

If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

123463

## 123463

## statistical series no. 65

# 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 material has been

Public	Domain/U.S	. Dept.	of
Health	Education	and We	Ifare

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

## JUVENILE COURT STATISTICS

1960

1 24

٩.

Ļ

NCJRS

MAY 16 1990

ACQUISITIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Social Security Administration

Children's Bureau 1961

The statistics in this publication represent the volume of children's cases disposed of by juvenile courts. They are affected by several factors. Ages of children and types of cases (e.g., traffic violations) over which courts have jurisdiction are established by State law and often differ for courts in different States and sometimes for courts within the same State. This affects the number of cases reported and consequently the comparability of the reports from the various courts.

The number of children's cases reported by different courts is also greatly influenced by variations in the organization and scope of the services of other agencies. Many communities have established agencies, such as a juvenile division of the police department, that adjust many cases or refer them to other community agencies rather than to the juvenile courts. In some communities the juvenile court is one of the few agencies providing social services to children. In others, programs of social services for children are well established; in these, the juvenile court is only one of many agencies dealing with children and is primarily used only when its authority as a judicial agency is needed.

Furthermore, whether a child comes to the attention of the court is influenced by community and parental attitudes toward a child's behavior, and these attitudes vary from place to place.

Because of these and other limitations (many of which are not statistically assessable), juvenile court statistics, when taken by themselves, cannot measure the full extent of either delinquency, dependency, or neglect. They may be particularly misleading when used to make comparisons between one community and another. They do, however, indicate how frequently one important community resource, the juvenile court, is utilized for dealing with such cases. (For further discussion of the problems of measurement of juvenile delinquency, see I. Richard Perlman: "Reporting Juvenile Delinquency," <u>Na-</u> tional Probation and Parole Association Journal, July 1957, 3, pp. 242-249.)

# CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Findings	ב
Delinquency cases (excluding traffic offenses) Traffic cases Other cases (dependency and neglect or special proceedings)	
Sources of Data	6
Definition of Terms	7
Summary Tables	8
Delinquency cases (excluding traffic offenses) Traffic cases Trend table (and chart) on delinquency and traffic cases Dependency and neglect cases	8 10 11-12 13
Appendix Table	15

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

#### Delinquency cases (excluding traffic offenses)

Extent.....

(Table 1)

About 514,000 juvenile delinquency cases (excluding traffic offenses) were handled by juvenile courts in the United States in 1960. The estimated number of different children involved in these cases was somewhat lower (443,000), since the same child may have been referred more than once during the year. These children represent 1.8 percent of all children aged 10 through 17 in the country. (Note: These data are not comparable to those reported for years prior to 1957 when traffic offenses were included with other delinquency cases. See section on "Traffic cases" below.)

Trend..... (Tables 4, 7 and chart)

In 1960, for the 12th consecutive year, delinquency cases increased over the previous year. The increase for 1960 was 6 percent while the increase in the child population, aged 10 through 17, increased by only 2 percent. Thus, as in every year in the past decade, except 1959, the increase in delinquency cases exceeded the increase in the child population.

In the past, the percentage increase in girls' cases was usually less than that for boys'. In 1960, however, girls' cases increased by 10 percent over 1959 whereas boys' cases increased by only 5 percent. The largest increase in girls' cases occurred in rural courts.

The pattern noted in recent years of court delinquency cases increasing faster in rural areas than elsewhere was reversed in 1960. The increase was 7 percent in urban courts, which handle two-thirds of all court delinquency cases in the country, while it was 3 percent in the rural courts.

Sex ratio...... Delinquency cases are primarily a boy's problem; boys are (Table 1) referred more than four times as often as girls.

(Table 2)

Manner of handling. Cases handled unofficially -- without filing a petition -are included in the data of this report. Half of the delinquency cases were disposed of in this way. The proportion of cases handled unofficially was higher in urban courts than in rural courts, owing perhaps to the availability of specialized intake or probation staff in the urban courts. (For a discussion of policy consideration in the unofficial disposition of cases, see Standards for Specialized Courts Dealing with Children, Children's Bureau Publication No. 346, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954, pp. 43-45.)

> The increase between 1959 and 1960 was much greater in unofficial delinquency cases than in official cases (10 and 3 percent respectively) when date from all types of courts are combined. When data are examined separately by type

> > ]

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS--continued

## Delinquency cases (excluding traffic offenses)--continued

of court, however, the changes in such cases between these 2 years are strikingly different. In rural courts, for example, the unofficial cases actually decreased while the official cases increased by 6 percent.

Differential rates. The rate of delinquency cases (the number of cases per 1,000 child population aged 10 through 17) was about 2 1/2(Table 3) times higher in predominantly urban areas than in predominantly rural areas. Courts in predominantly urban areas handle about two-thirds of all the delinquency cases in the country.

Traffic cases

Extent..

(Table 5)

..... In addition to the 514,000 juvenile delinquency cases, about 306,000 traffic cases were disposed of by juvenile courts in the country in 1960. These cases involved roughly 264,000 different children or about 1.0 percent of the child population. These traffic cases do not represent all traffic cases of juveniles since many juvenile courts do not have jurisdiction in such cases. They represent only those coming to the attention of juvenile courts.

Change from

(Table 6)

previous year..... Traffic cases increased by 6 percent in 1960 over the estimated number in 1959. This is the identical increase noted above for delinquency cases (excluding traffic offenses).

Discussion..... In former years traffic cases, in those courts that had jurisdiction in such cases, were included with other types of juvenile delinquency cases and could not be separately identified. Since 1957, courts have been requested to report data on traffic cases separately. The reasons for doing this are as follows:

> First, most traffic offenses can hardly be considered in the same category as other types of delinquency. Most do not involve the type of behavior or circumstances that require the study and specialized handling necessary in other forms of misconduct. This is recognized by the Standard Family and Juvenile Court Acts which permit special handling of juvenile traffic cases in a summary manner, without social investigation. It is generally believed therefore (and recommended recently by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges) that traffic offenses should be analyzed separately from other types of delinquency. This was not very important 5 to 10 years

#### Traffic cases--continued

ago when traffic cases comprised a small proportion of all juvenile delinquency cases. Lately, however, the increased availability and use of the auto by juveniles is accounting for increasingly more juvenile traffic cases.

Second, in at least one State, recent legislation prohibits the classification of traffic offenses under the heading of "juvenile delinquency," unless specifically adjudicated as such.

Third, some courts have jurisdiction in traffic cases and others do not. This disturbs the comparability of reporting. By reporting traffic cases separately, the data on delinquency cases (excluding traffic cases) become more precise. Also any changes in the methods of handling traffic cases (i.e., the increasing trend toward handling juvenile traffic cases in traffic courts) will only affect the series of data on traffic cases and not the other series on delinquency cases excluding traffic. Since traffic cases have been included with other delinquency cases up to now, the question may appropriately be raised as to whether the high rise in delinquency noted in the past 10 years may reflect merely the increased number of traffic offenses. This cannot be proved or disproved nationally since the data are not available. Nevertheless, the following observations are relevant.

Examination of some State reports (California, Ohio, Missouri, Florida) that maintain separate data on traffic cases reveals that traffic offenses have increased tremendously in recent years. In the courts in some of these States traffic cases comprise half or more of all types of delinquency cases. There is no question but that in such courts, where the proportion of traffic cases is so high, the rapid increase in traffic cases would seriously bias the overall delinquency picture for these specific States. For the United States as a whole, however, it is believed that the inclusion of traffic cases with other types of delinquency has not seriously affected the overall picture.

This belief is based on the following:

1. Many courts do not have jurisdiction over routine juvenile traffic cases so that <u>nationally</u> traffic cases comprise only about one-third of all types of delinquency cases, while non-traffic delinquency cases comprise the remaining two-thirds. This ratio buffers somewhat any disproportionate effect that the increase in traffic cases may have on the overall results.



617378 O -61 -2

## Traffic cases--continued

2. Trends over the past decade in juvenile court data that include traffic cases are strikingly similar to those of the police arrest data on juveniles issued by the F.B.I., which do not include traffic offenses (except for driving while intoxicated).

3. Delinquency data for some courts that do not have jurisdiction in juvenile traffic cases or where traffic cases are excluded show upward trends over the past 10 years. These trends parallel closely, but not exactly, the national trend where traffic cases have been included. A good example is the large State of New York where court delinquency cases have more than doubled since 1948, even though routine juvenile traffic cases are not handled by the children's courts. In Connecticut the same was true, and in several other States where data were available there were also large increases over that period.

The above observations do not mean that the inclusion of traffic cases may not have inflated somewhat the overall, year-to-year increases nationally, but rather that the degree of inflation has not been great.

Mention must be made of the many persons who believe that, although a lax view can sometimes be taken of traffic offenses by adults, this should not be done in the case of juveniles, who are in their formative years and for whom obedience to law should be stressed. To this group of persons, a juvenile traffic offender is as deliquent as any other delinquent child. The group holding this view would argue that juvenile court statistics understate the problem of delinquency since many juvenile traffic offenders appear in courts other than juvenile courts and are not included in the statistics.

The preceding discussion should be taken into consideration in interpreting the statistical data in this report.

## Other cases

Dependency and neglect.....

(Tables 8-10)

.. Most juvenile courts by statute have jurisdiction over court actions involving dependent and neglected children as well as delinquent children. Dependency and neglect cases in the United States totaled 131,000 in 1960. Such cases increased by 2 percent between 1959 and 1960. Thus, the upward trend which began in 1951 and occurred in each subsequent year, except 1956, continues.

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS--continued

## Other cases--continued

. .

Special

يشر ب

伧

proceedings..... A small proportion of all court cases are those involving adoption, custody, consent to marry and other "special proceedings." Courts vary in the types of such cases handled.

## SOURCES OF DATA

1. Data on the number of juvenile delinquency cases are based on reports from a national sample of juvenile courts, supplemented by estimates for Alaska and Hawaii.

The national sample of juvenile courts, drawn from the Current Population Survey Sample of the Bureau of the Census, is representative of the country as a whole. For this sample, the United States was first divided into about 2,000 primary sampling units, each consisting of a county or a number of contiguous counties, such as those in a standard metropolitan area. The 2,000 primary sampling units were then subdivided into 230 groups, each consisting of a set of sampling units as much alike as possible in such characteristics as regional location, population density, percent of nonwhite population, rate of growth, etc. From each group a single primary sample unit was selected at random, resulting in 230 sampling units in which 502 courts were located. (For a more detailed description of the Current Population Survey Sample, see Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 2, Bureau of the Census.)

As shown below, the majority of the urban courts serve large areas of 100,000 or more population; semi-urban courts serve medium-sized areas; and rural courts, small areas of under 20,000.

Type of court	All courts	Number of 100,000 or over	of courts 50,000- 99,999	serving po 20,000- 49,999	pulations of 10,000- 19,999	0f: Under 10,000
Total	502	187	70	123	61	61
Urban Semi-urban Rural	202 170 130	151 36 -	21 43 6	26 54 43	1 13 47	3 24 34

2. Data on dependency and neglect cases are based on all the courts reporting on such cases to the Children's Bureau. The national sample was not used here since data on these cases were not available for a sizeable number of courts in the national sample. In 1960, 1,761 courts reported on dependency and neglect cases. These courts included in their jurisdictions 77 percent of the child population under 18 years of age.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS

Juvenile delinquency cases are those referred to courts for acts defined in the statutes of the State as the violation of a law or municipal ordinance by children or youth of juvenile court age, or for conduct so seriously antisocial as to interfere with the rights of others or to menace the welfare of the delinquent himself or of the community. This broad definition of delinquency includes conduct such as ungovernable behavior and running away, conduct labeled "delinquency" but not usually considered a violation of law when committed by an adult. Also included, but separately reported, are traffic violations whenever the juvenile court has jurisdiction in such cases.

Dependency and neglect cases are those referred to the court because of some form of neglect or inadequate care on the part of the parents or guardians (e.g., lack of adequate care or support resulting from the death, absence or physical or mental incapacity of the parents, abandonment or desertion, abuse or cruel treatment, improper or inadequate condition in the home).

<u>Special proceedings</u> are cases involving children referred to court for reasons other than delinquency, dependency or neglect. They include adoption, institutional commitments for special purposes, material witnesses, application for consent to marry or to enlist in the armed forces, determination of custody or guardianship of a child, and permission to hospitals for the performance of operations on children.

Unit of count is the case disposed of by the court. A case is counted each time a child is referred to court during the year on a new referral in delinquency, dependency or neglect cases or in special proceedings. Referrals for alleged, as well as adjudged, delinquency cases are included. Not included are many children who have presented similar problems of conduct, but who either were not apprehended or were dealt with by the police, by social agencies, by schools, or by youth-serving agencies without referral to court.

Type of court is determined by the percentage of the population it serves that live in urban areas (as classified by the Bureau of the Census): for "urban courts," 70 percent or more; for "semi-urban courts," 30 to 69 percent; for "rural courts," under 30 percent. Up through 1959, data from the 1950 decennial census were used as a basis for classifying the type of court. For this 1960 report, data from the 1960 decennial census were used which resulted in a shift in type for some courts.

Method of handling cases is classified into official and unofficial, sometimes referred to as judicial and nonjudicial. "Official cases" are those that are placed on the official court calendar for adjudication by the judge or referee, through filing a petition or other legal paper to initiate court action. "Unofficial cases" are those not placed on the official court calendar through filing a petition or affidavit but adjusted by the judge, referee, probation officer, or other officer of the court.

<u>United States includes Alaska and Hawaii in all national estimates of this</u> 1960 report, except where otherwise indicated.

# SUMMARY TABLES

Type of court	Total		Bo	oys	Girls	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	<u>514,000</u>	<u>100</u>	415,000	100	99,000	<u>100</u>
Urban Semi-urban Rural	344,000 128,000 42,000	67 25 8	276,000 104,000 35,000	67 25 8	68,000 24,000 7,000	69 24 7

# Table 1.--Number of Delinquency Cases (Excluding Traffic) Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States, 1960

Acres -

A PARA

٠,

Table 2.--Manner of Handling Delinquency Cases (Excluding Traffic) Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States, 1960

Type of court	Total		Offi	lcial	Unofficial	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	514,000	100	258,000	<u>50</u>	256,000	<u>50</u>
Urban Semi-urban Rural	344,000 128,000 42,000	100 100 100	178,000 54,000 26,000	52 42 62	166,000 74,000 16,000	48 58 38

Table 3.--Rate of Delinquency Cases (Excluding Traffic) Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States, 1960

	I	Rate per 1,000 (	child population	n <sup>a</sup>		
Type of court	ALL	Age jurisdiction of court				
	courts	Under 16	Under 17	Under 18 <sup>b</sup>		
Urban Semi-urban Rural	25.9 19.7 10.5	19.1 9.7 4.1	23.7 16.0 5.6	29.4 22.7 13.8		

<sup>a</sup>These differential rates are calculated on the basis of the 1960 child population at risk; that is, from age 10 to the upper limit of the court's jurisdiction.

<sup>b</sup>A small number of courts having jurisdiction under 21 years of age are included here. The number of cases involved does not seriously affect the rates of the courts in this column.

## Table 4.--Percent Change in Delinquency Cases (Excluding Traffic) Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States,<sup>a</sup> 1959-1960

Type of court	Total	Boys	Cirls	Official cases	Unofficial cases
Total	<u>+6</u>	+5	+10	+3	+10
Urban Semi-urban Rural	+7 +5 +3	+7 +4 -1	+8 +10 +30	+2 +5 +6	+13 +6 -1

<sup>a</sup>Excludes Alaska and Hawaii since data were not available for both years.

Table 5.--Number and Manner of Handling Traffic Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States, 1960

Type of court	Tota	1]	Offic	cial	Unofficial	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	<u>306,000</u>	100	70,000	100	<u>236,000</u>	100
Urban Semi-urban Rural	234,000 59,000 13,000	77 19 4	49,000 11,000 10,000	70 16 14	185,000 48,000 3,000	79 20 1

Table 6.--Percent Change in Traffic Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States,<sup>a</sup> 1959-1960

Type of court	Total	Official	Unofficial
Total	<u>+6</u>	<u>+5</u>	<u>+6</u>
Urban Semi-urban Rural	+7 +7 -15	+18 -11 -20	+4 +13

<sup>a</sup>Excludes Alaska and Hawaii since data were not available for both years.

Table	7 <u>Tr</u>	end ir	Del	inquency	7 Cases	Disposed	oſ	Ъy	Juvenile
		Cou	irts,	United	States,	, 1940-196	50		

	Delinquen	cy cases <sup>a</sup>	Child nonulation	
Year	Including traffic	Excluding traffic	Child population of U.S. (10-17 years of age) <sup>b</sup>	
1940	200,000		19,138,000	
1941	224,000		18,916,000	
1942	250,000		18,648,000	
L943	344,000		18,309,000	
1944	330,000		17,738,000	
1945	344,000		17,512,000	
946	295,000		17,419,000	
947	262,000		17,344,000	
.948	254,000		17,314,000	
L949	272,000		17,365,000	
1950	280,000		17,398,000	
1951	298,000		17,705,000	
L952	332,000	а. А.	18,201,000	
1953	374,000		18,980,000	
1954	395,000		19,551,000	
1955	431,000		20,112,000	
1956	520,000		20,623,000	
1957	603,000	440,000	22,173,000	
1958	°703,000	473,000	23,443,000	
1959	°773,000	_483,000	24,607,000 do5,780,000	
1960	<sup>d</sup> 820,000	<sup>a</sup> 514,000	<sup>a</sup> 25,189,000	

<sup>a</sup>Data for 1955-1960 estimated from the national sample of juvenile courts. Data prior to 1955 estimated by the Children's Bureau, based on reports from a comparable group of courts.

<sup>b</sup>Data based on estimates from Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce (Current Population Reports, Series P-25).

<sup>C</sup>Much of the increase is accounted for in one State by an administrative change in the method of handling juvenile traffic cases.

dInclusion of data for Alaska and Hawaii beginning in 1960 does not materially affect the trend.





144 B (\* 1

Table 8 .-- Number and Rate of Dependency and Neglect Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States, 1960a

Type of court		Rate	per 1,000	child populs	ation <sup>b</sup>
	Number of cases	All Age jurisdiction of			of court
		courts	Under 16	Under 17	Under 18 <sup>C</sup>
Urban Semi-urban Rural	96,000 27,000 8,000	2.7 2.0 1.3	2.5 1.6 0.7	3.0 2.4 1.6	2.7 2.0 1.4

<sup>a</sup>Estimates based on data from 1,761 courts whose jurisdictions include 77 percent of the child population under 18 years of age.

<sup>b</sup>Calculated on basis of the 1960 child population at risk; that is, the

child population under 16 for courts whose age jurisdiction is under 16, etc. CA small number of courts having jurisdiction under 21 years of age are included here. The number of cases involved does not seriously affect the rates of the courts in this column.

Table 9.--Percent Change in Dependency and Neglect Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States, 1959-1960a

Type of court	Total	Official	Unofficial		
Total	<u>+2</u>	<u>b</u> /	<u>+7</u>		
Urban Semi-urban Rural	+6 -10 +6	+5 -16 +5	+7 +5 +12		

<sup>a</sup>Estimates based on data from 1,599 courts reporting both years whose jurisdictions include about two-thirds of the child population under 18 years of age. <sup>b</sup>No change from 1959 to 1960.

Table 10.--<u>Trend in Dependency and Neglect Cases</u> Disposed of by Juvenile Courts, United States, 1946-1960

Year	Dependency and neglect cases <sup>a</sup>	Child population of U.S. (under 18 years of age) <sup>b</sup>				
10/6	101,000	41,759,000				
1946 1947	101,000	43,301,000				
	1					
1948	103,000	44,512,000				
1949	98,000	45,775,000				
1950	93,000	47,017,000				
1951	97,000	48,598,000				
1952	98,000	50,296,000				
1953	103,000	51,987,000				
1954	103,000	53,737,000				
1955	106,000	55,568,000				
	100,000	<i>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</i>				
1956	105,000	57,377,000				
1957	114,000	59,336,000				
1958	124,000	61,238,000				
1959	128,000	63,038,000				
1960	°131,000	°64,202,000				

<sup>a</sup>Data for 1955-1960 estimated from courts serving about two-thirds of the child population under 18 years of age in the United States. Data prior to 1955 estimated by the Children's Bureau, based on reports from a smaller but comparable group of courts.

<sup>b</sup>Data based on estimates from Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce (Current Population Report, Series P-25).

<sup>C</sup>Inclusion of estimates for Alaska and Hawaii beginning in 1960 does not materially affect the trend.

#### APPENDIX

#### CHILDREN'S CASES DISPOSED OF OFFICIALLY AND UNOFFICIALLY BY ALL JUVENILE COURTS REPORTING FOR 19604

	Age	OFFICIAL CASES				UNOFFICIAL CASES			
Area served by court <sup>b</sup>	which court has original jurisdiction	Delinquency (except traffic)	Traffic	Dependency and noglect	Special proceedings	Delinquency (except traffic)	Traffic	Dependency and neglect	Special proceeding
ALABAYA: Jefferson Co. (Birmingham) Mobile Co. (Mobile) Mantgomery Co. (Montgomery) 64 small courts	16, 18 16 16, 18 16	898 512 132 1,277	15 1  54	927 497 43 1,160		620 237 229 214	5   4	668 81 792 10	
ALASKA: Superior Court (Anchorage)	18	375	21	607	87	99		14	
ARIZONA: Muricopa (Phoenix)	18	2,976	629	365	325	6,049		163	2,447
ARKANIAI: Pulaski Co. (Little Rock) 21 small courts	21 21	236 495	च च	206 210		411 87	व/ व/	323 88	
CALIFORULA: Alamcds Co. (Oakland) Contra Costa Co. (Richmond) Fresno Co. (Fresno) Kern Co. (Bakersfield). Los Angeles Co. (Los Angeles). Monterey Co. (Monterey). Orang. Co. (Santa Ana). Riverpide Co. (Riverida). Sacramento Co. (Sar Faradia) San Diego Co. (San Diego). San Diego Co. (San Diego). San Juego Co. (San Diego). San Juego Co. (San Mateo). San Joequin Co. (Stockton). Santa Clara Co. (San Jose). Solano Co. (Vallejo) Sonos Co. (Santa Rosa) Stantslaus Co. (Modesto). Stantalaus Co. (Modesto). Stantalaus Co. (Oxand). Sa small courts.	21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 2	1,907 820 1,032 923 9,509 382 1,659 706 771 98, 1,575 1,41, 570 570 570 570 864 231 223 392 473 359 3,199	365 40 44 1,44 21 48 16 45 52 52 8 8 10 4 16 10 77 44 16 563	549 357 242 236 2,239 89 507 342 270 304 904 725 194 150 442 116 136 134 133 1,056	7) 2 5 19 267 2 7 15 4 13 16 1 10 1 3 1 10 1 3 3 8 36	3,551 1,372 33 949 978 978 978 928 2,201 526 1,611 526 1,611 2,621 2,822 873 2,042 275 411 501 453 520 4,776	8,7C7 3,015 205 4,525 8,077 3,324 8,078 2,977 4,518 1,813 1,885 3,495 3,495 4,411 8,396 1,573 317 8,396 1,420 2,614 5,385	2,014 151 33 9c 413 47 84 2c2 207 640 1,355 143 143 314 43 278 20 37 105 571	178 226 81 276 1,234 113 403 1 474 18 543 10 80 336 248 92 122 164 127 235 427
COLORADC: Denver (City and Co.) 21 small courts	18 18	1,128 1,383	4	440 215	1,461 445	174 257	 	42 5	3 2
CONNECTIONT: First Edstrict (Bridgeport) Second Edstrict (New Haven) Third Edstrict (Martford)	16 16 16	426 541 499	च/ च/ च/	285 323 434	240 480 607	1,859 2,307 1,202			
ELAWARE: Newsatle Co. (Wilmington) 1 small court	18 18	1,827 191	813 170	17 101	129	28	 	37	7
DISTRICT OF COLUMEIA: Weshington - City	16	1,579	148	327		99ú	27	2	<b></b>
FLORIDA: Dada Co. (Hiami). Duval Co. (Jacksonville). Escarbia Co. (Pensacola). Hillsborough Co. (Tampa). Orange Co. (Orlando). Palm Beach Co. (W. Palm Beach) Pinellas Co. (St. Petersburg). 60 small courts.	17 17 17	1,986 1,699 557 814 479 630 283 4,420	18 386 426 1,224 435 99 868 2,213	683 846 968 1,648 163 130 284 2,310	126 266 89 97 29 9 157	1,431 744 102 1,716 533 66' 572 4,226	16 5 4 30 2 1,244	829 500 52 204 105 11* 24* 1,439	3 12  - 9 3 5 47
GEORGIA: Bibb Co. (Macon) DeKalt Co. (Decatur) Pultor. Co. (Atlanta) Muscoget Co. (Columbu.) Richaord Co. (Augusta)	17 17 17 17 17 17 17	417 953 1,532 739 386 1,810	24 108 155 32 	305 282 411 260 173 506	30 176  63 46	33 2,269 250 200 1,738		31 241 95 26 612	1  14 57
HAVAll: First Circuit (Hanolulu)	18	2,491	800	402	861	1,420	142	242	
ILLINDIS: Cook Co. (Chicago) LuFage Co. (Elmiurst) Kane Co. (Aurora) Lakt Co. (Vaukegan) Hadisor, Co. (Altor.) Peoris Co. (Peoria) St. Clair Co. (E. St. Louis) Winnebage Co. (Rockford) ll smoll courts	J17, 18   c17, 18	6,294 124 127 282 77 74 123 35 118 190	ગેરોરોને સંસંસ્થ	1,666 104 117 421 185 133 185 22 160 191	6,922 373 203 365 259 352 361 164 390 463	916 6 121 62 193 12 17 70 580 239	عامامامة مامامامام	901 8* 20, 28` 15 15 19; 67	33 



#### 1 20 C20

## CHILDREN'S CASES DISPOSED OF OFFICIALLY AND UNOFFICIALLY BY ALL JUVENILE COURTS REPORTING FOR 19802

ŝ.

	Age		OFFICI	AL CASES	• <u>•••</u> ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	UNOFFICIAL CA		LAL CASES	ASES	
Area served by court <sup>b</sup>	under which court har original jurisdiction	Delinquency (except traffic)	Traffic	Dependency and neglect	Special proceedings	Delin juency (except traffic)	Traffic	Dependency and neglect	Special proceedings	
INDIANA: Marion Co. (Indianapolis) St. Joseph Co. (South Bend) 9 maall courts	18 18 18	2,274 279 464	₫/ ₫/ 2	579 112 111	79 125 29	23 129 493	<u>ط</u> / 14، ج	2  22	3	
IOWA: Black Hawk Co. (Waterloo) Linn Co. (Cedar Rajid:) Polk Co. (Dec Moines) Scott Co. (Davenjort) Woodbury Co. (Sioux City) 79 small courts	18 18 18 18	89 75 319 110 232 1,221	বাচালাচাচাচা	45 45 166 54 195 633	616161616	5779 584 84% 193 320 1,715		19 9 7: 25 237 597	ভাভাভাভাভাভা	
KANSAS: Sedgwick Co. (Michite) Shawew Co. (Topoka) Wymedott. Co. (Kansas City) 93 spull courts	c/10, 18 c/10, 18	481 72 368 655	151 34 70 346	177 73 148 279		48 450 1,381	61 12 175	23 135 238	· ····	
KENTUCKY: 2 smll courts	18	155	₫∕	58	8	107	/ە			
LOUISIANA: Caddo Parish Co. (Shreveport) E. Bator. Rouge Parish (Baton Rouge) 4th Judisial Dist. (Monroe) Orlean: Farish (Net Orleanc) 45 small courts	17 17 17	228 285 189 1,210 2,122	1 493 104 2,433 395	125 134 117 353 572	113 21 267	337 32: 129 6,545 2,580	50  101	4 17 <del>5</del> 487 742 685		
MAINE: 50 small courts	17	1,042		57	38	79		. 4		
MARYLAND: Arne Arundil Co. (Annapolir) Baltimore (City). Baltimore Co. Montgomery Co. (Silver Spring) Prime Georger Co. (Hysterville) 19 small courts	16 18 18	374 3,41; 1,23% 577 97. 1,191	d, d, d, 1,377 d, d/	98 2,209 502 217 152 429	1 88 2 	182 	히히히아 히키	4  154 5 17		
MAESACHUSETTS: BOETOM: Boston (Central Section) Brighton. Charlestown. Dorchester. Eart Boston Roxbury. South Boston West Roxbury.	17 17 17	753 59 110 251 151 547 132 255		3 14 12 17 73 7 6			ພາມາມາພາຍາມາຍາມາ			
DISTRICT: Worester Cent. (Worester) E. Norfolk (Quincy). E. Hiddlesex, 1st (Halden) Lavrence (Lavrence) Lovell (Lovell) Brittol, 2nd (Fall River) Somerville (Somerville). Southern: Essex (Lynn) Springfield (Springfield) Brittol, 3rd (New Bedford) E. Hiddlesex, 3rd (Cambridge) 54 small courts	17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	599 335 253 165 146 185 95 195 397 261 302 3,831	ોને છે. છે. છે. છે. છે. છે. છે. છે. છે. છે	39 14 21 18 15  13 23 8 43 208		103 147 36 	ما م			
HIGHIGAN: Berrien Co. (Benton Harbor) Calhoun Co. (Battle Creck). Genearee Co. (Fint) Jackson Co. (Lancing) Jackson Co. (Jackson) Kalamuzzo Co. (Kelamuzco). Kent Co. (Grend Repid.) Haconb Co. (Etext Rapids) Hiskegon Co. (Huskegon). Oakland Co. (Fontis). Saginav Co. (Saginav) Wayne Co. (Arn. Arbor). Wayne Co. (Detroit)	17 17 17 17 17 17 17	51 153 487 223 286 11t 294 402 103 559 213 106 2,084 5,078	1 116 5 4 12 7 3 3 2 4 2 22	20 133 463 166 103 56 195 111 117 419 12c 74 1,952 999		32., 35 1  33. 90 93 216 142 142 142 142 142 142 90	1	73 28 6 3 135 14 27 36 83 115 		
MINNESOTA: Hennepir. Co. (Minneapolis) Ramsey Co. (St. Paul) St. Louis Co. (Duluth) 6 small courts	18 18 18 18 18	2,137 988 304 808	3,870 48 48 978	1,445 675 102 62	709 20 24	1,3)4 202 420 148	2, 398 468 65	194  82	 	

モンジャマ

Street, but Farther and second of the second of the second of

	Age under	under					UNOFFICIAL CASES				
Area served by court <sup>b</sup>	which court has original Jurisdiction	Delinquency (except traffic)	Traffic	Dependency and neglect	Special proceedings	Delinquency (except traffic)	Traffic	Dependency and neglect	Special proceeding		
MISSISSIPPI: Hinds Co. (Jackson) 74 small courts	16 18	248 1,244	 6	18 727	•••	238 857	2	6 211			
USSOURI:   Greane Co. (Springfield)	17 17 17	75 1,092 584 544 1,522	12 58 23 3 351	104 124 77 324 717	4 7 70 556 59	279 1,300 995 3,042 1,378	225 689 435 180 775	1 213 370 525 237	е 5 33 ¢		
ENTANA: 2 small courts	18	62	· •	••		1,552	362				
EBRASKA: 3 mmll courts	18	271		280	3	ſ/	5	±/	۲,		
EV HAMPSHIRE: 89 small courts	16	394	d/	59	1	28			2		
EV JERSEY: Atlantic Co. (Atlantic City) Bergen Co. (Bergenfield) Canden Co. (Canden) Essex Co. (Newark) Hudson Co. (Jersey City) Hiddleaex Co. (Perth Amboy) Passaic Co. (Patterson) Lhion Co. (Elizabeth) 12 small courts	18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	659 1, 374 805 3, 478 2, 522 405 971 1, 020 3, 3, 11	રાગેએએએએએએ			1.					
<pre>HEVIEG: Bernalillo Co. (Albuquerque) 29 small courts</pre>	18 18	798 1,170	569 1,733	=		1,367 4,174	3,129 1,830		• ••		
<pre>HEW YORK: Albany Co. (Albany) Chautauque Co. (Jamestown). Dutchess Co. (Pougheepsie). Erie Co. (Buffalo). Manroe Co. (Buffalo). Maryoe Co. (Buffalo). Niagare Co. (Ridgare Falls). Oneide Co. (Utica) Onandage Co. (Syracuse). Orange Co. (Nevburgh). Rensselaer Co. (Troy). Scheneetady Co. (Scheneetady). Suffolk Co. (Iailp) Westchester Co. (Yonkers). 43 amall courts.</pre>	16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 1	373 105 137 157 635 341 13,950 244 146 521 146 521 140 117 171 456 256 1,903	9    9 11 2   3 12 20	187 93 68 21 170 148 3,777 148 3,777 148 3,777 148 51 51 86 201 1,037	284 97 109 75 1,034 383  223 221 66 81 121 197 289 2,703	46  985 385    301 540		  1,369 171    391			
WORTH CARGLINA:   Buncame Co. (Asheville)   Durham Co. (Durham)   Forsyth Co. (Winston-Salem)   Ceston Co. (Castonia)   Quilford Co. (Greensboro)   Wetklenburg Co. (Charlotte)   Bake Co. (Raleigh)	16 16 16 16 16 16 16	133 275 345 103 333 495 257 2,522	2 20 7 1 30 9 7 89	42 35 196 75 125 83 105 587	130 25 300 67 155 234 122 252	22 86 223 350 565 33 62	 4 5 9 18  2	 6 152 9 248 15 11	1 9 30 27 128		
WORTH DAKOTA: First Judicial District (Fargo) 3 small courts	18 18	330 515	238 201	84 96	136 31	218 416	376 95	27 42	24 1		
b.cler CO. (Hamilton)	18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 1	152 125 2,626 344 918 112 656 139 699 120 139 167 5,088	727 45 177 1,340 2,945 1,520 1,520 1,174 2,12 1,174 	104 100 557 207 480 104 132 77 36'/ 80 186 101 1,527	20 109 4 	885 497 1,660 607 3,191 610 2,176 1,996 1,991  2,192 309 3,197	263 4,347 1 359 280 597 1,501 1,056 396 1,612		13  1 8  199 7 5  1 2 119		
OELAHONA: Oklahoma Co. (Oklahoma City) Mulsa Co. (Tulsa) 6 gmall courts	c/16. 18	1,041 273 139	4/ 146 13	348 206 163	183 12 5	343 491 95	<u>م</u> ر 1 1	73 371 82	12		
CEECON: Lane Co. (Eugene) Multnossh Co. (PortLand) 29 small courts	18	518 577 914 3,659	29 116 701 1,072	98 139 836 874	11 149 213 206	767 497 2,560 4,156	28 8 3,255 1,348	52 84 816 876	7 60 196 667		



. . . . .

.

	Age under	under the second s							PTICIAL CASES		
Area served by source son	which sourt has original jurisdiction	Delinquency (except traffic)	274CEio	Dependency and Reglect	Special proceedings	Delinquency (except traffic)	Traffic	Dependency and neglect	Special proceedings		
PENNSTLVAMIA: Allegheny Co. (Pitisburgh) Berks Co. (Aliquipps) Bisir Co. (Aliquipps) Bucks Co. (Friotol) Ducks Co. (Friotol) Chester Co. (Wost Chester) Delnware Co. (Chester) Frie Co. (Erie) Fyrette Co. (Alicater) Lackawana Uo. (Scrawion) Lehigh Co. (Alientown) Lehigh Co. (Shistown) Hereer Co. (Shistown)	16 18 18 18 18 18	2,986 133 141 160 212 522 604 132 81 130 169 441 135	107 4 3 13 19 17  6 35 15 114 72	971 99 165 39 38 15 248 43 		2,180 268 432 262 402 143 255 242 21 87 103 39	105 5 21 14 	972 19 24 16 13 13 258 23 			
<pre>Hantgomery Co. (Horristown). Morthampton Co. (Bethlehez). Fhiladelphia (City and Co.). Schuylkill Co. (Pottsville). Westingration Co. (Mex Kensington). Westingration Co. (New Kensington). York Co. (York). 6 mmall courts</pre>	18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	66 115 9,696 276 168 244 96 128	164 72 47 44 80	10 39 1,740  34 17  27	 3 296    6	262 205 32 201 114 103 344 272	8	44 47 430   275	478		
PUERTO RICO: Ponce	16	481 1,799 1,615	4 360 52	738	- <del>1</del> -	259 1,501 750	60 18	368			
CHODE ISLAND: State (Providence)	18 -	911	728	258	642	70		,			
COTH CARCLINA: Greenville Co. (Greenville) Spartenburg Co. (Spartanburg) 2 small courts	16	444 266 211	43 5 d/	97 60	607 143 76	164 110	6 1 1	n 	76 98 		
SOUTH DAKOTA: 51 mmail courts	18	1,064	509	152	94	1,520	778	13	6		
TENNESSES: Berilton (Chettanonga) 69 small courts	18 18	924 3,272	761 500	377 267	209 91	97 407	117	152	76		
TEXAS: Buxar Co. (San Antonio) Causeron Co. (Brownsville) Calveston Co. (Dallas) Calveston Co. (Calveston) Hirdis Co. (Houston) Hildelgo Co. (McAllen) Jefferson Co. (Besumont) Lubbock Co. (Lubbock) Muečes Co. (Corpus Christi) Trevis Co. (Austin) 107 small courts	9/17, 18 9/17, 18	1,025 67 31 1,085 23 201 62 58 338 329 1,448	<u>ط/</u>	 359  1,403    2 232 232 145	25  258  258  111 1 223 319	1,835 461 3,938 672 4,332 513 1,037 694 1,001 924 516 4,677	d/1177512221531	1,628 396  2 197 127 294	301 40 60 427 65		
TAH: First District (Egden) Second District (Salt Lake City) Third District (Provo) 3 small courts	18 18 18	647 1,498 357 646	3,105 4,804 1,520 936	169 273 142 63		1,589 1,791 791 271		109 165 143 32			
ZEMONT: 17 mmall courts	16	185	4	372							
VIRGINIA: Arlington Co Pairfax Co. (Falls Church) Morfolk (City and Co.) 119 small courts	18 18 18 18	635 798 1,513 8,540	831 835 752 6,181	94 306 449 2,204	1 269 65 1,195	 9 1,404	21	  163			
<pre>KASHINGTON:</pre>	18	2,227 355 186 202 135 1,603	5,409 1,997 747 1,002 96 1,855	922 208 165 153 18 762	811 167 29 45 122 351	728 495 111 1,101 520 3,679	2 170 3 847 1,001 2,580	157 199 30 311 105 1,134	29 9 4 2 48		
MEST VIRGINIA: Cabell Co. (Huntington) Ranawah Co. (Churleston)	18 18 18	318 798 1,569		27 85 523	81 84 483	  640	20	267	2		
MISCONSIN: Dane Co. (Madison) Milwaukee Co. (Milwaukee) 64 samll bourts	18 18 15	106 1,926 3,226	1,692	126 552 1,189	144 654 604	4,961 662	329 720	478	27 9		

\*NOTE VEIL: This table is not limited to the sample group of courts but rather includes all courts that transmitted reports to the Children's Bursey. The data in this table should not be used to make comparisons between communities regarding the artest of delinquency. Questions concerning changes in an individual court's data from one year to another about be directed to that individual court. <sup>9</sup>Courts serving areas with population of 100,000 or more are listed separately, showing the chief city located in each area. Courts serving areas with less than 100,000 population are combined for each State and are presented as "mail courts." <sup>9</sup>The age under which court has original jurisdiction is different for boys and girls. The age for boys appears first. For Illinois, the age function is 18 for both boys and girls in dependency and neglect cases. <sup>9</sup>Interplicable -- juvenile court does not have jurisdiction over juvenils traffic eases. <sup>9</sup>Pairs on traffic cases only reported or not reported separately from other types of delinquency cases. In the latter case they are included under "Belinquency - stopy traffic."

A DOLLAR DE LA COMPANY

Ł

18

+ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1961 O - 617378

-2.0

\*\*\*\*\*

در **میتر** ناید

-