381.8	284.0
Perquimans	14	66.7%	6	28.6%	1	4.8%	21	309.1	224.0
District Totals	159	57.0%	74	26.5%	46	16.5%	279	409.7	287.0
District 2									
Beaufort	45	60.0%	18	24.0%	12	16.0%	75	397.1	300.0
Hyde	6	42.9%	4	28.6%	4	28.6%	14	636.1	495.5
Martin	28	52.8%	18	34.0%	7.	13.2%	53	430.4	310.0
Tyrrell	ч О	0.0%	0 1	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	1,244.5	1,244.5
Washington	15	51.7%	6	20.7%	8	27.6%	29	420.2	302.0
District Totals	94	54.3%	46	26.6%	33	19.1%	173	440.3	329.0
District 3									
Carteret	109	54.5%	67	33.5%	24	12.0%	200	364.8	319.5
Craven	138	62.4%	60	27.1%	23	10.4%	221	354.3	257.0
Pamlico	15	75.0%	1	5.0%	4	20.0%	20	484.8	264.0
Pict	222	68.3%	87	26.8%	16	4.9%	325	231.1	222.0
District Totals	484	63.2%	215	28.1%	67	8.7%	766	329.4	259.5
District 4									
Duplin	52	55.9%	30	32.3%	11 -	11.8%	93	399.3	515.0
Jones	10	71,4%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	14	282.9	249.5
Onslow	123	52.6%	78	33.3%	33	14.1%	234	417.3	348.0
Sampson	51	68.0%	16	21.3%	8	10.7%	75	312.8	251.0
District Totals	236	56.7%	126	30.3%	54	13.0%	416	389.9	302.5
District 5									
New Hanover	221	57.4%	100	26.0%	64	16.6%	385	376.7	318.0
Pender	29	65.9%	7	15.9%	8	18.2%	44	348.1	249.5
District Totals	250	58.3%	107	24.9%	72	16.8%	429	373.8	310.0
District 6									
Bertie	27	73.0%	. 9	24.3%	· · · 1	2.7%	37	288.0	284.0
Halifax	55	60.4%	29	31.9%	7	7.7%	91	325.4	292.0
Hertford	28	54.9%	14	27.5%	9	17.6%	51	426.4	342.0
Northampton	18	50.0%	13	36.1%	5	13.9%	36	437.7	363.0
District Totals	128	59.5%	65	30.2%	22	10.2%	215	361.7	306.0
District 7									
Edgecombe	90	64.7%	36	25.9%	13	9.4%	139	307.9	234.0
Nash	113	66.9%	46	27.2%	10	5.9%	169	293.3	228.0
Wilson	56	52.3%	37	34.6%	14	13.1%	107	422.7	354.0
District Totals	259	62.4%	119	28.7%	37	8.9%	415	331.6	263.0
District 8					· · ·				
Greene	15	44.1%	15	44.1%	4	11.8%	34	405 O	. A12 E
Lenoir	129	44.14	81	34.9%	22	9.5%		405.8	414.5
Wayne	134	61.8%	65	30.0%	18	9.5%	232 217	358.6 342.6	328.0 285.0
District Totals	278	57.6%	161	33.3%	44	9.1%	483	354.8	311.0

AGES OF CIVIL CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 to June 30, 1988

		Ages	of Dispose	d Cases (!	а.			Median	
	<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Total Disposed	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 9									
Franklin	24	35.8%	33	49.3%	10	14.9%	67	425.1	440.0
Granville	27	60.0%	10	22.2%	8	17.8%	45	405.2	308.0
Person	41	67.2%	16	26.2%	4	6.6%	61	291.6	254.0
Vance	42	62.7%	19	28.4%	6	9.0%	67	324.4	253.0
Warren	17	54.8%	9	29.0%	5	16.1%	31	434.5	310.0
District Totals	151	55.7%	87	32.1%	33	12.2%	271	367.9	308.0
District 10									
Wake	823	56.5%	479	32.9%	155	10.6%	1,457	361.2	305.0
District 11	107	10.04		05 0W	· · ·	F 08	150	001 0	
Harnett	107	69.0%	40	25.8%	.8	5.2%	155	281.2	238.0
Johnston	121	63.0%	60	31.3%	11	5.7%	192	302.9	223.5
Lee	50	64.9%	20	26.0%	7	9.1%	77	347.0	301.0
District Totals	278	65.6%	120	28.3%	26	6.1%	424	303.0	244.0
District 12									
Cumberland	262	54.2%	144	29.8%	77	15.9%	483	413.3	323.0
Hoke	7	41.2%	7	41.2%	3	17.6%	17	496.2	366.0
District Totals	269	53.8%	151	30.2%	80	16.0%	500	416.2	324.0
District 13									
Bladen	32	86.5%	4	10.8%	1	2,7%	37	207.8	201.0
Brunswick	34	43.0%	31	39.2%	14	17.7%	79	482.9	403.0
Columbus	44	40.7%	31	28.7%	33	30.6%	108	524.3	468.5
District Totals	110	49.1%	66	29.5%	48	21.4%	224	457.4	373.5
District 14									
Durham	355	59.7%	162	27.2%	78	13.1%	595	364.3	292.0
District 15A									
Alamance	70	40.7%	55	32.0%	47	27.3%	172	562.0	430.5
<u>District 15B</u> Chatham	45	69.2%	20	30.8%	0	0.0%	65	289.1	242.0
Orange	135	64.9%	70	33.7%	3	1.47	208	291.9	263.0
District Totals	180	65.9%	90	33.0%	3	1.17	273	291.2	263.0
District 16	n an								
Robeson	143	63.3%	74	32.7%	9	4.0%	226	291.1	266.0
Scotland	37	71.2%	14	26.9%	í	1.9%	52	260.8	197.0
District Totals	180	64.7%	88	31.7%	10	3.6%	278	285.4	257.5
District 17A									
Caswell	10	71.4%	4	28.6%	0	0.0%	14	239.4	210.0
Rockingham	70	69.3%	28	27.7%	3	3.07	101	292.4	244.0
District Totals	80	69.6%	32	27.8%	3	2.6%	115	286.0	244.0
District 17B									•
Stokes	21	75.0%	7	25.0%	0	0.0%	28	244.0	227.5
Surry	99	86.3%	15	13.27	ŏ	0.0%	114	215.3	201.0
e a Transferra e la								· • ·	
District Totals	120	84.5%	22	15.5%	0	0.0%	142	221.0	211.5

AGES OF CIVIL CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS

						1201 10 1	une 30, 190	JO	
			of Dispose				Total	Mean	Median
	<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Disposed	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
District 18 Guilford	648	63.4%	326	31.9%	48	4.7%	1,022	313.1	280.0
District 19A									
Cabarrus Rowan	100 111	71.9%	31 66	22.3%	8	5.8%	139 186	292.2 319.6	259.0 315.5
	. 	33.14		33.34	,	4.04	100	313.0	319.5
District Totals	211	64.9%	97	29.8%	17	5.2%	325	307.9	293.0
District 19B					_				
Montgomery Randolph	6 85	50.0% 67.5%	6 31	50.0% 24.6%	0 10	0.0%	12 126	316.4 299.8	312.0 274.5
Kandorbii		07.3%	51	24.04		1.3%	120	277.0	2/4.J
District Totals	91	65.9%	37	26.8%	10	7.2%	138	301.3	274.5
District 20	1999 - 1999 -		۰. د بر و						
Anson	35	52.2%	24	35.8%	8 15	11.9%	67	387.1	345.0
Moore Richmond	52 43	51.5% 44.8%	34 44	33.7% 45.8%	15 9	14.9%	101 96	397.0 392.7	344.0 383.5
Stanly	39	63.9%	15	24.6%	7	11.5%	61	355.2	258.0
Union	62	47.7%	52	40.0%	16	12.3%	130	404.3	387.0
District Totals	231	50.8%	169	37.1%	55	12.1%	455	391.1	357.0
District 21									
Forsyth	468	71.8%	179	27.5%	5	0.8%	652	269.4	257.0
District 22				•					
Alexander	23	59.0%	14	35.9%	2	5.1%	39	347.3	335.0
Davidson	106	67.5%	46	29.3%	5	3.2%	157	287.9	279.0
Davie	23	65.7%	12	34.3%	0	0.0%	35	253.7	281.0
Iredell	133	63.0%	68	32.2%	10	4.7%	211	313.0	314.0
District Totals	285	64.5%	140	31.7%	17	3.8%	442	302.4	302.0
District 23									
Alleghany	8	50.0%	7	43.8%	1	6.3%	16	369.6	345.5
Ashe	13	72.2%	4	22.2%	1	5.6%	18	245.0	240.0
Wilkes Yadkin	84 38	60.0% 77.6%	47	33.6%	9	6.4%	140 49	335.7 309.1	318.0 267.0
District Totals	143	64.1%	64	28.7%	16	7.2%	223	324.9	287.0
District 24					· · · ·				
Avery	46	64.8%	23	32.4%	2	2.8%	71 60	325.8	301.0
Madison Mitchell	16 9	26.7% 45.0%	19 9	31.7% 45.0%	25 2	41.7%	20	632.3 414.3	647.5 432.5
Watauga	66	60.6%	41	37.6%	2	1.8%	109	299.8	281.0
Yancey	15	51.72	12	41,4%	2	6.9%	29	344.7	355.0
District Totals	152	52.6%	104	36.0%	33	11.4%	289	387.6	352.0
District 25									
Burke	114	68.3%	46	27.5%	7	4.2%	167	308.9	291.0
Caldwell	83	51.2%	65	40.17	14	8.67	162	375.3	364.0
Catawba	194	70.5%	76	27.6%	5	1.8%	275	276.2	267.0
District Totals	391	64.7%	187	31.0%	26	4.3%	604	311.8	301.0
District 26						t transformer and the			
Mecklenburg	1,144	53.0%	884	41.0%	129	6.0%	2,157	364.8	335.0

Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 to June 30, 1988

AGES OF CIVIL CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 to June 30, 1988

		Ages (an a	Total	Mean	Median			
	<12	%	12-24	%	>24	%	Disposed	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
District 27A								n an Anna Anna Taolach Anna Anna Anna Anna	
Gaston	402	76.1%	112	21.2%	14	2.7%	528	257.0	241.0
District 27B									
leveland	71	57.3%	52	41.9%	1	0.8%	124	303.2	304.5
incoln	42	60.9%	24	34.8%	3	4.3%	69	321.6	314.0
District Totals	113	58.5%	76	39.4%	4	2.1%	193	309.8	313.0
latrict 28									
Buncombe	350	75.1%	100	21.5%	16	3.4%	466	260.7	231.5
Districz 29									
lenderson	61	55.5%	35	31.8%	14	12.7%	110	393.6	316.5
IcDowell	13	28.3%	24	52.2%	9	19.6%	46	523.2	531.5
olk	17	89.5%	1	5,3%	1	5.3%	19	276.6	185.0
lutherford	42	50.6%	20	24.1%	21	25.3%	83	435.7	359.0
Cransylvania	24	40.0%	24	40.0%	12	20.0%	60	485.9	480.5
District Totals	157	49.4%	104	32.7%	57	17.9%	318	433.8	371.5
District 30									
Cherokee	10	41.7%	10	41.7%	- 4	16.7%	24	434.6	466.5
Clay	2	25.0%	4	50.0%	2	25.0%	8	535.4	635.0
Graham	8	50.0%	- 6	37.5%	2	12.5%	16	450.6	331.5
laywood	43	45.3%	42	44.2%	10	10.5%	95	405.3	412.0
Jackson	24	60.0%	11	27.5%	5	12.5%	40	445.1	193.5
Macon	20	42.6%	18	38.3%	9	19.1%	47	461.9	1,43.0
Swain	6	37.5%	8	50.0%	2	12.5%	16	482.8	436.0
District Totals	113	45.9%	99	40.2%	34	13.8%	246	437.7	415.0
State Totals	.403	59,9%	4,943	31.5%		8.5%	15,685	345.9	293.0

Ages of Disnessed Cuses (Months)



SPECIAL PROCEEDING CASES



Following the general trend of the last decade, filings of estate and special proceedings increased. During 1987-88, estate filings increased by 4.0% and estate dispositions by 2.9%; special proceeding filings increased by 6.6% while dispositions of these cases increased by 17.5%.

FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS FOR ESTATES AND SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CLERKS OF SUPERIOR COURT

n

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

	Estates		Special Proceedings		
	Filed	Disposed	Filed	Disposed	
District 1					
Camden	66	69	32	24	
Chowan	171	148	78	50	
Currituck	171	159	95	59	
Dare	209	238	139	135	
Gates	73	60	47	21	
Pasquotank	332	298	135	81	
Perquimans	104	75	48	33	
District Totals	1,126	1,047	574	403	
District 2					
Beaufort	434	352	260	403	
Hyde	73	67 .	30	26	
Martin	212	242	107	66	
Tyrrell	33	37	26	12	
Washington	115	113	47	70	
District Totals	867	811	470	577	
District 3					
Carteret	430	465	343	183	
Craven	454	416	519	462	
Pamlico	74	59	32	27	
Pitt	653	690	579	507	
District Totals	1,611	1,630	1,473	1,179	
District 4					
Duplin	363	326	307	198	
Jones	89	86	51	47	
Onslow	457	307	1,165	846	
Sampson	431	421	369	268	
District Totals	1,340	1,140	1,892	1,359	
District 5					
New Hanover	792	627	1,223	1,125	
Pender	163	164	135	117	
District Totals	955	791	1,358	1,242	
District 6					
<u>District 6</u> Bertie	167	154	104	59	
Halifax	494	465	318	274	
Hertford	192	184	120	110	
Northampton	206	203	107	80	
District Totals	1,059	1,006	649	523	
District 7					
Edgecombe	471	477	301	253	
Nash	501	502	465	272	
Wilson	512	502	374	306	
District Totals	1,484	1,481	1,140	831	
District 8					
Greene	139	106	87	34	
Lenoir	514	487	350	381	
Wayne	731	728	845	833	
District Totals	1,384	1,321	1,282	1,248	

FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS FOR ESTATES AND SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CLERKS OF SUPERIOR COURT

Ø

0

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

	Estates		Special Proceedings	
	Filed	Disposed	Filed	Disposed
District 9			* 1160	Dishosed
Franklin	259	198	212	187
Granville	256	260	331	315
Person	229	251	140	137
Vance	284	273	176	165
Warren	211	211	104	85
District Totals	1,239	1,193	970	889
District 10				
Wake	1,878	1,786	2,827	2,736
District 11		.		
Harnett	423	394	304	208
Johnston	635	626	673	645
Lee	311	352	150	199
District Totals	1,369	1,372	1,127	1,052
District 12				
Cumberland	1,042	981	2,103	2,099
Hoke	92	99	83	88
District Totals	1,134	1,080	2,186	2,187
District 13				
Bladen	217	209	201	200
Brunswick	426	394	324	321
Columbus	399	454	302	276
District Totals	1,042	1,057	827	797
District 14				
Durham	1,204	1,186	1,660	1,544
District 15A				
Alamance	754	774	713	534
District 15B				
Chatham	292	299	156	195
Orange	471	462	542	508
District Totals	763	761	698	703
	705	/01	090	703
District 16				
Robeson	665	681	709	723
Scotland	275	276	347	267
District Totals	940	957	1,056	990
District 17A				
Caswell	128	123	106	94
Rockingham	676	705	365	335
District Totals	804	828	471	429
		· .		
<u>District 17B</u> Stokes	196	206	132	112
Surry	480	476	307	113 207
		· · · · ·		
District Totals	676	682	439	320
FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS FOR ESTATES AND SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CLERKS OF SUPERIOR COURT

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

(l

		Estates	Special	Special Proceedings				
	Filed	Disposed	Filed	Disposed				
District 18	0.000	a 164						
Guilford	2,302	2,189	2,367	2,380				
	an an the second se Second second							
District 19A								
Cabarrus	694	687	403	244				
Rowan	953	939	895	833				
District Totals	1,647	1,626	1,298	1,077				
0								
District 19B Montgomery	184	181	115	53				
Randolph	661	578	419	439				
District Totals	845	759	534	492				
District 20	and the second second							
Anson	132	113	93	42				
Moore	631	555	357	360				
Richmond	312	247	289	200				
Stanly	462	415	205	143				
Union	482	457	294	244				
District Totals	2,019	1,787	1,238	989				
District 21								
Forsyth	1,899	1,733	1,691	1,715				
		-,		-,				
Ristaria Do								
District 22 Alexander	136	112	183	121				
Davidson	902	831	553	424				
Davie	202	198	162	83				
Iredell	734	766	464	459				
District Totals	1 074	1 007	1 360	1 0.97				
District lotals	1,974	1,907	1,362	1,087				
District 23								
Alleghany	105	64	121	62				
Ashe	200	209	111	117				
Wilkes	283	253	398	347				
Yadkin	230	235	92	96				
District Totals	818	761	, 722	622				
District 24								
Avery	116	89	97	80				
Madison	106	84	71	72				
Mitchell	116	92	50	27				
Watauga	178	180	211	199				
Yancey	108	45	63	45				
District Totals	694	600	400	400				
District Totals	624	490	492	423				
District 25								
Burke	487	411	476	425				
Caldwell	487	618	337	309				
Catawba	704	638	500	253				
District Totals	1,678	1,667	1,313	987				
District 26								
Mecklenburg	2,984	3,065	4,307	4,441				
an a		-,	· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	.,				

FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS FOR ESTATES AND SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE CLERKS OF SUPERIOR COURT

0

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

	1	Estates	Special Proceedings			
	Filed	Disposed	Filed	Disposed		
District 27A Gaston	1,183	1,276	684	622		
		[-]				
District 27B						
Cleveland	606	539	531	400		
Lincoln	350	350	189	191		
District Totals	956	889	720	591		
District 28						
Buncombe	1,525	1,583	1,373	1,137		
District 29						
Henderson	753	663	330	371		
McDowell	248	200	243	233		
Polk	148	177	62	73		
Rutherford	506	444	263	193		
Transylvania	212	193	103	95		
District Totals	1,867	1,677	1,001	965		
District 30						
Cherokee	179	170	137	160		
Clay	42	28	36	32		
Graham	40	43	31	15		
Haywood	364	352	226	172		
Jackson	163	131	223	188		
Macon	223	202	278	266		
Swain	52	50	36	47		
District Totals	1,063	976	967	880		
State Totals	45,013	43,288	41,881	37,951		

CASELOAD TRENDS OF CRIMINAL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS

1978-79 - 1987-88



The number of criminal cases filed in the superior court continued to grow in 1987-88 largely due to an 8.0% increase in felony filings compared to 1986-87. Misdemeanor filings increased by 4.3%. Criminal filings grew at a faster pace than criminal dispositions, resulting in a 14.0% increase in the number of criminal cases pending in superior courts on June 30, 1988, as compared to the beginning of the fiscal year.

FILINGS OF CRIMINAL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS — BY TYPE OF CASE

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

A total of 88,948 criminal cases were reported filed in the Superior Courts, of which 55,284 were felonies, and 33,664 misdemeanors. These are broken down into the following specific types of cases:

FELONIES	Number Filed	% of Total Filings
Murder	529	1.0%
Manslaughter	100	0.2%
First Degree Rape	1,391	2.5%
Other Sex Offenses	371	0.7%
Robbery	2,073	3.7%
Assault	1,973	3.6%
Burglary/Breaking or Entering	11,823	21.4%
Larceny	6,454	11.7%
Arson & Burnings	286	0.5%
Forgery & Utterings	6,691	12.1%
Fraudulent Activity	5,045	9.1%
Controlled Substances	11,283	20.4%
Other*	7,265	13.1%
TOTAL	55,284	100.0%

MISDEME	ANORS
---------	-------

DWI Appeal	6,127	18.2%
Other Motor Vehicle Appeal	5,537	16.4%
Non-Motor Vehicle Appeal	18,209	54.1%
Misdemeanor Originating in Superior Court	3,791	11.3%
TOTAL	33,664	100.0%

*"Other" felony cases include a wide variety of offenses that do not fit squarely into any of the listed offenses above, including kidnapping, trespassing, crimes against public morality, perjury, and obstructing justice. When more than one offense is charged, the first offense listed in the criminal pleading (originating document) is used to assign the case type given above.

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

			Feld	onies					Misdeme	anors		
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caselond	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	
District_1												
Camden	7	31	38	27	71.1%	11	18	62	80	61	76.3%	19
Chowan	31	103	134	89	66.4%	45	29	150	179	127	70.9%	52
Currituck	12	74	86	64	74.4%	22	34	179	213	142	66.7%	71
Dare	86	311	397	242	61.0%	155	112	708	820	562	68.5%	258
Gates	17	51	68	48	70.6%	20	22	83	105	75	71.4%	30
Pasquotank	75	205	280	218	77.9%	62	123	542	665	587	88.3%	78
Perquimans	10	57	67	21	31.3%	46	40	112	152	113	74.3%	39
District Totals	238	832	1,070	709	66.3%	361	378	1,836	2,214	1,667	75.3%	547
District_2												
Beaufort	108	366	474	394	83.1%	80	105	326	431	343	79.6%	88
Hyde	16	52	68	34	50.0%	34	2	26	28	18	64.3%	10
Martin	36	173	209	147	70.3%	62	35	63	.98	74	75.5%	24
Tyrrell	15	22	37	31	83.8%	6	7	47	54	49	90.7%	
Washington	20	173	193	150	77.7%	43	21	81	102	84	82.4%	18
	105	786	0.01	754	77 12	0.05	170	640	710	560	70 78	94 E
District Totals	s 195	/00	981	756	77.1%	225	170	543	713	568	79.7%	145
District 3												
Carteret	51	408	459	404	88.0%	55	12	167	179	153	85.5%	26
Craven	146	566	712	546	76.7%	166	65	560	625	553	88.5%	72
Pamlico	21	42	63	39	61.9%	24	3	39	42	35	83.3%	7
Pitt	372	1,354	1,726	1,295	75.0%	431	314	1,407	1,721	1,356	78.8%	365
District Totals	s 590	2,370	2,960	2,284	77.2%	676	394	2,173	2,567	2,097	81.7%	470
District 4												
Duplin	17	692	709	649	91.5%	60	11	45	56	51	91.1%	5
Jones	56	64	120	114	95.0%	6	3	16	19	18	94.7%	ī
Onslow	260	1,541	1,801	1,520	84.4%	281	32	526	558	482	86.4%	76
Sampson	10	457	467	296	63.4%	171	0	86	86	67	77.9%	19
District Totals	s 343	2,754	3,097	2,579	83.3%	518	46	673	719	618	86.0%	101
	5 545	2,134	5,057	-,575	03.54	510	40	0,3	115	010		
District 5			1. Start 1.									
New Hanover	418	2,505	2,923	2,282	78.1%	641	125	1,027	1,152	873	75.8%	279
Pender	212	360	572	415	72.6%	157	30	100	130	88	67.7%	42
District Totals	s 630	2,865	3,495	2,697	77.2%	798	155	1,127	1,282	961	75.0%	321
Distantion 6												
District 6	61	100	104	121	01 14	22	17		03	94	41 04	40
Bertie	61	133	194	161	83.0%	33	13	70	83	34	41.0%	49
Halifax	66	474	540	440	81.5%	100	46	220	266	173	65.0%	93
Hertford Northampton	32 23	176 161	208 184	166 113	79.8% 61.4%	42 71	30 9	120 71	150 80	126 33	84.0% 41.3%	24 47
District Total	s 182	944	1,126	880	78.2%	246	98	481	579	366	63.2%	213
District 7												
Edgecombe	109	355	464	313	67.5%	151	74	241	315	244	77.5%	71
Nash	119	695	814	705	86.6%	109	35	341	376	307	81.6%	69
Wilson	164	482	646	540	83.6%	105	41	248	289	206	71.3%	83
District Total	s 392	1,532	1,924	1,558	81.0%	366	150	830	980	757	77.2%	223
District 8												
Greene	17	88	105	84	80.0%	21	12	58	70	.60	85.7%	10
Lenoir	78	356	434	333	76.7%	101	95	506	601	514	85.5%	87
Wayne	159	574	733	551	75.2%	182	164	701	865	697	80.6%	168
District Total	s 254	1,018	1,272	968	76.1%	304	271	1,265	1,536	1,271	82.7%	265

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988 Felonies

			Felc	onles					Misdeme	anors		
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caselond	Disposed	% Caselond Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
District 9												
Franklin	84	251	335	235	70.1%	100	60	295	355	221	62.3%	134
Granville	49	305	354	251	70.9%	103	41	172	213	136	63.8%	77
Person	83	274	357	237	66.4%	120	77	173	250	163	65.2%	87
Vance	132	420	552	307	55.6%	245	103	335	438	319	72.8%	/il19
Warren	30	66	96	82	85.4%	14	37	118	155	95	61,3% 🗠	60
District Totals	378	1,316	1,694	1,112	65.6%	582	318	1,093	1,411	934	66.2%	477
District 10												
Wake	1,888	3,992	5,880	4,511	76,7%	1,369	515	1,811	2,326	1,762	75.8%	564
District Il												
Harnett	49	285	334	281	84.1%	53	14	106	120	104	86.7%	16
Johnston	61	330	391	324	82.9%	67	26	494	520	447	86.0%	73
Lee	24	393	417	299	71.7%	118	11	229	240	198	82.5%	42
District Totals	134	1,008	1,142	904	79.2%	238	51	829	880	749	85,1%	131
DIBULICE TOLATS	134	1,000	1,146	504	13.44	230	7.	023	000	745	05,14	*~ 1
District 12	601	1 000	0 (10	1 004	79 59	(05	<u> </u>	00.1	757	005	CC (9)	110
Cumberland Hoke	621 35	1,998 156	2,619	1,924 150	73.5%	695 41	62 13	291 71	353 84	235 69	66.6%	118 15
поке	30	170	191	150	78.5%	41	13	/1	04	09	82.1%	12
District Totals	656	2,154	2,810	2,074	73.8%	736	75	362	437	304	69.6%	133
District 13												
Bladen	42	410	452	125	27.7%	327	31	99	130	106	81.5%	24
Brunswick	342	856	1,198	564	47.1%	634	39	135	174	147	84.5%	27
Columbus	115	231	346	203	58.7%	143	108	257	365	226	61.9%	139
District Totals	499	1,497	1,996	892	44.7%	1,104	178	491	669	479	71.6%	190
District 14												
Durham	737	1,765	2,502	1,880	75.1%	622	250	350	600	398	66.3%	202
N/												
<u>District 15A</u> Alamance	311	947	1,258	1,045	83.1%	213	155	604	759	651	85.8%	108
				• • •								
<u>District 15B</u> Chatham	64	215	279	189	67.7%	90	47	81	128	91	71.1%	37
Orange	187	717	904	677	74.9%	227	29	152	128	140	77.3%	41
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	10,				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						,,	-
District Totals	251	932	1,183	866	73.2%	317	76	233	309	231	74.8%	78
<u>District 16</u>												
Robeson	346	1,761	2,107	1,284	60.9%	823	193	779	972	675	69.4%	297
Scotland	161	428	589	244	41.4%	345	136	250	386	131	33.9%	255
District Totals	507	2,189	2,696	1,528	56.7%	1,168	329	1,029	1,358	806	59.4%	552
District 17A												
Caswell	8	127	135	105	77.8%	30	45	194	239	188	78.7%	51
Rockingham	350	974	1,324	1,000	75.5%	324	229	856	1,085	821	75.7%	264
District Totals	358	1,101	1,459	1,105	75.7%	354	274	1,050	1,324	1,009	76.2%	315
District 17B												
Stokes	53	283	336	261	77.7%	75	31	188	219	199	90.9%	20
Surry	43	595	638	441	69.1%	197	90	610	700	614	87.7%	86
District Totals	96	878	974	702	72.1%	272	121	798	919	813	88,5%	106

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

			Feld	nies					Misdeme	anors		
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
District 18												
Guilford	1,861	3,560	5,421	4,109	75.8%	1,312	286	456	742	607	81.8%	135
District 19A				1997) 1997 - 1997 1997 - 1997								
Cabarrus Rowan	396 291	724 727	1,120	844 900	75.4%	276	264	530	794	573	72.2%	221
NUWAII	291	121	1,018	900	88.4%	118	189	488	677	584	86.3%	93
District Totals	687	1,451	2,138	1,744	81.6%	394	453	1,018	1,471	1,157	78.7%	314
District 19B												
Montgomery	71	153	224	169	75.4%	55	125	301	426	268	62.9%	158
Randolph	526	573	1,099	712	64.8%	387	303	740	1,043	742	71.1%	301
District Totals	597	726	1,323	881	66.6%	442	 428	1,041	1,469	1,010	68.8%	459
District 20												
Anson	27	183	21(-	160	76.2%	50	72	350	422	326	77.3%	96
Moore	196	537	733	569	77.6%	164	108	442	550	394	71.6%	156
Richmond	106	604	710	581	81.8%	129	94	358	452	342	75.7%	110
Stanly	54	336	390	218	55.9%	172	52	261	313	219	70.0%	94
Union	166	502	668	532	79.6%	136	182	552	734	545	74.3%	189
District Totals	549	2,162	2,711	2,060	76.0%	651	508	1,963	2,471	1,826	73.9%	645
District 21												
Forsyth	813	2,598	3,411	2,542	74.5%	869	316	2,369	2,685	2,011	74.9%	674
District 22												
Alexander	30	. 91	121	- 90	74.4%	31	26	186	212	176	83.0%	36
Davidson	227	537	764	599	78.4%	165	94	584	678	568	83.8%	110
Davie	16	90	106	51	48.1%	55	30	214	244	158	64.8%	86
Iredell	150	462	612	416	68.0%	196	121	713	834	621	74.5%	213
District Totals	423	1,180	1,603	1,156	72.1%	447	271	1,697	1,968	1,523	77.4%	445
District 23												
Alleghany	15	17	32	16	50.0%	16	26	45	71	53	74.6%	18
Ashe	73	48	121	74	61.2%	47	45	70	115	52	45.2%	63
Wilkes	136	304	440	345	78.4%	95	144	375	519	393	75.7%	126
Yadkin	16	201	217	146	67.3%	71	4	155	159	119	74.8%	40
District Totals	240	570	810	581	71.7%	229	219	645	864	617	71.4%	247
District 24												
Avery	29	76	105	58	55.2%	47	20	47	67	53	79.1%	14
Madison	24	84	108	41	38.0%	67	. 13	18	31	10	32.3%	21
Mitchell	62	95	157	100	63.7%	57	20	58	78	49	62.8%	29
Watauga	200	261	461	188	40.8%	273	45	70	115	73	63.5%	42
Yancey	30	52	82	33	40.2%	49	24	18	42	25	59.5%	17
District Totals	345	568	913	420	46.0%	493	122	211	333	210	63.1%	123
District 25												
Burke	329	587	916	521	56.9%	395	323	495	818	497	60.8%	321
Caldwell	200	702	902	597	66.2%	305	218	579	797	574	72.0%	223
Catawba	801	1,012	1,813	1,108	61.17	705	376		1,048	601	57.3%	447
District Totals	1,330	2,301	3,631	2,226	61.3%	1,405	917	1,746	2,663	1,672	62.8%	991
District 26	1 020	2 0/1	6 070	3 645	71 04	1 005						
Mecklenburg	1,029	3,241	4,270	3,065	71,8%	1,205	511	1,602	2,113	1,534	72.6%	579

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL CASES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

 \mathcal{O}

			Felc	onies					Misdeme	anors		
Distant 274	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Cuselond	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
District 27A Gaston	317	1,471	1,788	1,396	78.1%	392	221	917	1,138	702	61.7%	436
District 27B												
Cleveland	147	429	576	448	77.8%	128	70					
Lincoln	72	302	374	302	80.7%	72	79 35	241	320	263	82.2%	57
			5/4	JU2	00.7%	14	32	201	236	158	66.9%	78
District Totals	219	731	950	750	78.9%	200	114	442	556	421	75.7%	135
District 28						an an An Anna an Anna						
Buncombe	282	1,011	1,293	1,011	78.2%	282	123	539	662	609	92.0%	53
District 29					1							
Henderson	98	380	478	272	56.9%	000						
McDowell	100	375	475	370		206	71	190	261	222	85.1%	39
Polk	30	53	83	32	77.9%	105	55	238	293	227	77.5%	66
Rutherford	175	379	554	414	38.6%	51	18	49	67	32	47.8%	35
Transylvania	83	276	359	130	74.7%	140	119	376	495	331	66.9%	164
,		2/0	222	130	36.2%	229	21	54	75	50	66.7%	25
District Totals	486	1,463	1,949	1,218	62.5%	731	284	907	1,191	862	72.4%	329
District 30												
Cherokee	114	272	386	244	63.2%	142	71			1		
Clay	7	22	29	21	72.4%	8	71	74	145	91	62.8%	54
Graham	41	46	87	60	69.0%	27	11 17	15	26	18	69.2%	8
Haywood	101	506	607	446	73.5%	161		51	68	42	61.8%	26
Jackson	77	282	359	179	49.9%	181	32	238	270	212	78.5%	58
Macon	63	109	172	122	70.9%		18	47	65	39	60.0%	26
Swain	57	134	191	139	72.8%	50 52	13 13	63 45	76 58	51 48	67.1% 82.8%	25 10
District Totals	460	1,371	1,831	1,211	66.1%	620	175	533	708	501	70.8%	207
State Totals	18,277	55,284	73,561	53,420	72.6% 2	0,141	8,952	33,664	42,616	31,703	74.4% 10	

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF FELONIES IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS



Guilty pleas continue to account for more than 60% of all superior court felony dispositions, with the overwhelming majority of these being guilty pleas to the offense as charged. Dismissals on this chart include voluntary dismissals with and without leave, and speedy trial dismissals. "Other" dispositions, i.e., those which do not fall into the specific categories given on this chart, may include change of venue, dismissal by the court, no true bill, dispositions of writs of habeas corpus from fugitive warrants, and dispositions of probation violations from other countries.

	Guil	ty Pleas			DA I	Dismissal	Speedy			Total
	A s Charged	Lesser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Trial Dismissals	Other	Total Dispositions	Negotiated Pleas
District 1										
Camden	8 4	6	2	3	0	0	0	8	27	9
Chowan	3	57	8 5	16 16	2 0	0 0	0 0	36	89	74
Currituck Dare	36 113	1 14		92	1	0	0		64 242	37 16
Gates	7	31	1	7	Ō	0	ŏ	2	48	40
Pasquotank	86	40	21	64	5	0	0	2	218	159
Perquimans	8	6	0	3	0	0	0	4	21	13
District Totals	261	155	48	201	8	0	0	36	709	348
% of Total	36.8%	21.9%	6.8%	28.3%	1.17	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	100.0%	49.1%
District 2			in the st					n gerin. The second		
Beaufort	221	67	26	65	8	0	2	5	394	311
Hyde	20		2 15	8 8	0	0	0	3	34 147	20
Martin Tyrrell	101 20	14 1	13	ŝ	4	0	Ö	0	31	103 13
Washington	92	13	7	28	6	õ	Õ	4	150	88
District Totals	454	96	53	112	24	Ŭ	2	15	756	535
% of Total	60.1%	12.7%	7.0%	14.8%	3.2%	0.0%	0.3%	2.0%	100.0%	70.8%
District 3										
Carteret	225	15	0	133	15	0	0	16	404	230
Craven	279	57	3	171	27	0	0	9	546	372
Pamlico Pitt	16 655	6 302	0 42	13 246	1 39	0	0 0	3 11	39 1,295	34 1,009
District Totals % of Total	1,175 51.4%	380 16.6%	45 2.0%	563 24.6%	82 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	39 1.7%	2,284 100.0%	1,645 72.0%
District 4										
Duplin	291	126	11	219	0	0	0	2	649	600
Jones	51	4	3	56	0	0	0	0	114	107
Onslow Semacon	573 177	167 27	63 5	671 80	24	0	0	22 5	1,520 296	696 154
Sampson	1//	21		00	.	v	Ŭ	,	270	154
District Totals	1,092 42.3%	324	82 3.2%	1,026	26	0 0.0%	0.0%	29 1.1%	2,579	1,557 60.4%
% of Total	44.34	12.6%	3,2%	39.8%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1/6	100.0%	00.4%
<u>District 5</u> New Hanover	1,313	332	55	541	28	0	0	13	2,282	991
Pender	161	47	14	186	1	Õ	0	6	415	269
District Totals	1,474	379	69	727	29	0	0	19	2,697	1,260
% of Total	54.7%	14.1%	2.6%	27.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	100.0%	46.7%
District 6										
Bertie	22	82	16	35	3 6	0	0	3	161	111
Halifax	141	41	17	223		9	1	. 2	440	334
Hertford	86	14	17	33	1	0	0	15	166	118.
Northampton	54	7	13	35	1	0	0	3	113	88
District Totals	303	144	63	326	11	9	1	23	880	651
% of Total	34.4%	16.4%	7.2%	37.0%	1.3%	1.0%	0.1%	2.6%	100.0%	74.0%
District 7	100	0E	`	120	7	^	•	10	21.5	144
Edgecombe Nash	128 359	25 66	9 17	132 227	25	0	0	12 11	313 705	146 408
Wilson	336	36	35	104	4	ŏ	0	25	540	381
District Totals	823	127	61	463	36	0	0	48	1,558	935
Z of Total	52.8%	8.2%	3.9%	29.7%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	100.0%	60.0%
	$g_{1}(\mathbf{r}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n} \setminus \mathbb{C}^{n}$									

(L-7)

	Guil	y Pleas			DA I	Dismissal	Speedy			Total
	A s Charged	Lesser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Trial Dismissals	Other	Total Dispositions	Negotiated Pleas
District 8										
Greene	3	44	2	30	3	. 0	0	2	84	64
Lenoir	162	31	28	80	22	Õ	õ	10	333	237
Wayne	232	93	35	167	10	ð	0	14	551	326
District Totals % of Total	397 41.0%	168 17.4%	65 6.7%	277 28.6%	35 3.6%	0.0%	0 0.0%	26 2.7%	968 100.0%	627 64.8%
<u>District 9</u> Franklin	114	33	5	71	2	0	0	10	235	189
Granville	152	**35	- 11	43	1	ŏ	õ	9	251	183
Person	118	49	15	46	2	ŏ	ŏ	7	237	170
Vance	189	0	6	81	16	0	0	15	307	186
Warren	60	9	1	12	0	0	0	0	82	68
District Totals % of Total	633 56.9%	126 11.3%	38 3.4%	253 22.8%	21 1.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	41 3.7%	1,112 100.07	796 71.6%
<u>District 10</u> Wake % of Total	2,368 52.5%	328 7.3%	78 1.7%	1,232 27.3%	396 8.8%	0 0.0%	28 0.6%	81 1.8%	4,511 100.0%	2,628 58.3%
District 11 Harnett	155	38	8	59	0	0	0	21	281	147
Johns ton	202	45	5	64	4	0	0	4	324	246
Lee	188	53	8	33	10	0	0	7	299	230
District Totals % of Total	545 60.3%	136 15.0%	21 2.3%	156 17.3%	14 1.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	32 3.5%	904 100.0%	623 68.9%
District 12 Cumberland	1,307	137	20	207	26	0	•		1.00/	1 226
Hoke	116	2	63 4	327 17	35 1	0	0	55 10	1,924 150	1,336 110
District Totals % of Total	1,423 68.6%	139 6.7%	67 3.2%	344 16.6%	36 1.7%	0.0%	0 0.0%	65 3.1%	2,074 100.0%	1,446 69.7%
District 13	·		· · · ·	1						
Bladen	51	21	5	41	2	0	0	5	125	71
Brunswick Columbus	234 79	82 6	26 14	204 86	13 2	0	0 1	5 15	564 203	404 99
	364									
District Totale % of Total	40.8%	109 12.2%	45 5.0%	331 37.1%	17 1.9%	0 0.0%	1 0.1%	25 2.8%	892 100.0%	574 64.3%
District 14 Durham	1,078	233	43	418	74	0	0	34	1,880	1,319
% of Total	57.3%	12.4%	2.3%	22.2%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	100.0%	70.2%
District 15A										
Alamance % of Total	657 62.9%	91 8.7%	50 4.8%	215 20.6%	8 0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	24 2.3%	1,045 100.0%	816. 78.1%
	02174	0.77		20.0%	0.0%	0.04	0.0%	2.54	100.0%	70.1%
District 15B Chatham	100	16	16	49	•4	0	0	4	189	143
Orange	377	25	10	192	21	0	0 0	55	677	395
District Totals	477	41	23	241	25	0	0	59	866	538
% of Total	55.1%	4.7%	2.7%	27.8%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.8%	100.0%	62.1%
District 16				· -		·				
Robeson Scotland	1,053 201	26 15	109 9	44 2	18 0	0 1	3 0	31 16	1,284 244	247 89
District Totals	1,254	41	118	46	10	1	3	47	1,528	336
% of Total	82.1%	2.7%	7.7%	3.0%	18 1.2%	0.1%	0.2%	3.1%	1,528	22.0%

5

	Gull	ty Pleas			DA I	Dismissal	Speedy			Total
	A s Charged	Lesser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Trial Dismissals	Other	Total Dispositions	Negotiated Pleas
District 17A										
Caswell	47	31	15	7	0	0	0	5	105	60
Rockingham	706	78	20	169	14	Ο	0	13	1,000	765
District Totals % of Total	753 68.1%	109 9.9%	35 3.2%	176 15.9%	14 1.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	18 1.62	1,105 100.0%	825 74.7%
<u>District 178</u> Stokes	199 370	6 21	19 7	1 24	0 6	0 0	0 0	36 13	261 441	64 173
Surry	570	41		24	U	v	.	13	441	
District Totals % of Total	569 81.1%	27 3.8%	26 3.7%	25 3.6%	6 0.9%	0.0%	0 0.0%	49 7.0%	702 100.0%	237 33.8%
District 18										
Guilford % of Total	2,655 64.6%	217 5.3%	129 3.1%	843 20,5%	180 4.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	85 2.1%	4,109 100.0%	2,762 67.2%
n										
<u>District 19A</u> Cabarrus	320	125	31	350	5	0	0	13	844	405
Rowan	331	206	31	301	13	ŏ	Ő	18	900	575
District Totals % of Total	651 37.3%	331 19.0%	62 3.6%	651 37.3%	18 1:0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	31 1.8%	1,744 100.0%	980 56.2%
District 19B										
Montgomery	61	23	10	60	0	0	0	15	169	82
Randolph	328	52	47	201	58	1	0	25	712	342
District Totals	389	75	57	261	58	1	ана 100 г. – 100	40	881	424
% of Total	44.2%	8.5%	6.5%	29.6%	6.6%	0.1%	0.0%	4.5%	100.0%	48.1%
District 20										
Anson	31	70	7	45	0	0	0	7	160	103
Moore	175	81	11	275	0	0	0	27	569	318
Richmond	248	46	14	241	6 0	0	0	26	581	443
Stanly Union	77 239	39 71	9 11	78 185	6	0	0	15 20	218 532	166 416
District Totals % of Total	770 37.4%	307 14.9%	52 2.5%	824 40.0%	12	0	0.0%	95 4.6%	2,060 100.0%	1,446 70.2%
				10.00	0104	0,0,0	0.00			,012.2
District 21	1 = 20	433	76	368	60	٥	0		0 540	1 600
Forsyth % of Total	1,539 60.5%	17.0%	3.0%	14.5%	2.4%	0 0,0%	0 0.0%	66 2.6%	2,542 100.0%	1,500 59.0%
District 22			1 .							
Alexander	41	9	8	28	0	0	0	4	90	64
Davidson	387	42	12	116	6	0	0	36	599	368
Davie	28	3	6	6	0	0	0	8	51	20
Iredell	238	26	30	100	0	0	0	22	416	208
District Totals % of Total	694 60.0%	80 6.9%	56 4.8%	250 21.6%	6 0.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	70 6.1%	1,156 100.0%	660 57.1%
District 23	. ·							· _	· · · ·	
Alleghany	3	7 9	5 2	1	0	0	0	0	16	13
Ashe Wilkes	28 215	37	11	21 42	10 19	0	0	21	74 345	44 159
Yadkin	126	9	3	42	.0	0	0	1	146	139
District Totals % of Total	372 64.0%	62 10.7%	21 3.6%	71 12.2%	29 5.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	26 4.5%	581 100.0%	347 59.7%

	Guil	ty Pleas			DA I	Dismissal	Speedy			Total
	A s Charged	Lesser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Trial Dismissals	Other	Total Dispositions	Negotiated Pleas
District 24										
Avery	0	16	21	19	1	0	0	1	58	32
Madison	13	11	8	4	1	1	0	3	41	28
Mitchell	13	32	2	49	1	1	0	2	100	78
Watauga	41	71	13	63	0	0	0	0	188	156
Yancey	0	13	5	15	0	0	0	0	33	21
District Totals	67	143	49	150	3	2	0	6	420	315
% of Total	16.0%	34.0%	11.7%	35.7%	0.7%	0.5%	0.0%	1.4%	100.0%	75.0%
District 25	100.	<u>(</u>)	• •						FO 1	101
Burke	188	68	16	210	33	0	0	6	521	181
Caldwell Catawba	205 503	87 0	13 27	252 462	28 34	0 0	0 0	12 82	597 1,108	445 489
District Totals	896	155	56	924	95	0	0	100	2,226	1,115
% of Total	40.3%	7.0%	2.5%	41.5%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	100.0%	50.1%
District 26										
Mecklenburg	229	1,622	96	856	190	0	3	69	3,065	1,633
% of Total	7.5%	52.9%	3.1%	27.9%	6.2%	0.0%	0.1%	2.3%	100.0%	53.3%
District 27A										
Gaston	543	93	82	515	101	0	1	61	1,396	617
% of Total	38.9%	6.7%	5.9%	36.9%	7.2%	0.0%	0.1%	4.4%	100.0%	44.2%
District 27B										
Cleveland	163	56	17	190	7.	0	0	15	448	92
Lincoln	169	16	14	74	5	0	0	24	302	166
District Totals	332	72	31	264	12	0	0	39	750	258
% of Total	44.3%	9.6%	4.1%	35.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	100.07	34.4%
District 28	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		· · · ·							
Buncombe	667	46	16	228	39	0	0	15	1,011	687
% of Total	66.0%	4.5%	1.6%	22.6%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	100.0%	68.0%
District 29										
Henderson	153	24	6	57	24	0	0	8	272	166
McDowell	226	35	5	96	6	0	0	2	370	324
Polk	7	4	1	19	0	0	0	1	32	9
Rutherford	223	62	22	93	9 .	0	0	5	414	298
Transylvania	39	17	7	49	14	0	0	4	130	82
District Totals % of Total	648 53.2%	142 11.7%	41 3.4%	314 25.8%	53 4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	20	1,218 100.0%	879 72.2%
* OF TOTAL	33.6%	11.14	3.44	23.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	100.0%	12.024
District 30	~	•	~ ~		· · ·	~	~		<u></u>	200
Cherokee	0	3	96	118	4	0	0	23	244	202
Clay	10	3	2	5	0	0	0	1	21	13
Graham	2 151	55	1 39	43 165	1	0	0	33	60 446	16. 257
Haywood Jackson	57	19	39	77	2	0	0	21	446	162
Macon	19	19	5	75	1	0	0	4	122	92
Swain	37	19	9	43	2	Ŏ	ŏ	29	139	100
District Totals	276	123	156	526	13	6	0	111	1,211	842
% of Total	22.8%	10.2%	12.9%	43.4%	1.1%	0.5%	0.0%	9.2%	100.0%	69:5%
State Totals	26,828	7,054	2,010	14,177	1,749	19	39	1,544	53,420	32,161
% of Total	50.2%	13.2%	3.8%		3.3%	0.0%	0.1%	2.9%	100.0%	60.2%

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF MISDEMEANORS IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS



July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

Guilty pleas account for 37% of misdemeanor dispositions in superior court, the overwhelming majority of which are guilty pleas to the offense charged. The "other" category on this chart includes withdrawn appeals, cases remanded to district court for judgment, and other miscellaneous dispositions such as change of venue, dismissal

Ø

C

33

by the court, no true bill, probation violations from other counties, and dispositions of writs of habeas corpus from fugitive warrants. Dismissals on this chart include voluntary dismissals with and without leave, and speedy trial dismissals. 'n

	Guilt	y Pleas	July 1, 1987 — Julie 30, 1988 DA Dismissal				Speedy			Total
	A s Charged	Leșser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Trial Dismissais	Other	Total Dispositions	Negotiated Pleas
District 1 Camden Chowan Currituck Dare Gates Pasquotank Perquimans	32 35 76 146 22 153 62	8 8 7 15 6 - 12	2 0 7 14 2 14 6	4 21 13 74 10 66 11	4 0 8 2 3 32 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	11 63 30 319 23 316 22	61 127 142 562 75 587 113	15 35 37 9 18 78 29
District Totals % of Total	526 31.6%	64 3.8%	45 2.7%	199 11.9%	49 2.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	784 47.0%	1,667 100.0%	221 13.3%
District 2 Beaufort Hyde Martin Tyrrell Washington	109 9 24 32 19	22 0 6 0 3	14 2 9 2 7	67 0 5 4 6	11 0 16 1 3	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	120 7 14 10 46	343 18 74 49 84	109 3 15 6 2
District Totals % of Total	193 34.0%	31 5.5%	34 6.0%	82 14.4%	31 5.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	197 34.7%	568 100.0%	135 23.8%
<u>District 3</u> Carteret Craven Pamlico Pitt	74 217 16 568	5 27 4 29	0 9 0 37	21 67 8 151	0 19 0 130	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	53 214 7 441	153 553 35 1,356	21 151 21 366
District Totals % of Total	875 41.7%	65 3.1%	46 2.2%	247 11.8%	149 7.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	715 34.1%	2,097 100.0%	559 26.7%
<u>District 4</u> Duplin Jones Onslow Sampson	8 3 215 24	3 5 8 2	2 4 31 4	23 1 134 26	0 2 11 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	15 3 83 10	51 18 482 67	27 8 172 17
District Totals % of Total	250 40.5%	18 2.9%	41 6.6%	184 29.8%	14 2.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	111 18.0%	618 100.0%	224 36.2%
<u>District 5</u> New Hanover Pender	449 41	52 8	22 10	194 17	21 2	0 0	0	135 10	873 88	231 29
District Totals % of Total	490 51.0%	60 6.2%	32 3.3%	211 22.0%	23 2.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	145 15.1%	961 100.0%	260 27.1%
<u>District 6</u> Bertie Halifax Hertford Northampton	3 36 20 9	10 0 1 0	1 4 2 0	13 30 14 11	1 9 6 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	6 94 83 12	34 173 126 33	17 62 20 13
District Totals % of Total	68 18.6%	11 3.0%	7 1.9%	68 18.6%	17 4.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	195 53.3%	366 100.0%	112 30.6%
<u>District 7</u> Edgecombe Nash Wilson	78 104 49	3 16 5	7 4 6	65 76 46	21 19 6	0 0 0	0 0 0	70 88 94	244 307 206	53 40 36
District Totals % of Total	231 30.5%	24 3.2%	17 2.2%	187 24.7%	46 6.1%	0 0.0%	0.0%	252 33.3%	757 100.0%	129 17.0%

123

	Guilt	ty Pleas	Jui	y 1, 19		June 30, 1988 Dismissal				
	As	Lesser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Speedy Trial Dismissals	Other	Total Dispositions	Total Negotiated Pleas
District 8								0	with our controlling	1143
Greene	14	24	2	11	2	0	0	7	60	11
Lenoir	158	36	16	104	28	Q	0	172	514	155
Wayne	137	65	27	131	23	0	0	314	697	178
District Totals % of Total	309 24.3%	125 9.8%	45 3.5%	246 19.4%	53 4.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	≉493 38.8%	1,271 100.0%	344 27.1%
District 9 Franklin	111	8	0	36	0	0	0	66	221	121
Granville	41	8	3	35	4	0	0	45	136	48
Person	52	8	1	37	5	0	0	60	163	60
Vance	174	0 4	9	84 18	4	0	0	48 26	319	156
Warren	44	4	U	10	3	U	U	20	95	46
District Totals % of Total	422 45.2%	28 3.0%	13 1.4%	210 22,5%	16 1,7%	0 0.0%	0.0%	245 26.2%	934 100.0%	431 46.1%
District 10		in an								
Wake	396	31	30	283	439	0	7	576	1,762	380
% of Total	22.5%	1.8%	1.7%	16.1%	24.9%	0.0%	0.4%	32.7%	100.0%	21.6%
District 11										
Harnett	37	8	5	14	0	Ú.	0	40	104	32
Johnston	119	32	8	51	15	Ō	0	222	447	138
Lee	87	6	2	38	5	0	0	60	198	105
District Totals % of Total	243 32.4%	46 6.1%	15 2.0%	103 13,8%	20 2.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	322 43.0%	749 100.0%	275 36.7%
Disturbation 12										
District 12 Cumberland	66	0	25	25	14	0	0	105	235	59
Hoke	22	2	1	9	6	õ	Ő	29	69	17
		- -	-	· .						
District Totals	88	2	26	34	20	0	0	134	304	76
% of Total	28.9%	0.7%	8.6%	11.2%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	44.1%	100.0%	25.0%
District 13										
Bladen	24	9	5	25	3	0	0	40	106	28
Brunswick	52	14	13	30	11	õ	ŏ	27	147	49
Columbus	74	4	19	32	5	1	0	91	226	67
District Totals	150	27	37	87	19	1	0 0	158	479	144
% of Total	31.3%	5.6%	7.7%	18.2%	4.0%	0.2%	0.0%	33.0%	100.0%	30.1%
District 14										
Durham	118	21	13	89	19	0	0	138	398	140
% of Total	29.6%	5,3%	3.3%	22.4%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	34.7%	100.0%	35.2%
District 15A Alamance	296	9	22	98	18	0	0	208	651	289
% of Total	45.5%	1.4%	3.4%	15.1%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%	100.0%	44.4%
	13.54	* • - 7/*			210/3	0.0.	0.00	02107	200108	
District 15B										
Chatham	20	6	8	7	0	0	0	50	91	25
Orange	18	1	5	69	2	0	0	45	140	18
District Totals	38	7	13	76	2	0	0	95	231	43
% of Total	16.5%	3.0%	5.6%	32.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	41.1%	100.0%	18.6%
District 16				· · ·						
Robeson	273	1	58	25	14	0	4	300	675	68
Scotland	43	2	7	3	0	0	0	76	131	16
District Totals	316	3	65	28	14	0	4	376	806	84
% of Total	39.2%	0.4%	8.1%	3.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.5%	46.7%	100.0%	10.4%

	Guilt	y Pleas			DAI	Dismissal	Canada			PPD at a b
	A s Charged	Lesser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Speedy Trial Dismissals	Other	Total Dispositions	Total Negotiated Pleas
<u>District 17A</u> Caswell	69	45	11	38	0	0	0	25	188	• 58 , •
Rockingham	426	35	22	82	31	Ŏ	Ŏ	225	821	370
District Totals % of Total	495 49.1%	80 7.9%	33 3.3%	120 11.9%	31 3,1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	250 24.8%	1,009 100.0%	428 42.4%
District 17B Stokes Surry	118 271	6 2	12 16	3 18	7 31	0 0	0 0	53 276	199 614	15 81
District Totals % of Total	389 47.8%	8 1.0%	28 3.4%	21 2,6%	38 4.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	329 40.5%	813 100.0%	96 11.8%
District 18										
Guilford % of Total	257 42.3%	8 1.3%	20 3.3%	126 20.8%	48 7.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	148 24.4%	607 100.0%	244 40.2%
District 19A Cabarrus Rowan	202 123	14 16	18 19	106 161	55 51	0	0	178 214	573 584	94 108
District Totals	325	30	37	267	106	Ö	0	392	1,157	202
% of Total	28.1%	2.6%	3.2%	23.1%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	33.9%	100.0%	17.5%
District 19B Montgomery	77	11 · ·	0.1	77	0	0	0	103	268	71
Randolph	321	11	14	106	94	0	0	196	742	218
District Totals % of Total	398 39.4%	22 2.2%	14 1.4%	183 18.1%	94 9.3%	0 0.0%	0.0%	299 29,6%	1,010 100.0%	289 28.6%
District 20 Anson	80	61	9	70	1	0	0	105	326	92
Moore Richmond	130 96	11 13	5	118 99	0	0	0	130 130	394 342	165 169
Stanly Union	65 144	8 31	1	39 157	4 18	0	Ő	102 191	219 545	55 213
District Totals % of Total	515 28.2%	124 6.8%	19 1.0%	483 26.5%	27 1.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	658 36.0%	1,826 100.0%	694 38.0%
District 21 Forsyth	851	79	31	269	140	0	0	641	2,011	690
% of Total	42.3%	3.9%	1.5%	13.4%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.9%	100.0%	34.3%
District 22 Alexander	25	4	3	22	4	0	0	118	176	21
Davidson	122	9	8	88	31	0	0	310	568	92
Davie Iredell	33 123	5	3 13	5 85	0 12	0 0	0	112 381	158 621	8 68
District Totals % of Total	303 19,9%	25 1.6%	27 1.8%	200 13.1%	47 3.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	921 60.5%	1,523 100.0%	189 12.4%
<u>District 23</u> Alleghany	2		9	14	1	0	0	27	53	7
Ashe	15	1	6	9	2	0	0	19	52	14
Wilkes Yadkin	85 45	15 7	19 6	25 6	15 2	0	0	234 53	393 119	28 43
District Totals % of Total	147 23.8%	23 3.7%	40 6.5%	54 8.8%	20 3.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	333 54.0%	617 100.0%	92 14.9%

	Guil	ty Pleas			DA E	lismissal	Speedy			Total
	A s Charged	Lesser Offense	Jury Trials	Without Leave	With Leave	After Deferred Prosecution	Trial Dismissals	Other	Total Dispositions	Negotiated Pleas
<u>District 24</u> Avery Madison Mitchell Watauga Yancey	1 3 7 16 2	8 0 2 3 6	25 2 3 7 6	11 3 22 31 11	0 0 1 2 0	0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	8 1 14 14 14 0	53 10 49 73 25	17 3 13 28 8
District Totals % of Total	29 13.8%	19 9.0%	43 20.5%	78 37.1%	3 1.4%	1 0.5%	0 0.0%	37 17.6%	210 100.0%	69 32.9%
<u>District 25</u> Burke Caldwell Catawba	87 80 157	23 43 0	11 9 14	94 130 112	35 37 82	0 0 0	0 0 0	247 275 236	497 574 601	48 195 122
District Totals % of Total	324 19.4%	66 3.9%	34 2.0%	336 20.1%	154 9.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	758 45.3%	1,672 100.0%	365 21.8%
District 26 Mecklenburg % of Total	96 6.3%	289 18.8%	64 4.2%	630 41.1%	45 2.9%	0 0.0%	2 0.1%	408 26.6%	1,534 100.0%	293 19.1%
District 27A Gaston % of Total	153 21.8%	5 0.7%	63 9.0%	191 27.2%	101 14.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	189 26.9%	702 100.0%	107 15.2%
<u>District 27B</u> Cleveland Lincoln	54 38	23 6	23 11	74 45	4 1	0 0	0 0	35 57	263 158	9 26
District Totals % of Total	92 21.9%	29 6.9%	34 8.1%	119 28.3%	5 1.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	142 33.7%	421 100.0%	35 8.3%
District 28 Buncombe % of Total	371 60.9%	7 1.1%	18 3.0%	60 9.9%	45 7.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	108 17.7%	609 100.0%	241 39.6%
District 29 Henderson McDowell Polk Rutherford Transylvania	113 121 11 138 14	4 3 1 8 3	6 8 1 17 4	32 47 8 63 18	5 9 0 15 3	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	62 39 11 90 8	222 227 32 331 50	93 121 9 132 23
District Totals % of Total	397 46.1%	19 2.2%	36 4.2%	168 19.5%	32 3.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	210 24.4%	862 100.0%	378 43.9%
District 30 Cherokee Clay Graham Haywood Jackson Macon Swain	1 7 24 89 3 9 8	3 0 4 6 6 1 1	31 3 0 15 4 2 4	24 2 3 27 8 13 10	U 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	32 6 10 75 18 26 25	91 18 42 212 39 51 48	38 6 12 85 15 15 13
District Totals % of Total	141 28.1%	21 4.2%	59 11.8%	87 17.4%	0.0%	1 0.2%	0 0.0%	192 38.3%	501 100.0%	184 36.7%
State Totals % of Total	10,292 32.5%	1,426 4.5%	1,101 3.5%	5,824 18.4%	1,885 5.9%	3 0.0%	13 0.0%	11,159 35.2%	31,703 100.0%	8,442 26.6%

(A)

			Ago	s of Pendir	ng Cases (I	Days)		Total	Mean	Median
0		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Pending	Age	Age
District 1	са с с С. С. С. С.									
Camden	Fe1	4	1	0	6	0	0	11	160.9	241.0
	Mis	11	1	1	4	2	0	19	145.3	80.0
Chowan	Fel	21	16	3	3	2	0	45	94.5	108.0
Currituck	Mis Fel	31 4	9 1	2 5	8 8	2	0	52	96.4	61.5
CUTTILUCK	Mis	34	5	12	11	9	0	22 71	257.0 160.7	265.0 115.0
Dare	Fel	67	16	16	37	19	ŏ	155	162.8	97.0
	Mis	86	33	47	06	10	2	258	154.7	126.0
Gates	Fel	18	0	1	0	1	0	20	60.7	38.0
Pasquotank	Mis Fel	18 42	4 12	1	5 5	2 0	0	30	117.5 68.4	63.0
rasquotaux	Mis	53	7	3	15	0	0	62 78	97.7	42.0 63.0
Perquimans	Fel	7	19	17	2	i	ŏ	46	122.5	106.0
	Mis	12	3	7	13	3	1	39	205.4	134.0
Dist Totals % of Total	Fel	163 45.2%	65	45	61	27	0 0.0%	361	132.9	97.0
% OL IOLAL	Mis	245	18.0% 62	12.5% 73	16.9% 136	7.5% 28	3	100.0% 547	143.1	105.0
% of Total		44.8%	11.3%	13.3%	24.9%	5.1%	0.5%	100.0%	14041	103.0
District 2	n -		••	-	1.0	•	2 <u>-</u> 11	~~		
Beaufort	Fel Mis	43 58	10 6	7	12 11	1 0	7	80	230.1	69.0
Hyde	Fel	27	0	13 3	2	2	0.0	88 34	80.5 62.1	44.0 10.0
nyac	Mis	9	0	1	õ	õ	0	10	25.0	10.0
Martin	Fel	40	0	19	0	3	ō	62	109.1	75.5
	Mis	12	1	2	9	0	0	24	120.7	87.0
Tyrrell	Fel	1	0	1	4	0	0	6	161.1	183.0
Washington	Mis Fel	5 9	0 4	0 23	0 6	0	0	5	49.0	52.0
Washington	Mis	14	0	25	3	0	0	43 18	128.6 66.1	121.0 42.5
		••••			.		ų	10	00.1	42.7
Dist Totals	Fe1	120	14	53	24	7	7	225	150.2	80.0
% of Total		53.3%	6.2%	23.6%	10.7%	3.1%	3.1%	100.0%		
% of Total	Mis	98 67.6%	7 4.8%	17 11.7%	23 15.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	145	80.4	45.0
% OI IOLAI		07.0%	4.0%	11.7/2	13.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 3										
Carteret	Fel	31	12	3	1	8	0	55	143.2	78.0
	Mis	14	4	3	5	0	0.0	26	103.8	75.0
Craven	Fel Mis	114 55	7 9	13 4	30 4	2 0	0	166 72	85.5 69.6	20.5 51.0
Pamlico	Fel	15	0	. 7.	1	0	1	24	123.1	52.0
	Mis	2	1	2	2	Õ	ō	7	142.0	146.0
Pitt	Fel	280	54	46	39	7	5	431	94.9	58.0
	Mis	222	45	55	42	1	0	365	84.8	48.0
Dist Totals	Fel	440	73	69	71	17	6	676	97.5	52.0
% of Total		65.1%	10.8%	10.2%	10.5%	2.5%	0.9%	100.0%	21.2	52.0
	Mis	293	59	64	53	1	0	470	84.4	51.0
% of Total		62.3%	12.6%	13.6%	11.3%	0.2%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 4										
Duplin	Fel	53	0	3	4	0	0	60	45.7	10.0
	Mis	5	0	Ō	0	Õ .	õ	5	17.8	23.0
Jones	Fel	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	37.5	37.5
• •	Mis	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	135.0	135.0
Onslow	Fel Mis	228 62	12 10	18	21 3	2	0	281	64.8 48.7	50.0
Sampson	Fel	171		0	.0	0	0	76 171	48.7 29.7	29.0 27.0
- amp a 411	Mis	17	2	ŏ	0	ŏ	ŏ	19	27.6	13.0
the second se				-	-				11	
Dist Totals		458	12	21	25	2	0	518	50.7	28.0
% of Total		88.4%	2.3%	4.1%	4.8%	0.4%	0.0%	100.0%		00.0
% of Total	Mis	84 83.2%	12 11.9%	2 2.0%	3 3.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	101 100.0%	44.0	28.0
. or local		UJ 0 L /6		2.0/	J. UM	0.0%	0.04	100.0%		

		Ages of Pending Cases (Days)						Total	Mean	
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Pending	Age	Age
District 5										
New Hanover	Fel	360	82	72	98	29	0	641	113.0	71.0
	Mis	153	30	41	47	8	0	279	109.2	76.0
Pender	Fel	135	3	2	15	0	2	157	85.1	59.0
	Mis	27	3	4	6	2	0	42	106.3	49.0
Dist Totals	Fel	495	85	74	113	29	2	798	107.5	64.0
% of Total		62.0%	10.7%	9.3%	14.2%	3.6%	0.3%	100.0%		
% of Total	Mis	180 56.1%	33 10.3%	45 14.0%	53 16.5%	10 3.1%	0 0.0%	321 100.0%	108.8	73.0
			101.5.4	*****	10.5%	J 5 4 / 6	0.0%	100.0%		
District 6 Bertie	Fe1	20	0	6	5	2	0	33	118.8	77 0
DELCIC	Mis	20	2	5	13	8	1	49	194.7	77.0 126.0
Hallfax	Fel	48	21	8	21	2	ō	100	110.0	91.0
	Mis	43	10	8	22	10	õ	93	150.6	97.0
Hertford	Fel	20	6	7	7	1	1	42	127.8	107.0
	Mis	11	9	2	1	1	0	24	107.6	106.5
Northampton	Fel	28	10	22	11	0	0	71	109.1	115.0
	Mis	13	8	10	16	0	0	47	153.1	123.0
Dist Totals	Fel	116	37	43	44	5	1	246	114.0	101.0
% of Total		47.2%	15.0%	17.5%	17.9%	2.0%	0.4%	100.0%		
	Mis	87	29	25	52	19	1	213	156.5	113.0
% of Total		40.8%	13.6%	11.7%	24.4%	8.9%	0.5%	100.0%		
District 7										
Edgecombe	Fel	83	14	20	19	15	0	151	128.4	78.0
	Mis	28	7	13	13	10	0	71	153.2	125.0
Nash	Fel	90	9	0	9	. 1	0	109	58.3	38.0
Wilson	Mis Fel	48 28	7	6	7	0	1	69	83.7	38.0
WLISON	Fel Mis	36	39 4	11 20	17 16	10 4	1 3	106 83	170.7	115.0
	1110	50	4	20	10	. 4		03	154.3	129.0
Dist Totals	Fe1	201	62	31	45	26	1	366	119.8	78.0
% of Total		54.9%	16.9%	8.5%	12.3%	7.1%	0.3%	100.0%		
	Mis	112	18	39	36	14	4	223	132.1	86.0
% of Total		50.2%	8.1%	17.5%	16.1%	6.3%	1.8%	100.0%		
District 8				e te è						
Greene	Fel	14	0	3	2	2	0	21	111.3	45.0
	Mis	8	1	1	0	0	0	10	62.0	56.5
Lenoir	Fel	42	10	12	36	1	0	101	138.6	92.0
	Mis	62	9	4	11	1	0	87	76.7	50.0
Wayne	Fel	103	26	20	26	7	0	182	103.0	64.0
	Mis	83	22	23	36	3	1	168	124.6	96.0
Dist Totals	Fel	159	36	35 -	64	10	0	304	115.4	83.0
% of Total		52.3%	11.8%	11.5%	21.1%	3.3%	0.0%	100.0%	1998 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 -	
% of Total	Mis	153 57.7%	32 12.1%	28 10.6%	47. 17.7%	4 1.5%	1 0.4%	265 100.0%	106.5	69.0
							••••			
District 9	8.01	27	3	10	n .	_	•	100	107.0	FA A
Franklin	Fel Mis	67 83	18	19 4	2	7	2	100	107.8	50.0
Granville	Fel	82	6	7	5	12	12	134 103	198.7 86.5	37.0
OLANVIIIC	Mis	50	11	5	7	4	0	77	111.1	73.0 73.0
Person	Fel	56	19	33	3	2	7	120	189.3	93.0
	Mis	42	19	9	10	0	7	87	165.0	93.0
Vance	Fel	188	10	10	6	8	23	245	149.7	36.0
	Mis	76	4		13	8	9	119	172.0	57.0
Warren	Fel	7	1	9 2	3	1	0	14	141.0	87.5
	Mis	38	10	3	1	8	0	60	110.0	71.0
Dist Totals	Fel	400	39	71	21	18	33	582	139.3	64.0
% of Total		68.7%	6.7%	12.2%	3.6%	3.1%	5.7%	100.0%		
	Mis	289	62	30	36	32	28	477	160.6	64.0
% of Total		60.6%	13.0%	6.3%	7.5%	6.7%	5.9%	100.0%		

Ages	or Ca	ses P	ending	lune 30,	1988
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		-		

			Age	s of Pendir	ng Cases (E	Days)		Total	Mean	Median
		0.90	91-120	121-180	181.365	366-730	>730	Pending	Age	Age
District 10 Wake % of Total	Fel	637	121 8.8%	299 21.8%	206	98 7 9%	8 0.6%	1,369	134.0	104.0
% of Total	Mis	46.5% 371 65.8%	59 59 10.5%	35 6.2%	15.0% 47 8.3%	7.2% 48 8.5%	4 0.7%	100.0% 564 100.0%	111.6	55.0
		0.0.4	10.3%	0164	0.3%	0.3%	0.7.4	100.0%		
District 11 Harnett	Fel	30	9	0	8	5	1	53	132.4	83.0
	Mis	8	1	2	0	4	1	16	228.5	87.0
Johnston	Fel Mis	58 62	4	1 6	4 2	0	0	67 73	63.5 53.0	51.0 36.0
Lee	Fe1	76	18	12	9	3	0	118	71.1	42.0
	Mis	28	2	4	7	1	0	42	90.0	65.5
Dist Totals % of Total	Fel	164 68.9%	31 13.0%	13 5.5%	21 8.8%	а 3.4%	1 0.4%	238 100.0%	82.6	52.0
	Mis	98	6	12	9	5	1	131	86.3	43.0
% of Total		74.8%	4.6%	9.2%	6.9%	3.8%	0.8%	100.0%		
District 12	R-1	200	140	126	61	07		(05	117 7	02.0
Cumberland	Fel Mis	308 60	140 35	136 12	81 7	27 4	3 0	695 118	117.7 97.3	92.0 86.0
Hoke	Fel	8	3	4	23	3	0	41	211.6	262.0
	Mis	10	2	1	2	. 0	0	15	78.7	43.0
Dist Totals % of Total	Fel	316 42,9%	143 19.4%	140 19.0%	104 14.1%	30 4.1%	3 0.4%	736 100.0%	122.9	92.0
% OI IQUAL	Mis	70	37	13	9	4.1%	0.4%	133	95.2	86.0
% of Total		52.6%	27.8%	9.8%	6.8%	3.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 13										
Bladen	Fel Mis	306 12	0 3	5 7	16 2	0	0	327 24	30.5 100.8	17.0 87.0
Brunswick	Fel	487	18	17	13	88	11	634	140.3	73.0
	Mis	7	2	4	13	1	0	27	173.6	192.0
Columbus	Fel	53 91	5 13	7 10	59	12 6	7 3	143	249.4	206.0
	Mis		15	10	16	0	3	139	124.6	48.0
Dist Totals % of Total	Fel	846 76.6%	23 2.1%	29 2.6%	88 8.0%	100 9.1%	18	1,104 100.0%	121.9	45.0
A OL IOLAL	Mis	110	18	21	31	7	3	190	128,6	70.5
% of Total		57.9%	9.5%	11.1%	16.3%	3.7%	1.6%	100.0%		
District 14										
Durham % of Total	Fel	308 49.5%	66 10.6%	72 11.6%	98 15.8%	65 10.5%	13 2.1%	622 100.0%	168.0	93.0
% OI IOCAL	Mis	66	25	16	21	28	46	202	338.6	161.0
% of Total		32.7%	12.4%	7.9%	10.4%	13.9%	22.8%	100.0%		
District 15A										n in sentense Sentense fils
	Fel	174	22	10	6	1	0	213	56.8	50.0
% of Total	Mis	81.7%	10.3% 5	4.7%	2.8%	0.5% 3	0.0%	100.0% 108	91.8	50.0
% of Total		75.9%	4.6%	3.7%	12.0%	2.8%	0.9%	100.0%		
District 15B										
Chatham	Fel	77	8	3	2	0	0	90	49.5	35.0
Orange	Mís Fel	26 152	2 25	3 31	5 16	1 3	0	37 227	89.3 85.5	45.0 64.0
orange.	Mis	22	6	7	5	1	0	41	94.6	65.0
Dist Totals	Fel	229	33	34	18	3	0	317	75.3	48.0
% of Total		72.2%	10.4%	10.7%	5.7%	0.9%	0.0%	100.0%		
% of Total	Mis	48 61.5%	8 10.3%	10 12.8%	10 12.8%	2 2.6%	0.0%	78 100.0%	92.1	52.0
N OL IUCAL		01.3%	10.3%	42.0%	12:0%	4 • V /a	0.0%	100.0%		

			Age	s of Pendir	ng Cases (I	Days)	요구 신문	Total	Mean	Median
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Pending	Age	Age
District 16									, se stêre	
Robeson	Fel	384	202	124	102	• 7	4	823	108.2	93.0
	Mis	151	62	44	33	5	2	297	112.3	86.0
Scotland	Fel	135	60	44	69	36	1	345	152.5	111.0
	Mis	63	16	41	65	16	54	255	369.0	226.0
Dist Totals	Fe1	519	262	168	171	43	5	1,168	121.3	94.0
% of Total	1 A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	44.4%	22.4%	14.4%	14.6%	3.7%	0.4%	100.0%		
	Mis	214	78	85	98	21	56	552	230.9	115.0
% of Total	.110	38.8%	14.1%	15.4%	17.8%	3.8%	10.1%	100.0%	230+3	115.0
District 17A										
Caswell	Fel	15	0	14	1	0	0	30	105.8	106.0
ORSWELL	Mis	41	0	6	4	0	0	51		
Rooktochom		193	19	.75	31		-		70.5	30.0
Rockingham	Fel	132		54		6	0	324	97.2	56.0
	Mis	132	40	54	30	8	0	264	106.3	88.0
Dist Totals	Fel	208	19	89	32	6	0	354	98.0	64.0
% of Total		58.8%	5.4%	25.1%	9.0%	1.7%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	173	40	60	34	8	0	315	100.5	76.0
% of Total		54.9%	12.7%	19.0%	10.8%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 17B		· · · ·								
Stokes	Fel	46	24	0	5	0	0	75	73.0	51.0
DEORES	Mis	15	2	1	2	0	0	20	66.1	
Surry	Fel	156	2	22	13					40.0
Surry						0	4	197	113.6	70.0
	Mis	73	2	2	7	2	0	86	71.5	50.5
Dist Totals	Fel	202	26	22	18	0 0	4	272	102.4	59.0
% of Total		74.3%	9.6%	8.1%	6.6%	0.0%	1.5%	100.0%		
	Mis	88	4	3	9	2	0	106	70.5	50.0
% of Total		83.0%	3.8%	2.8%	8.5%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 18										
Guilford	Fel	569	175	123	279	145	21	1,312	174.8	100.0
% of Total		43.4%	13.3%	9.4%	21.3%	11.1%	1.6%	100.0%	1/4.0	100.0
a or rotar	Mis	77	29	10	11	7	1.0%	135	112 2	79.0
% of Total		57.0%	21.5%	7.4%	8.1%	5.2%	0.7%	100.0%	113.2	72.0
Di										
District 19A	7 -1	150		61	60	·		076	00.0	70.0
Cabarrus	Fel	150	33	64	22	7	0	276	99.3	79.0
b	Mis	130	28	15	32	14	2	221	122.0	55.0
Rowan	Fel	56	11	8	14	29	0	118	180.3	95.5
	Mis	61	3	9	9	10	1	93	115.0	49.0
Dist Totals	Fel	206	44	72	36	36	0	394	123.6	79.0
% of Total		52.3%	11.2%	18.3%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	191	31	24	41	24	3	314	119.9	55.0
% of Total		60.8%	9.9%	7.6%	13.1%	7.6%	1.0%	100.0%		55.0
District 19B										
	Fal	23	2	λ	21		^	**	102 0	147 0
Montgomery	Fel		3	4	21	2	2	55	183.2	147.0
0	Mis	69	9	7	23	23	27	158	281.8	125.0
Randolph	Fe1	160	55	76	64	32	0	387	138.1	101.0
	Mis	94	47	40	88	29	. 3	301	183.2	141.0
		100	58	80	85	34	2	442	143.7	106.0
Dist Totals	Fel	103	20	00						
Dist Totals % of Total		183 41.4%							143.1	100.0
			13.1% 56	18.1% 47	19.2% 111	7.7% 52	0.5% 30	100.0% 459	217.1	141.0

			Age	s of Pendin	ng Cases (l	Days)		Total	Mean	Median
	n sense i la Nord de la Sense	0-90	91.120	121-180	181-365		>730	Pending	Age	Age
District 20										
Anson	Fel	19	12	10	8	1	0	50	110.3	98.0
	Mis	44	19	19	7	7	0	96	107.8	99.0
Moore	Fel	66	42	11	34	10	1	164	144.9	115.0
	Mis	94	15	23	14	9	1	156	127.0	86.0
Richmond	Fel	72 69	2 17	48 5	2 11	3	2	129	101.6 114.9	73.0
Stanly	Mis Fel	64	56	23	25	4	Ö	110 172	121.0	56.0 92.0
Ucanty	Mis	62	5	11	16	ō	Ŭ,	94	94.4	66.0
Union	Fel	.76	12	18	13	2	15	136	253.3	73.0
	Mis	68	22	29	12	16	42	189	364.2	122.0
Dist Totals	Fe1	297	124	110	82	20	18	651	150.0	92.0
% of Total		45.6%	19.0%	16.9%	12.6%	3.1%	2.8%	100.0%	130.0	72,0
	Mis	337	78	87	60	40	43	645	186.9	86.0
% of Total		52.2%	12.1%	13.5%	9.3%	6.2%	6.7%	100.0%		
District 21										
Forsyth	Fel	507	144	94	78	46	0	869	106.7	78.0
% of Total		58.3%	16.6%	10.8%	9.0%	5.3%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	480	46	79	55	12	2	674	80.9	55.0
% of Total		71.2%	6.8%	11.7%	8.2%	1.8%	0.3%	100.0%		
District 22										
Alexander	Fel	16	2	1	7	5	0	31	163.8	86.0
	Mis	21	0	10	· · 5 ·	0	0	36	103.8	86.0
Davidson	Fel	109	12	22	8	9	5	165	117.3	36.0
	Mis	79	18	4	6	2	1	110	77.9	52.0
Davie	Fel	27	14	7	2	5	0	55	117.1	91.0
Triada 11	Mis Fel	51 90	6 46	13	16	0	0	86	102.0	69.0
Iredell	Mis	136	40	36	12 19	4	0	196 213	98.4 89.6	97.0 65.0
	111.3	150	10	50		-	v	213	02.0	02.0
Dist Totals	Fel	242	74	74	29	23	5	447	112.2	80.0
% of Total		54.1%	16.6%	16.6%	6.5%	5.1%	1.1%	100.0%		
% of Total	Mis	287 64.5%	42 9.4%	63 14.2%	46 10.3%	6 1.3%	1 0.2%	445 100.0%	90.3	65.0
District 23				·	· · · ·					
Alleghany	Fel	3	4	3	4	1	1	16	231.1	177.0
Acho	Mis	10 8	1	1	4	0	2	18	199.2	78.0
Ashe	Fel Mis	17	6	18.	6 17	15 11	0	47 63	241.3 218.2	161.0 143.0
Wilkes	Fel	63	7	9	13	1	2	95	116.5	64.0
	Mis	58	10	15	33	6	4	126	164.5	101.0
Yadkin	Fe1	58	8	5	0	Ö -	0	71	43.7	36.0
	Mis	30	4	2	4	0	0	40	71.3	43.0
D.J	D 1	100	10	75	0.0		~	000	107 (<i>(</i>) <i>(</i>)
Dist Totals % of Total	Fe1	132 57.6%	19 8.3%	35 15.3%	23 10.0%	17 7.4%	3 1.3%	229 100.0%	127.6	64.0
% OI IUCAI	Mis	115	21	30	58	17	6	247	165.7	97.0
% of Total		46.6%	8.5%	12.1%	23.5%	6.9%	2.4%	100.0%	105.7	37.0
Diabut-h 91					•					
District 24	Pol	16	9	15	3	2	2	47	167 1	112.0
Avery	Fel Mis	2	2	3	3	4	2 0	14	167.1	189.5
Madison	Fel	15	12	ŏ	34	6	ŏ	67	233.0	322.0
	Mis	7	0	4	1	9	0	21	242.2	170.0
Mitchell	Fel	7	10	24	3	13	0	57	209.6	163.0
	Mis	20	1	5	2	1	0	29	96.1	45.0
Watauga	Fel	22	110	11	9	121	0	273	261.5	128.0
	Mis	18	5	3	4	12	0	42	216.0	112.0
Yancey	Fel	6	0	15	25	3	0	49	212.6	192.0
	Mis	3	5	3	5	0	1	17	198.0	128.0
Dist Totals	Fel	66	141	65	74	145	2	493	237.8	161.0
% of Total		13.4%	28.6%	13.2%	15.0%	29.4%	0.4%	100.0%		
.	Mis	50	13	18	15	26	-1	123	191.1	113.0
% of Total		40.7%	10.6%	14.6%	12.2%	21.1%	0.8%	100.0%		

131

			Age	s of Pendir	ng Cases (I	Days)		Total	Mean	Median
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Pending	Age	Age
District 25										
Burke	Fel	135	13	53	137	41	16	395	228.7	162.0
	Mis	102	30	75	76	20	18	321	240.7	140.0
Caldwell	Fel	161	51	49	34	7	3	305	109.1	79.0
	Mis	115	30	40	23	14	1	223	116.4	78.0
Catawba	Fe1	158	97	71	178	182	19	705	258.9	198.0
	Mis	193	65	46	69	62	12	447	187.7	104.0
Dist Totals	Fel	454	161	173	349	230	38	1,405	217.9	148.0
% of Total		32.3%	11.5%	12.3%	24.8%	16.4%	2.7%	100.0%	21/.7	140.0
	Mis	410	125	161	168	96	31	991	138.8	111.0
% of Total		41.4%	12.6%	16.2%	17.0%	9.7%	3.1%	100.0%	100.0	111.0
D										
District 26	n . 1	(20	107	n+3	101		~ ~			
Mecklenburg	Fel	632	137	218	134	62	22	1,205	136.7	78.0
% of Total		52.4%	11.4%	18.1%	11.1%	5.1%	1.8%	100.0%		
	Mis	282	97	69	78	47	6	579	148.8	91.0
% of Total	•	48.7%	16.8%	11.9%	13.5%	8.1%	1.0%	100.0%		
District 27A										
Gaston	Fel	258	54	30	44	6	0	392	89.7	58.0
% of Total		65.8%	13.8%	7.7%	11.2%	1.5%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	228	49	67	70	15	7	436	127.1	81.5
% of Total		52.3%	11.2%	15.4%	16.1%	3.4%	1.6%	100.0%		
District 27B			•							•
Cleveland	Fel	64	16	24	20			100	120 6	
Cleveland			16	- ·	20	3	1	128	130.6	89.0
	Mis	31	8	6	10	1	1	57	128.3	73.0
Lincoln	Fel	22	3	6	26	8	7	72	265.5	212.0
	Mis	28	2	21	21	3	3	78	182.9	154.0
Dist Totals	Fel	86	19	30	46	11	8	200	179.1	112.0
% of Total		43.0%	9.5%	15.0%	23.0%	5.5%	4.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	59	10	27	31	4	4	135	159.8	100.0
% of Total		43.7%	7.4%	20.0%	23.0%	3.0%	3.0%	100.0%		
District 28					and the second sec					
Buncombe	Fel	215	20	15	17			000	70 /	69.0
			29	15	17	4	2	282	78.4	57.0
% of Total		76.2%	10.3%	5.3%	6.0%	1.4%	0.7%	100.0%		
% of Total	Mis	43 81.1%	5 9.4%	3 5.7%	2 3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	53 100.0%	62.0	49.0
						••••				
District 29 Henderson	Rai	85	64	10	20	17	· · · ·	007	120.2	
uenuer soll	Fel.			19	20	17	1	206	139.3	112.0
McDowe11	Mis .	23	11	1	2	2	0	39	97.8	66.0
ACDOWEIT	Fel	39 44	26	28 5	2	7	3	105	138.5	119.0
Bath	Mis		8		5	4	0	66	101.3	48.0
Polk	Fel	9	5	10	13	11	3.	51	311.8	325.0
0	Mis	9	Ö -	11	11	4	0	35	188.8	129.0
Rutherford	Fel	77	4	19	25	13	2	140	145.1	60.0
	Mis	122	6	13	16	4	3	164	94.8	45.0
Transylvania	Fel	160	19	14	17	10	9	229	135.6	24.0
	Mis	8	4	2	8	3	0	25	193.0	135.0
Dist Totals	Fel	370	118	90	77	58	18	731	151.2	85.0
% of Total		50.6%	16.1%	12.3%	10.5%	7.9%	2.5%	100.0%		
	Mis	206	29	32	42	17	3	329	113.9	58.0
% of Total		62.6%	8.8%	9.7%	12.8%	5.2%	0.9%	100.0%		-010

			Age	Total	Mean	Median				
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Pending	Age	Age
District 30										
Cherokee	Fel	23	2	20	61	18	18	142	379.2	205.0
	Mis	6	4	5	8	5	26	54	677.6	460.5
Clay	Fel	1	3	0	4	Ö	0	8	171.8	178.0
	Mis	6	1	0	0	Ō	ĩ	8	168.8	3.0
Graham	Fel .	10	0	4	13	a l	õ	27	157.2	126.0
	Mis	11	1	2	7	3	2	26	257.8	134.5
Haywood	Fel	73	32	22	19	6	9	161	200.8	92.0
	Mis	44	7	1	4	2	0	58	81.9	60.0
Jackson	Fel	70	0	74	32	4	0	180	130.6	129.0
	Mis	11	0 0	9	5 5	0	1	26	157.6	143.0
Macon	Fel	7	0	21	13	7	2	50	271.2	150.0
	Mis	16	3	0	2	0	4	25	287.1	57.0
Swain	Fel	16	33	1	2	0	0	52	94.2	101.0
	Mis	2	0	1	6	1	0	10	267.1	315.0
Dist Totals	Fel	200	70	142	144	35	29	620	215.7	125.5
% of Total	на 1976 г. Н	32.3%	11.3%	22.9%	23.2%	5.6%	4.7%	100.0%		
	Mis	96	16	18	32	11	34	207	306.0	94.0
% of Total		46.4%	7.7%	8.7%	15.5%	5.3%	16.4%	100.0%		
State Totals	Fel	10,572	2,536	2,669	2,727	1,367	270	20.141	136.9	79.0
% of Total		52.5%	12.6%	13.3%	13.5%	6.8%	1.3%	100.0%		
	Mis	5,885	1,241	1,317	1,540	610	320	10,913	145.4	78.0
% of Total		53.9%	11.4%	12.1%	14.1%	5.6%	2.9%	100.0%		

AGES OF FELONY (FEL) AND MISDEMEANOR (MIS) CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

		2		of Dispos	34. ⁻ 1			, c 50, 198		
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365		>730	Total Disposed	Mean Age	Median Age
District 1										
Camden	Fel	15	0	1	11	0	0	27	120.1	49.0
	Mis	24	3	9	22	3	0	61	159,9	143.0
Chowan	Fe1	61	5	7	15	0	1	89	111.2	71.0
	Mis	101	8	7	11	0	0	127	62.5	55.0
Currituck	Fel	33	8	17	6	0	0	64	85.8	85.0
Dawa	Mis	86 100	17 35	23 32	14	2 7	0	142 242	97.1	71.0
Dare	Fel Mis	378	65	52 61	68 49	9	0	562	134.6 77.8	101.0 56.5
Gates	Fel	23	7	9	8	0	1	48	129.8	98.5
	Mis	30	12	21	12	ŏ	ō	75	120.0	108.0
Pasquotank	Fel	109	45	31	28	4	1	218	117.0	91.0
	Mis	389	64	92	41	1.1	0	587	73.8	57.0
Perquimans	Fel	10	4	2	5	0	0	21	106.1	96.0
	Mis	63	16	18	15	1	0	113	99.6	89.0
Dist Totals	Fel	351	104	99	141	- 11	3	709	120.1	91.0
% of Total		49.5%	14.7%	14.0%	19.9%	1.6%	0.4%	100.0%		
	Mis	1,071	185	231	164	16	0	1,667	83.3	63.0
% of Total		64.2%	11.1%	13.9%	9.8%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 2										
Beaufort	Fel	226	47	63	50	8	0	394	99.9	77.0
	Mis	219	55	36	29	4	0	343	84.5	65.0
Hyde	Fel	12	5	4	7	0	6	34	379.6	120.5
Martin	Mis R-1	9	3	6	0	0 3	0	18	79.1	85.5
nartin	Fel Mis	87 29	9	33 18	16 15	3	0	147 74	101.5 139.9	80.0 115.5
Tyrrell	Fel	11	2	10	16	1	0	31	161.1	181.0
	Mis	22	15	7	4	1	ŏ	49	107.9	106.0
Washington	Fe1	116	13	4	16	1	Ō	150	83.2	63.0
	Mis	49	17	5	11	2	0	84	103.8	84.5
Dist Totals	Fel	452	75	105	105	13	6	756	112.0	72.0
% of Total		59.8%	9.9%	13.9%	13.9%	1.7%	0.8%	100.0%	112.0	72.0
	Mis	328	99	72	59	10	0	568	96.4	77.0
% of Total		57.7%	17.4%	12.7%	10:4%	1.8%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 3										
Carteret	Fel	258	47	64	35	0	0	404	74.3	38.0
	Mis	122	11	12	7	0	1	153	61.6	42.0
Craven	Fel	301	73	65	97	6	4	546	108.7	84.0
	Mis	451	39	31	28	4	0	553	58.2	43.0
Pamlico	Fel	12	8	10	5	4	0	39	155.0	112.0
	Mis	16	6	7	6	0	0	35	95.1	105.0
Pitt	Fel Mis	635 751	170 176	247 157	175 215	68 57	0	1,295 1,356	130.2 112.5	93.0
		751	110	171	215	57	U	00.061	112.5	80.5
Dist Totals	Fel	1,206	298	386	312	78	4	2,284	115.6	86.0
% of Total		52.8%	13.0%	16.9%	13.7%	3.4%	0.2%	100.0%		
	Mis	1,340	232	207	256	61	1	2,097	94.2	66.0
% of Total		63.9%	11.1%	9.9%	12.2%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 4										
Duplin	Fel	608	30	5	6	· 0	0	649	31.6	20.0
	Mis	46	4	1	0	0	0	51	34.2	22.0
Jones	Fel	75	5	23	11	0	0	114	62.1	8.0
A A	Mis	7	5	4	2	0.00	0	18	109.8	92.0
Onslow	Fel	1,256	118	101	40	3	2	1,520	54.9	39.0
Sampson	Mis Fel	395 269	47 6	29 5	11 12	0	0	482 296	53.2	43.0
Jampson	Mis	65	2	0	0	4	0	296	41.9 31.4	27.0 21.0
		05	4.	v			U I		91.4	21.0
Dist Totals	Fel	2,208	159	134	69	7	2	2,579	47.9	33.0
% of Total		85.6%	6.2%	5.2%	2.7%	0.3%	0.1%	100.0%		
	Mis	513	58	34	13	0	0	618	50.9	39.0
% of Total		83.0%	9.4%	5.5%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%		

AGES OF FELONY (FEL) AND MISDEMEANOR (MIS) CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

			Ages of Disposed Cases (Days)					Total	Mean	Median
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Disposed	Age	Age
District 5										
New Hanover	Fel	1,340	278	327	314	21	2	2,282	97.4	75.0
	Mis	574	97	137	63	2	0	873	83.4	66.0
Pender	Fel	140	21 21	81 18	152 7	21 1	0	415 88	159.8 112.6	133.0 110.0
	Mis	40	21	19	· · · · · · · · ·	1	-	00	112.0	110.0
Dist Totals	Fel	1,480	299	408	466	42	2	2,697	107.0	79.0
% of Total	161	.54.9%	11.1%	15.1%	17.3%	1.6%	0.1%	100.0%		
W OT ICCHT	Mis	614	118	155	70	3	1	961	86.1	69.0
% of Total		63.9%	12.3%	16.1%	7.3%	0.3%	0.1%	100.0%		
District 6										
Bertie	Fel	85	13	21	39	3	0	161	123.4	81.0
	Mis	20	3	. 8	2	1	0	34	97.3	82.0
Halifax	Fel	306	32	57	27	16	2	440	82.7	42.0
	Mis	95	7	38	27	6	0	173	103.6	76.0
Hertford	Fel	114	16	5	29	2 .	~ 0	166	83.9	45.0
	Mis	53	42	19	12	0	0	126	95.4	111.0
Northampton	Fel	80	10	14	6	3	0	113	82.6	80.0
	Mis	22	2	3	6	0	0	33	92.8	73.0
				07	101	•	•	0.00	00.4	/0 0
Dist Totals	Fel	585	71	97	101	24	2	880	90.4	49.0
% of Total		66.5%	8.1%	11.0%	11.5%	2.7%	0.2%	100.0%	99.2	85.0
9 - E M 1	Mis	190	54	68	47	7 1.9%	0 0.0%	366 100.0%	99.2	0.00
% of Total		51.9%	14.8%	18.6%	12.8%	1.9%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 7		te de la composition								
Edgecombe	Fel	195	22	36	45	15	0	313	101.8	55.0
nagecompe	Mis	167	20	14	31	12	Õ	244	96.9	62.0
Nash	Fel	588	65	33	15	4	÷ õ	705	62.8	53.0
nuon	Mis	249	20	19	17	1	1 1	307	60.9	35.0
Wilson	Fel	365	38	57	66	14	0	540	78.4	45.0
	Mis	144	7	26	23	6	0	206	93.1	60.5
Dist Totals	Fel	1,148	125	126	126	33	0	1,558	76.0	52.0
% of Total		73.7%	8.0%	8.1%	8.1%	2.1%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	560	47	59	71	19	1	757	81.3	49.0
% of Total		74.0%	6.2%	7.8%	9.4%	2.5%	0.1%	100.0%		
District 8						1997 - 1 997 - 1 99	•		00.0	77 0
Greene	Fel	50	15	2	16	1	0	84	82.0	77.0
	Mis	45	. 7	3	5	0	0	60 333	77.3 85.3	62.5
Lenoir	Fel	230	30	29 36	34	10 6	0	514	70.0	47.0 47.0
17	Mis	397	42 49	82	33 55	19	0	551	103.8	74.0
Wayne	Fel Mis	346 410	76	95	94	22	0	697	98.7	76.0
	018	410	10	95			U U	. 057	50.7	70.0
Dist Totals	Fe1	626	94	113	105	30	0	968	95.5	70.0
% of Total		64.7%	9.7%	11.7%	10.8%	3.1%	0.0%	100.0%		
. 01 10001	Mis	852	125	134	132	28	0	1,271	86.1	59.0
% of Total		67.0%	9.8%	10.5%	10.4%	2.2%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 9										
Franklin	Fel	113	25	46	50	· 1	0	235	116.9	92.0
	Mis	136	44	22	13	5	1	221	99.5	77.0
Granville	Fel	164	27	14	46	0	0	251	97.8	72.0
	Mis	75	11	18	21	8	3	136	150.5	81.0
Person	Fe1	119	35	33	42	. 4	4	237	129.6	90.0
	Mis	78	27	15	26	11	6	163	180.8	91.0
Vance	Fe1	131	53	44	55	6	18	307	201.4	101.0
	Mis	157	62	44	40	13	3	319	131.1	92.0
Warren	Fel	39	13	12	15	3	0	82	110.6	96.0
	Mis	43	18	11	19	4	0	95	122.3	98.0
						1.2	~~ `	1 1	100.0	00.0
Dist Totals	Fel	566	153	149	208	14	22	1,112	138.2	90.0
% of Total	M 4 -	50.9%	13.8%	13.4%	18.7%	1.3%	2.0%	100.0% 934	126 9	86.5
9 a E mar 1	Mis	489	162	110	119	41	13		134.2	00.0
% of Total		52.4%	17.3%	11.8%	12.7%	4.4%	1.4%	100.0%		

AGES OF FELONY (FEL) AND MISDEMEANOR (MIS) CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS

Ages of	Cases	Disposed	July 1	, 1987 —	June 30, 1	1988
 - · · ·						

			Ages	of Dispos	ed Cases ()	Days)	Total	Total	Mean	Median
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Disposed	Age	Age
District 10										
Wake	Fel	2,022	537	634	841	390	87	4,511	166.2	104.0
% of Total		44.8%	11.9%	14.1%	18.6%	8.6%	1.9%	100.0%		
	Mis	1,266	133	115	175	60	13	1,762	97.3	52.0
% of Total		71.9%	7.5%	6.5%	9.9%	3.4%	0.7%	100.0%		
District 11										
	Fel	197	41	24	17	2	0	281	76.4	58.0
	Mis	83	11	8	0	2	0	104	57.3	40.0
Johns ton	Fe1	264	20	30	10	0	0	324	64.4	53.0
	Mis	329	46	61	11	0	0	447	58.7	45.0
Lee	Fel	222	34	28	9	6	0	299	73.1	61.0
	Mis	160	26	4	8	0	0	198	64.7	56.0
Dist Totals	Fel	683	95	82	36	8	0	904	71.0	57.0
% of Total		75.6%	10.5%	9.1%	4.0%	0.9%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	572	83	73	19	2	0	749	60.1	49.0
% of Total		76.4%	11.1%	9.7%	2.5%	0.3%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 12										
	Fel	1,081	189	283	280	85	6	1,924	112.0	78.0
	Mis	161	26	19	22	6	Î.	235	88.8	55.0
	Fe1	57	16	31	43	.3	0	150	130.7	128.0
	Mis	43	2	9	9	4	2	69	129.6	55.0
Dist Totals	Fel	1,138	205	314	323	88	36	2,074	113.3	80.0
% of Total		54.9%	9.9%	15.1%	15.6%	4.2%	0.3%	100.0%	110.0	00.0
	Mis	204	28	28	31	10	3	304	98.1	55.0
% of Total		67.1%	9.2%	9.2%	10.2%	3.3%	1.0%	100.0%		
District 13										
	Fel	39	27	28	12	16	3	125	188.8	108.0
	Mis	57	15	20	12	2	õ	106	100.5	87.0
	Fel	229	85	123	82	44	1	564	151.4	101.0
	Mis	56	31	26	20	13	ī	147	161.4	111.0
Columbus	Fel	30	21	59	75	18	0	203	186.3	145.0
	Mis	97	32	28	53	15	1	226	140.7	109.0
Dist Totals	Fel	298	133	210	169	78	4	892	164.6	126.5
% of Total		33.4%	14.9%	23.5%	18.9%	8.7%	0.4%	100.0%	104.0	120.0
	Mis	210	78	74	85	30	2	479	138.2	106.0
% of Total		43.8%	16.3%	15.4%	17.7%	6.3%	0.4%	100.0%		
District 14										
Durham	Fel	942	188	275	335	99	41	1,880	149.9	90.0
% of Total		50.1%	10.0%	14.6%	17.8%	5.3%	2.2%	100.0%		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
	Mis	194	33	44	57	35	35	398	242.0	94.0
% of Total		48.7%	8.3%	11.1%	14.3%	8.8%	8.8%	100.0%		
District 15A										
	Fel	606	143	166	112	15	3	1,045	98.5	72.0
% of Total		58.0%	13.7%	15.9%	10.7%	1.4%	0.3%	100.0%	50.5	,
	Mis	454	66	61	58	10	2	651	85.9	62.0
% of Total		69.7%	10.1%	9.4%	8.9%	1.5%	0.3%	100.0%		
District 15B										
	Fel .	81	20	39	37	11	1	189	149.4	113.0
	Mis	34	4	12	39	2	Ō	91	149.4	147.0
Orange	Fel	308	150	120	93	5	1	677	112.1	99.0
	Mis	100	14	12	14	ō	ō	140	75.7	55.0
Dist Totals	Fel	389	170	159	120	16	2	044	100.0	100.0
% of Total	.et	44.9%	19.6%	18.4%	130 15.0%	1.8%	0.2%	866	120.3	100.0
	Mis	134	19.0%	24	53	2	0.2%	100.0%	104.4	80.0
% of Total		58.0%	7.8%	10.4%	22.9%	0.9%	0.0%	100.0%		00.0
				~~ • 7/4	~~~~	V. 7 M		200.08		1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -

AGES OF FELONY (FEL) AND MISDEMEANOR (MIS) CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

		••••	Ares	Ages of Disposed Cases (Days)					Mean	Median
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Total Disposed	Age	Age
District 16										
Robeson	Fe1	710	244	164	148	17	1	1,284	102.7	84.0
	Mis	385	88	110	73	15	4	675	109.1	80.0
Scotland	Fel	45	47	32	102	13	5	244	199.3	175.0
	Mis	34	31	18	30	17	1	131	188.0	122.0
Dist Totals	Fel	755	291	196	250	30	6	1,528	118.1	91.0
% of Total		49.4%	19.0%	12.8%	16.4%	2.07	0.4%	100.0%		
i i de l'estate de la companya de la	Mis	419	119	123	103	32	5	806	121.9	86.0
% of Total		52.0%	14.8%	15.9%	12.8%	4.0%	0.6%	100.0%		
District 17A										
Caswell	Fel	65	13	17	· · · 7 · ·	3	0	105	89.1	71.0
	Mis	131	12	21	23	0	1	188	88.4	71.5
Rockingham	Fel	469	132	195	196	7	1	1,000	119.9	96.0
e Artico de La Cartera. A porte de la Cartera de La	Mis	399	99	156	150	14	. 3	821	112.7	94.0
Dist Totals	Fel	534	145	212	203	10	1	1,105	117.0	91.0
% of Total		48.3%	13.1%	19.2%	18.4%	0.9%	0.1%	100.0%		
	Mis	530		177	173	14	4	1,009	108.2	83.0
% of Total		52.5%	11.0%	17.5%	17.1%	1.4%	0.4%	100.0%		
District 17B										
Stokes	Fel	135	23	50	49	4	0	261	118.5	80.0
	Mis	116	10	44	28	1	0	199	104.9	69.0
Surry	Fel	244	123	35	37	2	Ó	441	91.6	81.0
•	Mis	417	79	46	65	7	0	614	83.3	64.0
Dist Totals	Fel	379	146	85	36	6	0	702	101.6	80.5
% of Total		54.0%	20.8%	12.1%	12.3%	0.9%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	533	89	90	93	8	0	813	88.6	65.0
% of Total		65.6%	10.9%	11.1%	11.4%	1.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 18										
Guilford	Fel	1,776	403	705	738	401	86	4,109	169.8	111.0
% of Total		43.2%	9.8%	17.2%	18.0%	9.8%	2.1%	100.0%	102.0	111.0
	Mis	290	28	73	159	46	11	607	162.7	101.0
% of Total		47.8%	4.6%	12.0%	26.2%	7.6%	1.8%	100.0%	102.	101.0
District 19A										
Cabarrus	Fel	426	139	179	81	19	0	844	102.6	90.0
	Mis	227	87	114	131	13	1	573	133.4	110.0
Rowan	Fel	478	91	176	128	27	0	900	109.7	83.0
	Mis	352	90	36	55	44	7	584	119.0	64.0
Dist Totals	Fel	904	230	355	209	46	0	1,744	106.3	88.0
% of Total		51.8%	13.2%	20.4%	12.0%	2.6%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	579	177	150	186	57	8	1,157	126.1	90.0
% of Total		50.0%	15.3%	13.0%	16.1%	4.9%	0.7%	100.0%		
District 19B										
Montgomery	Fel	41	23	44	44	14	3	169	191.1	154.0
	Mis	137	28	42	46	15	õ	268	131.7	88.0
Randolph	Fel	122	77	198	234	69	12	712	202.7	159.0
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Mis	340	92	109	156	42	3	742	135.7	97.0
Dist Totals	Fel	163	100	242	278	83	15	881	200.5	156.0
% of Total		18.5%	11.4%	27.5%	31.6%	9.4%	1.7%	100.0%		
	Mis	477	120	151	202	57	3	1,010	134,6	97.0
% of Total		47.2%	11.9%	15.0%	20.0%	5.6%	0.3%	100.0%		
	÷.,									

137

AGES OF FELONY (FEL) AND MISDEMEANOR (MIS) CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

			Ages	of Dispos	of Disposed Cases (Days)				Mean	Median
		0.90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Total Disposed	Age	Age
District 20										
Anson	Fe1	118	12	12	15	3.	0	160	82.6	55.5
	MLs	232	15	34	34	.11	0	326	90.1	55.0
Moore	Fel	373	33	92	52	16	3	569	105.4	64.0
Richmond	Mis Fel	247 429	40 79	51 27	48	6	2	394	98.0 65.6	74.0
ATCHINGHA	Mis	250	38	27	24	3	0	581 342	69.0	35.0 46.0
Stanly	Fel	104	42	38	26	8	Õ	218	107.3	93.0
	Mis	149	16	21	29	4	0	219	93.8	60.0
Union	Fe1	365	42	46	69	10	0	532	91,5	60.0
	Mis	353	50	55	73	9	5	545	103,7	65.0
Dist Totals	Fel	1,389	208	215	204	41	3	2,060	89.0	64.0
% of Total		67.4%	10.1%	10.4%	9.9%	2.0%	0.1%	100.0%	0510	01.0
	Mis	1,231	159	188	208	33	7	1,826	92.4	58.0
% of Total		67.4%	8.7%	10.3%	11.4%	1.8%	0.4%	100.0%		
District 21										
Forsyth	Fel	1,339	422	446	299	36	0	2,542	105.1	86.0
% of Total		52.7%	16.6%	17.5%	11.8%	1.4%	0.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	1,455	239	117	160	40	0	2,011	81.8	61.0
% of Total		72.4%	11.94	5.8%	8.0%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 22										
Alexander	Fel	45	16	5	24	0	0	90	110.4	84.5
	Mis	110	27	12	24	3	0	176	93.1	69.0
Davidson	Fel	314	91	88	87	17	2	599	116.1	83.0
Davie	Mis Fel	404 26	53 7	53 10	52 8	6	0	568 51	81.2	61.0
DAVIE	Mis	112	18	22	6	0	0	158	100.6 69.3	85.0 49.0
Iredell	Fel	230	30	63	86	7	ŏ	416	112.8	82.0
	Mis	488	56	43	31	2	1	621	64.3	46.0
Dist Totals	Fel	615	144	166	205	24	2	1,156	113.8	83.0
% of Total	rer	53.2%	12.5%	14.4%	17.7%	2.1%	0.2%	100.0%	115.0	03.0
. 01 10001	Mis	1,114	154	130	113	11	1	1,523	74.5	53.0
% of Total		73.1%	10.1%	8.5%	7.4%	0.7%	0.1%	100.0%		5510
District 23										
Alleghany	Fe1	8	. 0	0	3	4	1	16	283.9	184.0
	Mis	21	6	4	12	10	ō	53	184.6	118.0
Ashe	Fel	18	8	8	11	19	10	74	336.3	224.0
te produktione en	Mis	8	14	7	13	8	2	52	235.4	143.0
Wilkes	Fel	74	79	67	78	39	8	345	208.0	144.0
Valleta	Mis Rel	192	37	60	66	31	7	393	148.8	93.0
Yadkin	Fel Mis	84 77	33	14 25	12 8	3	0	146	90.0	76.0
	111.5		,	4.5	0		, V	119	87.6	69.0
	Fel	184	120	89	104	65	19	581	196.8	120.0
% of Total		31.7% 298	20.7%	15.3%	17.9%	11.2%	3.3%	100.0%	117 1	04.0
% of Total	Mis	48.3%	66 10.7%	96 15.6%	99 16.0%	49 7.9%	9 1.5%	617 100.0%	147.4	94.0
District 24	Rai	7	05	•	16	•	• • •	50	1/6 1	110 -
Avery	Fel Mis	.30	25 3	9 10	15 10	2	0	58 53	145.1 113.8	113.5 85.0
Madison	Fel	11	7	9	9	5	Ő	41	197.2	149.0
	Mis	- 4	0	2	3	1	õ	10	195.5	149.0
Mitchell	Fel	7	9	35	39	7	3	100	213.6	176.5
	Mis	16	6	10	16	1	Ó	49	146.9	148.0
Watauga	Fel	88	31/	34	16	17	2	188	142.6	٥7.0
¥	Mis	24	7	14	22	6	0	73	176.3	148.0
Yancey	Fel	1	1	4	7	20	0	33	451.7	522.0
	Mis	0	0	2	15	8	0	25	355.1	303.0
Dist Totals	Fel	114	73	91	86	51	5	420	189.5	127.0
% of Total		27.1%	17.4%	21.7%	20.5%	12.1%	1.2%	100.0%		
.	Mis	74	16	38	66	16	0	210	175.9	148.0
% of Total		35.2%	7.6%	18.1%	31.4%	7.6%	0.0%	100.0%		

AGES OF FELONY (FEL) AND MISDEMEANOR (MIS) CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

			Ages	of Dispos		Total	Mean	Median		
		0.90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Disposed	Age	Age
District 25										
Burke	Fel	106	48	151	119	68	29	521	239.4	154.0
	Mis	135	49	129	137	47	0	497	173.4	150.0
Caldwell	Fel	147	92	132	195	28	3	597	168.9	138.0
	Mis	236	65	134	111	28	0	574	132.9	117.0
Catawba	Fel	347	146	247	290	71 .	7	1,108	166.2	140.0
	Mis	211	б8	109	107	93	13	601	205.4	129.0
Dist Totals	Fel	600	286	530	604	167	39	2,226	184.0	146.0
% of Total		27.0%	12.8%	23.8%	27.1%	7.5%	1.8%	100.0%		
	Mis	582	182	372	355	168	13	1,672	171.0	130.0
% of Total		34.8%	10.9%	22.2%	21.2%	10.0%	0.8%	100.0%		
District 26										
Mecklenburg	Fel	1,408	544	520	470	108	15	3,065	122.8	94.0
% of Total		45.9%	17.7%	17.0%	15.3%	3.5%	0.5%	100.0%		
	Mis	824	209	225	215	54	7	1,534	115.6	84.0
% of Total		53.7%	13.6%	14.7%	14.0%	3.5%	0.5%	100.0%		
District 27A										
Gaston	Fel	893	197	194	107	3	2	1,396	80.5	64.0
% of Total		64.0%	14.1%	13.9%	7.7%	0.2%	0.1%	100.0%	0015	04.0
W OL IVUL	Mis	371	98	98	109	24	2	702	115.9	85.0
% of Total		52.8%	14.0%	14.0%	15.5%	3.4%	0.3%	100.0%		05.0
District 27B										
Cleveland	Fe1	228	35	56	92	28	9	448	147.6	89.0
oreverand	Mis	144	40	44	30	3	2	263	101.4	75.0
Lincoln	Fel	152	37	52	44	12	5	302	121.0	89.0
DIRCOIN	Mis	86	14	19	28	10	1	158	121.0	76.5
		00	14	. 15	20	10	-	100	120.0	70.5
Dist Totals	Fe1	380	72	108	136	40	14	750	136.9	89.0
% of Total		50.7%	9.6%	14.4%	18.1%	5.3%	1.9%	100.0%		
	Mis	230	54	63	58	13	3	421	108.6	75.0
% of Total		54.6%	12,8%	15.0%	13.8%	3.1%	0.7%	100.0%		
District 28										
Buncombe	Fel	441	196	226	130	18	0	1,011	117.3	97.0
% of Total		43.6%	19.4%	22.4%	12.9%	1.8%	0.0%	100.0%	11/.5	57.0
A OI IULAI	Mis	448	33	105	19	4	0.0%	609	71.7	51.0
% of Total		73.6%	5.4%	17.2%	3.1%	0.7%	0.0%	100.0%	/ /	51.0
District 29								· · ·		
Henderson	Fe1	102	33	48	80	9	0	272	145.4	122.0
	Mis	111	24	42	30	14	1	222	120.8	90.0
McDowell	Fel	207	38	57	49	14	5	370	120.1	84.0
	Mis	103	26	61	23	9	5	227	133.0	96.0
Polk	Fel	6	1	15	5	3	2	32	233.3	158.0
LOTU	Mis	12	4	6	6	4	ō	32	153.9	123.0
Rutherford	Fel	194	63	59	73	25	0	414	134.5	93.5
"arneriora	Mis	136	74	59	43	15	4	331	134.5	101.0
Transylvania	Fel	29	9	34	43	11	7	130	228.0	157.0
Transylvania	Mis	14	10	4	15	4	3	50	228.5	140.5
					a.(-					
Dist Totals	Fel	538	144	213	247	62	14	1,218	145.1	101.0
% of Total		44.2%	11.8%	17.5%	20.3%	5.1%	1.1%	100.0%		
	Mis	376	138	172	117	46	13	862	138.4	101.0
% of Total		43.6%	16.0%	20.0%	13.6%	5.3%	1.5%	100.0%		

AGES OF FELONY (FEL) AND MISDEMEANOR (MIS) CASES DISPOSED IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

			Age	s of Dispos	Total	Mean	Median			
		0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Disposed	Age	Age
District 30										
Cherokee	Fel	123	12	42	22	33	12	244	168.9	79.0
	Mis	38	7	21	19	6	0,0,0	91	144.1	125.0
Clay	Fel	11	1	2	t	2	4	21	311.5	50.0
	Mis	5	3	3	5	2	0	18	165.8	153.0
Graham	Fel	11	1	- 1 - 1	47	0	0	60	219.7	280.0
	Mis	12	10	11	5	3	1	42	170.5	119.0
Haywood	Fel	303	63	42	31	4	3	446	83.4	58.5
	Mis	162	19	18	11	2	0	212	63.9	38.0
Jackson	Fel	101	12	10	50	б	0	179	126.0	90.0
	Mis	13	3	10	13	0	0	39	151.6	133.0
Macon	Fe1	55	12	33	16	5	1	122	149.0	112.0
	Mis	29	5	7	9	0	1	51	115.9	75.0
Swain	Fe1	69	17	28	8	13	4	139	149.6	91.0
	Mis	30	5	5	8	0	0	48	98.5	74.0
Dist Totals	Fel	673	118	158	175	63	24	1,211	131.8	84.0
% of Total		55.6%	9.7%	13.0%	14.5%	5.2%	2.0%	100.0%		
	Mis	289	52	75	70	13	2	501	106.5	70.0
% of Total		57.7%	10.4%	15.0%	14.0%	2.6%	0.4%	100.0%		
State Totals	rel	27,785	6,688	8,208	8,110	2,200	429	53,420	124.4	86.0
% of Total		52.0%	12.5%	15.4%	15.2%	4.1%	0.8%	100.0%		
	Mis	19,111	3,563	3,937	3,914	1,019	159	31,703	106.3	70.0
% of Total		60.3%	11.2%	12.4%	12.3%	3.2%	0.5%	100.0%		

PART IV, Section 2

ίΰ

C.

Ø

Ű.

District Court Division Caseflow Data

This section contains data tables and accompanying charts depicting the caseflow in 1987-88 of cases filed and disposed of in the State's district courts.

0

in

Data are given on four major case classifications in the district court division: civil cases, juvenile proceedings, criminal cases, and infractions. Civil cases are divided into "small claims" cases assigned to magistrates; domestic relations cases (chiefly concerned with annulments, divorces, alimony, custody and support of children); and "general civil" cases. Juvenile proceedings are classified according to the nature of the offense or condition alleged in the petition that initiates the case. District court criminal cases are divided into motor vehicle cases (where the offense charged is defined in Chapter 20 of the North Carolina General Statutes) and non-motor vehicle criminal cases.

Infractions are non-criminal violations of law punishable by a fine not to exceed \$100 and not punishable by imprisonment. This category of cases in the district courts was created effective September 1, 1986, when the General Assembly decriminalized most minor traffic offenses. Prior to September 1, 1986, "infractions" were prosecuted as criminal motor vehicle cases. Therefore, for purposes of comparing present to past district court criminal caseloads, criminal motor vehicle caseloads of 1985-86 and earlier are substantially coparable to the combined motor vehicle and infraction caseloads of 1986-87 amd later. (This comparison is not exact, since not all cases now prosecuted as infractions were criminal motor vehicle cases in prior, years. For example, the infraction of purchase or possession of alcohol by a person by age 19 or 20 was neither an infraction nor a criminal violation prior to September 1, 1986.)

Magistrates may handle civil, criminal, and infraction cases in district court. When the plaintiff in a civil case requests, and the amount in controversy does not exceed \$1,500, the case may be classified as a "small claim" civil action and assigned to a magistrate for hearing. In misdemeanor or infraction cases involving alcohol, traffic, hunting, fishing, and boating violations, magistrates may accept written appearances, waivers of trial or hearing, and pleas of guilty or admissions of responsibility, and enter judgment in accord with the schedule of fines and penalties promulgated by chief district court judges. Also, magistrates may accept guilty pleas in other misdemeanor cases where the sentence cannot be in excess of 30 days or \$50 fine; and may hear and enter judgment in worthless check cases where the amount involved is \$1000 or less, and any prison sentence imposed does not exceed 30 days.

Appeals from magistrates' judgments in civil, criminal, and infraction cases are to the district court, with a district court judge presiding.

Consistent with previous years, the pie charts on the following page illustrate that district court criminal cases filed and disposed of in the 1987-88 year greatly outnumbered civil cases. Motor vehicle criminal cases and infractions accounted for over fifty percent of total filings and dispositions, and the non-motor vehicle criminal cases accounted for about twenty-five percent. As in past years, the greatest portion of district court civil filings and dispositions were small claims referred to magistrates.

The large volume categories of infraction, criminal motor-vehicle, and civil magistrate cases are not reported to AOC by case file numbers. Therefore, it is not possible to obtain, by computer processing, the numbers of pending cases as of a given date or the ages of cases pending and ages of cases at disposition. These categories of cases are processed through the courts faster than any others, thus explaining the decision not to allocate personnel and computer resource to reporting these cases in the detail that is provided for other categories of cases.

Also, juvenile proceedings and hearings on commitment or recommitment of persons to the State's mental hospital facilities are not reported to AOC by case file numbers.

Two tables are provided on juvenile proceedings: offenses and conditions alleged, and numbers of adjudicatory hearings held.

Data on district court hearings for mental hospital commitments and recommitments is reported in Part III, "Cost and Case Data on Representation of Indigents."

Ages of district court cases pending on June 30, 1988, and ages of cases disposed of during 1987-88 are reported for the domestic relations, general civil and magistrate appeal/transfer, and criminal non-motor vehicle case categories.

The tables for domestic relations and general civil and magistrate appeal/transfer cases show that the median age of such cases which were pending on June 30, 1988, was 155 and 182 days, respectively, compared with a median age of 154 days for domestic relations and 167 days for general civil and magistrate appeal/transfer cases pending on June 30, 1987. At the time of disposition during 1987-88, the median age of domestic relations cases was 51 days, and the median age for general civil and magistrate/transfer cases was 110 days, compared with a median age of 53 days at the time of disposition for domestic relations cases and 109 days for civil and magistrate appeal/transfer cases during 1986-87.

For district court non-motor vehicle criminal cases, the median age for cases pending on June 30, 1988, was 57 days compared with a median age of 54 days for cases pending on June 30, 1987. The median age of cases in this category at the time of disposition during 1987-88 was 30 days compared with a median age of 29 days at the time of disposition during 1986-87.

The statewide total district court filings during 1987-88, not including juvenile cases and mental hospital commitment hearings, was 2,004,447 cases, compared with 1,868,985 during 1987-88, an increase of 135,462 (7.2%). Criminal motor vehicle cases and infraction cases together account for much of this increase. There were 1,028,252 of these cases filed during 1987-88, compared with 975,488 during 1986-87, an increase of 52,764 cases (5.4%). There was an increase of 46,579 cases (9.9%) in the non-motor vehicle criminal case category.

There also was an increase (10.2%) in district court civil case filings (not including civil license revocation cases),

from a total of 364,271 in 1986-87 to 401,387 in 1987-88. Most of this increase was in civil magistrate filings, from 247,455 cases in 1986-87 to 277,336 cases in 1987-88, an increase of 12.1%. During 1987-88, compared to 1986-87, filings of domestic relations cases increased by 5.9% and filings of general civil cases increased by 6.6%. The changes from year-to-year in the individual case categories are not unusual. The over-all trend for *total* district court case filings over the past several years has been upward. This upward trend is reflected in the total 1987-88 district court case filings.

FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS



Criminal motor vehicle and infraction cases together comprise more than half the district court caseload. The 60,098 civil license revocations in the upper chart are automatic, 10-day driver license suspensions imposed on drivers arrested on suspicion of impaired driving whose breath tests showed a blood alcohol content of 0.10 or more. They are counted only at filing, and do not appear on the disposition chart.
FILING AND DISPOSITION TRENDS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

1978-79 - 1987-88



This graph includes all civil, infraction, and criminal case filings and dispositions in the district courts for the last decade. During the ten year period depicted on this graph, filings and dispositions have increased in all but one year. In the 1987-88 fiscal year the number of filing increased by 7.2%, and dispositions increased 8.4% over 1986-87.

FILING AND DISPOSITION TRENDS OF CIVIL CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

1978-79 - 1987-88





Civil magistrate filings increased by 12.1%.

CIVIL (NON-MAGISTRATE) CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988



From 1986-87 to 1987-88, filings of domestic relations caces increased by 5.9% and dispositions of domestic rela-

tions cases increased by 3.6%. General civil filings increased by 6.6% and dispositions incressed by 8.3%.

FILINGS OF CIVIL (NON-MAGISTRATE) CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988



"URESA" stands for the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act, and refers to actions enforcing child support orders entered by judges in one state by the courts in another. "IV-D Child Support" refers to actions initiated by counties or the Department of Human

٠Ĥ

18

Resources to collect child support owed to social services clients. "Non IV-D Child Support" actions are initiated by custodial parents themselves. The "Other" category includes civil actions such as annulment, divorce, equitable distribution of property, and alimony.

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL (NON-MAGISTRATE) CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

		D	omestic R	elations Ca	ses	•	General Civil and Magistrate Appeals/Transfers					
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total	Disposed	%Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total	Disposed	%Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
District 1												
Camden	11	24	35	17	48.6%	18	13	11	24	10	41.7%	14
Chowan	62	198	260	201	77.3%	59	57	59	116	64	55.2%	52
Currituck	36	121	157	103	65.6%	54	61	71	132	71	53.8%	61
Dare	82	217	299	201	67.2%	98	123	215	338	177	52.4%	161
Gates	21	59	80	56	70.0%	24	10	22	32	19	59.4%	13
Pasquotank	113	382 101	495	344	69.5%	151	113 34	133	246 75	138 45	56.1%	108 30
Perquimans	49	101	150	86	57.3%	64	54	41	15	40	60.0%	30
District Totals	374	1,102	1,476	1,008	68.3%	468	411	552	963	524	54.4%	439
District 2												
Beaufort	150	398	548	354	64.6%	194	131	160	291	160	55.0%	131
Hyde	15 94	45	60 334	40 224	66.7% 67.1%	20	21 34	17 68	38 102	27 65	71.1% 63.7%	11 37
Martin Tyrrell	94 7	240 25	334	224	78.1%	110 7	17	00 7	24	16	66.7%	8
Washington	41	216	257	193	75.1%	64	19	53	72	47	65.3%	25
waantugeou		210	~J1	173	(JeL/6				••		021270	
District Total	s 307	924	1,231	836	67.9%	395	222	305	527	315	59.8%	212
District 3												
Carteret	167	605	772	569	73.7%	203	149	334	483	332	68.7%	151
Craven	365	1,055	1,420	1,013	71.3%	407	251	660	911	656	72.0%	255
Pamlico	30	84	114	92	80,7%	22	12	29	41	31	75.6%	10
Pitt	263	856	1,119	854	76.3%	265	299	819	1,118	769	68.8%	349
District Total	s 825	2,600	3,425	2,528	73.8%	897	711	1,842	2,553	1,788	70.0%	765
District 4												
Duplin	148	402	550	402	73.1%	148	93	145	238	137	57.6%	101
Jones	25	90	115	69	60.0%	46	48	48	96	47	49.0%	49
Onslow	918	1,826	2,744	1,854	67.6%	890	686	847	1,533	973	63.5%	560
Sampson	144	525	669	536	80.1%	133	127	325	452	314	69.5%	138
District Total	s 1,235	2,843	4,078	2,861	70.2%	1,217	954	1,365	2,319	1,471	63.4%	848
District 5												
New Hanover	554	1,673	2,227	1,521	68.3%	706	921	1,798	2,719	1,639	60.3%	1,080
Pender	101	251	352	237	67.3%	115	85	234	319	194	60.8%	125
District Total	s 655	1,924	2,579	1,758	68.2%	821	1,006	2,032	3,038	1,833	60.3%	1,205
District 6												
Bertie	85	252	337	270	80.1%	67	46	75	121	84	69.4%	37
Halifax	169	950	1,119	893	79.8%	226	77	196	273	187	68.5%	86
Hertford	91	381	472	375	79.4%	97	73	166	239	181	75.7%	58
Northampton	54	224	278	207	74.5%	71	26	74	100	60	60.0%	40
District Total	s 399	1,807	2,206	1,745	79.1%	461	222	511	733	512	69.8%	221
District 7												
Edgecombe	218	595	813	624	76.8%	189	104	275	379	219	57.8%	160
Nash	221	1,043	1,264	995	78.7%	269	241	659	900	647	71.9%	253
Wilson	215	700	915	751	82.1%	164	141	480	621	412	66.3%	209
District Total	s 654	2,338	2,992	2,370	79.2%	622	486	1,414	1,900	1,278	67.3%	622
District 8												
Greene	32	88	120	99	82.5%	21	16	93	109	70	64.2%	39
Lenoir	244	741	985	672	68.2%	313	223	439	662	428	64.7%	234
Wayne	518	1,447	1,965	1,433	72.9%	532	461	779	1,240	709	57.2%	531
District Total	в 794	2,276	3,070	2,204	71.8%	866	700	1,311	2,011	1,207	60.0%	804

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL (NON-MAGISTRATE) CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

		Domestic Relations Cases						General Civil and Magistrate Appeald'Transfers				
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total	Disposed	%Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
District 9												
Franklin	102	335	437	334	76.4%	103	77	115	192	119	62.0%	73
Granville	97	321	418	301	72.0%	117	40	145	185	108	58.4%	77
Person	69	286	355	291	82.0%	64	89	106	195	132	67.7%	63
Vance	152	560	712	546	76.7%	166	115	207	322	189	58.7%	133
Warten	62	215	277	202	72.9%	75	36	77	113	58	51.3%	55
District Total	s 482	1,717	2,199	1,674	76.1%	525	357	650	1,007	606	60.2%	401
District 10												
Wake	2,840	3,970	6,810	3,502	51.4%	3,308	4,092	6,032	10,124	5,803	57.3%	4,321
District 11												
Harnett	222	714	936	698	74.6%	238	203	575	778	497	63.9%	281
Johnston	309	935	1,244	925	74.4%	319	307	- 642	949	522	55.0%	427
Lee	133	618	751	569	75.8%	182	153	577	730	463	63.4%	267
District Total	.s 664	2,267	2,931	2,192	74.8%	739	, 663	1,794	2,457	1,482	60.3%	975
District 12												
Cumberland	2,407	4,751	7,158	4,901	68.5%	2,257	866	1,352	2,218	1,388	62.6%	830
Hoke	103	284	387	278	71.8%	109	48	105	153	103	67.3%	50
District Total	s 2,510	5,035	7,545	5,179	68.6%	2,366	914	1,457	2,371	1,491	62.9%	880
District 13												
Bladen	62	295	357	275	77.0%	82	139	246	385	225	58.4%	160
Brunswick	281	501	782	410	52.4%	372	566	519	1,085	467	43.0%	618
Columbus	349	610	959	570	59.4%	389	445	372	817	329	40.3%	488
District Total	s 692	1,406	2,098	1,255	59.8%	843	1,150	1,137	2,287	1,021	44.6%	1,266
<u>District 14</u> Durham	948	1,875	2,823	1,706	60.4%	1,117	1,313	1,788	3,101	1,819	58.7%	1,282
District 15A												
Alamance	309	1,167	1,476	1,125	76.2%	351	314	732	1,046	589	56.3%	457
District 15B												
Chatham	83	287	370	268	72.4%	102	53	116	169	105	62.1%	64
Orange	301	623	924	573	62.0%	351	389	518	907	458	50.5%	449
District Total	ls 384	910	1,294	841	65.0%	453	442	634	1,076	563	52.3%	513
District 16							$\{0, \dots, 0\}$					
Robeson	237	1,185	1,422	1,109	78.0%	313	471	649	1,120	722	64.5%	398
Scotland	130	355	485	347	71.5%	138	89	195	284	182	64.1%	102
District Total	ls 367	1,540	1,907	1,456	76.4%	451	560	844	1,404	904	64.4%	500
District 17A												•
Caswell	53	142	195	158	81.0%	37	25	70	95	59	62.1%	36
Rockingham	180	876	1,056	829	78.5%	227	104	541	645	394	61.1%	251
District Tota	ls 233	1,018	1,251	987	78.9%	264	129	611	740	453	61.2%	287
District 17B												
Stokes	38	172	210	144	68.6%	66	76	136	212	148	69.8%	64
Surry	172	566	738	597		141	137	285	422	324	76.8%	98
District Tota		738	948	741	78.2%	207	213	421	634	472	74.4%	162
PIOLILL IULS.	-5 -10	, 55		· · · · ·			,					

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL (NON-MAGISTRATE) CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

	Domestic Relations Cases						General Civil and Magistrate Appeals/Transfers					
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total		% Caseload Disposed	End
District 18 Guilford	1,921	4,165	6,086	3,715	61.0%	2,371	3,273	4,770	8,043	3,911	48.6%	4,132
District 19A												
Cabarrus	219	1,034	1,253	965	77.0%	288	352	469	821	480	58.5%	341
Rowan	233	966	1,199	981	81.8%	218	308	558	866	590	68.1%	276
District Total	s 452	2,000	2,452	1,946	79.4%	506	660	1,027	1,687	1,070	63.4%	617
District 19B												
Montgomery	84	192	276	170	61.6%	106	173	232	405	239	59.0%	166
Randolph	247	755	1,002	710	70.9%	292	137	355	492	326	66.3%	166
District Total	s 331	947	1,278	880	68.9%	398	310	587	897	565	63.0%	332
District 20												
Anson	94	345	439	301	68.6%	138	82	99	181	63	34.8%	118
Moore	335	490	825	547	66.3%	278	494	296	790	303	38.4%	487
Richmond	136	547	683	449	65.7%	234	116	248	364	141	38.7%	223
Stanly	202	403	605	358	59.2%	247	310	209	519	174	33.5%	345
Union	254	702	956	658	68.8%	298	399	397	796	418	52.5%	378
District Total	s 1,021	2,487	3,508	2,313	65.9%	1,195	1,401	1,249	2,650	1,099	41.5%	1,551
District 21												
Forsyth	1,376	2,823	4,199	2,987	71.1%	1,212	1,955	2,522	4,477	2,640	59.0%	1,837
District 22												e de la post
Alexander	40	223	263	219		44	36	108	144	108	75.0%	36
Davidson	430	1,067	1,497	977		520	324	623	947	617	65.2%	330
Davie	68	214	282	214	75.9%	68	61	187	248	155	62.5%	93
Iredell	281	938	1,219	954	78.3%	265	301	585	886	569	64.2%	317
District Total	s 819	2,442	3,261	2,364	72.5%	897	722	1,503	2,225	1,449	65.1%	776
District 23												
Alleghany	17	88	105	84	80.0%	21	26	50	76	48	63.2%	28
Ashe	52	197	249	178	71.5%	71	50	67	117	75	64.1%	42
Wilkes	130	585	715	612	85.6%	103	325	478	803	623	77.6%	180
Yadkin	70	225	295	211	71.5%	84	87	146	233	149	63.9%	84
District Total	.s 269	1,095	1,364	1,085	79.5%	279	488	741	1,229	895	72.8%	334
District 24												
Avery	67	134	201	127	63.2%	74	115	165	280	186	66.4%	94
Madison	34	139	173	112		61	24	35	59	38	64.4%	21
Mitchell	47	121	168	121		47	98	83	181	151	83.4%	.30
Watauga	112	283	395	305		90	133	315	448	340	75.9%	108
Yancey	46	123	169	112		57	19	36	55	35		20
District Total	Le 306	800	1,106	777	70.3%	329	389	634	1,023	750	73.3%	273
District 25												
Burke	206	764	970	708	73.0%	262	160	342	502	363	72.3%	139
Caldwell	195	774	969	703		266	161	432	593	359	60.5%	234
Catawba	454	1,418	1,872	1,356	72.4%	516	370	745	1,115	805		310
District Tota	Ls 855	2,956	3,811	2,767	72.6%	1,044	691	1,519	2,210	1,527	69.1%	683
District 26 Mecklenburg	1,828	5,224	7,052	4,511	64.0%	2,541	4,663	8,383	13,046	7,461	57.2%	5,585
	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		· · · · ·	,								

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CIVIL (NON-MAGISTRATE) CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

		מ	omestic R	cintions Ca	SC5	General Civil and Magistrate Appeals/Transfers						
	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total	Disposed	%Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filings	Total	Disposed	% Caselond Disposed	End Pendin 6/30/\$1
District 27A Gaston	707	2,386	3,093	2,261	73.12	832	317	724	1,041	668	64.24	373
District 278 Cleveland Lincoln	211 92	1,140 432	1,351 574	1,115 488	82.5% 85.0%	236 86	84 59	341 164	425 223	321 167	75.5% 74.9%	104 56
District Total	s 303	1,622	1,925	1,603	83.3%	322	143	505	648	488	75.3%	160
District 28 Buncombe	899	2,074	2,973	2,159	72.6%	314	741	1,415	2,156	1,514	70.2%	642
<u>District 29</u> Henderson McDowell Polk Rutherford	214 130 30 150	683 332 97 538	897 462 127 688	709 335 105 464	79.0% 72.5% 82.7% 67.4%	185 127 22 224	205 64 29 80	339 135 31 146	544 199 60 226	335 132 44 137	61.6% 66.3% 73.3% 60.6%	209 67 16 89
Transylvania	128	232	360	259	71.9%	101	140	131	271	192	70.8%	79
District Total	s 652	1,882	2,534	1,872	73.9%	.662	518	732	1,300	840	64.6%	460
District 30 Cherokee Clay	68 17	171 70	239 87	163 60	68.2% 69.0%	76 27	13 9	63 26	31 35	60 19	74.1%	21 16
Graham Haywood Jackson	36 229 94	78 484 197	114 713 291	91 503 211	79.8% 70.5% 72.5%	23 210 80	18 135 54	30 177 150	48 312 204	31 184 143	64.6% 59.0% 70.1%	17 128 61
Macon Swain	94 78 47	197 192 94	291 270 141	172	63.7% 70.2%	98 42	56 31	130 138 28	194 59	143 105 47	54.1% 79.7%	89 12
District Total	s 569	1,286	1,355	1,299	70.04	556	321	ó12	933	589	63.1%	344
State Totals	27,190	71,646	98,836	68,507	69.3%	30,329	31,451	52,405	83,856	49,597	59.1%	34,259

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CIVIL (NON-MAGISTRATE) CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

Voluntary Dismissal (20,998) 17.8% Trial by Judge (45,875) 38.8% Judge's Final Order/Judgment Without Trial 20.9% (24,709) 15.7% 6.2% 0.5% Trial by Jury (584) Other Clerk (7,363) (18,575)

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

Most civil cases in the district courts are disposed of by judges, either before trial or with a bench (non-jury) trial. The "other" category includes actions such as removal to

ò

federal court or an order from another state closing a Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Case.

Judge's Final

		te para di Ali. Mangelari di Ali			Judge's Final			
		Trial by	Trial by	Voluntary	Order or Judgment			Total
		Jury	Judge	Dismissal	without Trial	Clerk	Other	Disposed
District 1								
Camden	Gen Dom	0 0	1 7	3	1	\$ 1	ა 1	10 17
Chowan	Gen	0	LO	25	3	21	5	17 64
Currituck	Dom Gen	0 1	90 13	19 14	85 5	3 8	4	201
Currituck	Dom	0	55	14	26	ა ე	30 4	71 103
Dare	Gen	Û	11	78	30	54	4	177
Gates	Dom Gen	0	3 0	25 3	157 1	0	11 2	201 19
	Dom	11	16	3	25	0	1	56
Pasquotank	Gen Dom	1	22 208	34 31	11	61 1	9 12	138 344
Perquimans	Gen	1	6	24	7	6	1	45
	Dom	0	45	7	31	Û,	2	86
Dist Totals	Gen	4	63	186	58	162	51	524
% of Total	Dom	0.8% 11	12.0% 430	35.5% 106	11.1% 421	30.9% 5	9.7% 35	100.0%
% of Total		1.1%	42.7%	10.5%	41.8%	0.5%	3.5%	100.0%
District 2								
Beaufort	Gen	1	20	49	24	58	8	160
Undo	Dom	1	188	23	113	17	7	354
Hyde	Gen Dom	0	1	10	8 36	6 0	2 3	27 40
Martin	Gen	0	12	19	4	26	4	65
Tyrrell	Dom Gen	. 0. 1	71	21 9	106	1	25 U	224 16
	Dom	0	0	0	25	0	0	25
Washington	Gen Dom	1	3 73	25 5	5 106	9	4	47 193
Dist Totals % of Total	Gen	3 1.0%	37 11.7%	112 35.6%	46 14.6%	99 31.4%	18 5.7%	315 100.0%
	Dom	1	332	50	391	13	44	836
% of Total	•	0.1%	39.7%	ó.0%	46.3%	2.2%	5.3%	100.0%
District 3								
Carteret	Gen Dom	3	49 339	115 30	59 79	86 3	20 68	332 569
Craven	Gen	1	41	195	100	258	61	656
Pamlico	Dom Gen	17	545 3	63	203	7	178	1,013
Familico	Dom	0	36	10 3	11 40	4 0	3 13	31 92
Pitt	Gen	1	95	261	348	2	62	769
	Dom	0	671	45	35	1	102	854
Dist Totals		5	188	581	518	350	146	1,788
% of Total	Dom	0.3% 17	10.5% 1,641	32.5% 141	29.0% 357	19.6% 11	8.2% 361	100.0% 2,528
% of Total		0.7%	64.9%	5.6%	14.1%	0.4%	14.3%	100.0%
District 4								
Duplin	Gen	2 2	16	39	20	56	2	137
Jones	Dom Gen	2	140	20 4	231 32	ა 6	9 5	402 47
	Dom	0	0	8	51	3	· · · 7 · ·	69
Onslow	Gen Dom	2 13	247 1,401	188 109	31 70	271 3	234 258	973 1 854
Sampson	Gen	7	31	170	4	89	13	1,854 314
	Dom	8	219	64	188	2	55	536
Dist Totals	Gen	11	294	401	87	424	254	1,471
% of Total		0.7%	20.0%	27.3%	5.9%	28.8%	17.3%	100.0%
% of Total	Dom	23 0.8%	1,760 61.5%	201 7.0%	540 18.9%	8 0.3%	329 11.5%	2,861 100.0%
	-							

원한 11 가지 않는. 이 것은 것은 것은 것이다.			1 u i	, 1, 1707 —				
		Trial by Jury	Trial by Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	Order or Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Disposed
District 5								
New Hanover	Gen	14	224	505	175	594	127	1,639
	Dom	4	351	90	476	4	96	1,521
Pender	Gen Dom	2 2	14 101	82 16	19 103	74 U	3 10	194
	DOIII	4	101	10	100	V	tu	237
Dist Totals	Gen	16	238	587	194	668	130	1,833
% of Total		0.9%	13.0%	32.0%	10.6%	36.4%	7.1%	100.0%
% of Total	Dom	6 0.3%	952 54.24	106 6.0%	584 33.24	4 U.2%	106 6.0%	1,758 100.0%
							0.00	100.04
District 6	Gen		0	0.1				
Bertie	Dom	6 1	9 83	22 17	5 159	40 3	1 7	84
Halifax	Gen	3	49	50	36	49	0	270 187
	Dom	ĩ	235	26	. 607	1	23	893
Hertford	Gen	2	14	35	57	72	- ī	181
	Dom	0	150	22	198	2	3	375
Northampton	Gen	0	15	8	0	34	3	60
	Dom	1. 1 - 1	178	, e 7 , e	2	0	19	207
Dist Totals	Gen	11	87	115	99	195	5	512
% of Total		2.1%	17.0%	22.5%	19.3%	38.1%	1.0%	100.0%
	Dom	3	646	72	966	6	52	1,745
% of fotal		0.2%	37.0%	4.1%	55.4%	0.3%	3.0%	100.0%
District 7				ter ter fan se se				
Edgecombe	Gen	0	21	77	24	60	37	219
•	Dom	4	284	39	250	1	46	624
Nash	Gen	5	73	180	105	280	4	647
	Dom	2	547	30	405	1	10	995
Wilson	Gen	4	48	135	54	155	16	412
	Dom	2	422	42	248	7	29	751
Dist Totals	Gen	9	142	392	133	495	57	1,278
% of Total		0.7%	11.1%	30.7%	14.3%	38.7%	4.5%	100.0%
	Dom	9	1,253	111	903	9	85	2,370
% of Total		0.4%	52.9%	4.7%	38.1%	0.4%	3.6%	100.0%
District 8								
Greene	Gen	1	0	11	44	8	6	70
and the second	Dom	0	1	4	80	υ	14	99
Lenoir	Gen	9	40	125	85	169	0	428
Janna	Dom Gen	2 8	402 99	68 258	194	4	2	672
Wayne	Dom	5	842	186	37 334	262 12	45 54	709 1,433
	- • • •				554	**		4,455
Dist Totals	Gen	18	139	394	166	439	51	1,207
% of Total		1.5%	11.5%	32.6%	13.8%	36.4%	4.2%	100.0%
% of Total	Dom	7 0.3%	1,245 56.5%	258 11.7%	608 27.6%	16 0.7%	70 3.2%	2,204 100.0%
~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~		0104	30.3%		21.04	0.7%	J. 24	100.0%
District 9								
Franklin	Gen	0	14	41	12	39	13	119
Cumund 11 -	Dom	2	96	31	193	3	9	334
Granville	Gen Dom	1 0	23 122	43 17	9 61	23 64	9 37	108
Person	Gen	2	45	40	3	40	2	301 132
	Dom	õ	262	29	ŏ	0	Õ	291
	Gen	0	44	48	2	69	26	189
	Dom	0	268	37	211	2	28	546
Warren	Gen	1	10	20	13	14	0	58
	Dom	0	86	12	100	0	4	202
Dist Totals	Gen	4	136	192	39	185	50	606
% of Total		0.7%	22.4%	31.7%	6.4%	30.5%	8.3%	100.0%
.	Dom	2	834	126	565	69	78	1,674
% of Total		0.1%	49.8%	7.5%	33.8%	4.1%	4.7%	100.0%
+Canon novero	A 15 1	hie table ar	a general of	vil and anno	ls/transfers from	manietwatee	to induce	a11

			Jui	y 1, 1907 —	June 30, 1908	et en en en tra			
		Trial by	Trial by	Voluntary	Judge's Final Order or Judgment	ror			
		Jury	Judge	Dismissal	without Trial	Clerk	Other	Disposed	
District 10			ter en ter esp						
Wake	Gen	29	448	1,471	755	2,895	205	5,803	
% of fotal		0.5%	7.7%	25.3%	13.0%	49.9%	3.5%	100.0%	
	Dom	0	2,145	190	912	3	252	3,502	
% of Total		0.0%	61.3%	5.4%	26.0%	0.1%	7.2%	100.0%	
District 11									
Harnett	Gen	5	57	249	72	114	0	497	
	Dom	1	306	79	296	7	9	698	
Johnston	Gen	7	3	180	150	177	5	522	
	Dom	3	303	107	498	5	8	925	
Lee	Gen	5	35	183	52	183	0	463	
	Dom	0	300	73	189	1	1	569	
Dist Totals	Gen	17	95	617	274	474	5	1,482	
% of Total		1.1%	6.4%	41.6%	18.5%	32,0%	0.3%	100.0%	
	Dom	4	909	264	983	14	18	2,192	
% of Total		0.2%	41.5%	12.0%	44.8%	0.6%	0.8%	100.0%	
District 12									
Cumberland	Gen	8	258	423	63	462	174	1,388	
	Dom	1	2,613	370	1,095	5	817	4,901	
Hoke	Gen	0	25	42	0	36	0	103	
	Dom	0	100	32	85	0	61	278	
Dist Totals	Gen	8	283	465	63	493	174	1,491	
% of Total		0.5%	19.0%	31.2%	4.2%	33.4%	11.7%	100.0%	
	Dom	1	2,713	402	1,180	5	878	5,179	
% of Total		0.0%	52.4%	7.8%	22.8%	0.1%	17.0%	100.0%	
District 13									
Bladen	Gen	7	26	101	17	62	12	225	
	Dom	1	125	16	124	· <u>1</u>	6	275	
Brunswick	Gen	5	84	242	41	91	4	467	
	Dom	0	201	48	159	0	3	410	
Columbus	Gen	14	60	109	37	89	20	329	
	Dom	1	399	62	105	0	3	570	
Dist Totals	Gen	26	170	452	95	242	36	1,021	
% of Total		2.5%	16.7%	44.3%	9.3%	23.7%	3.5%	100.0%	
	Dom	2	725	125	387	1	14	1,255	
% of Total		0.2%	57.8%	10.0%	30.8%	0.1%	1.1%	100.0%	
District 14				•					
Durham	Gen	3	160	516	167	752	221	1,819	
% of Total		0.2%	3.8%	28.4%	9.2%	41.3%	12.1%	100.0%	
	Dom	0	1,074	95	393	2	142	1,706	
% of Total		0.0%	63.0%	5.6%	23.0%	0.1%	8.3%	100.0%	
District 15A									
Alamance	Gen	7	81	202	35	227	37	589	
% of Total		1.2%	13.8%	34.3%	5.9%	38.5%	6.3%	100.0%	
	Dom	3	725	88	246	28	35	1,125	
% of Total		0.3%	64.4%	7.8%	21.9%	2.5%	3.1%	100.0%	
District 158									
Chatham	Gen	5	18	47	7	24	4	105	
	Dom	1	150	14	83	3	17	268	
Orange	Gen	1	115	130	25	186	1	458	
	Dom	1	344	39	177	3	9	573	
Dist Totals	Gen	6	133	177	32	210	5	563	
% of Total		1.1%	23,6%	31.4%	5.7%	37.3%	0.9%	100.0%	
	Dom	2	494	53	260	6	26	841	
% of Total	•	0.2%	58.7%	6.3%	30.9%	0.7%	3.1%	100.0%	

Indue's Final

		Trial by Jury	Trial by Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	Judge's Final Order or Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total- Disposed
District 16								
Robeson	Gen	5	130	235	19	201	132	722
	Dom	0	574	79	397	201	50	1,109
Scotland	Gen	2	25	43	9	86	17	182
	Dom	ō	215	20	75	ິບ	36	347
								547
Dist Totals	Gen	7	155	278	28	287	149	904
% of Total	La i jai	J.8%	17.1%	30.8%	3.1%	31.7%	16.5%	100.0%
	Dom	0	790	99	472	9	86	1,456
% of Total	L	0.0%	54.3%	6.8%	32.4%	0.6%	5.9%	100.0%
District 17A		1.1.2.1		a de la companya de l				
Caswell	Gen	0	0	16	23	15	5	59
	Dom	0	4	13	121	4	16	158
Rockingham	Gen	8	21	93	12	243	17	394
	Dom	0	469	68	231	. 5	56	829
Dist Totals	Gen							
% of Totals		8	21	109	35	258	22	453
% OL IOLAI		1.8%	4.6%	24.1%	7.7%	57.0%	4.9%	100.0%
% of Total	Dom	0.0%	473	81	352	9	72	987
% OL IOLAI	•	0.0%	47.9%	8.2%	35.7%	0.9%	7.3%	100.0%
District 17B								
Stokes	Gen	1	10	37	8ó	5	9	140
	Dom	3	21	3	104	0	8	148 144
Surry	Gen	2	38	101	44	138	1	324
•	Dom	ō.	293	41	258	4	i	597
								557
Dist Totals	Gen	3	48	138	130	143	10	472
% of Total	L	0.6%	10.2%	29.2%	27.5%	30.3%	2.1%	100.0%
and the second second	Dom	- 3	314	49	362	4	9	741
% of Total	L	0.4%	42.4%	6.6%	48.9%	0.5%	1.2%	100.0%
District 18			1	and a straight of the			н., стр. 4.5	
Guilford	Gen	23	368	1,262	477	1,625	156	3,911
% of Total		0.6%	9.4%	32.3%	12.2%	41.5%	4.0%	100.0%
w . c . a	Dom	24	3,229	143	227	21	71	3,715
% of Total		0.6%	86.9%	3.8%	6.1%	0,6%	1.9%	100.0%
District 104								
<u>District 19A</u> Cabarrus	Gen	Ę	50	101		~~		
Cabarrus	Dom	5	50 557	191	140	89	5	480
Rowan	Gen	4	111	46 202	353	4	5	965
nowan	Dom	0	715	78	33	240	0	590
	DOIA	Ų	715	10	185	2	1	981
Dist Totals	Gen	9	161	393	173	329	5	1,070
% of Total		0.8%	15.0%	36.7%	16.2%	30.7%	0.5%	100.0%
	Dom	0	1,272	124	538	6	6	1,946
% of Total		0.0%	65.4%	6.4%	27.6%	0.3%	0.3%	100.0%
						0.00	0.0%	100.0%
District 198								
Montgomery	Gen	0	26	99	19	95	0	239
	Dom	0	161	6	3	0	Õ	170
Randolph	Gen	8 .	45	90	ló	151	16	326
	Dom	1 1	375	57	195	11	71	710
		4						
Dist Totals	Gen	8	71	139	35	246	16	565
% of Total		1.4%	12.6%	33.5%	6.2%	43.5%	2.8%	100.0%
9 at 10-7 1	Dom	1	536	63	198	11	71	880
% of Total		0.1%	60.9%	7.2%	22.5%	1.3%	3.1%	100.0%
*Cases covere	d in th	is table are	e general ci	vil and appeal	ls/transfers from	magistrates	to judges,	a11

"Cases covered in this table are general civil and appeals, identified as (GEN), and Domestic Relations (DOM) cases. agistrates to judges, all

Judge's Final

	Trial by Jury	Trial by Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	Judge's Final Order or Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Disposed
District 20			-				
Anson Ge		8	30	6	14	2	63
Do Moore Ge		138 94	11 113	139 16	10 68	23	301 303
Do		332	57	85	2	19	547
dichmond Ge		27	61	5	45	ō	141
Do		396	23	16	12	0	449
Stanly Ge		13	44	106	3	1	174
Do		203	14	135	0	6	358
Union Ge		65	137	20	130	1 3	418
Do	m Z	441	55	154	3	3	658
Dist Totals Ge	n 25	212	440	155	260	7	1,099
% of Total	2.3%	19.3%	43.0%	14.1%	23.7%	0.6%	100.0%
Do		1,560	160	529	27	30	2,313
% of Total	0.3%	67.4%	6.9%	22.9%	1.2%	1.3%	100.0%
Distantian 01							
District 21 Forsyth Ge	n 11	168	888	319	1 020	174	2 640
% of Total	0.4%	6.4%	33.6%	12.1%	1,080 40.9%	6.6%	2,640 100.0%
Do		1,801	288	566	21	311	2,987
% of Total	0.0%	60.3%	9.6%	18.9%	0.7%	10.4%	100.0%
District 22	_	_	~~				
Alexander Ge		7	38	3	49	11	108
Do Davidson Ge		66	13 214	67 61	2 252	21 19	219 617
Davidson De		506	83	357	10	20	977
Davie Ge		35	51	12	32	22	155
Do		136	33	30	2	13	214
Iredell Ge		109	184	30	209	35	569
Do	m 6	435	137	306	9	61	954
Dist Totals Ge	n 10	217	487	106	542	87	1,449
% of Total	0.7%	15.0%	33.6%	7.3%	37.4%	6.0%	100.0%
Do		1,193	266	760	23	115	2,364
% of Total	0.3%	50.5%	11.3%	32.1%	1.0%	4.9%	100.0%
and the state of the							
District 23							
Alleghany Ge		13 56	18	2	10	4	48
Ashe Ge		12	5 - 30	17 4	0 19	4	84 75
Do		143	12	12	2	9	178
Wilkes Ge		43	177	155	239	7	623
Do		212	53	322	7	18	612
Yadkin Ge		7	46	27	64	2	149
Do	m 1	121	17	67	1	4	211
Dist Totals Ge	n 10	75	271	183	332	19	895
% of Total	1.1%	8.4%	30.3%	21.0%	37.1%	2.1%	100.0%
Do		532	37	418	10	35	1,085
% of Total	0.3%	49.0%	8.0%	38.5%	0.9%	3.2%	100.0%
District 24		-		AT			
Avery Ge		5 70	82	25	68	6	186
Do Madison Ge		9	10 11	37 14	0 1	10 3	127 38
Do		55	18	31	0	8	112
Mitchell Ge		10	99	39	Ő	3	151
Do	m O	41	16	60	0	4	121
Watauga Ge		57	135	29	100	19	340
Do		160	28	72	0	45	305
Yancey Ge		10 76	11	9	4	1	35
Do	m V	/0	16	15	1	4	112
Dist Totals Ge	n 0	91	338	116	173	32	750
% of Total	0.0%	12.1%	45.1%	15.5%	23.1%	4.3%	100.0%
Do	m O	402	88	215	1	71	777
% of Total	0.0%	51.7%	11.3%	27.7%	0.1%	9.1%	100.0%

Judge's Final

		Trial by	Trial by		Judge's Final Order or			
		Jury	Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Disposed
District 25								
Burke	Gen	4	59	103	62	30	49	363
	Dom	2	437	63	172	Ŭ.	34	708
Caldwell	Gen	3	3	133	65	133	12	359
	Dom	0	458	34	192	1	13	705
Catawba	Gen	14	69	243	140	304	30	805
	Dom	2	793	107	456	υ	8	1,356
Dist Totals	Gen	21	136	495	267	517	91	1,527
% of Total		1.4%	8.9%	32.4%	17.5%	33.9%	6.0%	100.0%
	Dom	4	1,578	204	820	1	60	2,767
% of Total		0.14	60.6%	7.4%	29.64	0.0%	2.2%	100.0%
District 26								
Mecklenburg	Sen	25	385	2,435	754	2,792	420	7,461
% of Total		0.3%	13.24	33.3%	10.1%	37.4%	5.6%	100.02
	Dom	2	3,525	274	660	27	23	4,511
% of Total		0.0%	73.1%	6.1%	14.6%	0.6%	0.5%	100.0%
District 27A						an an Capital an Aliga		
Gaston	Gen	14	103	247	42	223	39	668
% of Total		2.1%	15.4%	37.0%	6.3%	33.4%	5.0%	100.0%
	Dom	2	1,475	136	364	4	280	2,261
% of Total		0.1%	65.2%	6.0%	16.14	0.2%	12.4%	100.0%
District 27B								
Cleveland	Gen	7	37	92	45	110	30	321
	Dom	. 4	538	66	394		63	1,115
Lincoln	Gen	7	26	47	36	49	2	167
	Dom	0	216	43	222	5	2	488
Dist Totals	Gen	14	53	139	81	159	32	488
% of Total		2.9%	12.9%	23.5%	16.64	32.6%	6.6%	100.0%
	Üos	- 4	334	109	616	5	65	1,603
Z of Total		0.22	50.24	6.8%	38.4%	0.3%	4.1%	100.0%
District 28								
Buncombe	Gen	20	186	473	173	502	160	1,514
Z of fotal		1.3%	12.3%	31.24	11.4%	33.2%	10.6%	100.0%
	Dom	1	837	220	827	25	249	2,159
% of Total	•	0.0%	33.3%	10,2%	38.34	1.2%	11.54	100.02
District 29								
Henderson	Gen	3	15	94	56	73	93	335
	Dom	3	487	35	101	4	79	709
NcDowell	Gen	4	5	33	27	54	. 9	132
	Dom	ð	20	33	252	2	28	335
Polk	Gen		2	22	9	5	6	44
	Dom	0	2		89 89	0	11	105
Rutherford	Gen	6	29	44	26	22	10	137
	Von	0	327	18	105	6	6	464
Transylvania	Gen	1	14	85	52	32	8	192
	Dom	0	121	22	60	1	55	259
Dist Totals	Gen	14	56	278	170	186	126	840
% of Total		1.7%	7.9%	33.1%	20.2%	22.1%	15.0%	100.0%
	Dom	3	957	.111	607	15	179	1,372
% of Total		0.2%	51.12	5.9%	32.4%	0.8%	9.62	100.0%

					Judge's Final Order or			
		Trial by Jury	Trial by Judge	Voluntary Dismissal	Judgment without Trial	Clerk	Other	Total Disposed
District 30								
Cherokee	Gen	1	14	18	1	19	7	60
	Dom	0	103	13	24	0	18	163
Clay	Gen	1	3	12	0	0	3	19
	Dom	0	21	7	29	1 .	2	60
Graham	Gen	3	7	10	2	9	U	31
	Dom	7	49	23	8	2	2	91
Haywood	Gen	2	41	52	9	70	10	184
	Dom	3	349	50	85	Û	16	503
Jackson	Gen	6	13	43	19	50	12	143
	Dom	1	28	19	153	0	10	211
Macon	Gen	0	16	40	18	22	9	105
	Dom	0	88	24	45	0	15	172
Swain	Gen	7	8	11	6	. 8	5	47
	Dom	2	59	10	21	Ĺ	6	99
Dist Totals	Gen	20	102	186	57	178	46	589
% of Total		3.4%	17.3%	31.5%	9.7%	30.2%	7.8%	100.0%
	Dom	13	697	151	365	4	69	1,299
% of fotal		1.0%	53.7%	11.6%	28.1%	0.3%	5.3%	100.0%
State Totals	Gen	419	5,922	15,956	6,117	18,147	3,036	49,597
% of Total		0.8%	11.9%	32.2%	12.3%	36.6%	6.1%	100.0%
	Dom	165	39,953	5,042	18,592	428	4,327	68,507
% of Total		0.2%	58.3%	7.4%	27.1%	0.6%	6.3%	100.0%

		Ages	of Pend	ing Cases (M		Total	Mean	Median	
	< 6	70	6-12	%	>12	%	Pending	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
<u>District l</u>									
Camden	11	61.1%	2	11.1%	5	27.8%	18	248.4	104.5
Chowan	36	61.0%	11	18.6%	12	20.3%	59	237.5	105.0
Currituck	34	63.0%	14	25.9%	6	11.1%	54	186,0	106.5
Dare	61	52.2%	19	19.4%	18	13.4%	98	202.6	120.5
Gates	17	70.8%	4 14	16.7%	3	12.5%	24	138.7	86.0
Pasquotank	101 31	66.9% 48.4%	14	9.3% 12.5%	36 25	23.3% 39.1%	151 64	219.2 503.2	100.0 207.0
Perquimans	31	43.4%	0	12.74	2.3	JJ • 1%	04	JUJ.2	207.0
District Totals	291	62.2%	72	15.4%	105	22.4%	468	250.0	111.0
District 2									
Beaufort	72	37.1%	43	22.2%	79	40.7%	194	369.6	274.0
Hyde	11	55.0%	5	25.0%	4	20.0%	20	183.1	172.0
Martin	62	56.4%	15	13.6%	33	30.0%	110	339.5	129.5
Tyrrell	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	7	170.4	168.0
Washington	45	70.3%	11	17.2%	8	12.5%	64	173.4	0.05
District Totals	194	49.1%	77	19.5%	124	31.4%	395	316.5	190.0
District 3									
Carteret	155	76.4%	42	20.7%	6	3.0%	203	111.2	69.0
Craven	298	73.2%	80	19.7%	29	7.1%	407	130.6	80.0
Pamlico	15	68.2%	3	13.6%	4	18.2%	22	162.8	98.5
Pitt	205	77.4%	46	17.4%	14	5.3%	265	121.4	62.0
District Totals	673	75.0%	171	19.1%	53	5.9%	897	124.3	71.0
District 4									
Duplin	92	62.2%	29	19.6%	27	13.2%	148	213.0	92.5
Jones	24	52.2%	6	13.0%	16	34.8%	46	404.1	152.5
Onslow	502	56.4%	154	17.3%	234	26.3%	890	246.7	130.5
Sampson	107	80.5%	11	8.3%	15	11.3%	133	140.1	56.0
District Totals	725	59.6%	200	16.4%	292	24.0%	1,217	237.5	111.0
District 5									
New Hanover	376	53.3%	163	23.1%	167	23.7%	706	235.2	146.0
Pender	49	42.6%	26	22.6%	40	34.8%	115	361.5	237.0
District Totals	425	51.8%	189	23.0%	207	25.2%	821	252.9	157.0
District 6									
Bertie	45	67.2%	14	20.9%	. 8	11.9%	67	159.2	77.0
Halifax	178	78.8%	35	15.5%	13	5.8%	226	120.0	71.0
Hertford	73	75.3%	21	21.6%	3	3.1%	97	110.6	69.0
Northampton	44	62.0%	15	21.1%	12	16.9%	71	173.4	114.0
District Totals	340	73.8%	85	18.4%	36	7.8%	461	131.9	77.0
District 7			1	· · ·					
Edgecombe	123	65.1%	22	11.6%	44	23.3%	189	268.5	94.0
Nash	178	66.2%	42	15.6%	49	18.2%	269	224.8	106.0
Wilson	133	81.1%	20	12.2%	11	6.7%	164	117.9	51.0
District Totals	434	69.8%	84	13.5%	104	16.7%	ó22	209.9	84.5
District 8									
Greene	11	52.4%	2	9.5%	8	38.1%	21	307.4	156.0
Lenoir	216	69.0%	59	18.8%	38	12.1%	313	169.2	91.0
Wayne	312	58.6%	120	22.6%	100	18.8%	532	211.0	134.0
District Totals	539	62.2%	181	20.9%	146	16.9%	366	198.2	114.0

Ares of Pending Cases (Months)

		Ages	of Pendl	ng Cases (l Mean	Madian	
	< 6	%	6-12	%	>12	%	Total Pending		Median
District 9		, end and a second s		10		10	renaing	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
Franklin	71	68.9%	21	20.4%	11	10.7%	103	196.7	84.0
Granville	77	05.8%	22	18.8%	18	15.4%	117	192.0	100.0
Person	51	79.7%	10	15.6%	3	4.7%	64	103.0	49.0
Vance	110	66.3%	32	19.3%	24	14.5%	166	183.6	97.0
Warren	44	58.7%	17	22.7%	14	18.7%	75	198.3	139.0
							ant set an eigen An t-statua		
District fotals	353	67.2%	102	19.4%	70	13.3%	525	180.3	94.0
District 10									
Wake	961	29.1%	447	13.5%	1,900	57.4%	3,308	623.3	489.0
District 11	147	61.3%	58	01 17	33	12.04	0.3.0	174.1	106.0
Harnett	147	55.5%	78	24.4%	64	13.9% 20.1%	238 319	174.1 201.3	149.0
Johnston Lee	121	66.5%	49	26.9%	12	6.6%	182	145.4	98.0
Lee	141	00.3%		20.7%	12	0.0%	102	143.4	30.0
District Totals	445	60.2%	185	25.0%	109	14.7%	739	173.8	118.0
District 12									
Cumberland	1,184	52.5%	418	18,5%	655	29.0%	2,257	254.2	161.0
Hoke	47	43.1%	16	14.7%	46	42.2%	109	669.4	273.0
		at a star							
District Totals	1,231	52.0%	434	18.3%	701	29.6%	2,366	273.3	161.0
Distantiate 12								1	
District 13 Bladen	53	64.6%	9	11.0%	20	24.4%	82	235.9	132.0
Brunswick	123	33.1%	55	14.8%	194	52.2%	372	519.3	400.5
Columbus	128	32.9%	50	12.9%	211	54.2%	389	524.9	451.0
0010.000	140	5245%		*******		341240	505	22402	19110
District Totals	304	36.1%	114	13.5%	425	50.4%	843	494.3	377.0
District 14		00 77						075.0	050 0
Durham	443	39.7%	242	21.7%	432	38.7%	1,117	375.2	259.0
District 15A							1		
Alamance	249	70.9%	56	16.0%	46	13.1%	351	145.5	70.0
District 15B								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Chatham	65	63.7%	19	18.6%	18	17.6%	102	207.9	115.0
Orange	168	47.9%	76	21.7%	107	30.5%	351	306.6	212.0
District Totals	233	51.4%	95	21.0%	125	27.6%	453	284.4	168.0
DISCILCE IOCUIS		71.4%		21.0%	***	27.0%	455	207.7	100.0
District 16									
Robeson	203	64.9%	71	22.7%	39	12.5%	313	166.3	93.0
Scotland	87	63.0%	33	23.9%	18	13.0%	138	203.6	112.5
District Totals	290	64.3%	104	23.1%	57	12.6%	451	177.7	99.0
District 17A									
Caswell	18	48.6%	10	27.0%	. 9	24.3%	37	256.7	204.0
Rockingham	148	65.2%	61	26.9%	18	7.9%	227	156.4	86.0
nock Ingham	140	05127		20.54	10	1.270	247	150.4	30.0
District Totals	166	62.9%	71	26.9%	27	10.2%	264	170.4	98.5
									10 15 16 10
District 17B							e server s		
Stokes	42	63.6%	13	19.7%	11	16.7%	66	180.7	95.5
Surry	97	68.8%	17	12.1%	27	19.1%	141	209.0	86.0
		, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				10 17			
District Totals	139	67.1%	30	14.5%	38	18.4%	207	200.0	91.0

일 같은 것은 것이 같은 것		Ag	s of Pen	ding Cases					
	< 6	%	6.12	%	>12	%	Total Pending	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 18				이 관계 같이 있					URe (Duys)
Guilford	909	38.3%	308	13.02	1,154	48.7%	2,371	521.9	339.0
District 19A									
Cabarrus	199	69.1%	49	17 44				je na se ha se	
Rowan	176	80.7%		17.0%	40	13,9%	288	156.5	36.0
		DU , / 4	18	8.3%	24	11,0%	213	132.6	58.5
District Totals	375	74.1%	67	13.2%	ó4	12.6%	506	146.2	70.0
District 198									
Montgomery	43	40.6%	18	17 3#					
Randolph	198	67.8%	47	17.0%	45	42.5%	106	435.6	285.0
		07.04	47	16.1%	47	16.1%	292	190.8	105.0
District Totals	241	60.6%	65	16.3%	92	23.1%	398	256.0	125.0
District 20									**?*4
Anson	62	44.9%	33	23.9%	43	31.2%	138	210.3	107 5
Moore	117	42.1%	40	14.4%	121	43.5%	278	312.1	197.5
Richmond	123	52.6%	58	24.8%	53	22.6%		380.6	260.0
Stanly	69	27.9%	31	12.6%	147	59.5%	234	249.2	160.0
Union	150	50.3%	59	19.8%	89		247	739.1	570.0
				13.0%	69	29.9%	298	270.5	177.0
District Totals	521	43.6%	221	18.5%	453	37.9%	1,195	393.6	245.0
District 21									
Forsyth	657	54.2%	226	18.6%	329	27.1%	1 210		
					527	47.1%	1,212	261.1	147.0
District 22									
Alexander		7. 							
	28	63.6%	.10	22.7%	6	13.6%	44	163.3	108.5
Davidson	205	39.4%	112	21.5%	203	39.0%	520	347.9	254.0
Davie	52	76.5%	10	14.7%	6	3.8%	68	133.3	
Iredell	164	61.9%	58	21.9%	43	16.2%	265	187.9	66.0 122.0
District Totals	449	50.1%	190	21.2%	258	28.8%	897	275.3	
Distantion 00							0,7	273.3	178.0
District 23 Alleghany	• •								
Ashe	18	85.7%	- 3 .	14.3%	0	0.0%	21	85.1	69.0
	44	62.0%	17	23.9%	10	14.1%	71	191.2	
Wilkes	85	82.5%	15	14.6%	3	2.9%	103	102.0	111.0
Yadkin	53	63.1%	16	19.0%	15	17.9%	84	252.5	61.0
District Totals	200	₩1.1 m/ <i>di</i>				-/ • //	04	232.5	126.5
	200	71.7%	51	18.3%	28	10.0%	279	168.8	80.0
District 24									
Avery	32	43.2%	23	31.1%	19	25.7%	74		
Madison	41	67.2%	10	16.4%	10		74	328.2	215.0
Mitchell	32	68.1%	4	8.5%		16.4%	61	171.0	87.0
Watauga	55	61.1%			11	23.4%	47	278.5	85.0
Yancey	47	82.5%	20 8	22.2%	15	16.7%	90	232.1	121.5
	•••			14.0%	2	3.5%	57	111.0	73.0
District Totals	207	62.9%	65	19.8%	57	17.3%	329	228.0	114.0
<u>Pistrict 25</u>									
Burke	158	60.3%	77	29.4%	07	10 22			
Caldwell	183	68.8%	47		27	10.3%	262	169.4	106.5
Catawba	308	59.7%	90	17.7% 17.4%	36	13.5%	266	174.0	86.5
			20	11.46	118	22.9%	516	215.9	93.5
District Totals	649	62.2%	214	20.5%	181	17.3%	1,044	193.6	97.5
District 26							•		~ • • •
	1,385	54.5%	376	16 89	700	20.7*			
č			510	14.8%	780	30.7%	2,541	280.1	139.0

		Age	s of Pendi	ing Cases (Total	Mean	Median		
	< 6	%	6-12	<i>%</i>	>12	<i>%</i>	Pending	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
District 27A									
Gaston	473	57.5%	1 50	13.0%	204	24.5%	832	218.2	127.0
District 27B									
Cleveland	212	89.3%	22	9.3%	2	0.8%	236	85.6	50.5
Lincoln	82	95.3%	3	3.5%	1	1.2%	36	73.3	56.5
District Totals	294	91.3%	25	1.8%	3	0.9%	322	32.3	51.5
District 28									
Buncombe	437	59.8%	191	23.5%	136	16.7%	314	195.0	121.5
District 29									
Henderson	125	66.5%	33	17.6%	30	15.0%	138	222.0	77.0
McDowell	34	66.1%	27	21.34	16	12.64	133	169.5	108.0
Polk	14	63.6%	1	4.5%		31.8%	22	334.5	92.0
Rutherford	119	53.1%	24	10.7%	81	36.2%	224	385.9	141.0
Transylvania	63	62.4%	14	13.9%	24	23.8%	101	273.7	126.0
District Totals	405	61.2%	99	15.0%	153	23.9%	662	279.0	112.0
District 30					a ser estas				
Cherokee	37	48.7%	15	19.7%	24	31.6%	76	386.5	190.0
Clay	23	85.2%	2	7.4%	2	7.4%	27	135.8	55.0
Graham	14	60.9%	5	21.7%	4	17.4%	23	204.7	129.0
Haywood	127	60.5%	39	13.67	44	21.0%	210	243.2	149.0
Jackson	51	63.8%	7	8.3%	22	27.5%	80	303.8	96.0
Macon	49	50.0%	16	16.3%	33	33.7%	98	345.9	181.0
Swain	24	57.1%	11	26.2%	7	16.7%	42	214.3	158.5
District Totals	325	58.5%	95	17.1%	136	24.5%	556	282.5	146.5
State Totals	16,017	52.8%	5,282	17.4%	9,030	29.8%	30,329	314.0	155.0

AGES OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

Ages of Disposed Cases (Months) 'Cotal Medlan Mean 6.12 % % Disposed < 6 7 >12 Age (Days) Age (Days) District 1 11 64.7% 35.34 0.0% 6 0 17 Camden 124.8 75.0 86.1% 201 Chowan 173 18 9.0% 10 5.0% 103.3 41.0 Currituck -83 30.6% 17 16.5% .3 2.9% 103 113.9 68.0 Dare 152 75.6% 23 11.4% 26 12.9% 201 173.0 77.0 49 87.5% 7.1% Gates 4 3 5.4% 56 96.7 75.0 298 Pasquotank 86.6% 29 8.4% 17 344 100.6 4.9% 58.5 Perquimans 64 74.4% 9 10.5% 13 15.1% 36 180.3 86.0 District Totals 830 82.34 106 10.5% 72 7.1% 1,008 123.9 64.0 District 2 311 87.9% 6.2% Beaufort 21 5.9% 22 354 92.5 41.0 Hyde 31 77.5% 4 10.0% 5 12.5% 40 129.5 42.5 Martin 177 79.0% 12 5.4% 35 15.6% 224 221.4 41.0 Tyrrell 25 100.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 46.9 29.0 25 Washington 172 89.1% 12 6.2% 9 4.7% 193 82.9 17.0 District Totals 716 85.6% 49 5.9% 71 3.5% 836 125.2 39.0 District 3 442 77.7% Carteret 32 14.4% 45 7.9% 569 125.7 64.0 Craven 744 73.4% 148 14.6% 121 11.9% 1,013 134.7 59.0 Pamlico 70 76.1% 15 16.3% 7 7.6% 92 106.5 56.0 Pitt 688 80.6% 91 10.7% 75 8.8% 854 110.4 54.0 **District** Totals 1,944 76.9% 336 13.3% 243 9.8% 2,528 123.4 59.0 District 4 322 80.1% Duplin 41 10.2% 39 9.7% 402 123.0 54.5 Jones 60 87.0% 2 2.9% 7 10.1% 69 147.6 38.0 Onslow 1,387 74.8% 177 9.5% 290 1,854 15.6% 170.1 69.5 Sampson 444 82.8% 51 9.5% 41 536 7.6% 102.7 43.5 2,213 District Totals 77.4% 271 9.5% 377 13.2% 2,361 150.3 62.0 District 5 1,259 82.8% 139 1,521 New Hanover 9.1% 123 8.1% 114.9 53.0 Pender 77.2% 183 30 12.7% 24 10.1% 237 135.3 54.0 **District** Totals 1,442 82.0% 169 9.6% 147 3.4% 1,758 117.6 53.0 District 6 207__ Bertie 76.7% 39 14,4% 8.9% 24 270 105.3 37.5 783 Halifax 87.7% 94 10.5% 16 1.8% 893 72.6 46.0 Hertford 299 79.7% 55 14.7% 21 5.6% 375 103.1 57.0 Northampton 174 84.1% 23 11.1% 10 4.8% 207 100.6 52.0 District Totals 211 1.463 83.8% 12.1% 71 4.1% 1,745 87.5 48.0 District 7 Edgecombe 509 81.6% 69 11.1% 46 7.4% 624 115.9 53.0 Nash 897 90.2% 62 6.2% 36 3.6% 995 47.0 75.3 Wilson 624 83.1% 55 7.3% 751 156.1 72 9.6% 50.0 District Totals 2,030 85.7% 186 7.8% 154 6.5% 2,370 111.6 49.0 District 8 79 79.8% 9 11.1% Greene 9.1% 99 11 105.9 28.0 522 Lenofr 84 77.7% 12.5% 66 9.8% 672 121.8 57.0 Wayne 1,152 80.4% 135 9.4% 146 10.2% 1,433 55.0 116.3 **District** Totals 1,753 79.5% 228 10.3% 223 10.1% 2,204 117.5 55.0

رى _

~Q.,

AGES OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

		1907 — June 30, 1900							
	< 6	%	6-12	sed Cases (1	>12	%	Total Disposed	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 9		• •							
Franklin	279	83.5%	31	9.3%	.24	7.2%	334	119.6	48.5
Granville	247	82.1%	36	12.0%	15	6.0%	301	101.7	47.0
Person	252	86.6%	24	8.2%	15	5.2%	291	86.3	42.0
Vance	460	84.2%	46	8.4%	40	7.3%	546	91.0	39.0
Warren	167	82.7%	25	12.4%	10	5.0%	202	89.1	45.5
District Totals	1,405	83.9%	162	9.7%	107	6.4%	1,674	97.6	43.0
District 10									
Wake	2,373	82.0%	178	5.1%	451	12.9%	3,502	158.5	47.0
District 11									
Harnett	555	79.5%	96	13.8%	47	6.7%	698	109.4	46.5
Johnston	757	81.8%	49	5.3%	119	12.9%	925	118.5	49.0
Lee	478	84.0%	74	13.0%	17	3.0%	569	81.8	43.0
District Totals	1,790	81.7%	219	10.0%	183	3.3%	2,192	106.1	48.0
DISTLICT IOTAIS	1,750	01.7%	217	10.04	105	0.J%	2,172	100.1	40.0
District 12									
Cumberland	3,504	71.5%	516	10.5%	881	18.0%	4,901	179.8	71.0
Hoke	239	36.0%	25	9.0%	14	5.0%	273	63.8	5.0
District Totals	3,743	72.3%	541	10.4%	395	17.3%	5,179	174.7	69.0
District 13									
Bladen	247	89.8%	20	7.3%	- 8	2.9%	275	69.1	28.0
Brunswick	357	87.1%	28	6.8%	25	6.1%	410	100.2	48.0
Columbus	479	84.0%	47	8.2%	44	7.7%	570	109.5	44.5
District Totals	1,083	36.3%	95	7.5%	77	6.1%	1,255	97.0	42.0
<u>District 14</u> Durham	1,339	78.5%	123	7.5%	239	14.0%	1,706	157.8	57.0
	.,	,					-,		
District 15k			en de la composition de la composition La composition de la c						
<u>District 15A</u> Alamance	1,009	89.7%	73	6.5%	43	3.8%	1,125	84.1	50.0
District 15B									
Chatham	221	82.5%	18	6.7%	29	10.8%	263	120.1	43.0
Orange	433	75.6%	33	5.8%	107	18.7%	573	185.6	55.0
District Totals	654	77.8%	51	6.1%	136	16.2%	841	164.8	51.0
District 16									
Robeson	988	39.1%	84	7.6%	37	3.3%	1,109	67.1	34.0
Scotland	289	83.3%	30	8.6%	28	8.1%	347	104.6	53.0
District Totals	1,277	87.7%	114	7.3%	65	4.5%	1,456	76.1	39.0
District 17A									
Caswell	124	78.5%	20	12.7%	14	8.9%	158	121.1	60.5
Rockingham	704	84.9%	83	10.0%	42	5.1%	829	89.3	44.0
District Totals	828	83.9%	103	10.47	56	5.7%	987	94.4	46.0
District 17B									
Stokes	124	86.1%	13	9.0%	7	4.9%	144	79.2	36.5
Surry	509	85.3%	38	6.4%	50	8.4%	597	109.9	49.0
District Totals	633	85.4%	51	6.9%	57	7.7%	741	103.9	47.0
							-		

AGES OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

		Ages	of Dispo	sed Cases (1		m		Medlan	
	< 6	%	6-12	%	>12	%	Total Disposed	Mean Age (Days)	Age (Days)
<u>District 18</u> Guilford	3,373	90.8%	134	5.0%	153	4.3%	3,715	82.6	48.0
District 19A									
Cabarrus	339	92.14	50	5.2%	2ŏ	2.7%	965	73.3	43.0
Rowan	874	89.1%	76	7.7%	31	3.2%	981	78.4	48.0
NUW dil	0/4					2 	,		
Vistrict Totals	1,763	90.6%	125	ó.5%	57	2.9%	1,946	75.9	45.0
District 19B									
Montgomery	149	87.0%	14	8.2%	7	4.1%	170	89.2	51.0
Randolph	571	80.4%	74	10.4%	65	9.2%	710	123.1	56.5
District Totals	720	81.3%	88	10.0%	72	8.2%	088	116.5	56.0
District 20									
Anson	273	90.7%	19	6.3%	9	3.0%	301	65.7	38.0
Moore	412	75.3%	40	7.3%	95	17.4%	547	233.9	66.0
Richmond	402	89,5%	36	3.0%	11	2.4%	449	72.8	48.0
Stanly	324	90.5%	23	6.4%	ü	3.1%	358	71.0	36.0
Union	541	82.2%	51	7.8%	66	10.02	658	129.1	46.0
OUTON	741	02.24	21	1.54	00	10.0~	0.70	127.1	40.0
District Totals	1,952	84.4%	169	7.3%	192	8.3%	2,313	125.7	48.0
District 21									
Forsyth	2,325	77.8%	131	4.4%	531	17.8%	2,987	222.6	62.0
DJ-AmJ-A 22									
District 22	120	86.3%	10	0 74		5.0%	210	00 3	42.0
Alexander	189		19	8.7%	11		219	88.3	42.0
Davidson	813	83.2%	85	8.7%	79	8.1%	977	105.4	49.0
Davie	170	79.4%	23	10.7%	21	9.8%	214	128.4	56.0
Iredell	778	81.6%	99	10.4%	77	8.1%	954	102.0	43.0
District Totals	1,950	82.5%	226	9.6%	188	8.0%	2,364	104.6	47.0
District 23									
Alleghany	76	90.5%	7	8.3%	1	1.2%	84	70.2	44.5
Ashe	162	91.0%	8	4.5%	à	4.5%	178	76.2	39.0
Wilkes	524	85.6%	63	10.3%	25	4.1%	612	84.9	43.0
Yadkin	173	82.0%	21	10.0%	17	8.1%	211	102.8	46.0
IAGKIN	1/3	02.0%	41	10.04	±1	0.14	~11	102.0	40.0
District Totals	935	86,2%	99	9.1%	51	4.7%	1,085	85.8	42.0
District 24									
Avery	93	73.2%	12	9,4%	22	17.3%	127	193.4	76.0
Madison	95	84.8%	12	10.7%	5	4.5%	112	102.8	55.0
Mitchell	98	81.0%	13	10.7%	10	8.3%	121	124.6	68.0
Watauga	224	73,4%	50	16.4%	31	10.2%	305	153.7	74.0
Yancey	84	75.0%	15	13.4%	13	11.6%	112	143.7	56.0
District Totals	594	76.4%	102	13.1%	81	10.4%	777	146.9	67.0
			1						
District 25	570	NA 57	ØA	11 27	c .3	0.0*	708	127 0	48.0
Burke	570	80.5%	80	11.3%	58	8.2%		127.0	48.0
Caldwell	603	85.8%	61	8.7%	39	5.5%	703	95.0	43.0
Catawba	1,133	83.6%	90	ō.6%	133	9.8%	1,356	117.6	52.0
District Totals	2,306	83.3%	231	8.3%	230	8.3%	2,767	114.3	49.0
District 26 Mecklenburg	4,029	89.3%	241	5.3%	241	5.3%	4,511	96.0	54.0
•							•		

-1

AGES OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

		Ages	of Dispose	d Cases (N	Aonths)		Total	Mean	Medlan
	< 6	170	6-12	%	>12	76	Disposed	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
District 27A				en en en					
Gaston	1,992	38.17	89	3.9%	190	3.0%	2,261	99.9	43.0
District 278									
Cleveland	1,007	90.3%	100	9.0%	8	0.7%	1,115	71.2	45.0
Lincoln	433	83.7%	52	10.7%	3	0.0%	483	72.8	44.0
District Totals	1,440	89.3%	152	9.5%	11	0.7%	1,603	71.7	45.0
District 28									
Buncombe	1,586	73.5%	339	15.7%	234	10.8%	2,159	144.5	67.0
D1 1 1 0 0									
District 29 Henderson	573	30.3%	60	8.5%	76	10.7%	709	128.4	51.0
McDowell	241	71.9%	51	15.2%	43	12.8%	335	157.4	06.0
Polk	90	85.7%	4	3.8%	11	10.5%	105	122.4	48.0
Rutherford	430	92.7%	13	2.8%	21	4.5%	464	82.5	40.0
Transylvania	166	64.1%	26	10.0%	67	25.9%	259	278.9	61.0
District Totals	1,500	80.1%	154	8.2%	213	11.6%	1,872	142.7	50.0
District 30									
Cherokee	128	78.5%	25	15.3%	10	6.1%	163	112.0	55.0
Clay	46	76.7%	10	16.7%	4	6.7%	60	168.5	73.5
Graham	65	71.4%	17	18.7%	9	9.9%	91	147.5	73.0
Haywood	362	72.0%	ō5	12.9%	7 ó	15.1%	503	179.6	73.0
Jackson	150	71.1%	34	16.1%	27	12.8%	211	150.8	67.0
Macon	136	79.1%	16	9.3%	20	11.6%	172	135.1	54.5
Swain	60	60.6%	13	13.1%	26	26.3%	99	267.4	85.0
District Totals	947	72.9%	180	13.9%	172	13.2%	1,299	164.5	68.0
State Totals	56,437	82.4%	5,782	8.4%	6,288	9.2%	68,507	123.6	51.0

' 영화한 위' 내 가격한 가지 ' 이 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같이 같이 같이 같이 있다.		Ages	of Pending	g Cases (Me		10 - 4 - 1		Median	
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Total Pending	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 1									
Camden	6	42.9%	4	28.6%	4	28.6%	14	436.6	290.5
Chowan	30	57.7%	11	21.2%	11	21.2%	52	440.8	219.5
Currituck	30	49.2%	21	34.4%	10	16.4%	61	305.4	293.0
Dare	109	67.7%	25	15.5%	27	16.8%	161	248.8	178.0
Gates	11	34.6%	0	0.0%	2	15.4%	13	266.6	77.0
Pasquotank	52	48.1%	39	36.1%	17	15.7%	108	327.3	279.5
Perquimans	13	43.3%	6	20.0%	11	36.7%	30	503.7	407.0
District Totals	251	57.2%	106	24.1%	82	18.7%	439	322.7	199.0
District 2									
Beaufort	72	55.0%	35	26.7%	24	/ 18.3%	131	340 :	224.0
Hyde	5	45.5%	4	36.4%	2 //	18.2%	11	411.0	345.0
Martin	22	59.5%	2	5.4%	13	35.1%	37	440.3	241.0
Tyrrell	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	1	12.5%	8	278.4	183.5
Washington	21	84.0%	. 1	4.0%	3	12.0%	25	230.8	111.0
District Totals	125	59.0%	44	20.8%	43	20.3%	212	346.6	216.5
District 3									
Carteret	129	85.4%	16	10.6%	6	4.0%	151	152.5	121.0
Craven	216	84.7%	35	13.7%	4	1.6%	255	143.5	92.0
Pamlico	. 9	90.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	10	83.6	47.0
Pitt	317	90.8%	28	8.0%	4	1.1%	349	128.0	94.0
	517	JU.U%	20	0.0%	.	1.1%	545	120.0	54.0
District Totals	671	87.7%	80	10.5%	14	1.8%	765	137.4	99.0
District 4									
Duplin	61	60.4%	24	23.8%	16	15.8%	101	300.5	191.0
Jones	24	49.0%	10	20.4%	15	30.6%	49	559.0	387.0
Onslow	318	56.8%	138	24.6%	104	18.6%	560	356.5	220.0
Sampson	106	76.8%	14	10.1%	18	13.0%	138	223.4	100.0
District Totals	509	60.0%	186	21.9%	153	18.0%	848	339.9	198.0
District 5									
New Hanover	659	61.0%	269	24.9%	152	14.1%	1,080	263.3	199.0
Pender	83	66.4%	34	27.2%	8	6.4%	125	274.1	190.0
District Totals	742	61.6%	303	25.1%	160	13.3%	1,205	264.4	199.0
District 6									
Bertie	28	75.7%	7	18.9%	2	5.4%	37	198.6	135.0
Halifax	71	82.6%	12	14.0%	3	3.5%	86	146.3	79.0
Hertford	52	89.7%	6	10.3%	0	0.0%	58		
Northampton	33	82.5%	4	10.0%	3	7.5%	58 40	124.3 176.7	79.0 112.0
District Totals	184	83.3%	29	13.1%	8	3.6%	221	154.8	84.0
District 7									
Edgecombe	126	78.8%	20	12.5%	14	8.8%	160	206.3	92.0
Nash	214	34.6%	26	10.3%	13	5.1%	253	160.7	107.0
Wilson	160	76.6%	34	16.3%	15	7.2%	209	210.7	106.0
District Totals	500	80.4%	80	12.9%	42	6.8%	622	189.2	102.0
District 8			_			.	· <u>1</u> · ·		
Greene	31	79.5%	6	15.4%	2	5.1%	39	165.8	118.0
Lenoir	171	73.1%	53	22.6%	10	4.3%	234	207.9	169.0
Wayne	317	59.7%	189	35.6%	25	4.7%	531	232.6	209.0
District Totals	519	64.6%	248	30.8%	37	4.6%	804	222.2	184.5

Ģ

		Ages	of Pendin	g Cases (M		10 I	Mean	Modiun	
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Total Pending	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 9 Franklin	48	65.8%	10	13.7%	15	20.5%	73	366.9	140.0
Granville	69	89,6%	6	7.8%	2	2.6%	77	116.3	73.0
Person	53	84.1%	6	9.5%	4	6.3%	63	208.9	97.0
Vance	108	81.2%	14	10.5%	11	8.3%	133	196.4	125.0
Warren	36	65.5%	13	23.6%	6	10.9%	55	227.6	141.0
District Totals	314	78.3%	49	12.2%	38	9.5%	401	218.3	108.0
District 10					1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1				
Wake	2,441	56.5%	1,051	24.3%	829	19.2%	4,321	321.8	219.0
District 11	014	76 08	60	01.64	5. st. 2 . s	1 34	001	171 7	117 0
Harnett	216	76.9%	60	21.4%	5	1.8%	281	171.7	147.0
Johnston	284	66.5%	129	30.2%	14	3.3%	427	208.3	169.0
Lee	240	89.9%	20	7.5%	7	2.6%	267	134.8	100.0
District Totals	740	75.9%	209	21.4%	26	2.7%	975	177.6	128.0
District 12			· · ·						
Cumberland	508	61.2%	209	25.2%	113	13.6%	830	253.8	169.5
Hoke	23	46.0%	7	14.0%	20	40.0%	50	739.3	382.0
District Totals	531	60.3%	216	24.5%	133	15.1%	880	281.4	170.0
District 13									
Bladen	97	60.6%	21	13.1%	42	26.3%	160	300.0	174.0
Brunswick	212	34.3%	95	15.4%	311	50.3%	618	671.7	559.5
Columbus	167	34.2%	99	20.3%	222	45.5%	488	555.7	481.0
District Totals	476	37.6%	215	17.0%	575	45.4%	1,266	580.0	455.0
District 14									
Durham	697	54.4%	242	18.9%	343	26.8%	1,282	344.7	216.0
District 15A Alamance	321	70.2%	118	25.8%	18	3.9%	457	200.0	122.0
District 15B									
Chatham	47	73.4%	17	26.6%	0	0.0%	64	160.8	114.0
Orange	166	37.0%	150	33.4%	133	29.6%	449	425.5	353.0
District Totals	213	41.5%	167	32.6%	133	25.9%	513	392.4	317.0
District 16									
Robeson	279	70.1%	86	21.6%	33	8.3%	398	233.6	169.0
Scotland	62	60.8%	24	23.5%	16	15.7%	102	277.9	172.0
District Totals	341	68.2%	110	22.0%	49	9.8%	500	242.6	169.0
District 17A									
Caswell	33	91.7%	1	2.8%	2	5.6%	36	156.1	104.0
Rockingham	197	78.5%	53	21.1%	- 1	0.4%	251	151.8	141.0
District Totals	230	80.1%	54	18.8%	3	1.0%	287	152.3	134.0
District 17B									
Stokes	48	75.0%	15	23.4%	1	1.6%	64	193.8	177.0
Surry	75	76.5%	13	13.3%	10	10.2%	98	180.3	70.5
District Totals	123	75.9%	28	17.3%	11	6.8%	162	185.6	130.5

		Ages	of Pendin	g Cases (N					
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Total Pending	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)
District 18									
Guilford	1,981	47.9%	858	20.8%	1,293	31.3%	4,132	411.3	295.5
District 19A									
Cabarrus	215	63.0%	113	33.1%	13	3,8%	341	228.0	183.0
Rowan	232	84.1%	33	12.0%	11	4.0%	276	156.3	98.5
District Totals	447	72.4%	146	23.7%	24	3.9%	617	195.9	136.0
District 19B									
Montgomery	66	39.8%	22	13.3%	78	47.0%	166	621.3	512.0
Randolph	145	87.3%	15	9.0%	6	3.6%	166	137.8	97.5
District Totals	211	63.6%	37	11.1%	84	25.3%	332	379.6	168.5
District 20						an an an Araga Aragana			
Anson	56	47.5%	20	16.9%	42	35.6%	118	466.5	310.0
Moore	127	26.1%	85	17.5%	275	56.5%	487	690.5	650.0
Richmond	141	63.2%	57	25.6%	25	11.2%	223	278.7	211.0
Stanly	75	21.7%	53	15.4%	217	62.9%	345	1,064.9	869.0
Union	184	48.7%	131	34.7%	63	16.7%	378	307.7	274.5
District Totals	583	37.6%	346	22.3%	622	40.1%	1,551	604.2	399.0
District 21 Forsyth	1,067	58.1%	503	27.4%	267	14.5%	1,837	281.1	196.0
District 22									
Alexander	32	88.9%	4	11.1%	0	0.0%	36	104.3	57.0
Davidson	197	59.7%	114	34.5%	19	5.8%	330	241.5	190.5
Davie	74	79.6%	14	15.1%	5	5.4%	93	186.3	119.0
Iredell	246	77.6%	65	20.5%	6	1.9%	317	152.8	105.0
District Totals	549	70.7%	197	25.4%	30	3.9%	776	192.3	132.0
District 23					·				
Alleghany	19	67.9%	7	25.0%	2	7.1%	28	216.3	135.0
Ashe	29	69.0%	11	26.2%	2	4.8%	42	174.6	77.0
Wilkes Yadkin	134 49	74.4% 58.3%	37 15	20.6% 17.9%	9 20	5.0% 23.8%	180 84	176.2 565.4	97.0 196.0
District Totals	231	69.2%	70	21.0%	33	9.9%	334	277.2	122.0
District 24	70		16	16 07		6 1.00	04	106.0	00.0
Avery	73	77.7%	15	16.0%	6	6.4%	94	196.8	99.0
Madison	14	66.7%	6	28.6%	1	4.8%	21	225.8	206.0
Mitchell	23	76.7%	6	20.0%	1	3.3%	30	182.9	141.0
Watauga Yancey	100	92.6% 45.0%	8	7.4% 40.0%	0 3	0.0%	108 20	92.4 300.3	55.5 304.5
District Totals	219	80.2%	43	15.8%	11	4.0%	273	163.8	84.0
District 25									
Burke	110	79.1%	26	18.7%	3	2.2%	139	159.7	107.0
Caldwell	171	73.1%	50	21.4%	13	5.6%	234	189.2	139.0
Catawba	262	84.5%	36	11.6%	12	3.9%	310	140.9	85.0
District Totals	543	79.5%	112	16.4%	28	4.1%	683	161.3	107.0
District 26 Mecklenburg	4,102	73.4%	1,054	18.9%	429	7.7%	5,585	205.6	148.0
			• • • •						

		Ages	of Pendin	g Cases (N		Total	Mean	Median	
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Pending	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
District 27A									
Gaston	308	82.6%	51	13.7%	14	3.8%	373	174.5	133.0
District 278									
Cleveland	102	98,1%	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	104	94.7	87.0
Lincoln	55	98.2%	1.5	1.8%	0	0.0 %	56	60.6	52.0
District Totals	157	98.1%	3	1.9%	0	0.0%	160	82.8	66.0
District 28									
Buncombe	555	86.4%	68	10.6%	19	3.0%	642	144.8	99.0
District 29									
Henderson	134	64.1%	42	20.1%	33	15.8%	209	274.0	155.0
McDowell	50	74.6%	12	17.9%	5	7.5%	67	201.6	115.0
Polk	12	75.0%	2	12.5%	2	12.5%	16	263.3	173.5
Rutherford	55	61.8%	19	21.3%	15	16.9%	89	306.6	160.0
Transylvania	37	46.8%	23	29.12	19	24.1%	79	354.2	303.0
District Totals	288	62.6%	98	21.3%	74	16.1%	460	283.2	163.0
District 30									
Cherokee	17	81.0%	2	9.5%	2	9.5%	21	179.8	83.0
Clay	14	87.5%	1	6.3%	1	6.3%	16	156.1	70.5
Graham	7	41.2%	5	29.4%	5	29.4%	17	397.9	286.0
Haywood	62	48.4%	43	33.6%	23	13.0%	128	332.5	275.0
Jackson	54	88.5%	7	11.5%	0	0.0%	61	135.6	127.0
Macon	45	50.6%	29	32.6%	15	16.9%	89 12	338.1 261.8	266.0
Swain	8	66.7%	2	16.7%	2	16.7%	12	201.0	159.0
District Totals	207	60.2%	89	25.9%	48	14.0%	344	282.3	182.0
State Totals 2	1,376	62.4%	7,210	21.0%	5,673	16.6%	34,259	296.7	182.0

AGES OF GENERAL CIVIL AND MAGISTRATE APPEAL/TRANSFER CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

 \mathbf{O}

		Ages of Disposed Cases (Months)									
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Total Disposed	Mean Age (Days)	Median Age (Days)		
District 1											
Camden	6	60.0%	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	10	234.3	170.5		
Chowan	37	57.8%	18	28.1%	Ş	14.17	64	296.9	196.5		
Gurrituck	42	59.2%	8	11.3%	21	29.6%	71	301.8	206.0		
Dare	117	66.1%	23	13.0%	37	20.9%	177	258.4	126.0		
Gates	15	78.9%	3	15.8%	1	5.3%	19	181.1	141.0		
Pasquotank	108	78.3%	14	10.1%	16	11.6%	138	196.1	100.0		
Perquimans	30	66.7%	3	6.7%	12	26.7%	45	366.6	147.0		
District Totals	355	67.7%	72	13.7%	97	18.5%	524	258.6	136.5		
District 2											
Beaufort	109	68.1%	21	13.17	30	18.8%	160	258.0	123.5		
Hyde	19	70.4%	3	11.1%	5	18.5%	27	320.9	148.0		
Martin	52	80.0%	5	7.7%	8	12.3%	65	276.7	98.0		
Tyrrell	4	25.0%	7	43.8%	5	31.3%	16	495.7	453.0		
Washington	39	83.0%	4	8.5%	4	8.5%	47	182.0	128.0		
District Totals	223	70.8%	40	12.7%	52	16.5%	315	268.0	128.0		
District 3	260	91 OV		16 0%	-		399	164 1	114.0		
Carteret	269	81.0%	56	16.9%		2.1%	332	164,1	114.0		
Craven	566	86.3%	74	11.3%	16	2.4%	656	134.7	82.0		
Pamlico	27	87.1%	3	9.7%	1	3.2%	31	129.0	92.0		
Pitt	702	91.3%	60	7.8%	7	0.9%	769	121.9	85.0		
District Totals	1,564	87.5%	193	10.8%	31	1.7%	1,788	134.6	90.0		
District 4				••••							
Duplin	89	65.0%	31	22.6%	17	12.4%	137	244.4	99.0		
Jones	37	78.7%	7	14.9%	3	6.4%	47	171.7	93.0		
Onslow	639	65.7%	88	9.0%	246	25.3%	973	330.4	146.0		
Sampson	268	85.4%	33	10.5%	13	4.1%	314	139.4	59.0		
District Totals	1,033	70.2%	159	10.8%	279	19.0%	1,471	276.6	112.0		
District 5							36				
New Hanover	1,253	76.4%	211	12.9%	175	10.7%	1,639	210.6	104.0		
Pender	156	80.4%	23	11.9%	- 15	7.7%	194	205.9	104.5		
District Totals	1,409	76.9%	234	12.8%	190	10.4%	1,833	210.1	104.0		
District 6											
Bertie	70	83.3%	11	13.1%	3	3.6%	84	153.9	90.0		
Halifax	156	83.4%	27	14.4%	4	2.1%	187	145.2	97.0		
Hertford	163	90.1%	14	7.7%	. 4	2.2%	181	144.6	114.0		
Northampton	56	93.3%	4	6.7%	0	0.0%	60	112.6	75.0		
District Totals	445	86.9%	56	10.9%	11	2.1%	512	142.6	96.0		
District 7											
Edgecombe	167	76.3%	31	14.2%	21	9.6%	219	234.1	106.0		
Nash	510	78.8%	104	16.1%	33	5.1%	647	178.6	104.0		
Wilson	348	84.5%	46	11.2%	18	4.4%	412	171.1	84.0		
District Totals	1,025	80.2%	181	14.2%	72	5.6%	1,278	185.7	94.0		
District 8		a se		· · · ·							
Greene	62	88.6%	7	10.0%	1	1.4%	70	107.2	61.5		
Lenoir	308	72.0%	102	23.8%	18	4.2%	428	177.9	87.5		
Wayne	439	61.9%	230	32.4%	40	5.6%	709	220.2	120.0		
District Totals	809	67.0%	339	28.1%	59	4.9%	1,207	198.6	103.0		

AGES OF GENERAL CIVIL AND MAGISTRATE APPEAL/TRANSFER CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

24,

		Ages o	of Dispose	d Cases (N		Tabul	Mean	Median	
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Total Disposed	Age (Days)	Age (Days)
District 9		••						11 <u>5</u> - (1011))	
Franklin	84	70.6%	27	22.7%	8	6.7%	119	214.0	147.0
Granville	89	82.4%	16	14.8%	3	2.8%	108	154,3	87.5
Person	90	68.2%	31	23.5%	11	8.3%	132	237.0	208.0
Vance	138	73.0%	41	21.7%	10	5.3%	189	193.6	119.0
Warren	44	75.9%	10	17.2%	., 4	6.9%	58	202.7	160.0
District Totals	445	73.4%	125	20.6%	36	5.9%	606	200.9	143.0
<u>District 10</u> Wake	4,420	76.2%	346	14.6%	537	9.3%	5,803	133.1	100.0
District 11									
Harnett	432	86.9%	58	11.7%	7	1.4%	497	132.6	84.0
Johnston	373	71.5%	120	23.0%	29	5.6%	522	190.2	103.0
Lee	392	84.7%	65	14.0%	6	1.3%	463	133.7	70.0
District Totals	1,197	30.8%	243	16.4%	42	2.8%	1,482	153.3	84.0
District 12									
Cumberland	987	71.1%	172	12.4%	229	16.5%	1,388	235.0	111.5
Hoke	96	93.2%	··5 ₁	4.9%	2	1.9%	103	123.8	68.0
District Totals	1,083	72.6%	177	11.9%	231	15.5%	1,491	227.3	104.0
District 13									
Bladen	156	69.3%	24	10.7%	45	20.0%	225	299.1	81.0
Brunswick	341	73.0%	65	13.9%	61	13.1%	467	252.5	101.0
Columbus	207	62.9%	49	14.9%	73	22.2%	329	313.4	132.0
District Totals	704	69.0%	138	13.5%	179	17.5%	1,021	282,4	105.0
District 14	1 007	711 74	010	10.08	0.57	16 79	1 0 1 0	224	110 0
Durham	1,297	71.3%	218	12.0%	304	16.7%	1,819	284.1	116.0
District 15A									
Alamance	454	77.1%	103	17.5%	32	5.4%	589	173.2	85.0
District 15B									
Chatham	70	66.7%	28	26.7%	7	6.7%	105	214.1	125.0
Orange	370	80.8%	59	12.9%	29	6.3%	458	178.1	101.5
District Totals	440	78.2%	87	15.5%	36	6.4%	563	184.8	107.0
District 16	n de la composition d La composition de la c								
Robeson	483	66.9%	170	23.5%	69	9.6%	722	224.5	136.0
Scotland	150	82.4%	23	12.6%	9	4.9%	182	142.1	69.0
District Totals	633	70.0%	193	21.3%	78	8.6%	904	208.0	110.0
District 17A	1.		a the a						-
Caswell	47	79.7%	4	6.8%	8	13.6%	59	199.7	94.0
Rockingham	347	88.1%	44	11.2%	3	0.8%	394	131.8	77.0
District Totals	394	87.0%	48	10.6%	11	2.4%	453	140.6	78.0
District_17B									
Stokes	117	79.1%	25	16.9%	6	4.1%	148	153.0	69.5
Surry	267	82.4%	43	13.3%	14	4.3%	324	152.9	93.0
District Totals	384	81.4%	68	14.4%	20	4.2%	472	152.9	85.0

AGES OF GENERAL CIVIL AND MAGISTRATE APPEAL/TRANSFER CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

		Ages	of Dispose	d Cases	(Months)		Total	Mean	Median	
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Disposed	Age (Days)	Age (Days)	
District 18										
Guilford	3,129	80.0%	378	9.7%	404	10.3%	3,911	200.9	84.0	
District 19A										
Cabarrus	302	62.9%	133	27.7%	45	9.4%	480	235.8	190.5	
Rowan	450	76.3%	126	21.4%	14	2.4%	590	172.6	121.0	
District Totals	752	70.3%	259	24.2%	59	5.5%	1,070	200.9	135.0	
District 19B										
Montgomery	211	88.3%	23	9.6%	5	2.1%	239	123.7	75.0	
Randolph	254	77.9%	59	18.1%	13	4.0%	326	156.4	75.5	
District Totals	465	82.3%	82	14.5%	18	3.2%	565	142.5	75.0	
District 20										
Anson	41	65.1%	14	22.2%	8	12.7%	63	237.2	79.0	
Noore	192	63.4%	32	10.6%	79	26.1%	303	413.4	164.0	
Richmond Stanly	99	70.2%	25	17.7%	17	12.1%	141	233.8	103.0	
Union	154 214	88.5%	12 55	6.9%	8	4.6%	174	138.4	71,5	
		51.2%		13.2%	149	35.6%	418	392.9	264.J	
District Totals	700	63.7%	138	12.6%	261	23.7%	1,099	328.9	134.0	
District 21										
Forsyth	1,748	66.2%	236	8.9%	656	24.8%	2,640	329.3	117.0	
<u>District 22</u> Alexander	98	00 74	0	0 7*		0.07	100			
Davidson	515	90,7% 83,5%	9	8.3% 10.4%	1	0.9%	108	111.3	67.0	
Davie	122	78.7%	64 22	14.2%	38 11	6.2% 7.1%	617	154.6	75.0	
Iredell	403	70.8%	146	25.7%	20	3.5%	155 569	174.4 193.7	84.0 118.0	
District Totals	1.138	78.5%	241	16.6%	70	4.8%	1,449	168.9	84.0	
						1.0.0	•••••	10013	0410	
District 23 Alleghany	41	85.4%	4	8.3%	3	6.3%	40	166 1	100 E	
Ashe	53	70.7%	14	18.7%	8	10.7%	48 75	165.1 210.0	108.5	
Wilkes	510	81.9%	91	14.6%	22	3.5%	623	171.7	126.0 115.0	
Yadkin	122	81.9%	19	12.8%	8	5.4%	149	153.6	69.0	
District Totals	726	81.1%	128	14.3%	41	4.6%	895	171.6	106.0	
District 24										
Avery	132	71.0%	37	19.9%	17	9.1%	186	256.3	179.0	
Madison	19	50.0%	8	21.1%	11	28.9%	38	366.2	264.5	
Mitchell	74	49.0%	11	7.3%	66	43.7%	151	318.2	293.0	
Watauga	288	84.7%	39	11.5%	13	3,8%	340	154.7	102.5	
Yancey	31	88.6%	3	8.6%	1. 1	2,9%	35	146.7	104.0	
District Totals	544	72.5%	98	13.1%	108	14.4%	7 50	223.2	127.0	
District 25										
Burke	283	78.0%	73	20.1%	7	1.9%	363	174.3	145.0	
Caldwell	306	85.2%	41	11.4%	12	3.3%	359	150.7	76.0	
Catawba	610	75.8%	144	17.9%	51	6.3%	805	192.7	131.0	
District Totals	1,199	78.5%	258	16.9%	70	4.6%	1,527	178.4	113.0	
District 26					1. 1.	· ·				
Mecklenburg	4,902	65.7%	1,942	26.0%	617	8.3%	7,461	227.8	152.0	

Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

AGES OF GENERAL CIVIL AND MAGISTRATE APPEAL/TRANSFER CASES DISPOSED IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

		Ages	of Dispose	d Cases (N		Total	Mean	Median	
	< 9	%	9-18	%	>18	%	Disposed	Age (Days)	Age (Days
District 27A				100.01					
Gas ton	52()	77.8%	127	19.0%	21	3.1%	668	174.8	113.0
District 278									
Cleveland	306	95.3%	15	4.7%	0	0.0%	321	107.2	87.0
Lincoln	154	92.2%	13	7.8%	0	0.0%	167	117.3	95.0
District Totals	460	94.3%	28	5.7%	0	0.0%	488	110.6	89.0
District 28									
Buncombe	1,246	82.3%	240	15.9%	28	1,8%	1,514	165.7	134.0
District_29									
Henderson	220	65.7%	29	8.7%	86	25.7%	335	302.3	141.0
McDowell	107	81.1%	21	15.9%	4	3.0%	132	150.5	89.0
Polk	28	63.6%	6	13.6%	10	22.7%	44	346.5	211.5
Rutherford	98	71.5%	28	20.4%	11	8.0%	137	209.1	123.0
Transylvania	118	61.5%	22	11.5%	52	27.1%	192	364.9	151.0
District Totals	571	68.0%	106	12.6%	163	19.4%	840	279.8	133.5
District 30									
Cherokee	50	83.3%	10	16.7%	0 - 5	0.0%	60	119.9	50.0
Clay	14	73.7%	2	10.5%	. 3	15.8%	19	208.7	92.0
Graham	25	80.6%	2	6.5%	4	12.9%	31	209.4	141.0
Haywood	121	65.8%	52	28.3%	11	6.0%	184	236.6	180.0
Jackson	113	79.0%	21	14.7%	9	6.3%	143	197.3	114.0
Macon	88	83.8%	14	13.3%	3	2.9%	105	153.1	91.0
Swain	22	46.8%	12	25.5%	13	27.7%	47	424.3	320.0
District Totals	433	73.5%	113	19.2%	43	7.3%	589	212.9	128.0
State Totals	36,847	74.3%	7,894	15.9%	4,856	9.8%	49,597	212.7	110.0

Ages of Cases Disposed July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

CIVIL MAGISTRATE FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

New Street

July 1,-1987 — June 30, 1988

	Filings	Dispositions		Filings	Dispositions
District 1		- 영국 유민 영영 이상 영	Dist <u>rict 9</u>		
Camden	92	94	Franklin	1,019	1,235
Chowan	778	628	Granville	1,451	1,451
Currituck	292	295	Person	885	927
Dare	506	515	Vance	3,443	3,568
Gates	247	237	Warren	1,051	1,071
Pasquotank	1,035	1,011		.,	-,
Perquimans	367	314	District Totals	7,849	8,252
District Totals	3,317	3,094	District 10		
			wake.	17,861	16,984
District 2	1 607	1 540			
Beaufort	1,527	1,549	Disaulas 11		
Hyde	131	130	District 11	1 700	1
Martin Wartin	962	1,004	Harnett	1,723	1,665
Tyrrell	126	141	Johnston	2,960	2,786
Washington	519	484	Lee	1,402	1,393
District Totals	3,265	3,308	District Totals	6,085	5,844
District 3			District 12	a da para 1974	
Carteret	1,631	1,636	Cumberland	12,623	12,529
Craven	2,692	2,604	Hoke	726	672
Pamlico	324	316			
Pitt	3,995	3,946	District Totals	13,349	13,201
District Totals	8,642	8,502	District 13		
			Bladen	1,871	1,821
District 4			Brunswick	1,289	1,022
Duplin	2,996	2,875	Columbus	1,547	1,525
Jones	201	181			
Onslow	5,463	6,070	District Totals	4,707	4,368
Sampson	1,406	1,247	Disenter 14	an a	
District Totals	10,066	10,373	<u>District 14</u> Durham	18,464	18,593
District 5					
New Hanover	6,148	5,825	District 15A		
Pender	749	647	Alamance	3,231	3,315
District Totals	6,897	6,472			
DISCILL IOCAIS	0,007	0,472	District 15B		
District 6			Chatham	851	852
Bertle	940	978	Orange	1,807	1,725
Halifax	2,162	2,174	orange	1,007	~ ,//
Hertford	789	852	District Totals	2,658	2,577
Northampton	830	836		2,000	-,-,-,
			District 16		
District Totals	4,721	4,840	Robeson Scotland	4,201 1,551	4,277 1,532
District 7			ococrana	-,	-,
Edgecombe	7,024	7,122	District Totals	5,752	5,809
Nash	6,085	6,083	Sistillet totals	3,.32	5,005
Wilson	4,593	4,325	District 17A		
			Caswell	748	776
District Totals	17,702	17,530	Rockingham	3,009	2,980
District 8			District fotals	3,757	3,756
Greene	400	373			
Lenoir	2,509	2,557	District 17B		
Wayne	4,242	4,256	Stokes	792	748
		s s i de la companya	Surry	1,822	1,786
District Totals	7,151	7,186	District Totals	2,614	2,534

CIVIL MAGISTRATE FILINGS AND DISPOSITIONS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

	Filings	Dispositions		Filings	Dispositions
District 18			District 25		
Guilford	19,668	18,355	Burke	1,937	1,958
			Caldwell	1,937	1,971
방법 전 가격 전 전 가격 가격 한다.			Catawba	2,847	2,733
District 19A					
Cabarrus	2,412	2,093	District Totals	6,721	6,662
Rowan	2,983	2,975			
방법 방법을 통하려는 것이 같아.			District 26		
District Totals	5,395	5,068	Mecklenburg	36,617	30,195
			성화 이 가지 않는 것 같은 승규는 것 같은 것		t i juli selata e s
District 19B					
Montgomery	907	825	District 27A		
Randolph	1,968	1,939	Gaston	5,207	4,790
District Totals	2,875	2,764			
			District 278		
District 20			Cleveland	3,446	3,278
Anson	792	774	Lincoln	1,217	1,295
Moore	1,429	1,409			
Richmond	1,464	1,333	District Totals	4,663	4,573
Stanly	964	971			
Union	2,898	2,975	District 28		
			Buncombe	5,170	5,020
District Totals	7,547	7,462			
District 21			District 29		
Forsyth	16,507	16,067	Henderson	1,238	1,188
		an an an the second	McDowell	669	650
			Polk	183	191
District 22			Rutherford	1,770	2,152
Alexander	649	652	Transylvania	503	542
Davidson	2,977	2,899			
Davie	630	573	District Totals	4,363	4,723
Iredell	3,468	3,327		.,	.,
		-	District 30		
District Totals	7,724	7,451	Cherokee	349	338
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,,,,,,	Clay	76	67
District 23			Graham	169	178
Alleghany	235	221	Haywood	820	864
Ashe	300	257	Jackson	336	287
Wilkes	1,856	1,903	Macon	483	462
Yadkin	443	433	Swain	96	402
		455	Swarn	50	51
District Totals	2,834	2,814	District Totals	2,329	2,247
District 24			State Totals	277,336	266,355
Avery	286	316			
Madison	158	150			
Mitchell	241	222			
Watauga	708	715			
Yancey	235	223			
an a	1 600				
District Totals	1,628	1,626			

MATTERS ALLEGED IN JUVENILE PETITIONS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

OFFENSES

District 1 Camden 0 1 2 3 0 0 Chowan 0 2 25 27 0 0	Dendent Neglected Abuse 7 7 0 0 4 0 1 6 0 0 0 0	d Petitions T O	Children before rand Court for otal First Time
District 1 0 1 2 3 0	7 7 0 0 4 0 1 6 0	d Petitions T O	
District 1 Camden 0 1 2 3 0 0 Chowan 0 2 25 27 0 0	7 7 0 0 4 0 1 6 0	0	
Chowan 0 2 25 27 0 0 0	0 4 0 1 6 0		
Chowan 0 2 25 27 0 0 0	0 4 0 1 6 0		17 10
	1 6 0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	17 10 31 15
Currituck 0 0 16 16 0 0			23 23
Dare 0 4 31 35 0 0 0			35 32
Gates 0 2 8 10 0 0 0	0 4 0		14 11
Pasquotank 0 13 75 98 0 3 3 Perquimans 0 7 8 15 0 0 0	$\frac{10}{2}$ 10 10 10 2		24 58
Perquimans 0 7 8 15 0 0 0			24 12
District Totals 0 29 165 194 0 3 3	18 34 12	7 2	.68 161
District 2			
Beaufort 0 92 93 185 0 0 0	13 9 3		
Hyde 0 1 6 7 0 0 0	2 5 4		10 80
Martin 0 16 20 36 0 2 2	20 24 3		18 8 85 50
Tyrrell 0 1 2 3 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	
Washington 0 64 38 102 0 0 0	0 <u>10</u> 0		3 3 18 35
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		10 22
District Fotals 0 174 159 333 0 2 2 District 3	35 48 10	6 4	34 176
Contonat	and the later of the second		
	1 10 3		80 59
Dem14 er	7 10 5		52 149
	0 2 2		39 19
	8 17 3	8 34	41 145
	6 39 13	35 8.	12 372
District 4 Duplin 0 12 44 56 1 1 2	1 7 2		70
Jones 0 0 8 8 1 0 1	4 1 1		73 42 16 11
Onslow 0 130 261 391 1 5 6	1 36 24	1 1 3 47	
Sampson 0 30 40 70 1 1 2	1 1 5		71 183 36 37
			,0 J
District Totals 0 172 353 525 4 7 11	7 45 32	16 64	46 273
District 5			
Nett Hanaver			
Dondon J. J. J.	8 28 6	16 59	2 249
Pender 0 18 25 43 0 11 11	0 2 1	1 5	58 32
District Totals 0 193 326 524 0 64 64			
District lotals 0 193 326 524 0 64 64	8 30 7	17 65	50 281
District 6			
Bertie 0 4 0 4 0 0	0 0		
Halifax 0 76 87 163 0 13 13	0 0 0 6 2 5		5 4
Hertford 0 16 56 82 0 0 0	0 9 0	0 18 0 9	
Northampton 0 9 11 20 0 6 6	1 11 0		1 46 8 31
District Totals 0 105 164 269 0 19 19	7 22 5	1 32	
District 7			5 158
Rdan and			
Nooh	l 38 15	4 32	9 116
		5 36	
Wilson 0 79 165 244 3 3 6	21 16	17 31	
District Totals 0 241 571 812 5 12 17 2	90 38	26 1,01	
District 8			
Granno			ana an ann an Arailte. Bha an 1986 an Anna an Ar
Lenoir 0 46 55 101 1 12 13 1		0 1	
Wayne 0 63 84 147 0 28 28 3		8 16	
	53 20	40 31	8 145
District Totals 3 110 143 256 1 40 41 4	74 28	48 49	4 245

MATTERS ALLEGED IN JUVENILE PETITIONS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

	OFFENSES CONDITIONS												
	Delinquent			FENS		Undisciplined					Children		
		Other	Misde-								Parental Rights	Grand	before Court for
Distantion 0	Capital	Felony	meanor	Total	Truancy	Other	Total	Dependent	Neglected	Abused	Petitions	Total	First Time
<u>District 9</u> Franklin	0	14	34	48	0	18	18	5	12	10	1	94	60
Granville	Õ	22	56	78	0	3	3	2	2	3	3	91	58
Person	0	8	14	22	5	2	7	3	5	6	0	43	40
Vance Warren	0	14 5	42 17	56 22	2	13	15	2 1	2	4 1	2 0	81 31	62 21
warren	U		17		U				v		U	31	61
District Totals	0	63	163	226	7	43	50	13	21	24	6	340	241
<u>District 10</u> Wake	0	279	500 ·	779	9	57	66	35	47	21	33	981	428
District 11													
Harnett	0	26	115	141	2	3	5	6	8	3	8	171	65
Johnston Lee	0	66 42	78 75	144 117	1	2	3 5	10 12	17 19	2 11	11 3	187 167	92 78
hee	v	74				-	, 	12	15	11	,	107	70
District Totals	0	134	268	402	4	9	13	28	44	16	22	525	235
District 12		e a Teoreta		1997 - S.	1.1.1								
Cumberland	0	300	586	886	3	351	354	132	127	55	16	1,570	466
lloke	0	12	50	62	7	2	9	13	11	2	2	99	54
District Totals	0	312	636	948	10	353	363	145	138	57	18	1,669	520
District 13													
Bladen	0	15	72	87	0	2	2	5	15	9	0	118	43
Brunswick	0	108	115	223	6	14	20	3	8	3	7	264	92
Columbus	0	6	27	33	1	3	4	8	6	1	0	52	33
District Totals	0	129	214	343	7	19	26	16	29	13	7	434	168
<u>District 14</u> Durham	0	166	179	345	12	71	83	41	40	13	23	545	231
D' L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L	•		117			• •		74				545	201
<u>District 15A</u> Alamance	0	57	167	224	4	34	38	21	25	10	12	330	136
<u>District 158</u> Chatham			12	13	1	a .	3	7	5	e	9	10	35
Orange	0	1 61	71	132	1.	2 12	17	7 13	21	5	12	42 201	189
District Totals		62	83	145	6	14	20	20	26	11	21	243	224
District 16	. V	UL.	05	14,5	Ū		20	20	20	4.4	41	243	264
Robeson	0	189	265	454	12	12	24	5	65	42	21	611	226
Scotland	Ō	77	178	255	1	0	ĩ	1	31	7	3	298	115
District Totals	Ó	266	443	709	13	12	25	6	96	49	24	909	341
			•										
District 17A Caswell		25	10	43	0		0	· •	e			c 3	00
Rockingham	0	25 128	18 166	294	0 8	0 25	0 33	3 14	5 20	2 13	0 2	53 376	28 113
	, e		100		, T		55				· · •	570	1.0
District Totals	0	153	184	337	8	25	33	17	25	15	2	429	141
District 178		1997 - 1997 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -											
Stokes	0	54	72	126	3	11	14	12	6	1	7	166	52
Surry	0	86	118	204	27	7	34	8	2.3	1	6	276	108
District Totals	0	140	190	330	30	18	48	20	29	2	13	442	160
MATTERS ALLEGED IN JUVENILE PETITIONS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

N.

Nond

				C	FFENSI	ES				CONDITIO	NS			
í.			Delingu	ent		Un	discipli	ned			n an thailtean Tao an tao an tao an	Parental		Children before
			Other	Misde	-	anin an in						Rights	Grand	Court for
, .		Capital	Felony	meano	r Total	Fruancy	Other	Total	Dependent	Neglected	Abused	Petitions	Total	First Time
	District 18 Guilford	0	225	676	901	47	200	247	57	139	56	78	1,478	529
	GUILIOEd	v	223	070	501	47	200	247	51	1.55		10	1,470	543
	District 19A													
	Cabarrús	0	47	128	175	5	18	23	6	23	3	11	246	129
	Rowan	0	129	192	321	38	80	118	78	88	33	11	649	160
	District Totals	0	176	320	496	43	98	141	84	111	41	22	895	289
					i teri									
	District 19B	^	14	·. ·	23		5	a	3	Ó	2	0	1.0	24
	Montgomery Randolph	0 0	14 43	9 138	181	3 18	103	8 125	50	8 64	3 19	0 15	45 455	34 218
													155	
	District Totals	0	57	147	204	21	113	134	53	72	22	15	500	252
	District 20								1. A. A. A. A.					
	Anson	0	0	18	18	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	21	20
	Moore	0	21	94	115	0	9	9	3	49	3	13	192	73
	Richmond	.0	65	56	121	0	7	. 7	16 👘	16	9	5	174	68
	Stanly	1	23	86	110	17	18	35	8	12	9	7	181	96
	Union	0	82	107	189	1	7	8	48	81	32	7	365	165
	District Totals	1	191	361	553	19	42	61	76	158	53	32	933	422
	and the second second													
	District 21	0	218	384	602	15	45	60	22	50	10	19	770	61C
	Forsyth	, U	210	504	002	10	45	60	22	58	18	19	779	415
	District 22													
	Alexander	0	8	22	30	2	11	13	5	3	3	2	56	54
	Davidson	0	48	138	186	1	60	61	23	31	7	17	325	188
	Davie Iredell	0	8 144	26 104	34 248	4	9 82	13 90	5	6 37	2 3	5 21	65 417	39 173
	TTEGETT	Ŭ	144	104	240	•	02		• • •	57	Ū.	61	71/	1/5
	District Totals	0	208	290	498	15	162	177	46	77	20 ·	45	863	454
	D. 1 - 4 - 1 - 4 - 9 9													
	District 23 Alleghany	0	4	27	31	1	4	5	0	l	1 I	1	39	16
	Ashe	ŏ	6	43	49	2	4	6	2	6	ŝ	ĩ	67	24
	Wilkes	υĎ	35	148	183	66	52	113	71	105	54	20	551	138
	Yadkin	0	25	124	149	. 9	25	34	24	17	19	2	245	49
	District Totals	0	70.	342	412	73	85	163	97	129	77	24	902	227
		, T	70.	576	416			103					502	
	District 24													
	Avery	0	51	9	60	14	3	17	2	7	1	1	88	38
	Madison Mitchell	0	6 1	3	9	14 0	10 9	24	10 2	16 8	11	1	71 23	42 23
	Watauga	U O	2	31	33	12	14	26	2	1	Ō	7	69	36
	Yancey	Ō	ō	10	10	10	5	15	3	ĩ	Õ,	0	29	19
				·								-		
	District Totals	0	60	55	115	50	41	91	19	33	13	9	280	158
	District 25													
	Burke	0	49	67	116	7	68	75	28	57	36	9	321	128
	Caldwell	0	109	10	119	43	108	151	41	.32	9	14	366	112
	Catawba	0	79	111	190	14	34	48	24	27	21	7	317	200
	District Totals	0	237	188	425	64	210	274	93	116	66	30	1,004	440
			- • •											
	District 26	0	478	002	1 271	16	200	202	97	105	27	60	1 010	711
	Mecklenburg	U	4/0	893	1,371	15	308	323	27	105	32	60	1,918	711

MATTERS ALLEGED IN JUVENILE PETITIONS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

OFFENSES

		OFFENSES			CONDITIONS				NS		Children		
		Delinqu	ient -		Ur	discipl	ined				Parental	\$	Children before
	Capital	Other Felony	Misde- meanor	Total	Truancy	Other	Total	Dependen	t Neglected	Abused	Rights Petitions	Grand Total	Court for First Time
<u>District 27A</u> Gaston	0	261	358	619	4	201	205	38	42	9	37	950	310
<u>District 278</u> Cleveland Lincoln	0 0	60 35	163 62	223 97	5 11	12 9	17 20	4 10	37 16	9 7	3 2	293 152	129 70
District Totals	0	95	225	320	16	21	37	14	53	16	5	445	199
District 28 Buncombe	I	157	193	351	32	224	256	21	17	10	0	655	282
District 29 Henderson McDowell	0	12	42 29	54 34	47 19	9 14	56 33	5 17	5 16	5	13 5	138 106	86 69
Polk Rutherford	0 0 0	5 49 8	9 57 19	14 106 27	1 16 1	43	2 59 6	3 50 15	4 74 16	0 8 4	1 7 6	24 304 74	16 70 40
Transylvania District Totals	0	79	156	235	84	72	156	90	115	18	32	646	281
<u>District 30</u> Cherokee	0	6	16	22	4	8	12	4	4	0	8	50	42
Clay Graham Haywood	0	2 14 10	3 41 21	5 55 31	0 2 5	2 4 36	2 6 41	1 0 18	3 0 26	2 0 4	3 0 0	16 61 120	15 61 75
Jackson Macon Swain	0	6 9 3	15 14 1	21 23 4	4 2 0	3 5 1	7 7 1	6 10 7	7 8 5	5 2 1	4 4 3	5(54 21	46 48 21
District Totals	. 7	50	111	161	17	59	76	46	53	14	22	372	308
State Totals	5	5,587	10,025 1	5,617	644	2,709	3,353	1,340	2,180	841	767	24,104	10,142

	Delinquenc	cy Hearings	Undisciplin	ned Hearings	Dependenc	y Hearings	Neglect	Hearings	Abuse	Hearings	Parental	Rights	Total
	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed		Dismissed		Dismissed			Hearings
District 1													
Camden	2	0	o	^	_								
Chowan	25	3	0	0	5	2	5	2	0	0	0	0 •	16
Currituck	1	13		0	2	0	4	U U	0	0	0	0	35
Dare	32		0	0	_ L _ L _ L _ L	0	2	4	0	0	0	Ō	21
Gates	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ŏ	32
Pasquotank		5	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	ŏ	12
Perquimans	60	20	0	2	4	3	8	2	8	2	3	Ŭ	112
rerquimans	9	8	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	Ū	õ	Ŭ Ŭ	23
District lotals	133	49	0	2	13	5	26	8	10	2	3	0	251
District 2												·	6J1
Beaufort	111	28	0	Û	.7	,	1.5						
Kyde	2	0	Ŭ	0	2	1	10	0	3	0	0	0	160
Martin	32	29	1	8	7	0	6	Ŭ	1	3	0	0	14
Tyrrell	1	2	ō	0		13	19	21	6	6	0	1	143
Washington	79	õ	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		U	U	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
District Totals	225	59	1	8	16	14	35	21	10	9	0	1	399
District 3													
Carteret	247	63	12	2	3								
Craven	218	43	6	4		4	51	20	24	6	0	0	437
Pamlico	14	8	Ö	0	2	7	5	3	2	2	21	2	316
Pitt	202	123	6	2	0	2	2	0.	2	0	0	0	28
		163	y	4	23	5	11	5	1	3	4	0	385
District Totals	681	237	24	8	33	18	70	28	29	11	25	2	1,166
District 4													
Duplin	26	6	2	1	0	0	34	10	2				
Jones	6	0	2	0	ĩ	1	4	3	2 2	0	0	2	83
Onslow	145	31	1	Ð	10	î	41	0		0	0	0	16
Sampson	62	6	1	1	ĩ	ō	1		25	1	4	0	259
						v	-	Ø	5	0	6	0	83
District Totals	239	43	6	2	12	2	80	10	34	1	10	2	441
District 5													
New Hanover	441	40	52	1	8	0	28	· · · · · · ·					
Pender	40	3	11	0	õ	Ö	20	0	6	0	16	0	592
				an a	Ŭ	, v	۷	0	1	0	C	1	58
District Totals	481	43	63	1	8	0	30	0	7	0	16	1	650
<u>District 6</u>													
Bertie	6	6	0	0	2	1	0	1. 18 A. 19 A.		이 있는 것이 있다.			
Halifax	104	63	2	.8	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	18
Hertford	43	50	ī	0	0		2	0	2	0	0	0	189
Northampton	15	3	Ô	5	0	0	18	4	1	1	0	0	118
				,	U	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	39
District Totals	168	122	3	13	10	1	29	12	5	1	0	0	364

	Delinquenc	y Hearings	Undisciplin	ned Hearings	Dependent	cy Hearings	Neglect	Hearings	Abuse	Hearings	Parental	Rights	Total
	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Terminated Not	Terminated	Hearings
District 7													
Edgecombe	157	60	0	1	8	0	28	2	13	1	10	0	280
Nash	134	114	Ð	3	2	Ō	14	0	7	Ō	3	0	277
Wilson	181	71	5	i i	9	õ	17	ĩ	6	i	13	õ	305
					-								
District Total	472	245	5	5	19	0	59	3	26	2	25	0	862
District 8													
Greene	2	0	0		0	0.	. 0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Lenoir	89	28	19	7	9	. 4	22	5	4	2	4	4	197
Wayne	100	44	6	7	40	3	56	16	11	13	33	2	331
District Total	191	72	25	14	49	7	78	21	15	15	37	7	531
District 9													
Franklin	30	4	11	4	.1	1	3	1	2	2	1	0	60
Granville	68	17		i	1	ī	ĩ	ī	Ū	2	3	ŏ	95
Person	52	29	5	12	22	Ĝ	17	4	10	4	õ	ŏ	161
Vance	41	52	1	14	0	0	0	ō	0	õ	2	ŏ	101
Jarren	38	5	5	3	5	3	ŏ	ŏ	4	1	ō	ŏ	65
,		÷		, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i		°	, i	Ŭ		•	Ŭ		•••
District Total	229	108	22	34	29	11	21	6	16	9	6	0	491
District 10													
Wake	539	43	37	3	28	0	37	0	17	O	44	0	748
						1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -						•	
District 11													
Harnett	144	49	7	2	72	6	79	7	18	0	4	0	388
Johnston	138	31	2	0	1	7	5	8	1	2	4	2	201
Lee	70	26	0	3	7	10	9	4	3	7	3	1	143
												물건 관심 문제	
District Total	352	106	9	5	80	23	93	19	22	9	11	3	732
District 12													
Cumberland	483	425	68	259	97	33	56	57	14	23	17	5	1537
lloke	30	13	1	2	5	0	9	1	0	1	2	õ	64
HORE		13		-	,		· · · · ·	1 a * .	v	-	4	•	04
District Total	513	438	69	261	102	33	65	58	14	24	19	5	1601
District 13													
Bladen	54	46	0	4	7	1	2	10	0	8	0	Ô	132
Brunswick	158	33	7	9	2	2	4	10	3	2	0 7	0	230
Columbus	148		7	2	45	4	156	3	11	2	0	0	230 384
OUTUROUS	140	U		<u>د</u>	4.5	6 B. (* 1917)	1.10	3	11	4	v	v	304
District Total	360	85	14	15	54	7	162	16	14	12	7	0	746

 D^{-}

	Delinquen	cy Hearings	Undisciplined Hearings		Dependency Hearings		Neglect Hearings		Abuse	Hearings	Paren	al Rights	Total
	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Terminated l	Not Terminated	Hearings
District 14													
Durhan	1 50	44	21	4	23	0	23	1	13	1	11	0	291
District 15A													
Alamance	169	52	33	3	11	2	16	6	4	5	17	0	318
District 158		•			_								
Chathas	13	14	4	2	7	3	7	13	3	1	1	4	72
Jrange	101	80	4	1	10	3	18	2	3	2	8	0	232
District Totals	114	94	8	3	17	6	25	15	6	3	9	4	304
District 16													
Robeson	367	34	13	0	4	1	53	10	36	4	19	3	544
Scotland	182	41	1	0	0	1	26	7	7	4	-2	Û	271
Jistrict Totals	549	75	14	ΰ	4	2	79	17	43	8	21	3	815
District 17A													
Caswell	34	3	1	0	2	0	5	U	2	0	0	0	47
Rockingham	225	55	25	9	7	4	17	0	5	6	3	0	356
District Totals	259	58	26	9	9	4	22	0	7	6	3	0	403
District 17B													
Stokes	83	. 30	13	3	9.	0	3	2	1	0	3	1	148
Surry	174	36	23	5	Ö	2	20	7	4	0	1	2	274
District Totals	257	66	36	8	9	2	23	9	5	0	4	3	422
District 18								•					
Guilford	612	234	139	94	25	11	49	21	16	15	74	3	1,293
District 19A													
Cabarrus	151	16	23	2	6	0	18	0	6	0	7	3	232
Rovan	262	62	94	11	б2	4	126	9	34	1 1	9	0	674
District Totals	413	78	117	13	63	4	144	9	40	1	16	3	906
<u>District 198</u>													
Montgomery	61	25	10	3	13	2	16	2	14	1	0	Q	14//
Randolph	435	69	160	32	96	26	141	34	43	9	10	0	1,055
District Totals	496	94	170	35	109	28	157	36	57	10	10	0	1,202
												the second s	

	Delinquency Hearings		Undisciplined Hearings		s Dependency Hearings Negles		Neglect Hearings Abuse		Abuse	Hearings	Parental	Rights	Total
	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Terminated Not	Terminated	Hearings
District 20												a la jarvidu ja 1998 kontra i	
Anson	5	8	0	1	-0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	19
foore	86	24	1	8	2	1	40	9	3	0 .	13	0`	187
Richaond	127	100	1	1	27	18	10	14	3	7	7	ΰ	315
Stanly	72	14	22	10	1	0	Õ	1	ĩ	Ó	1	ŏ	122
Union	155	40	1	5	27	11	30	27	18	14	4	Õ	332
District Totals	445	186	25	25	57	31	84	51	25	21	25	U	975
District 21													
Forsyth	493	109	20	40	22	0	53	5	17	1	4	15	779
District 22													
AlexanJer	13	11	13	3	5	0	3	1	2	3	0	1	60
Davidson	90	25	16	30	19	1	29	1	3	ĩ	19	Ō	234
Javie	19	6	12	6	8	2	3	î	1	1	-0	1	60
Iradell	12.)	20	34	24	34	9	125	5	19	1	19	4	414
									19			4	414
District Totals	247	62	75	63	66	12	160	8	25	6	38	6	768
District 23													
Alleghany	25	9	4	. 5	0	0	1	2	. Ó	2	0	1	49
Ashe	33	20	4	ប៍ .	1	0	11	4	1	1	1	0	82
Tilkes	150	4	112	3	75	1	107	1 1	39	0	5	5	502
ladkin	121	16	34	8	18	7	15	7	23	3	3	0	- 255
District Totals	329	49	154	22	94	8	134	14	63	6	9	6	888
District 24													
Avery	56	17	39	7	20	4	46	1	17	1	1	1	210
Madison	26	11	35	16	25	15	63	24	52	9	0	0	276
litchell	2	4	. 3	2	1	4	1	14	1	2	1	0	35
Watauga	23	30	15	28	. 8	. 1	1	1	0	0	υ	0	112
lancey	5	ó	10	2	5	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	31
District Totals	117	68	102	55	59	24	111	42	70	13	2	1	664
District 25		•											
Burke	226	37	124	28	142	3	332	6	175	1	8	1	1,083
Caldvell	140	68	147	66	67	19	85	5	40	2	0	22	661
Catavba	143	53	66	3	17	1	18	1	3	3	16	1	325
District Totals	509	158	337	97	226	23	435	12	218	6	24	24	2,069
District 26													
Mecklenburg	835	463	208	62	10	6	104	6	18	2	43	3	1,760

	Delinquen	y Hearings	Undisciplin	ed Hearings	Dependenc	y Hearings	Neglect	Hearings	Abuse He	arings	Parenta	l Rights	Total
	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained	Dismissed	Retained Di	ismissed	Terminated N	ot Terminated	Hearings
District 27A													
Gaston	355	156	142	28	23	6	36	4	6	0	28	6	790
District 278													
Cleveland	134	89	15	· 1	5	1	35	7	8	3	4	0	302
Lincoln	78	17	16	7	6	0	10	0	1	0	4	0	139
District Totals	212	106	31	8	11	1	45	7	9	3	8	0	441
District 28										1			
Buncombe	177	153	115	124	14	2	13	2	8	0	4	4	616
District 29													
Henderson	47	9	30	4	1	3	6	1	1	1	10	2	115
McDowell	20	1	34	7	. 9 -	1	9	0	0	0	7	0	88
Polk	7	3	2	0	1	0 -	4	0	0	.0	0	0	17
Rutherford	85	3	20	5	52	0	90	1	11	0	3	0	270
Fransylvania	13	6	3	3	8	7	8	9	1	4	Ð	1	63
District Totals	172	22	89	19	71	11	117	11	13	5	20	3	353
District 30													
Cherokee	21	1	12	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	7	1	50
Clay	3	2	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	1	0	2	15
Graham	33	17	2	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Haywood	25	13	16	18	7.	3	10	3	2	3	0	0	105
Jackson	17	7	3	2	4	0	6	0	5	0	2		47
itacon	14	1	2	. L.	1	1	3	1	1	0	3	0	28
Swain	4	0	0	1	7	Û	5	0	1	0	0	0	18
District Totals	122	46	37	22	24	4	31	4	10	4	12	4	320
State Totals	11,615	4,023	2,177	1,105	1,405	308	2,646	482	892	211	586	109	25,559

FILING AND DISPOSITION TRENDS OF INFRACTIONS AND CRIMINAL CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

1978-79 - 1987-88



Infractions are non-criminal violations of law not punishable by improsonment. The category was first created September 1, 1986. To allow meaningful comparison of multi-year trends in the district courts, infracteions are included with criminal motor vehicle cases in this chart. Almost all infractions would have been criminal motor vehicle cases in prior years. Motor vehicle plus infraction filings together in 1987-88 were 5.4% greater than the corresponding motor vehicle and infraction filings the year before. Non-motor vehicle filings increased 9.9% in 1987-88. Non-motor vehicle dispositions increased 9.6%.

	Total		Disposition	S
	Filed	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions
District 1		금 경험을 가지 않는 것이 없는 것		
Camden	223	73	164	237
Chowan Currituck	321	149	178	327
Dare	713	223	760	983
Gates	2,715 532	737	1,768	2,505
Pasquotank	958	93	418	511
Perquimans	354	231 119	692	923
		**7	206	325
District Totals	5,826	1,625	4,186	5,811
District 2				
Beaufort	3,134	754	2,409	A 1 A
Hyde	484	99	388	3,163
Martin	1,385	490	1,911	487
Tyrrell	503	138	344	2,401 482
Washington	549	228	291	519
				• • •
District Totals	6,055	1,709	5,343	7,052
District 3	an a			
Carteret	3,731	869	2,528	3,397
Craven	4,844	872	4,008	4,880
Pamlico	475	120	268	388
Pitt	7,645	1,488	5,916	7,404
District Totals	16,695	3,349	12,720	16,069
District 4				
Duplin	1,715	647	2,189	2,836
Jones	657	78	475	553
Onslow	6,657	1,089	5,638	6,727
Sampson	3,340	906	2,484	3,390
District Totals	12,369	2,720	10,786	13,506
District 5				
New Hanover	8,643	2 016	6 452	
Pender	1,742	2,016 338	6,453	8,469
	- j / 10	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1,485	1,823
District Totals	10,385	2,354	7,938	10,292
District 6				
Bertie	794	246	713	959
Halifax	3,368	1,287	2,501	3,788
Hertford	1,387	373	1,101	1,474
Northampton	1,308	279	1,339	1,618
District Totals	6,857	2,185	5,654	7,839
District 7				
Edgecombe	4,043	1,230	2,150	3,380
Nash	5,997	2,029	3,549	5,578
Wilson	4,005	1,324	2,102	3,426
District Totals	14,045	4,583	7,301	12,384
District 8				
Greene	850	150	649	799
Lenoir	4,514	944	3,373	4,317
Wayne	4,878	1,091	2,591	3,682
District Totals	10,242	2,185	6,613	8,798
				0,720

	Total		Disposition	S
	Filed	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions
District 9				요즘 영화에 들어 있는 것이 같아.
Franklin	1,927	308	1,364	1,672
Granville	1,429	394	952	1,346
Person	1,559	319	1,142	1,461
Vance	2,218	369	1,715	2,084
Warren	966	198	605	803
District Totals	8,099	1,588	5,778	7,366
District 10				
Wake	38,712	6,747	31,063	37,810
District 11 Harnett	4,309	946	2,557	3 503
and the second se				3,503
Johnston Lee	5,341 2,587	1,269 711	4,376 1,688	5,645
nee	2,307	/11	1,000	2,399
District Totals	12,737	2,926	8,621	11,547
District 12				
Cumberland	17,380	3,444	13,933	17,377
floke	2,375	621	1,762	2,383
District Totals	19,755	4,065	15,695	19,760
District 13				
Bladen	2,545	509	1,978	2,487
Brunswick	2,684	2,639	3,589	6,228
Columbus	3,386	537	2,701	3,238
District Totals	8,615	3,685	8,268	11,953
District 14				
Durham	13,570	3,098	9,204	12,302
District 15A				· · · ·
Alamancé	6,364	1,291	4,941	6,232
District 15B				
Chatham	3,127	569	2,361	2,930
Orange	4,461	811	3,259	4,070
District Totals	7,588	1,380	5,620	7,000
D1				
District 16	6 010	1,000	1 7/0	5.017
Robeson Scotland	6,010 1,321	1,098 456	4,748 1,426	5,846 1,882
District Totals	7,831	1,554	6,174	7,728
District 17A	1 100	007	100	
Caswell Reckforter	1,123	236	939	1,175
Rockingham	4,083	867	3,107	3,974
District Totals	5,206	1,103	4,046	5,149
District 17B				
Stokes	1,349	349	951	1,300
Surry	3,153	790	2,042	2,832
District Totals	4,502	1,139	2,993	4,132

 $\overline{\mathbf{n}}$

	Totol		Dispositions	
	Total Filed	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions
District 13	04 004			
Guilford	26,226	3,743	18,935	22,678
District 19A				
Cabarrus	5,759	1,430	4,299	5,729
Rowan	4,801	1,164	3,440	4,604
District Totals	10,560	2,594	7,739	10,333
District 19B	A 611	DO <i>C</i>	1	6 .000
Montgomery Randolph	2,011	286	1,719	2,005
	5,493	1,051	3,900	4,951
District Totals	7,504	1,337	5,619	6,956
District 20	0 105		1	
Anson	2,105	333	1,728	2,061
Moore	3,796	774	2,482	3,256
Richmond	2,955	985	1,766	2,751
Stanly Union	2,032 4,221	598	1,505	2,103
		1,081	2,726	3,807
District Totals	15,159	3,771	10,207	13,978
District 21	15 970	0.640	11 050	14 507
Forsyth	15,870	2,648	11,859	14,507
District 22				
Alexander	1,050	218	824	1,042
Davidson	6,990	1,947	4,714	6,661
Davie	1,263	346	1,267	1,613
Iredell	6,277	1,368	4,244	6,112
District Totals	15,586	4,379	11,049	15,428
District 23				
Alleghany	453	78	528	606
Ashe	782	224	521	745
Wilkes	2,611	691	1,938	2,629
Yadkin	1,331	300	1,009	1,309
District Totals	5,177	1,293	3,996	5,289
District 24				
Avery	911	175	740	915
Madison	985	532	447	979
Mitchell	645	230	434	664
Watauga	2,639	1,196	1,338	2,534
Yancey	587	277	330	607
District Totals	5,767	2,410	3,289	5,699
District 25				
Burke	4,211	1,023	2,878	3,901
Caldwell	4,310	898	2,990	3,888
Catawba	7,198	1,997	5,032	7,029
District Totals	15,719	3,918	10,900	14,818
District 26				
Mecklenburg	39,832	12,345	23,938	36,283
			4 - F	

	Total		Disposition	•
	Flied	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions
<u>District 27A</u> Gaston	12,477	3,109	8,538	11,647
District 27B Cleveland	1 206	1,075	2,938	4,013
Lincoln	4,606 2,731	\$36	1,951	2,637
District Totals	7,337	1,761	4,889	6,650
District 28 Buncombe	9,372	3,276	5,730	9,006
District 29				
Henderson	3,865	1,147	2,105	3,252
McDowell	1,553	545	860	1,405
Polk	843	287	581	868
Rutherford Transylvania	3,555 916	899 233	2,397 641	3,296 874
District Totals	10,732	3,111	6,584	9,695
District 30				
Cherokee	1,162	298	901	1,199
Clay	254	60	191	251
Graham	290	52	219	271
Haywood	2,365	518	1,492	2,010
Jackson	1,148	321	800	1,121
Macon	850	179	699	878
Swain	567	114	314	428
District Totals	6,636	1,542	4,616	6,158
State Totals	419,407	100,523	301,332	401,855

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

	Begin					End
	Pending		Total		% Caseload	Pending
	7/1/87	Filed	Caseload	Disposed	Disposed	6/30/88
<u>District 1</u>						
Camden	20	194	214	187	87.4%	27
Chowan	37	821	858	678	79.0%	180
Currituck	36	565	601	496	82.5%	105
Dare	470	2,992	3,462	2,892	83.5%	570
Gates	27	357	384	351	91.4%	33
Pasquotank	181	2,243	2,424	2,228	91.9%	196
Perquimans	41	465	506	451	89.1%	55
District Totals	812	7,637	8,449	7,283	86.2%	1,166
District 2						
Beaufort	217	3,344	3,561	3,207	90.1%	354
Hyde	67	522	589	541	91.9%	48
Martin	92	1,526	1,618	1,254	77.5%	364
Tyrrell	24	278	302	275	91.1%	27
Washington	36	926	962	910	94.6%	52
District Totals	436	6,596	7,032	6,187	88.0%	845
District 3						
Carteret	913	5,186	6,099	5,074	83.2%	1,025
Craven	915	6,592	7,507	6,551	87.3%	
Pamlico	77	723	800		83.6%	956
Pitt	1,291			669		131
FILL	1,291	13,063	14,354	12,394	86.3%	1,960
District Totals	3,196	25,564	28,760	24,683	85.8%	4,072
District 4						
Duplin	245	3,105	3,350	2,861	85.4%	489
Jones	35	534	569	520	91.4%	49
Onslow	1,206	12,231	13,437	12,281	91.4%	1,156
Sampson	401	3,629	4,030	3,553	88.2%	477
District Totals	1,887	19,499	21,386	19,215	89.8%	2,171
District 5						
New Hanover	2,244	15,571	17,815	15,438	86.7%	0 377
Pender	280	1,777				2,377
i ender	200	1,///	2,057	1,761	85.6%	296
District Totals	2,524	17,348	19,872	17,199	86.5%	2,673
District 6						
Bertie	78	1,364	1,442	1,292	89.6%	150
Halifax	506	4,457	4,963	4,444	89.5%	519
Hertford	103	1,906	2,009	1,790	89.1%	219
Northampton	81	1,039	1,120	1,021	91.2%	99
District Totals	768	8,766	9,534	8,547	89.6%	987
District 7						
Edgecombe	1,095	5,755	6 950	5 620	82.3%	1 011
			6,850	5,639		1,211
Nash	1,231	8,433	9,664	7,601	78.7%	2,063
Wilson	1,328	6,201	7,529	5,813	77.2%	1,716
District Totals	3,654	20,389	24,043	19,053	79.2%	4,990
District 8						
Greene	125	966	1,091	924	84.7%	167
Lenoir	849	4,732	5,581	4,739	84.9%	842
Wayne	1,060	7,040	8,100	6,802	84.0%	1,298
District Totals	2,034	12,738	14,772	12,465	84.4%	2,307

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988

	Begin Pending		Total		% Caseload	End Pending
District 9	7/1/87	Filed	Caseload	Disposed	Disposed	6/30/88
Franklin	197	2,663	2,860	2,563	89.6%	297
	224					292
Granville		2,508	2,732	2,440	89.3%	
Person	241	2,276	2,517	2,194	87.2%	323
Vance	275	4,696	4,971	4,341	87.3%	630
Warren	115	975	1,090	968	88.8%	122
District Totals	1,052	13,118	14,170	12,506	88.3%	1,664
District 10						
Wake	7,300	34,122	41,422	32,771	79.1%	8,651
HINC	7,500	J7,122	719722	52,771	1 2 • 1 10	0,001
District 11						
Harnett	564	4,487	5,051	4,416	87.4%	635
	740					819
Johnston		5,651	6,391	5,572	87.2%	
Lee	414	4,361	4,775	4,312	90.3%	463
D I I I I I I I I I I	1 710	14 400	14 017	14 000	00.0*	
District Totals	1,718	14,499	16,217	14,300	88.2%	1,917
A						
District 12						
Cumberland	4,533	21,638	26,171	22,132	84.6%	4,039
Hoke	304	2,205	2,509	2,141	85.3%	368
District Totals	4,837	23,843	28,680	24,273	84.6%	4,407
District 13						
Bladen	347	2,401	2,748	2.455	89.3%	293
Brunswick	483	3,067	3,550	2,894	81.5%	656
Columbus	456	4,079	4,535	4,061	89.5%	474
				·)		
District Totals	1,286	9,547	10,833	9,410	86.9%	1,423
	-,					
District 14						
Durham	4,427	17,736	22,163	16,596	74.9%	5,567
Politica	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	27,750		10,000	14.5%	5,507
District 15A						
Alamance	913	7,064	7,977	7,010	87.9%	967
Alamance	515	7,004	1,511	7,010	07,3%	307
District 150						
District 15B	264	0 6 7 7	0.044	0.140	04 0%	270
Chatham		2,577	2,841	2,469	86.9%	372
Orange	708	4,870	5,578	4,886	87.6%	692
	070		o 1 i n		27 14	1 24
District Totals	972	7,447	8,419	7,355	87.4%	1,064
Disease in						
District 16	1 074	11 000	10.004		0.0	
Robeson	1,074	11,930	13,004	11,478	88.3%	1,526
Scotland	306	4,849	5,155	4,636	89.9%	519
District Totals	1,380	16 770	10 150	16 114	00 79	2 0/5
District iotals	1,000	16,779	18,159	16,114	88.7%	2,045
District 176						
District 17A	107	1 0 1 0	1 150	1 0/0	00 (*	100
Caswell	107	1,043	1,150	1,042	90.6%	108
Rockingham	573	5,934	6,507	5,808	89.3%	699
District Totals	680	6,977	7,657	6,850	89.5%	807
District 178						
District 17B	190	1 480	1 3 3 6	1 600	07 09/	005
Stokes	180	1,658	1,838	1,603	87.2%	235
Surry	480	3,473	3,953	3,434	86.9%	519
		· · · · ·				
District Totals	660	5,131	5,791	5,037	87.0%	754

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

July	1,	1987		June	30,	1988
------	----	------	--	------	-----	------

	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Caseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
<u>District 18</u> Guilford	10,778	33,400	44,178	30,570	69.2%	13,608
District 19A						
Cabarrus	628	5,672	6,300	5,493	87.2%	807
Rowan	575	5,509	6,084	3,334	87.7%	750
District Totals	1,203	11,181	12,384	10,827	87.4%	1,557
District 198						
Montgomery	349	2,444	2,793	2,380	85.2%	413
Randolph	1,088	6,133	7,221	5,816	30.5%	1,405
District Totals	1,437	3,577	10,014	8,196	81.8%	1,818
District 20						
Anson	193	2,126	2,319	2,056	88.7%	263
Moore	497	4,433	4,930	4,295	87.1%	635
Richmond	201	4,164	4,365	3,921	89.8%	444
Stanly	253	2,711	2,964	2,603	87.8%	361
Union	602	4,667	5,269	4,683	38.9%	586
District Totals	1,746	18,101	19,847	17,558	88.5%	2,289
District 21						
Forsyth	3,580	21,068	24,648	21,365	86.7%	3,283
District 22						
Alexander	170	1,837	2,007	1,796	89.5%	211
Davidson	1,211	8,643	9,854	8,481	86.1%	1,373
Davie	152	1,231	1,383	1,184	85.6%	199
Iredell	912	8,439	9,351	8,082	86.4%	1,269
District Totals	2,445	20,150	22,595	19,543	86.5%	3,052
District 23				e a ser en		
Alleghany	29	356	385	361	93.8%	24
Ashe	67	682	749	647	86.4%	102
Wilkes	500	3,834	4,334	3,799	87.7%	535
Yadkin	80	1,021	1,101	1,025	93.1%	76
District Totals	676	5,893	6,569	5,832	88.8%	737
Distantian DA						
District 24	155	600	200	1.1	70 TV	
Avery Madison	155 148	628	783	616	78.7%	167
Mitchell	103	656	804	683	85.0%	121
Watauga	256	629	732	644	88.0%	88
Yancey	40	1,656 429	469	1,543 404	80.7% 86.1%	369 65
District Totals	702	3,998	4,700	3,890	82.8%	810
District 25	100				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Burke	466	4,535	5,001	4,419	88.4%	582
Caldwell Catawha	774	4,112	4,886	4,393	89.9%	493
Catawba	1,118	7,679	8,797	7,527	85.6%	1,270
District Totals	2,358	16,326	18,684	16,339	87.4%	2,345
District 26 Mecklenburg	8,902	44,055	52,957	43,396	81.9%	۶,561
						-,501

CASELOAD INVENTORY FOR CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

Q

	Begin Pending 7/1/87	Filed	Total Cnseload	Disposed	% Caseload Disposed	End Pending 6/30/88
District 27A						
Gaston	3,278	14,445	17,723	14,221	80.2%	3,502
District 27B						
Cleveland	524	5,036	5,560	4,749	85.4%	811
Lincoln	332	3,392	3,724	3,244	87.1%	480
District Total	356	8,428	9,284	7,993	36.1%	1,291
District 28				Ж		
Buncombe	1,653	15,434	17,087	15,251	89.3%	1,836
District 29						
Henderson	553	3,934	4,487	3,749	83.6%	738
McDowell	290	2,063	2,353	2,055	87.3%	298
Polk	100	603	703	604	85.9%	99
Rutherford	871	3,808	4,679	3,712	79.3%	967
Transylvania	290	1,520	1,310	1,492	82.4%	318
District Total	2,104	11,928	14,032	11,612	82.8%	2,420
District 30						
Cherokee	771	1,242	2,013	1,482	73.6%	531
Clay	36	380	416	348	83.7%	68
Graham	33	387	420	327	77.9%	93
Haywood	337	2,585	2,922	2,677	91.6%	245
Jackson	77	1,003	1,080	946	87.6%	134
Macon	128	681	809	660	81.6%	149
Swain	49	648	697	637	91.4%	60
District Total	1,431	6,926	8,357	7,077	84.7%	1,280
State Totals	83,685	514,710	598,395	500,529	83.6%	97,866

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF DISTRICT COURT CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES

July 1, 1987 — June 30, 1988





Guilty pleas predominate in the disposition of criminal non-motor vehicle cases in the district courts. The waivers referred to in the upper chart are waivers of trial in worthless check cases where the defendant pleads guilty before a magistrate. The "Other" category includes

changes of venue, waivers of extradition, findings of no probable cause at initial appearance, and dismissals by the court. The proportion of distrct court felony cases superceded by indictment increased again this year from 34.1% to 38.9%.

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

Ő.

	Worthless Check	Guili	iy Plea	Not Guilty	Dismissed by		Felony Probable Cause	Total
	Waiver	Judge	Magistrate	Plea	DĂ	Other	Matters	Disposed
District l								
Camden	0	64	19	32	29	28	15	187
Chowan	13	341	44	76	106	2	96	678
Currituck	15	284	1	49	86	33	28	496
Dare	122 -	989	20	238	625	685	213	2,892
Gates	13	141	24	72	44	4	53	351
Pasquotank	114	683	76	500	457	182	216	2,228
Perquimans	14	182	15	82	84	22	52	451
District Totals	291	2,634	199	1,049	1,431	956	673	7,283
% of Total	4.0%	36.9%	2.7%	14.4%	19.6%	13.1%	9.2%	100.0%
District 2								
Beaufort	281	1,091	338	460	314	368	355	3,207
Hyde	2	123	147	104	75	32	53	541
Martin	211	363	43	149	126	191	171	1,254
Tyrrell	8	73	84	34	32	19	25	275
Washington	124	245	74	180	55	56	176	910
District Totals	626	1,900	686	927	602	666	780	6,187
% of Total	10.1%	30.7%	11.1%	15.0%	9.7%	10.8%	12.6%	100.0%
District 3								
, Carteret	563	1,266	628	156	1,781	403	277	5,074
Craven	1,053	2,088	362	368	1,604	638	438	6,551
Pamlico	10	227	130	72	160	64	6	669
Pitt	3,028	3,950	367	898	2,307	590	1,254	12,394
District Totals	4,654	7,531	1,487	1,494	5,852	1,695	1,975	24,688
% of Total	18.9%	30.5%	6.0%	6.1%	23.7%	6.9%	8.0%	100.0%
District 4								
Duplin	447	987	53	153	451	133	632	2,861
Jones	17	109	2	42	106	172	72	520
Onslow	2,706	4,714	252	534	1,596	1,035	1,444	12,281
Sampson	704	1,406	69	101	664	172	437	3,553
District Totals	3,874	7,216	376	835	2,817	1,512	2,585	19,215
% of Total	20.2%	37.6%	2.0%	4.3%	14.7%	7.9%	13.5%	100.0%
District 5								
New Hanover	1,462	5,652	681	1,328	3,145	1,064	2,106	15,438
Pender	44	784	39	150	432	74	238	1,761
District Totals	1,506	6,436	720	1,478	3,577	1,138	2,344	17,199
% of Total	8.8%	37.4%	4.2%	8.6%	20.8%	6.6%	13.6%	100.0%
District 6	2							
Bertie	72	443	17	140	207	302	111	1,292
Halifax	286	1,751	234	418	1,014	314	427	4,444
Hertford	181	812	1	97	227	327	145	1,790
Northampton	64	378	20	125	214	113	107	1,021
District Totals	603	3,384	272	780	1,662	1,056	790	8,547
% of Total	7.1%	39.6%	3.2%	9.1%	19.4%	12.4%	9.2%	100.0%
District 7								
Edgecombe	757	1,900	272	699	1,278	384	349	5,639
Nash	1,830	2,425	240	693	1,397	355	661	7,601
Wilson	899	2,008	213	548	1,365	237	543	5,813
District Totals	3,486	6,333	725	1,940	4,040	976	1,553	19,053
% of Total	18.3%	33.2%	3.8%	10.2%	21.2%	5.1%	8.2%	100.0%

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

	Worthless Check	Construction of the local division of the lo	ty Plea	Not Guilty	Dismissed by	~ 4	Felony Probable Cause	Total
	Walver	Judge	Magistrate	Plea	DA	Other	Matters	Disposed
District 8	60	0 <i>1.</i>			22.5			
Greene	68 417	244	56	64	335	74	83	924
Lenoir Wayne	955	1,427	69 95	311 324	1,800	427 378	288	4,739
Wayiic		1,504	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	J24	2,636	3/0	510	6,802
District Totals % of Total	1,440 11,6%	3,575 28.7%	220 1.3%	699 5.6%	4,771 38.3%	879 7.1%	881 7.1%	12,465 100.0%
District 9								
Franklin	373	791	200	308	454	183	254	2,563
Granville	418	760	55	245	409	302	251	2,440
Person	206	678	154	274	431	169	282	2,194
Vance	503	1,397	227	656	842	460	256	4,341
Warren	60	230	38	207	244	148	41	968
Nistais Tabala	1 550	5. 354	(7)		0.000			
District Totals % of Fotal	1,560 12.5%	3,856	674	1,690	2,380	1,262	1,084	12,506
% OF TOTAL	12.34	30.8%	5.4%	13.5%	19.0%	10.1%	8.7%	100.0%
District 10								
Wake	5,952	8,011	2,725	1,655	9,471	1,590	3,367	32,771
% of Total	18.2%	24.4%	8.3%	5.1%	28.9%	4.9%	10.3%	100.0%
District 11								
Harnett	598	1,495	145	288	916	700	274	4,416
Johnston	842	1,845	270	481	1,064	745	325	5,572
Lee	815	1,304	296	393	802	324	378	4,312
District Totals	2,255	1. 61.1.	711	1 140	0 700	1 760	077	11 200
% of Total	15.8%	4,644 32.5%	711 5.0%	1,162 8.1%	2,782 19.5%	1,769	977	14,300
a of local	13.0%	J & • J /•	2.00	0.14	17.3%	12.4%	6.8%	100.07,
District 12		n an the second seco						
Cumberland	4,794	6,449	124	1,361	7,049	666	1,689	22,132
Hoke	346	12	3	1,086	388	154	152	2,141
District Totals	5,140	6,461	127	2,447	7,437	820	1,841	24,273
% of Total	21.2%	26.6%	0.5%	10.1%	30.6%	3.4%	7.6%	100.0%
District 13								
Bladen	344	701	49	455	586	224	96	2,455
Brunswick	166	1,057	330	193	925	52	171	2,894
Columbus	834	1,533	33	332	862	306	161	4,061
								,,
District Totals	1,344	3,291	412	980	2,373	582	428	9,410
% of Total	14.3%	35.0%	4.4%	10.4%	25.2%	6.2%	4.5%	100.0%
Distantian 11								
District 14 Durham	1,407	6,225	,	1 110	4,638	1 700	1 (00	14 604
% of Total	8.5%	37.5%	4 0.0%	1,110 6.7%	27.9%	1,732	1,480	16,596
a or rotar	0.54	51.5%	0.04	0.7%	61.3%	10.44	8.9%	100.0%
District 15A								
Alamance	5.86	2,997	298	653	1,432	396	648	7,010
% of Total	8.4%	42.8%	4.3%	9.3%	20.4%	5.6%	9.2%	100.0%
District 15B								
Chatham	202	597	207	112	560	646	145	2,469
Orange	633	1,286	183	148	1,615	360	661	4,886
District Totals	835	1,883	390	260	2,175	1,006	806	7,355
% of Total	11.4%	25.6%	5.3%	3.5%	29.6%	13.7%	11.0%	100.0%
				5.57		A 4 6 / /8	± 7 1 0 /0	100.0%
District 16								
Robeson	1,611	4,427	220	1,472	635	1,248	1,865	11,478
Scotland	613	2,009	89	546	465	482	432	4,636
Diabadon Monat-	3 134	6 1.26	200	0.010	1 100	1 700	0.007	10 100
District Totals % of Total	2,224 13.8%	6,436	309	2,018	1,100	1,730	2,297	16,114
" OF TOTAL	13.0%	39.9%	1.9%	12.5%	6.8%	10.7%	14.3%	100.0%

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 – June 30, 1988

	Worthless Check	Guilj	y Plea	Not Guilty	Dismissed by		Felony Probable Cause	Total
	Waiver	Judge	Magistrate	Plen	DA	Other	Matters	Disposed
District 17A Caswell Rockingham	51 369	227 2,013	89 165	282 966	176 823	115 562	102 910	1,042 5,808
District Totals % of Total	420 6.1%	2,240 32.7%	254 3.7%	1,248 18.2%	999 14.6%	677 9.9%	1,012 14.8%	6,850 100.0%
<u>District 17B</u> Stokes Surry	196 320	393 1,044	19 225	180 354	288 642	286 316	241 533	1,603 3,434
District Totals % of Total	516 10.2%	1,437 28.5%	244 4.8%	534 10.6%	930 18.5%	602 12.0%	774 15.4%	5,037 100.0%
District 18 Guilford % of Total	1,361 4.5%	8,984 29.4%	1,109 3.6%	1,629 5.3%	12,980 42,5%	1,841 6.0%	2,666 8.7%	30,570 100.0%
District 19A Cabarrus Rowan	710 509	1,545 1,506	205 98	749 738	1,119 1,042	408 715	757 726	5,493 5,334
District Totals % of Total	1,219 11.3%	3,051 28.2%	303 2.8%	1,487 13.7%	2,161 20.0%	1,123 10.4%	1,483 13.7%	10,827 100.0%
District 19B Montgomery Randolph	190 1,041	582 1,995	405 35	204 533	591 1,558	267 169	141 485	2,380 5,816
District Totals % of Total	1,231 15.0%	2,577 31.4%	440 5.4%	737 9.0%	2,149 26.2%	436 5.3%	626 7.6%	8,196 100.0%
District 20 Anson Moore Richmond Stanly Union	81 684 318 250 734	66 1,129 1,294 728 1,460	208 451 125 286 123	841 459 480 346 574	501 837 796 485 855	186 248 398 309 427	173 487 510 199 510	2,056 4,295 3,921 2,603 4,683
District Totals % of Total	2,067 11.8%	4,677 26.6%	1,193 6.8%	2,700 15.4%	3,474 19.8%	1,568 8,9%	1,879 10.7%	17,558 100.0%
District 21 Forsyth % of Total	1,372 6.4%	6,979 32.7%	0 0.0%	2,698 12.6%	6,172 28.9%	1,760 8.2%	2,384 11.2%	21,365 100.0%
District 22 Alexander Davidson Davie Iredell	85 437 74 655	542 2,614 335 2,758	1 256 61 364	138 538 115 515	593 3,385 371 2,666	336 804 171 711	101 447 57 413	1,796 8,481 1,184 8,082
District Totals % of Total	1,251 6.4%	6,249 32.0%	682 3.5%	1,306 6.7%	7,015 35.9%	2,022 10.3%	1,018 5.2%	19,543 100.0%
District 23 Alleghany Ashe Wilkes Yadkin	49 89 324 57	30 187 1,555 323	16 0 132 4	149 112 572 272	67 28 665 135	30 179 283 67	20 52 268 167	361 647 3,799 1,025
District Totals % of Total	519 8.9%	2,095 35.9%	152 2.6%	1,105 18.9%	895 15.3%	559 9.6%	507 8.7%	5,832 100.0%

MANNER OF DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL NON-MOTOR VEHICLE CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS July 1, 1987 - June 30, 1988

	Worthless Check	Guil	ty Plen	Not Guilty	Dismissed by		Felony Probable Cause	Total
District 74	Walver	Judge	Magistrate	Plea	DĂ	Other	Matters	Disposed
District 24								
Avery Madison	68	56	2	83	208	137	62	616
	17	56	0	35	. 268	204	93	683
Mitchell Volume	113	86	41	62	179	113	50	644
Watauga	345	289	28	68	518	132	163	1,543
Yancey	46	2	58	112	118	14	54	404
District Totals	589	499	129	360	1,291	600	422	3,890
% of Total	15.1%	12.8%	3.3%	9.3%	33.2%	15.4%	10.8%	100.0%
District 25								
Burke	435	1,397	55	246	1,204	612	470	4 410
Caldwell	371	1,413	276	253	1,046	434	600	4,419 4,393
Catawba	859	2,524	154	559	1,845	324	762	
					1,040	024	702	7,527
District Totals	1,665	5,334	485	1,058	4,095	1,870	1,832	16,339
% of Total	10.2%	32.6%	3.0%	6.5%	25.1%	11.4%	11.2%	100.0%
						11,40	±1,2/0	100.0%
District 26								
Mecklenburg	1,702	11,441	629	1,566	22,027	4,794	1,237	43,396
% of Total	3.9%	26.4%	1.4%	3.6%	50.8%	11.0%	2.9%	100.0%
District 27A			• •					
Gaston	648	3,981	463	1 002	5 950	1 9/9		
% of Total	4.6%	28.0%	3.3%	1,083	5,258	1,368	1,420	14,221
	4.0%	20.0%	3.34	7.6%	37.0%	9.6%	10.0%	100.0%
District 27B								
Cleveland	223	1,582	288	372	1,428	476	380	1 740
Lincoln	314	866	344	195	812	534	179	4,749
				199	012	5.54	179	3,244
District Totals	537	2,448	632	567	2,240	1,010	559	7,993
% of Total	6.7%	30.6%	7.9%	7.1%	28.0%	12.6%	7.0%	100.0%
								20010/2
District 28								
Buncombe	2,580	7,449	213	604	3,333	234	838	15,251
% of Total	16.9%	48.8%	1.4%	4.0%	21.9%	1.5%	5.5%	100.0%
District 29								
Henderson	275	1,370	258	133	998	474	241	2 7 4 2
McDowell	147	580	234	155	430	124	241	3,749
Polk	4	269	14	26	220	43	383	2,055
Rutherford	173	1,416	239	432	912	164	28	604
Transylvania	75	475	288	32	429	37	326 156	3,712
				54	425	57	100	1,492
District Totals	674	4,110	1,033	830	2,989	842	1,134	11,612
% of Total	5.8%	35.4%	8.9%	7.1%	25.7%	7.3%	9.8%	100.0%
District 30								
Cherokee	107	375	10	••				
Clay	21	1/0	18	12	447	250	273	1,482
Graham	0	149 84	23 1	22	109	5	19	348
Haywood	129			94	115	16	17	327
Jackson	29	794 201	136	173	898	147	400	2,677
Macon	33	165	111 54	42	252	34	277	946
Swain	20	105		52	205	92	59	660
	20	111	78	35	224	25	144	637
District Totals	339	1,879	421	430	2,250	569	1,189	7 077
% of Total	4.8%	26.6%	5.9%	6.1%	31.8%	8.0%	16.8%	7,077
				~		0.00	10.0%	100.0%
State Totals	56,473	158,293	18,717	41,119	138,798	41,640	45,489	500,529
% of Total	11.3%	31.6%	3.7%	8.2%	27.7%	8.3%	9.1%	100.0%
							2 · 1/0	100.0%

Ages of Pending Cases (Days)

		A	ges of Pendin	ig Cases (Days)		- Total	Mean	Median
	0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Pending	Age	Age
<u>District 1</u>								•	0-
Camden	25	2	0	0	0	0	27	23.5	14.0
Chowan	90	12	40	30	7	1	180	121.1	90.0
Currituck	68	4	11	18	- 4	0	105	87.7	37.0
Dare	515	<u>(</u>	17	22	4	1	570	37.5	16.0
Gates Pasquotank	28	4	1	ð	ð	0	33	43.7	35.0
Perquimans	175 48	7 0	10	3	1	0	196	38.9	24.0
rerquimans	40	U	2	4	1	0	55	51.3	27.0
District Totals	949	40	81	77	17	2	1,166	55.7	23.0
% of Total	81.4%	3.4%	6.9%	6.6%	1.5%	0.2%	100.0%		23.0
ang sa pina piné							100+0%		
District 2								dig salara i	
Beaufort	226	9	19	71	23	6	354	127.3	38.0
Hyde	46	0	0	2	0	0	48	30.6	12.0
Martín	236	5	.105	18	0	0	364	82.5	56.0
Tyrrell Maghington	25 50	0	0	1	1	0	27	43.9	28.0
Washington	50	0	0	1	1	0	52	34.6	17.0
District Totals	583	14	124	93	25	6	0.15		
% of Total	69.0%	1.7%	14.7%	11.0%	3.0%	0.7%	845 100.0%	94.1	52.0
			± ++ • / /u	11.070	J.0%	0.7%	100.0%		
District 3									
Carteret	795	57	97	53	16	7	1,025	72.5	37.0
Craven	677	68	98	77	16	20	956	95.5	35.0
Pamlico	88	9	8	20	6	0	131	91.1	41.0
Pitt	1,549	133	168	102	8	0	1,960	57.6	37.0
District Totals	2 100	0/7				an an an tha			
District Totals % of Total	76.4%	267 6.6%	371	252	46	27	4,072	71.3	37.0
" OI IOCAL	/0.4%	0.0%	9.1%	6.2%	1.1%	0.7%	100.0%		
District 4									
Duplin	438	13	12	20	6	0	489	49.5	29.0
Jones	49	0	0	Õ	0 O	õ	49	36.5	37.0
Onslow	944	86	82	41		ŏ	1,156	53.2	36.0
Sampson	350	86	23	17	ī	ŏ	477	60.6	49.0
District Totals		185	117	78	10	0	2,171	53.6	36.0
% of Total	82.0%	8.5%	5.4%	3.6%	0.5%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 5									
New Hanover	1,589	112	185	201					
Pender	195	112	185	304	131	56	2,377	127.9	51.0
- 04461	195	19	•	35	25	14	296	152.1	62.0
District Totals	1,784	131	193	339	156	70	2,673	130.6	51.0
% of Total	66.7%	4.9%	7.2%	12.7%	5.8%	2.6%	100.0%	100.0	21.0
							20010/1		
<u>District 6</u>									
Bertie	106	10	10	21	. 3	0	150	75.8	23.0
Halifax	339	58	61	58	3	0	519	79.4	41.0
Hertford	193	8	11	1	4	2 0	219	53.0	29.0
Northampton	83	2	3	10	1	0	99	57.7	27.0
District Totals	721	78	85	90	11	0			
% of Total	73.0%	7.9%	8.6%		114	2	987	70.8	34.0
		4 + 270	0.0%	9.1%	1.1%	0.2%	100.0%		
District 7									
Edgecombe	785	109	98	145	65	9	1,211	107.0	56.0
Nash	1,277	265	233	209	57	22	2,063	97.1	59.0
Wilson	899	143	214	285	153	22	1,716	149.1	86.0
							•• =- ••		
District Totals		517	545	639	275	53	4,990	117.4	65.0
% of Total	59.3%	10.4%	10.9%	12.8%	5.5%	1.1%	100.0%		

			Ages of Pendin	g Cases (Days	-	,, 1,00			
	0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	- Total Pending	Mean Age	Median Age
	0-90	91-120	121-180	101-202	300-750	2130	renaing	Age	Age
District 8 Greene	132	18	17	0	0	0	147	44.5	07.0
Lenoir	629	62	57	69	18	7	167 842		27.0
Wayne	936	113	144	84	19	2	1,298	81.8 74.1	48.0 48.0
wayne	510	115	144	04	12	. 4	1,290	74.1	40.0
District Totals	1,697	193	218	153	37	9	2,307	74.7	45.0
% of Total	73.6%	- 8.4%	9.4%	6.6%	1.0%	0.4%	100.0%		
District 9									
Franklin	225	22	30	19	1	0	297	62.8	35.0
Granville	231	19	11	13	17	1	292	74.1	35.0
Person	194	13	9	101	6	Ō	323	118.7	44.0
Vance	483	35	25	50	26	11	630	90.8	41.0
Warren	79	6	4	9	6	18	122	213.1	25.0
District Totals		95	79	192	56	30	1,664	97.2	36.0
% of Total	72.8%	5.7%	4.7%	11.5%	3.4%	1.8%	100.0%		
District 10									
Wake	4,094	777	910	1,503	862	505	8,651	201.8	99.0
% of Total	47.3%	9.0%	10.5%	17.4%	10.0%	5.8%	100.0%		55.0
District 11		-							
Harnett	409	62	68	61	26	9	635	119.8	51.0
Johnston	622	60	83	51	3	0	819	63.9	36.0
Lee	406	26	12	14	5	0	463	46.8	28.0
District Totals	1.437	148	163	126	34	9	1,917	78.3	37:0
% of Total	75.0%	7.7%	8.5%	6.6%	1.8%	0.5%	100.0%	70.5	57.0
District 12	÷								
Cumberland	2,751	393	422	413	53	7	4,039	82.6	52.0
Hoke	285	29	20	14	10	10	368	86.1	44.0
District Totals	3,036	422	442	427	63	17	4,407	82.9	51.0
% of Total	68.9%	9.6%	10.0%	9.7%	1.4%	0.4%	100.0%	02.0	51.0
						0.440	1001010		
District 13									
Bladen	248	13	6	18	6	2	293	61.8	29.0
Brunswick	353	58	54	135	49	7	656	139.1	79.0
Columbus	370	26	44	23	6	5	474	66.8	29.0
District Totals	971	97	104	176	61	14	1,423	99.1	41.0
% of Total	68.2%	6.8%	7.3%	12.4%	4.3%	1.0%	100.0%	77.1	41.0
						110/0	100.00		
District 14									
Durham	2,554	472	428	656	696	761	5,567	282.3	101.0
% of Total	45.9%	8.5%	7.7%	11,8%	12.5%	13.7%	100.0%		
District 15A							•		
Alamance	745	46	51	106	14	5	967	72.3	29.0
% of Total	77.0%	4.8%	5,3%	11.0%	1.4%	0.5%	100.0%	12.5	22.0
		, • • •							
District 15B	5 . E. S. S.			•					
Chatham	320	16	13	22	1	0	372	51.2	27.0
Orange	395	40	71	102	81	- 3	692	138.3	69.0
District Totals	715	56	84	124	32	3	1,064	107.9	44.0
% of Total	67,2%	5.3%	7.9%	11.7%	7.7%	0.3%	100.0%	107.5	44.0
		0.078	,,,,,,		· • / /=	0.0%			
District 16									
Robeson	1,067	96	104	200	52	7	1,526	88.6	41.0
Scotland	324	52	. 29	63	44	7	519	133.6	42.0
Dintuins Mober -	1 201	110	100	000	04	1.4	0.04F	100.0	11 0
District Totals % of Total	68.0%	148 7.2%	133 6.5%	263 12.9%	96 4.7%	14 0.7%	2,045 100.0%	100.0	41.0
" OF TOTAL	00.0%	1.44	0,5%	12.3%	H . / /a	0.74	100.0%		

Ages of Pending Cases (Days)

			Ages of Pendin	g Cases (Days)		- Total	Maan	Madha
	0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Pending	Mean Age	Median Age
District 17A									•
Caswell *	102	1	2	2	1	0	108	40.5	28.0
Rockingham	558	48	58	25	8	2	699	55.0	27.0
District Totals	660	49	60	27	9	2	007		
% of Total	81.8%	6.1%	7.4%	3.3%	1.1%	0.2%	807 100.0%	53.1	28.0
						0.2.4	100.0%		
District 17B Stokes	199	70							
Surry	440	20 28	5 27	6 21	5 2	0 1	235	62.6	44.0
			-	41	4	1	519	52.5	34.0
District Totals	639	48	32	27	7	1	754	55.7	36.0
% of Total	84.7%	6.4%	4.2%	3.6%	0.9%	0.1%	100.0%		
District 18									
Guilford	6,632	1,202	1,727	2,211	1,507	329	13,608	164.8	94.0
% of Total	48.7%	8.8%	12.7%	16.2%	11.1%	2.4%	100.0%	104.0	54.0
District 19A									
Cabarrus	654	41	54	46	12	0	807	58.1	20.0
Rowan	610	54	36	45	4	1	750	54.8	29.0 23.0
District Totals	3 064	0.5							
% of Total	81.2%	95 6.1%	90 5.8%	91 5.8%	16 1.0%	1	1,557	56.5	28.0
		0.1/	5.0%	J.0%	1.0%	0.1%	100.0%		
District 19B	1.1								
Montgomery Randolph	270 909	16	25	74	17	11	413	125.7	48.0
Nandorbu	909	118	104	173	94	7	1,405	108.3	52.0
District Totals	1,179	134	129	247	111	18	1,818	112.2	52.0
% of Total	64.9%	7.4%	7.1%	13.6%	6.1%	1.0%	100.0%	****	52.0
District 20									
Anson	225	8	4	11	12	3	262	74 0	
Moore	410	10	34	94	79	8	263 635	76.0 124.6	29.0 34.0
Richmond	362	25	8	47	2	Ō	444	58.3	27.0
Stanly Union	342 394	6 39	4	9	0	0	361	31.3	16.0
0.1.011	334	39	27	42	28	5ó	586	293.3	34.0
District Totals		83	77	203	121	67	2,289	134.6	28.0
% of Total	75.7%	3.8%	3.4%	8.9%	5.3%	2.9%	100.0%	134.0	20.0
District 21									
Forsyth	1,735	160	159	594	526	109	3,283	10/ 0	
% of Total	52.8%	4.9%	4.8%	18.1%	16.0%	3.3%	100.0%	194.8	77.0
District 22									
Alexander	184	14	6	6		•			
Davidson	1,133	59	75	57	1 24	0 25	211 1,373	46.2 71.9	34.0
Davie	154	16	10	14	3	2	199	76.1	30.0 43.0
Irede11	996	68	59	114	26	6	1,269	71,4	30.0
District Totals	2.467	157	150	191		2.2			
% of Total	80.8%	5.1%	4.9%	6.3%	54 1.8%	33 1.1%	3,052 100.0%	70.2	30.0
					£,0/8	1.14	100.0%		
District 23 Alleghany	17	· · · ·	•	· · ·					
Ashe	51	1 3	1	4 9	1	0	24	83.5	37.0
Wilkes	309	33	45	.84	28 52	11 12	102 535	311.8	89.0
Yadkin	70	3	1	2	0	0	76	137.2 38.2	69.0 17.0
District Totals	447	10	,	0 -					-, 10
% of Total	447 60.7%	40 5.4%	47 6.4%	99 13 49	81	23	737	149.4	52.0
	50,77	J a 19/6	V 4 4 /4	13.4%	11.0%	3.1%	100.0%		

	Ages of Pending Cases (Days)						Total	Mean	Median
	0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	– Total Pending	Mean Age	Median Age
District 24									
Avery	86	18	22	17	,18	6	167	177.6	86.0
Madison	42	4	14	27	29	5	121	251.2	191.0
Mitchell .	54	10	8	5	5	6	88	159.5	56.0
Watauga	219	32	55	52	10	1	369	103.5	65.0
Yancey	46	7	4	Ď	2	0	65	88.9	57.0
District Totals		71	103	107	64	18	810	145.8	73.0
% of Total	55.2%	8.8%	12.7%	13.2%	7.9%	2.2%	100.0%		
District 25									
Burke	529	9	21	14	8	1	582	44.7	22.0
Caldwell	405	36	26	13	12	1	493	59.0	30.0
Catawba	945	130	103	54	33	5	1,270	73.8	44.0
District Total:	s 1,879	175	150	81	53	7	2,345	63.5	35.0
% of Total	80.1%	7.5%	6.4%	3.5%	2.3%	0.3%	100.0%		
District 26									
Mecklenburg	5,307	653	1,005	1,780	643	173	9,561	142.4	74.0
% of Total	55.5%	6.8%	10.5%	18.6%	6.7%	1.8%	100.0%		
District 27A									
Gaston	2,290	325	380	321	111	75	3,502	114.8	55.0
% of Total	65.4%	9.3%	10.9%	9.2%	3.2%	2.1%	100.0%		
District 27B									
Cleveland	660	62	38	38	11	2	811	58.2	30.0
Lincoln	375	22	21	34	13	10	480	94.2	29.0
District Total	s 1,035	84	59	72	29	12	1,291	71.6	30.0
% of Total	80.2%	6.5%	4.6%	5.6%	2.2%	0.9%	100.0%	· •	
District 28									
Buncombe	1,334	98	173	209	21	1	1,836	69.4	35.0
% of Total	72.7%	5.3%	9.4%	11.4%	1.1%	0.1%	100.0%		
District 29									
Henderson	489	61	55	- 90	32	11	738	108.2	49.0
McDowell	243	19	13	4	17	2	298	74.6	28.0
Polk	67	2	17	11	2	0	99	83.6	45.0
Rutherford	485	41	73	100	157	111	967	268.0	87.0
Transylvania	185	17	16	26	73	1	318	163.5	65.0
District Total		140	174	231	281	125	2,420	174.2	62.0
% of Total	60.7%	5.8%	7.2%	9.5%	11.6%	5.2%	100.0%		
District 30									
Cherokee	157	10	55	32	107	170	531	475.4	443.0
Clay	58	3	1	4	2	0	68	54.7	15.0
Graham	52	9	14	16	5	0	93	120.2	72.0
Haywood	175	14	29	14	10	3	245	85.1	30.0
Jackson	115	5	7	4	1	2	134	61.3	28.0
Macon Swain	80 49	17 1	5 2	16 4	13 4	18 0	149 60	314.2 80.7	79.0 23.0
u#alli	47		4	4	- 4				
District Total	s 686 53.6%	59	110	90 7 07	142	193	1,280	271.9	72.0
% of Total	23.0%	4.6%	8.6%	7.0%	11.1%	15.1%	100.0%		
State Totals	60,943	7,264	8,753	11,875	6,317	2,714	97,866	134.5	57.0
% of Total	62.3%	7.4%	8.9%	12.1%	6.5%	2.8%	100.0%		

Ages of Disposed Cases (Days)

			Ages of Dispose	ed Cases (Days	;)		- Total	Mean	Median
	0.90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Disposed	Age	Age
District 1									
Camden	177	5	2	3	0	0	137	35.3	28.0
Chowan	659	8	1	6	4	0	678	26.1	18.0
Currituck	471	12	4	9	0	0	496	31.1	22.0
Dare	2,605	72	70	140	4	1	2,892	41.8	22.0
Gates	340	7	3	1	0	0	351	29.9	25.0
Pasquotank	2,155	19	22	28	4	0	2,228	28.9	20.0
Perquimans	428	8	7	8	0	0	451	31.3	22.0
District Totals	6,835	.131	109	195	12	1	7,283	34.3	21.0
% of Total	93.8%	1.8%	1.5%	2.7%	0.2%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 2									
Beaufort	3,063	59	36	32	7	10	3,207	26.1	14.0
Hyde	513	13	3	3	4	õ	541	32.2	21.0
Martin	1,202	18	17	13	3	ĩ	1,254	24.2	13.0
Tyrrell	261	8	4	2	Ō	Ō	275	30.4	23.0
Washington	893	8	7	2	0	0	910	21.9	15.0
District Totals	5,932	106	72	52	14	11	4 107	25.8	14.0
% of Total	95.9%	1.7%	1.2%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%	6,187 100.0%	23.0	14.0
% OL IUCAL	,,,, <u>,</u>	2	1.4/4	0.0%	0.2%	0.40	100.0%		
District 3									
Carteret	3,951	374	379	299	47	24	5,074	64.5	35.0
Craven	5,339	418	440	300	54	0	6,551	51.8	26.0
Pamlico	543	39	52	33	2	0	669	53.7	30.0
Pitt	10,618	793	609	358	15	1	12,394	46.9	30.0
District Totals	20.451	1,624	1,480	990	118	25	24,688	52.0	30.0
% of Total	82.8%	6.6%	6.0%	4.0%	0.5%	0.1%	100.0%		
District 4									
Duplin	2,594	114	91	59	2	1	2,861	39.5	23.0
Jones	472	16	19	10	3	0	520	36.5	22.0
Onslow	10,888	518	619	226	30	0	12,281	36.9	20.0
Sampson	3,202	170	129	45	7	0	3,553	43.4	33.0
District Totals	17,156	818	858	340	42	1	19,215	38.4	23.0
% of Total	89.3%	4.3%	4.5%	1.8%	0.2%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 5	10 30%	(0)	100	470	205	150	15 100	F7 0	06.0
New Hanover	13,384	621	499	479	305	150	15,438	57.9	26.0
Pender	1,503	88	66	69	26	9	1,761	54.3	22.0
District Totals	14,887	709	565	548	331	159	17,199	57.5	25.0
% of Total	86.6%	4.1%	3.3%	3.2%	1.9%	0.9%	100.0%		
District 6									
Bertie	1,253	i5	13	9	2	O N	1,292	23.6	15.0
Halifax	3,937	224	174	55	54	· . 0. ·		42.8	28.0
Hertford	1,713	46	22	9	0	0	4,444 1,790	28.7	20.0
Northampton	948	26	28	10	9	ŏ	1,021	31.1	14.0
nor enamp con	540	20	20				1,021	31.1	14.0
District Totals		311	237	83	65	0	8,547	35.5	22.0
% of Total	91.9%	3.6%	2.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 7									
Edgecombe	4,420	361	357	432	65	4	5,639	65.1	36.0
Nash	6,070	502	531	432	60	6	7,601	60.0	34.0
Wilson	4,084	475	560	505	168	21	5,813	84.6	47.0
Name and the second second	14 574	1 2 2 1	1 440	1.200	20.2	21	10.052	60.0	20 0
District Totals		1,338	1,448	1,369	293	31	19,053	69.0	38.0
% of Total	76.5%	7.0%	7.6%	7.2%	1.5%	0.2%	100.0%		

	Ages of Disposed Cases (Days)								
	0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	— Total Disposed	Mean Age	Median Age
District 8							Disposed	nge	Age
Greene	747	62	54	37	22	2	007	(1.0	
Lenoir	3,619	377	426	276	41	0	924 4,739	61.2	29.0
Wayne	5,347	497	553	367	38	0 0	6,802	63.8 60.7	37.0 39.0
District Totals	9,713	936	1,033	\$80	101	2	10.100		
% of Total	77.9%	7.5%	8.3%	5.5%	0.8%	0.0%	12,465 100.0%	61.9	37.0
District 9									
Franklin	2,294	102	98	e e					
Granville	2,249	57	55	55 42	10	4	2,563	38.3	19.0
Person	1,986	81	43	42	36	1	2,440	37.2	19.0
Vance	3,976	157	100	48 92	36 16	0	2,194	48.9	31.0
Warren	878	35	37	14	4	0	4,341	28.4	7.0
			"	4.4	- 	0	968	32.7	15.0
District Totals	11,383	432	333	251	102	5	10 500		
% of Total	91.0%	3.5%	2.7%	2.0%	0.8%	0.0%	12,506 100.0%	36.1	17.0
District 10									
Wake	24,717	2,366	2,125	2,755	750				
% of Fotal	75.4%	7.2%	6.5%	3.4%	752 2.3%	56 0.2%	32,771 100.02	74.9	43.0
District 11									
Harnett	3,824	180	105						
Johnston	4,797	276	185 271	188	36	3	4,416	47.0	23.0
Lee	3,949	147	149	210	18	0	5,572	47.0	27.0
	5,545	147	149	62	5	0	4,312	33.9	20.0
District Totals	12.570	603	605	460	59	•			
% of Total	87.9%	4.2%	4.2%	3.2%	0.4%	3 0.0%	14,300 100.0%	43.0	,23.0
					•••••		100.0%		
District 12								1.1	
Cumberland	14,992	1,901	2,512	2,439	249	39	22,132	79.5	45.0
Hoke	1,678	180	164	75	39	5	2,141	63.2	37.0
District Totals	16 670	2,031	2 676	0 51/					
% of Total	68.7%	8.6%	2,676 11.0%	2,514	288	44	24,273	78.1	44.0
		0.04	11.0%	10.4%	1.2%	0.2%	100.0%		
District 13									
Bladen	2,217	109	71	41	14	3	7 455	12.0	
Brunswick	2,446	180	138	97	25	8	2,455	43.2	27.0
Columbus	3,682	191	114	57	15	2	2,894 4,061	50.4	27.0
							4,001	39.3	24.0
District Totals	8,345	480	323	195	54	13	9,410	43.7	26.0
% of Total	88.7%	5.1%	3.4%	2.1%	0.6%	0.1%	100.0%	-3.7	20.0
Diabulas 16									
District 14 Durham	10 171			1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1					
% of Total	12,171	1,525	1,609	1,103	162	26	16,596	69.0	42.0
A OI IOCAL	73.3%	9.2%	9.7%	5.6%	1.0%	0.2%	100.0%		
District 15A									an a
Alamance	6,401	223	138	155	91			1.1	
% of Total	91.3%	3.2%	2.0%	2.2%	1.3%	2 0.0%	7,010 100.0%	42.7	25.0
District IED						0.00	100.0%		
District 15B Chatham	0.001								
	2,201	112	71	70	15	0	2,469	41.7	22.0
Orange	4,177	216	289	181	21	2	4,886	48.5	28.0
District Totals	6,378	328	360	251	36		7.000		
% of Total	86.7%	4.5%	4.9%	3.4%	0.5%	2 0.0%	7,355	46.2	26.0
Disenter 14						0100	100.0%		
District 16 Robeson	10 500	AF =							
	10,533	350	364	212	18	1	11,478	29.9	14.0
Scotland	4,363	147	70	49	6	1	4,636	29.0	16.0
District Totals	14.896	497	434	261	•	_			
% of Total	92.4%	3.1%	2.7%	261	24	2	16,114	29.6	15.0
		J, 1 10	2.14	1.6%	0.1%	0.0%	100.0%		

Ages of Disposed Cases (Days)

홍승은 옷 문제 같아.		A	ges of Dispose	ed Cases (Days	\$)		– Total	Mean	Median
	0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Disposed	Age	Age
District 17A	070					<u>,</u>	1 0/0	21.2	
Caswell	979	32	11	14	6	0	1,042	31.3	21.0
Rockingham	5,439	174	92	84	19	0	5,808	35.0	22.0
District Totals	6,418	206	103	98	25	0	6,850	34.4	22.0
% of Total	93.7%	3.0%	1.5%	1.4%	0.4%	0.0%	100.0%		
<u>District 17B</u> Stokes	1,256	123	185	35	4	ð	1,603	56.2	37.0
Surry	2,951	207	209	66	1	0	3,434	48.9	36.0
District Totals	4,207	330	394	101	5	0	5,037	51.2	36.0
% of Total	83.5%	6.6%	7.8%	2.0%	0.1%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 18									
Guilford	18,508	2,787	3,609	3,737	1,715	214	30,570	113.6	64.0
% of Total	60.5%	9.1%	11.8%	12.2%	5.6%	0.7%	100.0%		
D 4									
<u>District 19A</u> Cabarrus	5,069	177	88	111	48	0	5,493	42.9	29.0
Rowan	4,836	191	157	130	20	ŏ	5,334	41.5	27.0
District Totals		368	245	241	68	0	10,827	42.3	28.0
% of Total	91.5%	3.4%	2.3%	2.2%	0.6%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 19B									
Montgomery	2,103	109	67	60	40	1	2,380	46.7	26.0
Randolph	4,680	480	352	177	126	1	5,816	63.7	42.0
District Totals	6 702	589	419	237	166	2	8,196	58.7	37.0
% of Total	82.8%	7.2%	5.1%	2.9%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%	50.7	57.0
		•••••							
District 20				·				- 	
Anson	1,957	52	33	13	1	0	2,056	31.1	22.0
Moore	3,943	152	123	56	19	2	4,295	34.9	20.0
Richmond	3,735	67	72	45	2	Ð	3,921	26.3	14.0
Stanly	2,449	70	48	34	1	1	2,603	34.8	25.0
Union	4,358	140	98	79	7	1. I	4,683	35,0	21.0
District Totals	16,442	481	374	227	30	4	17,558	32.6	20.0
% of Total	93.6%	2.7%	2.1%	1.3%	0.2%	0.0%	100.0%		
District 21									
Forsyth	19,277	344	295	327	547	575	21,365	69.2	22.0
% of Total	90.2%	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	2.6%	2.7%	100.0%		
<u>District 22</u> Alexander	1,580	83	77	46	10	0	1,796	45.5	27.0
Davidson	7,376	504	326	219	53	3	8,431	49.5	30.0
Davie	1,023	74	46	41	0	õ	1,184	47.7	34.0
Iredell	6,943	524	326	233	48	8	1,184 8,082	53.5	36.0
		- 1 -4							
District Totals		1,185	775	539	111	11	19,543	50.7	33.0
% of Total	86.6%	6.1%	4.0%	2.8%	0.6%	0.1%	100.0%		
District 23									
Alleghany	337	5	6 4	13	0	0	361	35.3	21.0
Ashe	629	8		5	1	0	647	22.5	16.0
Wilkes	3,374	119	137	50	60	59	3,799	58.0	22.0
Yadkin	948	35	28	13	1 ·	0	1,025	35.0	23.0
District Totals	5,288	167	175	81	62	59	5,832	48.6	21.0
% of Total	90.7%	2.9%	3.0%	1.4%	1.1%	1.0%	100.0%		
			• • • •						

Ages of Disposed Cases (Days)

		A	ges of Disposed	Cases (Days)			- Total	Manu	Marthun	1
	0-90	91-120	121-180	181-365	366-730	>730	Disposed	Mean Age	Median Age	
District 24										
Avery	487	23	37	43	26	0	616	74.7	37.0	
Madison	543	44	30	49	13	4	683	73.3	45.0	
Mitchell	513	77	25	21	3	ō	644	57.9	41.0	
Watauga	1,177	103	106	111	45	1	1,543	72.5	36.0	ć
Yancey	346	26	16	14	2	ō	404	48.9	31.0	
rancey	340	20	10	4**	9 A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	U	404	40.7	J1:0	
District Totals	3,066	273	214	238	94	5	3,890	68.1	38.0	
% of Total	78.8%	7.0%	5.5%	6.1%	2.4%	0.1%	100.0%	00.1	J0.0	
a of locar	10.0%	1.0/	2024	0.14	4.4%	0.1%	100.0%			
District 25										
Burke	3,918	175	160	150	14	0	4 410	41 0	50.0	
Caldwell	3,732	261	216	152	14		4,419	41.2	22.0	
				162	22	0	4,393	48.7	28.0	
Catawba	6,293	434	416	367	17	0	7,527	50.7	29.0	
Distantiat Menale	12 012	070	700	101			14 000			
District Totals		870	792	681	53	0	16,339	47.6	27.0	
% of Total	85.3%	5.3%	4.8%	4.2%	0.3%	0.0%	100.0%			
Distantian Of					1'				an ^{an} an guile an an	
District 26	22 6 50	0.741								
Mecklenburg	33,658	2,761	2,434	3,212	1,075	256	43,396	72.3	36.0	
% of Total	77.6%	6.4%	5.6%	7.4%	2.5%	0.6%	100.0%			
District 27A	1									
Gaston	10,421	1,316	1,058	1,067	316	43	14,221	81.5	52.0	
% of Total	73.3%	9.3%	7.4%	7.5%	2.2%	0.3%	100.0%			
District 27B										
Cleveland	4,273	240	112	105	18	1	4,749	40.0	.24.0	
Lincoln	2,972	117	101	45	9	0	3,244	37.1	25.0	
	1									
District Totals	7,245	357	213	150 .	27	· 1	7,993	38.8	24.0	
% of Total	90.6%	4.5%	2.7%	1.9%	0.3%	0.0%	100.0%			
<u>District 28</u>								- M		
Buncombe	13,352	495	509	772	121	2	15,251	47.9	25.0	
% of Total	87.5%	3.2%	3.3%	5.1%	0.8%	0.0%	100.0%			
District 29				** .						
Henderson	3,145	223	164	133	65	19	3,749	61.5	33.0	
McDowell	1,812	95	72	55	20	1	2,055	49.9	30.0	
Polk	518	30	31	18	7	0	604	49.6	28.0	
Rutherford	3,089	218	205	177	23	0	3,712	56.3	37.0	
Transylvania	1,261	106	50	55	14	6	1,492	52.8	24.0	
District Totals	9,825	672	522	438	129	26	11,612	56.1	32.0	
% of Total	84.6%	5.8%	4.5%	3.8%	1.1%	0.2%	100.0%			
District 30										
Cherokee	934	171	139	109	111	18	1,482	111.4	60.0	
Clay	310	17	8	9	4	0	348	44.3	32.0	
Graham	289	17	14	7	0	0	327	47.8	34.0	
Haywood	2,422	75	36	77	17	Ō	2,677	40.5	23.0	
Jackson	852	39	31	17	7	Ō	946	39.9	21.0	
Macon	556	36	22	17	20	ğ	660	73.9	28.0	
Swain	570	32	24	9	20	Ő	637	43.4	30.0	
					т. Т				20.0	
District Totals	5,933	387	324	245	161	27	7,077	59.2	30.0	
% of Total	83.8%	5.5%	4.6%	3.5%	2.3%	0.4%	100.0%	J J 6 60	50.0	
				J + J /#	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	V • T/1	100.04			
State Totals	412,123	28,096	26,860	24,593	7,249	1,608	500,529	59.1	30.0	
% of Total	82.3%	5.6%	5.4%	4.9%	1.4%	0.3%	100.0%		30.0	
		2000			4 9 7 W	.	100.04			

	Total	Dispositions					
	Filed	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions			
District 1							
Camden	685	554	99	653			
Chowan	1,406	1,181	115	1,296			
Currituck	2,077	1,746	61	1,807			
Dare	7,253	6,055	1,029	7,084			
Gates	1,100	842	214	1,056			
Pasquotank	1,791	1,447	284	1,731			
Perquimans	1,400	1,151	188	1,339			
District Totals	15,712	12,976	1,990	14,966			
District 2							
Beaufort	6,045	4,284	1,460	5,744			
Hyde	1,031	642	333	975			
Martin	4,130	2,743	992	3,735			
Tyrrell	2,377	1,814	329	2,143			
Washington	1,235	941	. 302	1,243			
District Totals	14,813	10,424	3,416	13,840			
District 3							
Carteret	7,290	5,405	1,789	7,194			
Craven	7,994	5,590	2,376	7,966			
Pamlico	869	536	323	859			
Pitt	11,270	6,575	4,640	11,215			
District Totals	27,423	18,106	9,128	27,234			
District 4							
Duplin	3,152	2,262	490	2,752			
Jones	1,362	747	407	1,154			
Onslow	8,836	5,862	2,957	8,819			
Sampson	5,612	3,936	1,851	5,787			
District Totals	18,962	12,807	5,705	18,512			
District 5							
New Hanover	12,901	7,261	5,165	12,426			
Pender	2,759	1,644	908	2,552			
District Totals	15,660	8,905	6,073	14,978			
District 6							
Bertie	2,297	1,712	621	2,333			
Halifax	8,881	6,383	2,439	8,822			
Hertford	2,561	1,970	591	2,561			
Northampton	4,917	3,732	1,430	5,162			
District Totals	18,656	13,797	5,081	18,878			
District 7							
Edgecombe	5,696	4,264	1,340	5,604			
Nash	6,441	5,095	1,404	6,499			
Wilson	5,954	4,445	1,212	5,657			
District Totals	18,091	13,304	3,956	17,760			
District 8							
Greene	1,503	904	554	1,458			
Lenoir	6,147	3,673	2,285	5,958			
Wayne	6,447	3,831	2,455	6,286			
District Totals	14,097	8,408	5,294	13,702			

	Total	Dispositions					
	Filed	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions			
District 9							
Franklin	2,249	1,325	798	2,123			
Granville	3,161	2,228	854	3,082			
Person	2,397	1,571	775	2,346			
Vance	3,377	2,081	1,114	3,195			
Warren	1,987	1,298	562	1,860			
District Totals	13,171	8,503	4,103	12,606			
District 10							
Wake	42,173	22,944	19,804	42,748			
<u>District 11</u> Harnett	4,988	3,272	1,464	4,736			
Johnston	7,133	4,301	2,951	7,252			
Lee	3,336	2,227	394	3,121			
Stabulat Tabala			6. 200				
District Totals	15,457	9,800	5,309	15,109			
District 12	05 517	10.000		0 F 0.17			
Cumberland	25,516	16,835	8,492	25,327			
Hoke	2,880	2,172	625	2,797			
District Totals	28,396	19,007	9,117	28,124			
District 13							
Bladen	3,346	2,218	1,073	3,291			
Brunswick	4,475	3,886	2,003	5,889			
Columbus	4,177	2,547	1,557	4,104			
District Totals	11,998	8,651	4,633	13,284			
District 14							
Durham	18,339	11,628	5,875	17,503			
District 15A							
Alamance	10,340	6,216	3,669	9,885			
District 15B Chatham	E 30¢	2 2 2 4	1 772	F 100			
	5,306	3,334	1,775	5,109			
Orange	8,046	4,834	2,709	7,543			
District Totals	-13,352	8,168	4,484	12,652			
District 16							
Robeson	8,423	6,358	1,654	8,012			
Scotland	2,599	2,159	706	2,865			
District Totals	11,022	8,517	2,360	10,877			
District 17A							
Caswell	2,305	1,640	638	2,278			
Rockingham	7,742	5,579	1,917	7,496			
District Totals	10,047	7,219	2,555	9,774			
District 17B							
Stokes	2,170	1,602	622	2,224			
Surry	4,669	3,283	1,240	4,523			
District Totals	6,839	4,885	1,862	6,747			

	July I, I	.707 — June Ju, 1988					
	Total Filed		Disposition	and the second			
가장 이상 가장 있다는 것이 있는 것이 있다. 같은 것이 있다. 한 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있다.	riica	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions			
District 18 Guilford	45 630	97 007	17 004	10 000			
Guillord	45,680	24,297	17,926	42,223			
District 19A							
Cabarrus	7,893	5,614	2,281	7,895			
Rowan	6,715	4,589	1,898	6,487			
District Totals	14,608	10,203	4,179	14,382			
District 19B							
Montgomery	1,920	1,388	638	2,026			
Randolph	9,723	6,206	2,756	8,962			
District Totals	11,643	7,594	3,394	10,988			
District 20							
Anson	3,510	2,145	1,016	3,161			
Moore Richmond	5,314	3,167	1,758	4,925			
Stanly	4,127 3,216	2,863 2,274	910 838	3,773			
Union	6,523	4,529	1,502	3,112 6,031			
District Totals	22,690	14,978	6,024	21,002			
District 21			and the second secon				
Forsyth	23,967	13,472	10,114	23,586			
District 22	1 601	1 000					
Alexander Davidson	1,621	1,022	611	1,633			
Davie	6,972 2,479	4,435	2,265 508	6,700			
Iredell	9,480	1,569 6,056	3,043	2,077 9,099			
District Totals	20,552	13,082	6,427	19,509			
		10,001	0,727	17,505			
District 23	1 002	7/ 2	07.1	1 001			
Alleghany Ashe	1,092	743	261 389	1,004			
Wilkes	1,731 3,620	1,266 2,617	943	1,655			
Yadkin	2,530	1,727	717	3,560 2,444			
Dissuint Makala							
District Totals	8,973	6,353	2,310	8,663			
District 24	3 016	1 4 2 1	997	1.667			
Avery Madison	1,915	1,431	236 234	1,667			
	1,491	1,229		1,463			
Mitchell Watauga	2,840	444 2,208	192 613	636 2,821			
Yancey	1,091	828	94	922			
District Totals	8,006	6,140	1,369	7,509			
District 25							
Burke	6,530	4,388	2,121	6,509			
Caldwell	4,245	2,575	1,413	3,988			
Catawba	10,960	7,474	3,469	10,943			
District Totals	21,735	14,437	7,003	21,440			
District 26							
Mecklenburg	42,825	31,868	10,482	42,350			

이번 동안은 집에서	Total	Dispositions				
	Filed	Waiver	Other	Total Dispositions		
District 27A						
Gaston	12,536	8,211	3,909	12,120		
District 27B Cleveland	7,393	5,608	1 (00	and the second secon		
Lincoln	3,243	2,181	1,492	7,100		
DINCOIN	3,443	2,101	997	3,178		
District Totals	10,636	7,789	2,489	10,278		
District 28						
Buncombe	11,743	9,779	1,540	11,319		
District 29						
Henderson	5,101	4,290	626	4,916		
McDowell Polk	3,476	2,818	477	3,295		
Rutherford	1,622	1,343	212	1,555		
Transylvania	3,746	2,840	939	3,779		
Iransylvania	1,229	941	191	1,132		
District Totals	15,174	12,232	2,445	14,677		
District 30						
Cherokee	2,395	1 057	500			
Clay	577	1,957	500	2,457		
Graham	419	309	95 43	545		
Haywood	4,194	3,399	551	352		
Jackson	2,146	1,755	335	3,950		
Macon	1,634	1,862	226	2,090		
Swain	2,159	1,544	220	2,088		
	-,	*****	401	1,825		
District Totals	13,524	11,276	2,031	13,307		
State Totals	608,845	406,476	186,056	592,532		