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

# SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIPS IN GEORGIA



NCJRS MAR 1 9 1979 ACQUISITIONS

C.S

0

# SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING

J

à.

ŝ.

4

13

1.15

0

D

# THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL

#### JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF GEORGIA

#### ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Georgia Justice Center Suite 500 84 Peachtree Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303 (404)656-5171

#### COUNCIL MEMBERS

Judge Julian Webb, Chairman Judge James B. O'Connor, Vice Chairman Judge Charles L. Weltner, Sec./Treasurer Judge Francis W. Allen Judge Frank S. Cheatham, Jr. Judge W. Marion Guess, Jr. Wilton D. Harrington, Esq. Charles Hyatt, Esq. Justice Robert H. Jordan Judge Paul W. Painter Judge Marion T. Pope, Jr.

#### DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Robert L. Doss, Jr.

<u>The Sixth Annual Report Regarding the Need for Additional Superior</u> <u>Court Judgeships in Georgia</u> was approved by the Judicial Council of Georgia on December 1, 1978, and is provided for the information of Governor George Busbee and members of the Georgia General Assembly pursuant to Ga. Laws 1973, p. 288.

Funding for publication of this report was provided by Grants Nos. 77A-08-001 and 78A-08-002 awarded by the State Crime Commission under a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice.

E.C.

This document was prepared under the auspices of the Administrative

2

i

Office of the Courts. J. Chris Perrin, Assistant Director for Research and Courts Coordination, directed research efforts involved in this study. Holly K. O. Sparrow, Senior Research Associate, supervised the efforts of the research section and coordinated data collection efforts. George Nolan, Court Consultant/Systems Analyst, was responsible for all computer programming used in the compilation of the data for this report.

Other Administrative Office of the Courts personnel responsible for the development of this report were:

Research Staff:

Mr. Nicolas A. Bloom Ms. Molly McPhillamy Ms. Patty Bisbort Mr. Charlie Potts

Typists:

Graphics:

Ms. Cassandra Howard Ms. Yvonne Mays Ms. Elsa Miller Ms. Norma Wells

Programmer Analyst: Michael Crowe Data Entry Clerk: Martha Wilder

This report would have been impossible without the cooperation of the Administrative Judges and the meticulous efforts of the district administrators in collecting the data. District administrators who contributed the caseload data for counties in their districts are:

> District - Mr. Michael S. DeVegter 1 District 2 Mr. Roger E. Douglas Mr. David Ratley District 3 District 5 Mr. Ronald E. Owens -Mr. Fred Roney District 6 -District 7 Mr. Gerard P. Verzaal -Mr. Jack L. Bean District 8 -District 9 -Mr. Burton W. Butler - Mr. W. Leon Barfield District 10

> > 11

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	• 1
INTRODUCTION	
Statement of Policy	• 5
The Judicial Council Recommendations for 1979	• 7
Past Recommendations of the Judicial Council	• '10
Methodology	• 16
Report Design	• 34
CHAPTER I - ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1979	• 37
Circuit Reports:	
Eastern	
Ocmulgee	• 43
Toombs	46
CHAPTER II - CASELOAD IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS: FY1978 FILINGS	。 • 50
Exhibit I Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Total Caseload per Judge: FY 1978	• 54
Exhibit II Superior Court Criminal Filings: FY1978.	• 62
Exhibit III Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Felony and Domestic Relations Filings per Judge: FY1978	• 69
Exhibit IV Average and Observed Rate of Change in Superior Court Filings per Judge: CY1971 - FY1978 and FY1977 - FY1978	• 74

19. 19. 19.

Page

0

CHAPTER III - CASELOAD IN THE SUPERIOR DISPOSITIONS	
Dispositions and Pe	itions per Judge and rcent of Filings per 90
	itions per Judge and Each Method98
Exhibit VII FY1978 Criminal Dis Case Type and Perce Method	
Exhibit VIII FY1978 Civil Dispos Type and Number Disp	itions per Judge by Case bosed by Each Method 116
CHAPTER IV - CIRCUIT POPULATION: 1977	
Exhibit IX 1970 and 1977 Circu Change and 1977 Popu	it Population, Rate of ulation per Judge 130
CHAPTER V - POTENTIAL SOURCES OF JUDIC SUPPORTING COURTS AND ADMIN	IAL ASSISTANCE: NISTRATIVE DISTRICTS 138
Exhibit X Analysis of Support Probate and Juvenile	ing Courts: State, e: FY1978 141
Exhibit XI Superior Court FY19	
APPENDIX ONE - DUTIES OF THE JUDICIAL ( OFFICE OF THE COURTS	COUNCIL/ADMINISTRATIVE 160
APPENDIX TWO - JURISDICTION OF SUPERION JUVENILE COURTS	R, STATE, PROBATE AND 164
APPENDIX THREE - EXPENDITURES FOR AN AU JUDGESHIP	DDITIONAL SUPERIOR COURT 171

Ġ,

27-27

APPENDIX FOUR	- ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS	174
A-I	Total FY1978 Superior Court Caseload by Filing Type	177
A-II	Superior Court Open Cases by Filing Type:	
A-III	State Court Caseload: FY1978	181
A-IV	Probate Court Criminal Caseload: FY1978	183
A-V	Juvenile Court Caseload: FY1978	185
A-VI	Population and Population Change by County and Circuit: 1970, 1977, 1980P	.187
A-VII	Assistance from Senior Judges: FY1978	194
A-VIII	Resident Active Attorneys: November, 1978	195
A-IX	Judicial Personnel: Superior, State and Juvenile Courts by Circuit and County December 31, 1978	196

Ì

Ť

d,

-

ţ)



### INTRODUCTION

õ

R

ĊŻ.

STATEMENT OF POLICY JUDICIAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1979 PAST RECOMMENDATIONS METHODOLOGY REPORT DESIGN

 $c_{e}$ 

 $\odot$ 

a

 $\mathcal{Q}$ 

ŵ

6

0

87 · ···

 $\left(\right)$ 



#### INTRODUCTION

The following pages represent the sixth report<sup>a</sup> offered to the State of Georgia by the Judicial Council<sup>b</sup> regarding the need for additional superior court judgeships in the state. This <u>Sixth Annual Report Regard-</u> <u>ing the Need for Additional Superior Court Judgeships in Georgia<sup>C</sup></u> is offered to the 1979 General Assembly and to Governor George Busbee as an objective analysis of the need for additional superior court judgeships in Georgia. It is the strong belief of the Judicial Council that the addition of a judgeship is a matter of great gravity and should be approached through careful inquiry and deliberate study. The creation of new judgeships not only requires the compensation of additional judges, but also of assistant district attorneys, secretaries, bailiffs, and other personnel as well as expenditures for and the provision of office space, courtroom space, furniture and other innumerable items. The public is entitled to have a thorough and in-depth study made of such matters before action is taken.

The data for the 1979 Judgeship Study was collected by the nine district administrators in the districts in which such a position had been filled at the time of the study and by members of the Administrative Office of the Courts' research staff in the remaining district with assistance and cooperation of local court personnel. The definitions used for the collection and compilation of the data in this report are provided in the Methodology section of this introduction.

Sec.

83

R

0.0

a See p. 10 for a summary of past Judicial Council recommendations concerning the need for additional superior court judgeships.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> See Appendix One for a list of the duties of the Judicial Council/ Administrative Office of the Courts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup> See p. 7 for a summary of the 1979 Judicial Council recommendations concerning the need for additional superior court judgeships.

The present study includes a comprehensive evaluation of the need for additional superior court judgeships in all forty-two (42) judicial circuits in Georgia. All data was collected for the 1978 fiscal year in the superior, state, probate and juvenile courts of Georgia. The 1978 fiscal year was selected as the time period for this study so that the recommendations to the 1979 General Assembly could be based on the most current data that could be collected using a manual system.

In the process of formulating these recommendations, the Judicial Council considered the need for judgeships not only by reviewing the data for each circuit, but also by using a perspective based on the newly created Administrative Districts which were established to increase flexibility of judicial manpower. By using both perspectives, the Judicial Council seeks to achieve a balanced and equitable distribution of court work among the judges of the state.

6

4

et j

50.01

 $\mathcal{D}$ 

#### STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Judicial Council has stated a policy that multi-judge circuits should be established whenever possible to capture the benefits asso ciated with multi-judge courts, that is, improved court administration, caseload and jury management efficiencies and economies of personnel and administrative costs.  $G_{1,2}$ 

Some of the particular advantages of a multi-judge court are that it:

1. Allows division of responsibility or internal specialization-a multi-judge court can establish necessary divisions or specialization in such areas as criminal cases, civil cases, domestic relations cases, etc.

2. Provides for accommodation of judicial absences--multi-judge circuits allow efficient management in the absence of a judge from the circuit due to illness, disqualification, vacation, and the demands of other responsibilities such as continuing legal education.

3. Makes possible more efficient use of jurors--better use of jury manpower can be effected when two judges hold court simultaneously in the same county. One judge in a multi-judge circuit may use the other judge's excess jurors for a trial of a second case rather than excusing them at an added expense to the county. Present courtroom space in most counties may not permit two trials simultaneously, but such a practice, if implemented, may justify the building of a second, smaller courtroom by the county affected, or the making of other arrangements.

5

1

(\_\_\_\_

4. Promotes greater impartiality through flexibility in case assignment--a multi-judge circuit may permit a case, where the judge(s) is acquainted with the party or parties involved, to be considered by an out-of-town judge without the appearance that the local judge(s) is avoiding responsibility.

 $\mathbf{G}$ 

Ğ

5. Improves court administration--multi-judge circuits tend to promote impartiality and uniformity of administrative practices and procedures by making court administration something more than the extension of a single judge's personality. Multi-judge circuits also permit economies in the employment of auxiliary court personnel.

6. Expedites handling of cases--probably most important of all, under the arithmetic of calendar management, the judges of a multi-judge court can handle substantially more cases than an equal number of judges operating in separate courts.

19th

#### THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1979

S

oł.

The Judicial Council of Georgia recommends that additional judgeships be created in three of Georgia's forty-two (42) judicial circuits. In alphabetical order, these circuits are:

- 1. EASTERN
- 2. OCMULGEE
- 3. TOOMBS

It is the opinion of the Judicial Council that an additional judgeship is warranted in each of the three recommended circuits.

The following pages of this report include the results of a detailed survey of caseload and demographic characteristics of all forty-two (42) judicial circuits in Georgia. All circuits are evaluated on the basis of an established set of criteria (see Report Design p. 34) and the three circuits receiving recommendations generally exceed the other thirty-nine circuits in the relevant categories of analysis. Recommendations are made with the general objective of achieving a balanced and equitable distribution of court work among the judges of the state.

To these ends the Judicial Council of Georgia has sought to reduce disparity in caseload per judge among the various circuits. The task requires that the recommendations not only keep up with increasing caseloads, but also place judgeships in circuits where the court work is such that existing judges are forced to assume a disproportionate amount of the state's judicial workload.

One method of evaluating the current recommendations of the Judicial Council is to compare the circuit mean caseload per judge for the three circuits receiving recommendations with the statewide circuit mean per judge. Below is a comparison of the circuit mean caseload per judge of the three circuits receiving recommendations to the circuit mean caseload per judge for the entire state:

R.

	Recommended <u>Circuits</u>	Statewide Circuit <u>Mean</u>
Felony	383	269
Misdemeanor	417	203
Traffic	569	172
Total Criminal	1,369	645
General Civil	350	355
Dom. Relations	537	526
Ind. Motions	227	194
Total Civil	1,114	1,076
Juvenile	192	46
Total Filings	2,675	1,767

Note that in every filing category except general civil, the circuit mean of the recommended circuits exceeds the statewide circuit mean. The effect of creating additional judgeships in these three circuits will be to equalize the caseload of these circuits with the current circuit mean caseload per judge for the entire state. This would be in keeping with the stated policy of achieving a "more equitable distribution of court work among the judges in the state."

8

Of course, the current caseload was not the sole criteria for making the recommendations. Other factors considered were increases in filings in each case category, dispositions, demographic trends in the circuits, assistance from supporting courts, and distribution of caseload among circuits within a district.

÷ []

1

Sec.

#### PAST RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For the past six years the Judicial Council has recommended the creation of additional judgeships based on caseload and population data prepared by the Administrative Office of the Courts. Past recommendations have been made for the following circuits:

1974	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>
ATLANTA*	COBB	CHEROKEE	CHEROKEE	CHEROKEE*
CON ASAUGA*	SOUTHERN *	CLAYTON	MIDDLE*	SOUTH GEORGIA*
COWETA*	FLINT*	COBB	GRIFFIN*	ALCOVY*
DOUGHERTY*		GWINNETT	TALLAPOOSA*	COBB*
WAYCROSS*		MIDDLE	ALAPAHA*	LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN*
		NORTHERN	NORTHERN*	OGEECHEE*
		OCONEE*	CLAYTON*	
		TALLAPOOSA	СОВВ	
		WESTERN*	GWINNETT*	
			CHATTACHOOCHEE*	
	and the second			[1] A. Martin and A. Martin and M. Mattalana and A. Martin and A. Mar

#### \*Circuits in which an additional judgeship was actually created

Over this six-year period the caseloads and populations in Georgia's forty-two judicial circuits have continued to increase. Not only is the workload in the courts on the rise, but the increase is faster in some circuits—than—in others. It seems appropriate at this time to evaluate the Council's past recommendations in the light of their impact on statewide and average caseload. The question that must be considered is whether the additional judgeships have been placed in circuits in a manner that has provided a more equitable distribution of the judicial workload among the circuits and judges in the state.

10

()

There is no single statistical indicator of judicial workload. Although caseload data provides the primary criteria for evaluating the need for additional judgeships, even caseload is only an approximation of workload. The case types that make up the total caseload, the number and difficulty of dispositions, pleading practices of local attorneys, and efficiency of support personnel can affect the judicial workload without affecting the caseload. Therefore, the distribution of caseload is only a close approximation of the workload distribution.

One method for evaluating the placement of additional judgeships is observing the degree to which the caseloads in recommended circuits exceed the average caseload. The following table shows how the per judge caseload averages for recommended circuits compare to circuit averages for the entire state.<sup>d</sup>

d Averages for 1975 and 1976 recommendations are omitted because statewide data is not available for those years.

Å.

	<u>_1974</u>		<u>    1977                               </u>		<u>    1978                                </u>		<u>    1979                               </u>	
	RECOM. CIRCUITS AVG. PER JUDGE	STATE CIRCUIT AVERAGE <sup>3</sup> PER JUDGE	RECOM. CIRCUITS AVG. PER JUDGE	STATE CIRCUIT AVERAGE <sup>3</sup> PER JUDGE	RECOM. CIRCUITS AVG. PER JUDGE	STATE CIRCUIT AVERAGE <sup>3</sup> PER JUDGE	RECOM. CIRCUITS AVG. PER JUDGE	STATE CIRCUIT AVERAGE <sup>3</sup> PER JUDGE
FELONY MISDEMEANOR TRAFFIC TOTAL CRIMINAL <sup>1</sup>	318 354 192 864	266 343 216 825	343 356 471 1,170	269 289 224 781	465 395 359 1,219	301 215 169 686	383 417 569 1,369	269 203 172 645
GENERAL CIVIL DOMESTIC RELATIONS TOTAL CIVIL <sup>2</sup>	734 904 1,638	520 536 1,056	592 692 1,284	482 540 1,023	567 742 1,309	379 528 907	350 537 887	355 526 881
JUVENILE	9	34	26	35	67	35	192	46
TOTAL FILINGS	2,511	1,915	2,480	1,839	2,595	1,628	2,448	1,572

<sup>1</sup> All criminal case types are based on the number of defendants on separate indictments or accusations.

<sup>2</sup> Total civil does not include independent motions.

 $^3$  State circuit average per judge is adjusted for additional judgeships created.



From the table it can be seen that the recommended circuits have averaged considenably higher total caseloads per judge than the state as a whole. Generally this difference has been manifested in each case type. The three circuits receiving recommendations for 1979 judgeships average higher than the state circuit average for all case types except general civil.

Ð

Ø

Despite a decreasing statewide circuit average for total filings of 1,915 in 1974 to 1,572 in 1979, the circuit mean for the recommended circuits exceeds the state circuit average by over 875 filings per judge. In total criminal filings the three recommended circuits have an average per judge of over double the statewide circuit average per judge.

The preceding table demonstrates trends in statewide caseload as well as providing a comparison figure for the recommended circuits. The statewide circuit average for each case type, excluding juvenile cases, has declined since 1974. The domestic relations average has remained almost constant. The state circuit average for total filings has decreased by over three hundred cases per judge. Therefore, it appears that on a statewide basis the creation of additional judgeships is now keeping pace with increases in filings. Despite this, the average caseload per judge is still in excess of over 1,550 filings per year.

One effect of the placement of additional judgeships according to Judicial Council recommendations has been a more equal distribution of caseload among superior court judges in the state. More of the circuits exhibit per judge caseloads that are closer to the state mean. This "clustering" about the mean, or reduced dispersion from the mean, is shown in the generally decreasing standard deviation in the distribution

> đi E st

of per judge filings for each case type. Standard deviation is a measure of dispersion from the mean. If the standard deviation is decreasing, then more of the observed values are closer to the mean and closer to each other. The following table gives standard deviations for the caseload distribution in each of the case types:

O D

	<u>CY1973</u>	<u>FY1976</u>	<u>FY1977</u>	<u>FY1978</u>
FELONY	101	105	130	84
MISDEMEANOR	356	277	232	218
TRAFFIC	390	578	339	431
TOTAL CRIMINAL <sup>1</sup>	685	757	536	596
GENERAL CIVIL	223	195	141	102
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	231	196	204	196
TOTAL CIVIL <sup>2</sup>	375	298	264	211
TOTAL FILINGS	808	897	681	633

<sup>1</sup> Number of defendants on separate indictments or accusations

<sup>2</sup> Does not include independent motions

Another effect of the placement of additional judgeships has been a decrease in and an equalization of the average population per judge. The following table shows the mean circuit population per judge and the corresponding standard deviation for 1973, 1975, 1977 and 1978.

		1973 1	1975 2	1977 ]	1978 1
		<u>1973</u> .	<u>1975</u> -	<u>1977</u> ·	<u>1970</u> ·
MEAN		61 512	E9 076	52 010	10 521
a compared to a second		61,512	58,076	52,010	48,524
STANDARD	DEVIATION	19,632	13,608	13,690	13,067
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	521111101		10,000	10,050	14,007

<sup>1</sup> Based on the previous year's population statistics and the number of superior court judges in the current year.

<sup>2</sup> Based on the same year's population statistics and number of superior court judges

The mean population per judge has been reduced by almost 13,000 since 1973. The decrease in the standard deviation since 1973 indicates greater equalization in the size of the population served by each superior court judge. Eg

Recommendations do not automatically result in additional judgeships. Nevertheless, each year the Judicial Council makes recommendations concerning additional judgeships based primarily on caseload data and secondarily on demographic data. Recommended circuits have consistently been above the average in the number of filings per judge and the recommendations, if implemented, can contribute to the achievement of a more equitable and manageable distribution of judicial workload.

15

#### METHODOLOGY

The data for this report was collected under the direction of the Administrative Office of the Courts and with the cooperation of the Administrative Judges from the Judicial Districts. The data was collected by the Administrative Assistants in the nine districts which had filled such a position at the time of the study and by members of the research staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts in the remaining district with the cooperation of local court personnel. All data collection conformed to a single methodology which was sanctioned by the Judicial Council of Georgia as recommended by a study committee of superior court judges.

 $\hat{O}$ 

The methods of data collection used were designed for broad application to accommodate the numerous docketing systems and court practices throughout the state. The main objectives of the methodology were to assure that the caseload data was collected uniformly throughout the state and the data would accurately reflect the judicial workload in all courts under study. Since variation in docketing systems and court practices has been the most serious obstacle to these objectives, great care has been taken to define terms for universal application.

#### Data Collection

All caseload data included in this report was collected directly from the clerks' offices of the respective courts under study. In this sense, the data collection method can be described as a manual system, that is, the data was collected without the assistance of any computerized information system. The research staff of the Administrative Office of the

16

Ś

Courts presented the methodology and collection techniques to those persons responsible for the collection of the data at a seminar held in Atlanta on June 30, 1978. The seminar was followed by a pretest in each of the ten judicial districts. During the pretest a district administrative assistant or a member of the research staff conducted a practice case count. The case counters were shown the various types of docketing systems they would encounter and how to establish uniform counting practices.

Data collection began on July 1, 1978, and officially ended on September 30, 1978. Each district administrative assistant was responsible only for the data collection in circuits within his district. The data was returned to the Administrative Office of the Courts where members of the research staff verified the counting forms prior to creating computer files of all the data.

#### Courts

The data collection efforts were directed toward the four principal trial courts of record in Georgia: the superior, probate, state and juvenile courts. Included in this study are the superior courts in each of Georgia's 159 counties, the 92 probate courts that exercise concurrent jurisdiction in misdemeanor and traffic cases, and the 64 state courts in Georgia.<sup>e</sup> Data collection in the 159 juvenile courts was complete in all but one county.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>e</sup>County courts have been treated as state courts in this study. There are county courts in Baldwin, Echols and Putnam counties. Dispositions for cases filed in the State Court of DeKalb County from CY1973 to FY1977 were estimated based on statewide averages.

Disposition data was unavailable for Ware County. Dispositions were estimated by using the statewide ratio of children disposed to children filed.

The courts represented in this study are:

159 superior courts 92 probate courts 64 state courts <u>159</u> juvenile courts 474

The entire universe of courts is 474. This study is the first study in which usable data has been available from all of these trial courts. The only data that was unobtainable was certain disposition data (See footnotes e and f, p. 17) However, since disposition data was available for all other courts, reliable estimates could be made for the unobtainable data.

#### Unit of Analysis

The basic unit of analysis in the present study is the judicial circuit. Although caseload data was collected at the county level for each court under study, the data has been compiled into totals for the judicial circuits.

#### Counting Period

The counting period for this study was the 1978 fiscal year (July 1, 1977 through June 30, 1978).<sup>g</sup> The objective of the data collection effort was to measure the level of judicial activity in each court during the counting period. Therefore, all cases filed between July 1, 1977 and June 30, 1978,

**9** The counting period was also the fiscal year (FY) for years 1976 and 1977. <u>For 1971 and 1973 the counting period was the calendar year (CY).</u> inclusive, were considered within the counting period. All cases disposed between July 1, 1977 and June 30, 1978, inclusive, or remaining open as of June 30, 1978, were also considered within the counting period. In order to locate all dispositions during fiscal year 1978 and open cases as of June 30, 1978, the case counters were instructed to search all docket books as far as five years prior to the beginning of the counting period. Since many of the disposed and open cases were from filings in previous years, the disposition and open data should not be interpreted as the status of FY1978 filings as of June 30, 1978.

#### Variables

The following is a list of the data elements and case types collected for the study along with their definitions. It should be noted that the definitions are the same for all courts with jurisdiction in a given case. For example, a misdemeanor counted in a state court or probate court was counted according to the same instructions as a misdemeanor counted in the superior court.

#### Filing Categories

<u>Filing Types</u>: There are three general filing categories: criminal, civil and juvenile.

<u>Case Types</u>: Each filing type is sub-divided into a number of case types. The criminal case types are:

<u>Felony</u>: "A crime punishable by death; or by imprisonment for life, or by imprisonment for more than twelve months." (Ga. <u>Code</u> Ann. **§** 26-401 (e))

<u>Misdemeanor</u>: In general, "any crime other than a felony." (<u>Ga. Code Ann.</u> §26-401(g)) For the purposes of this report, "misdemeanor" refers to any non-traffic misdemeanor.

<u>Traffic</u>: Violations of motor vehicle laws except violation of motor vehicle laws that are serious charges and which may be punishable as a felony (e.g., vehicular homicide).

The civil case types are listed and defined as:

<u>Domestic Relations</u>: All original litigation pertaining to marital relations and/or child custody. This includes divorce, annulment, alimony, child support (including U.R.E.S.A.) and custody.

<u>General Civil</u>: All other original civil cases such as torts, contracts, complaints in equity and land condemnation.

Independent Motions: This case type is the most difficult to define. Generally, independent motions are those actions that occur after a final judgment or verdict has been issued. Certain original actions that are thought to consume less judge time than the domestic relations or general civil case types and are considered to be routine proceedings are also placed in this category. Examples of the former definition are post-judgment contempts and modifications. Examples of the latter are dispossessory warrants and foreclosures. No motion in a case filed prior to final disposition (motion to the proceedings) was counted as an independent motion or included in any other case type.

20

K.S.

There are five juvenile case types which are listed below and defined in the following paragraph:

> Delinquent Unruly Traffic Deprived Special Proceedings

The delinquent, unruly and deprived case types are defined in the <u>Georgia Code Ann</u>. § 24A-401. Traffic offenses are violations of any motor vehicle law by a child under the age of sixteen. Special proceedings are all juvenile cases that do not fall into any of the other case types.

Juvenile cases may be handled informally or may be heard in court before a judge. A complaint is handled without adjudication, and petitions require a court hearing. Both complaints and petitions have been counted for the purpose of this study.

Because there is a variety of methods for recording complaints throughout Georgia, collection of juvenile data is difficult. A greater effort was made is fiscal year 1978 to ensure a more accurate count of complaints than in previous years. As a result, there may have been some inflation of juvenile caseload this year.

<u>Additional Categories</u>: Several categories have been created from the raw data used in the compilation of this report. They, too, require definition, as they are frequently cited in the text of this report without prior qualification.

21

الطوانين

<u>Caseload</u>: This term has a very broad and, therefore, ambiguous usage. It can refer to all cases filed, disposed and open during a given counting period, or it can refer to any one case type or filing type separately. When used alone, the reader can generally expect the term to have a broad interpretation. Often it is used with a modifier, as in "felony caseload," which clarifies its meaning in a more specific context.

<u>Filings</u>: These can best be defined by distinguishing them from disposed and open cases. Filings, for any given period, refer to the number of actions (whether criminal, civil or juvenile) initiated, as opposed to the number disposed or remaining open.

Exclusive Jurisdiction Category: This refers to the felony and domestic relations case types which are heard exclusively in the superior courts. Felony and domestic relations are the only two "case types" where all actions included must be heard in a superior court. Many actions included in the general civil case type also fall under the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior court. However, <u>all</u> the actions within this case type are not within the exclusive jurisdiction, and therefore, cannot be included in the "exclusive jurisdiction category" as defined for this report.

<u>Concurrent Jurisdiction Category</u>: In general, concurrent jurisdiction is "the jurisdiction of several

22

the spectro destruction of the second

different tribunals, each authorized to deal with the same subject matter at the choice of the suitor." (Black's Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition, p. 363, 1968)). For the purposes of this study, the category includes the misdemeanor, traffic, general civil, independent motions and juvenile case types. Jurisdiction over the actions that appear as these case types is shared by limited jurisdiction courts with two exceptions. The general civil case type includes some actions within the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior courts, as explained above, and juvenile jurisdiction is not legally shared by the juvenile and superior court as is the case in the other concurrent jurisdiction case types. When a juvenile court is created, it has exclusive jurisdiction in juvenile cases. Juvenile cases are included in the concurrent jurisdiction category because in the absence of a juvenile court, these cases would be heard by the superior court judges. The distinguishing characteristic of this category is that all the actions within these case types are not exclusively within the jurisdiction of the superior court.

#### OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

#### Filings

Separate operational definitions are required for each filing type. All case types of the same filing type adhere to the same operational definitions. For example, misdemeanors are counted in the same manner as felonies, and domestic relations the same way as general civil.

<u>Criminal</u>: There were three data elements collected for every criminal case. The basic unit of a criminal case is an indictment or accusation. The derivatives of this unit are docket entries, defendants and counts. Docket entries are defined so as to correspond with indictments or accusations. Defendants are defined as the number of defendants listed on separate indictments or accusations, and counts are defined as the aggregate number of charges against each defendant listed on the charging document. An indictment filed against one defendant charged with one count would be counted as one docket entry, one defendant and one count. An indictment filed against two defendants with two charges against each of them would be counted as one docket entry, two defendants and four counts.

From calendar year 1971 to fiscal year 1976, the Administrative Office of the Courts collected criminal data only in terms of the number of defendants, but in fiscal year 1977 and fiscal year 1978, it collected this data in terms of docket entries, defendants, and counts. Therefore, all comparisons of criminal data which use calendar year 1971, calendar year 1973, for fiscal year 1976 data must be in terms of defendants.

<u>Civil</u>: A civil case is defined in general terms as a docket entry. The number of parties, counter-claims or cross-claims and issues entered on a docket number were not counted separately, but at times more than one case may be counted for a docket number. For example, many cases which fall into the independent motions case type do not appear as separate docket entries. Such actions may be filed with the original case. Case counters were instructed to read through the motions on each docket entry to ensure that no independent motions were missed.

Conversely, not all actions recorded as docket entries were always counted as cases. For example, bond forfeitures often appear in the motion book but are considered motions to proceedings, and therefore, are not counted.

<u>Juvenile</u>: There are two elements which were collected for a juvenile case, the number of children introduced into the system at a given time and the number of actions on behalf of each child.

There is some overlap within the criminal category and within the juvenile category. In the criminal area, multiple defendant and multiple count indictments may not contain all defendants and all counts of the same case type. For example, all counts against a single defendant may not be felonies. A defendant may have one felony count and two misdemeanor counts against him on the same charging document. Since there is a qualitative difference between a misdemeanor or traffic count contained as lesser included offenses on a felony indictment, and a misdemeanor that is the most serious charge against a defendant, they were counted separately. Consequently, the data pertaining to counts are separated according to the original charging documents. Misdemeanor and traffic counts listed on felony charging documents are separated from misdemeanor and traffic counts which appear as the most serious charge on separate docket entries. Similarly, juvenile counts may overlap. Unruly, deprived, traffic, and special proceedings counts may be separated, associated with a delinquent filing, or interchanged among themselves. Like the criminal data, this data was also collected according to how the counts were filed.

#### Dispositions

Separate operational definitions are again required for criminal, civil and juvenile filing types. The one standard applicable to all dispositions is that each required a formal order from the court which was either entered in the docket or filed with the original case. In certain types of civil cases this standard was difficult to maintain; discretionary judgements were often made to determine if a case was open or closed. As a general rule, however, in the absence of a formal order, the case was counted open.

<u>Criminal</u>: Disposition data was collected for each element of a criminal case: docket entries, defendants and counts. Docket entries were considered disposed only when all counts against all defendants listed on the docket entry were completely disposed. Similarly, a defendant was not considered disposed until all counts against the defendant were completely disposed. Since counts were collected individually and have no further sub-division, each disposed count was simply recorded appropriately.

<u>Methods of Disposition</u>: Although aggregate disposition data was collected on each element of a criminal case, criminal dispositions by method were collected only by counts. The most detailed criminal dispositions that appear in this report are listed and defined as follows:

<u>Cash Bond</u>: In certain cases, the forfeiture of a bond is accepted by the court as a form of disposition for the charges and thereby terminates the case. This occurs most frequently for traffic cases and often for some minor misdemeanors. Under certain conditions, the forfeiture of a bond can be

26

\$Y

accepted as a disposition for a felony case, but this is rather unusual. It is important to note that only cash bonds which terminate proceedings have been counted in this category. Cash bonds should be distinguished from "recognizance bond forfeitures" where the court issues a bench warrant on the defendant.

<u>Dead Docket</u>: Counts that were placed on the dead docket, either as indicated on the docket or by an order filed with the original case, were those in which all prosecutoral and judicial involvement in the case were discontinued. It should be understood that, although dead dockets were counted as dispositions, counts placed on the dead docket may be reopened at a later time.

<u>Nolle Prosequi</u>: A <u>nolle prosequi</u> is "[i]n practice, a formal entry upon the record,. . .by the prosecuting officer in a criminal action by which he declares that he will no further prosecute the case." (<u>Black's Law Dictionary</u>, Revised Fourth Edition, p.1198, (1968)). It is important to note that a <u>nolle</u> <u>prosequi</u> must be initiated by the prosecutor and accepted by the court.

<u>Dismissal</u>: A dismissal is "[a]n order or judgment finally disposing of an action, suit, motion, etc., by sending it out of court, though without a trial of the issues involved." (<u>Black's Law Dictionary</u>, Revised Fourth Edition, p.555, (1968)). Dismissals are distinguished from a <u>nolle prosegui</u> in that a nolle prosegui is initiated by the prosecuting attorney.
For the purpose of comparing criminal and civil disposition methods, the following two disposition categories, non-trial judgment and nonjury trials have been combined to form one disposition category, "judgment," but non-jury trials are also stated separately so that the reader can visualize the judge time spent in handling full-blown trials.

<u>Non-trial Judgement</u>: A non-trial judgment refers to the disposition of a court prior to the case going to trial and which is exclusive of the above-mentioned categories. The vast majority of non-trial judgments are guilty pleas. Also included are cases where the defendant was extradited, deceased or declared insane and unable to stand trial.

<u>Non-jury Trial:</u> When a count goes to full trial on the issues before a judge without a jury, and where a final judgment is reached by the judge, the disposition is that of a non-jury trial.

<u>Jury Trial</u>: Cases that were heard by a jury and terminated by a jury verdict were considered jury trials.

<u>Open Cases</u>: All cases that had not been completely disposed of were counted as open. Separate collection was made on open docket entries, defendants and counts.

<u>Civil</u>: Since there are no derivatives of a civil case similar to those of criminal cases, a civil case had to be closed to all parties and all claims before it was considered disposed. If any part of the case was unresolved, the case was counted open.

<u>Methods of Disposition</u>: When several actions appeared to be equally responsible for the final disposition, only the most time-consuming disposition was counted. The following is a list of all civil

disposition categories and their operational definitions.

<u>Settled</u>: Cases settled out of court by the parties themselves without judicial determination of the issues were considered settled.

<u>Dismissed</u>: Any case that was sent out of court by judicial order without formal adjudication was counted as a dismissal.

<u>Administrative Termination</u>: Cases dismissed by the clerk of court because no written order has been taken for a period of five years were counted as administratively terminated cases. (<u>Ga. Code Ann</u>. § 81A-141(e))

<u>Before Trial</u>: Cases that were disposed on the basis of the record prior to the case going to trial on the issues were considered before trial dispositions. Included in this category are consent judgments, summary judgments and default judgments.

<u>Non-Jury Trial</u>: Cases that were disposed by full trials on the issues before a judge without a jury were considered non-jury trial dispositions. Actions included in this category are judgment and decrees, judgments for the plaintiff or defendant and final judgments.

<u>Jury Trial</u>: Cases disposed by a jury verdict were considered as jury trial dispositions.

<u>Open Cases</u>: Open cases were those cases which were not completely closed as to all parties and all claims.

There is some overlap among several of the civil disposition categories which required qualification. It is often difficult to distinguish between the settled category and the dismissed category. For example, many cases that are settled out of court by the parties are accompanied by a "dismissed with prejudice" order from the court. Also, in many counties, distinctions between the two types of disposition are not made in the docket books; a clerk may enter "dismissed" whether the case was settled or dismissed. There was also some overlap between the "before trial" and "non-jury" categories. As a general rule, the case counters were instructed to give precedence to a court order. The civil disposition data presented in this study has combined the overlapping disposition types. Settled and dismissed are presented together as "non-adjudicated," and before trial and non-jury trial dispositions are presented as "judgment."

Will come -

<u>Juvenile</u>: Juvenile dispositions appearing in this study are aggregate counts processed by the juvenile court. Although there are specific method categories for juvenile dispositions, they do not appear in this report. For the purposes of this study, only the number of children disposed are reported.

### ADDITIONAL CRITERIA VARIABLES

The preceding has been a brief outline of the caseload data elements employed in this study. Caseload is considered the primary indicator of the courts' workloads. This study also includes what are considered secondary indices: circuit population, circuit population per judge, assistance from senior judges and resident active attorneys. A secondary index is defined as a variable which is associated with the caseload level. For example, circuit population is not a direct indicator of superior court caseload, but one expects caseload to increase as population increases. The important point about these secondary indices is that their import is secondary to that of the primary criteria, caseload per judge figures. For example, an increase in population would be meaningful only if the caseload was also increasing, and it would have little value if the caseload was actually decreasing.

 $\mathcal{O}_{i}$ 

### STATISTICAL TOOLS OF ANALYSIS

The analyses of caseload and population exhibits in this study involve the use of four basic statistical tools: range, rank, mean, and standard deviation.

The range is defined as the difference between the highest observed value and the lowest. In filings per judge, for example, if the highest circuit had 500 filengs per judge and the lowest had 100 filings per judge, the range would 500-100 or 400.

Circuits are often ranked in descending order. The circuit with the highest observed value is ranked number 1, and the circuit with the lowest is number 42. Ties are indicated by fractional ranks, for example, 21.5 means, tied for 21st and 22nd place.

The mean, or average, is the sum of all observations divided by the number of observations. In this study per judge circuit means are often used. The per judge circuit mean is obtained by dividing each circuit's caseload by the number of judges in the circuit and then averaging these figures. The circuit mean differs from the statewide average per judge. The latter is obtained by dividing the state's caseload by the number of judges.

The standard deviation is a measure of dispersion from the average. If all circuits had the same number of filings per judge, the standard deviation would be equal to zero. The greater the differences in circuit per judge caseloads, the higher the standard deviation will be. The traffic column in Exhibit I, for example, reveals a great deal of variation in the number of traffic cases per judge filed in different circuits. Two circuits have over a thousand traffic cases per judge

several other circuits have no traffic cases at all in the superior court. With such variation, the standard deviation is high - about 430. In felony filings per judge, however, there is much less difference among the circuits and the standard deviation is much smaller - about 79. Mathematically, a standard deviation is defined as the square root of the arithmetic mean of the squared deviations from the circuit mean.

In many instances, it was necessary to round off the entries in the exhibits. The procedure was as follows: if the digit to be rounded was not "5," the previous digit was rounded off to the nearest number, as appropriate; if the digit to be rounded was "5," then even numbers were rounded down and odd numbers were rounded up. For example, when only whole numbers appear in an exhibit, 26.3 is rounded to 26, 26.6 is rounded to 27, 26.5 is rounded to 26, and 27.5 is rounded to 28.

0

1.5

### **REPORT DESIGN**

This report could best be described as a comparative analysis of the demographic and caseload characteristics of the forty-two judicial circuits in Georgia. The report is divided into five chapters of text with accompanying appendices which include supplemental data and other relevant information.

All chapters contain only information pertinent to the consideration of additional superior court judgeships in Georgia. All material for the general information and reference of the reader is provided in the appendices.

The first chapter includes the 1979 Judicial Council recommendations followed by brief circuit reports on each of the circuits receiving recommendations. The circuit reports often refer to the subsequent chapters in identifying the salient characteristics of each recommended circuit.

Each of the next four chapters concentrates on one general characteristic of the forty-two circuits, while each exhibit in each chapter centers on a more specific characteristic. Chapter II is devoted entirely to filings in the superior courts. Each of the four exhibits in Chapter II centers on one aspect of the superior court filings, such as current FY1978 circuit filing levels and increases or decreases in circuit filings from 1971 through 1978.

Chapter III is devoted entirely to a comparison of disposition characteristics of the caseload in the forty-two circuits. The four

exhibits in this chapter include only current (fiscal year 1978) dispositions. The placement of the exhibits in this chapter is designed to focus on the more general aspects of case disposition and proceed to the more specific aspects. Exhibit V illustrates aggregate dispositions as a function of filing levels and proceeds to Exhibits VII and VIII where criminal and civil dispositions are categorized by method of disposition.

 $\dot{\circ}$ 

Chapter IV presents the demographic characteristics of the circuits. Circuit population for 1970 and 1977 and percent change in circuit population is illustrated in Exhibit IX. In addition, Exhibit IX ranks the forty-two circuits on the basis of 1977 population per judge and 1977 population per judge assuming that an additional judge had been added to each circuit.

Chapter V contains the last two exhibits in the text of this report. This chapter contributes the final aspects of a comprehensive study on the need for additional resources by concentrating on potential sources of judicial assistance other than new judgeships. Exhibit X observes the effective assistance from supporting courts by observing the number of supporting courts in each circuit and the percentages of cases in the concurrent jurisdiction categories heard by the supporting courts. Circuit caseload is presented in Exhibit XI for each circuit within the ten administrative districts.

Within each chapter, the sequence of exhibits is arranged so as to proceed from the general characteristics to the more specific. Each exhibit is preceded by a brief narrative identifying the data elements contained in the exhibit. Also included in this narrative are appropriate

> ს 35

 $\sim 0$ 

qualifications and limitations upon the interpretation of the data. Each exhibit is followed by a brief analysis of its content. Since all available data elements have been included in this report, it is very important that the reader study the narrative preceding each exhibit to assure understanding of the content. In comparing data among the various exhibits, it is important that the data elements be the same. Docket numbers in one exhibit should not be compared to defendants in another exhibit even though both types of elements qualify as "filings." Filings in one exhibit should not be compared to dispositions in another, even though both elements could be characterized as "caseload data."

Throughout this report the caseload data is standardized into the caseload per judge in each circuit. This provides easy comparison of the actual judicial workload among the circuits. For this type of study, the absolute circuit caseload is irrelevant because it does not control for the number of judges in the circuit. Therefore, unless otherwise specified, all caseload data is expressed in terms of the ratio of cases to superior court judges in the circuit.

and the second second

من المراجعين المراجعين المراجعين الم

## **CHAPTER I** - Analysis of Judicial Council

No)

recommendations for 1979

مسرا والمملك مساسين

ia.

1

فأنفله جيجا الأرواد دواري

1

ê

CIRCUIT REPORTS: EASTERN OCMULGEE TOOMBS

្ស័

فالحابية القول ويقتي وأركبتها ألا



### CHAPTER I

### CIRCUIT REPORTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a brief analysis of the circuit recommendations of the Judicial Council of Georgia. The Judicial Council has recommended the creation of additional superior court judgeships in three circuits. Listed in alphabetical order the circuits are:

### EASTERN OCMULGEE TOOMBS

This chapter contains separate circuit reports for each of the three circuits recommended. They identify the salient characteristics of each circuit which precipitated the Council's recommendations. For more detail, the reader is encouraged to refer to the exhibits set out in the following chapters. Those chapters present data for all forty-two judicial circuits.

As is the case throughout this study, the circuit caseload data is standardized to express the caseload in per judge terms for each circuit. This method facilitates comparison of the actual workload among the judges in the various circuits. The same method is used herein. Therefore, unless otherwise stated, all caseload figures cited in the circuit reports are per judge figures. The caseload per judge in a single circuit is often compared to other circuits as well as to the circuit averages for the state as a whole.

39

3

1

Another method often used in the following circuit reports is the ranking of circuits according to a given variable. All rankings have been arranged so as to place the circuit with the highest value as number one and the circuit with the lowest value as number forty-two. For example, all circuits were ranked from one to forty-two on the basis of the per judge values for total filings, felony defendants, misdemeanor defendants, traffic defendants, total criminal filings, general civil filings, domestic relations filings, independent motions, total civil filings, and for juvenile, the number of children. The circuit ranked number one in domestic relations filings per judge has the highest ratio of domestic relations filings to the number of superior court judges. For convenience, such a figure may be cited in the circuit report as "the circuit ranking number one in domestic relations filings." Although it would be more accurate to specify domestic relations filings per judge, the reader must remember that unless otherwise stated, all caseload figures are per judge figures.

### EASTERN CIRCUIT

The Eastern Judicial Circuit, one of the six single-county circuits in the state, encompasses Chatham County. The circuit has seen a 2% increase in population since 1970 (187,816 to 191,500). By 1980 it is estimated that the population will have risen by 5.5% to over 200,000. Presently, it ranks seventh in population per superior court judge with 63,833. The judicial resources currently available in the circuit include three superior court judges, two full-time state court judges, a full-time juvenile court judge and a juvenile court referee.

In fiscal year 1978, the Eastern Circuit ranks thirteenth in total filings per Grege with 1,857. With 1,246 felony and domestic relations filings per judge, it ranks second, exhibiting a very demanding caseload in terms of time required to process cases. Supporting courts provide a great deal of assistance in hearing over 85% of the misdemeanors, 95% of the traffic cases, 68% of general civil cases and 100% of juvenile cases filed in the circuit.

Overall, total filings in the Eastern Circuit have risen at an average rate of 3.4% since 1971. This becomes more meaningful when it is realized that the number of felony defendants has increased by 78% since 1971. The circuit ranks fourth in domestic relations filings per judge, which have increased 12% since 1971 to 446.

While the total number of cases disposed (1,683) is above the mean of 1,585, the disposition rate for Eastern Circuit is below 95% (90.6%). This means that although the superior court judges are

disposing of a great number of cases, pending cases are accumulating at a rate of 9%. The circuit ranks sixth in criminal counts heard by jury trial and third in civil cases heard by jury trial. When this is considered along with the large number of filings in the most demanding case types, the reader can realize the great quantity of time involved in processing the circuit's caseload.

In summary, the Eastern Circuit has a high volume caseload in the most demanding case types, felony and domestic relations. Although supporting courts located in the circuit hear a large percentage of cases in the concurrent jurisdiction case types, they have not provided the superior courts with sufficient resources to enable them to dispose of 100% of their caseload. While dispositions of felonies and domestic relations cases have approached 100%, dispositions in the other case categories have remained low. So that it can effectively deal with an excessive, increasing caseload in its exclusive jurisdiction case types, the Judicial Council recommends the creation of an additional superior court judgeship in the Eastern Judicial Circuit.

### OCMULGEE CIRCUIT

The geographic jurisdiction of the Ocmulgee Judicial Circuit includes Baldwin, Greene, Hancock, Jasper, Jones, Morgan, Putnam and Wilkinson counties. In 1977, the circuit had a population of 99,192, and the population is expected to increase to 104,600 by 1980. The current judicial resources in the circuit consist of two superior court judges, six probate court judges and two part-time county court judges.

In the fiscal year 1978 total caseload per judge in the Ocmulgee Judicial Circuit ranks tenth, considerably higher than its ranking of fifteenth in fiscal year 1977. The average caseload each of the two superior court judges faced this year was greater by ninety additional filings than 1977.

The Ocmulgee Circuit ranks among the top ten circuits in terms of filings per judge in three case categories: fourth in felony dockets, sixth in total criminal filings, and ninth in general civil filings. The Ocmulgee Circuit is close to the circuit mean in the combined number of felony, domestic relations and general civil cases; but upward trends in filings for these categories over the period of calendar year 1971 through fiscal year 1978 are inconsistent.

The Ocmulgee Circuit has a higher than average number of dispositions per judge in several case categories and in total case dispositions and has a lower than average disposition rate <sup>h</sup> for all case types except traffic and juvenile. This means that the two

"Number of dispositions as a percent of filings

43

ā.

superior court judges are disposing of a large number of filings, yet the high-volume caseload prevents them from meeting caseload demands without assistance. The total disposition rate is 83.5% which is twentyninth in the state. This percentage indicates that in the Ocmulgee Circuit, pending cases and backlog are accumulating at a rate of 16.5% of filings.

The circuit receives adequate assistance from supporting courts in criminal cases, but almost no assistance in hearing civil or juvenile cases. There are two county courts with jurisdictions similar to those of state courts, six probate courts, and no juvenile court judges or referees. Supporting courts hear 71.7% of the misdemeanors and 98% of the traffic cases, but only 0.2% of the general civil filings and no independent motions or juvenile filings.

Although the county and probate courts hear 71.7% of the misdemeanor cases filed in the circuit, each superior court judge heard more than 375 misdemeanor cases, ninth in the state, in fiscal year 1978. The lack of assistance from the supporting courts in other case types means that virtually the entire civil and juvenile caseload, 1,078.5 cases per judge, must be heard by the superior court judges.

In summary, the Ocmulgee Judicial Circuit has a high caseload volume per judge and a higher-than-average number of dispositions per judge, but a very low-ranking disposition rate. The circuit receives () virtually no assistance from supporting courts in civil and juvenile case categories. The two superior court judges must spend a great deal of their time in traveling among the eight county seats and in managing all the administrative matters involved in an eight-county circuit. Due

to these obstacles to the circuit's ability to handle its caseload, the Judicial Council recommends the creation of an additional superior court judgeship.

 $\langle C \rangle$ 

 $\Im$ 

### TOOMBS CIRCUIT

The geographic jurisdiction of the Toombs Judicial Circuit includes the six counties of Glascock, Lincoln, McDuffie, Taliaferro, Warren and Wilkes. The 1977 population was 44,700 and is expected to increase to 46,200 by the year 1980. The current judicial resources in the district consist of one superior court judge and six probate court judges hearing misdemeanors and traffic cases.

In fiscal year 1978, the Toombs Circuit had the second highest number of total filings per judge (4,059) in the state. In the two previous fiscal years, 1977 and 1976, the Toombs Circuit ranked fourth and sixth, respectively, in total filings per judge.

The Toombs Circuit has an extremely high filing rate per judge in both total criminal (2,621) and total juvenile (478) filing types. Although the case types for which Toombs Circuit recorded the greatest filings (misdemeanor, traffic and juvenile) are not the most time consuming case types, the sheer volume of total filings impose a heavy burden on the sole superior court judge.

Trends in caseload over the six year period, calendar year 1971 through fiscal year 1978, indicate (Exhibit IV) that the superior court filings are increasing in all major filing types (criminal, civil and juvenile). In both total criminal and total civil filings the average increase per year is over 5% despite statewide average decreases in case filings. Criminal case types have particularly increased (over 95%)

between fiscal years 1977 and 1978. In fact, Toombs Circuit is the only circuit for which both the number of felony filings and total caseload filings is greater than one standard deviation above the mean in both average change per year and the observed change 1977-1978 as illustrated in Exhibit IV.

The Toombs Circuit ranks second in total dispositions per judge, but the overall disposition rate (total dispositions per judge as a percent of total filings per judge) is less than 85%. These figures show that despite a high number of cases disposed, pending cases and backlog are accumulating in the superior court at a rate of over 15%. Toombs ranks fourth in percent of civil filings heard by the most time-comsuming disposition method, jury trial (3.1%). Although the Toombs Circuit does not have an equally large percentage (1.2%) of criminal jury trial dispositions, it ranks twelfth in criminal non-jury trial dispositions which also consume a great deal of judge time.

In the Toombs Judicial Circuit the greatest proportion of the caseload falls upon one superior court judge. The only judicial assistance available is from a probate court judge in each county. These supporting courts hear 32.3% of the misdemeanors and 77.9% of the traffic cases. This means that in addition to all felony cases, all civil cases and all juvenile cases in each of the six counties, over 2,300 misdemeanor and traffic cases were a component of the superior court judge's 1973 caseload.

In summary, the Toombs Judicial Circuit is a one-judge, multicounty circuit for which there is a high volume caseload and little further potential for expanded use of supporting courts' assistance.

47

à

Since there are no state or juvenile courts, the sole superior court judge must hear all civil cases and juvenile cases. With the second highest caseload per judge, an increasing caseload and no further relief available from supporting courts, the Judicial Council recommends that an additional superior court judgeship be created in the Toombs Judicial Circuit. 2

135

نې مېرې

# **CHAPTER II - Caseload in the Superior**

## **Courts: FY1978 Filings**

EXHIBIT I	SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY TOTAL FILINGS PER JUDGE: 1978
EXHIBIT II	SUPERIOR COURT CRIMINAL FILINGS: FY1978
EXHIBIT III	SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FELONY AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS FILINGS PER JUDGE: FY1978
EXHIBIT IV	AVERAGE AND OBSERVED RATE OF CHANGE IN SUPERIOR COURT FILINGS PER JUDGE CY1971 - FY1978 AND FY1977 - FY1978

### CHAPTER II INTRODUCTION

In providing a comprehensive description of the workload confronting Georgia's superior court judges, Chapter II investigates the number of filings in each circuit. Considered as a whole, the following exhibits speak not only in terms of total caseload volume, but they suggest how the distribution of case types can place constraints on the efficient management of the courts.

Exhibit I, "Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Total Caseload per Judge: FY1978," displays the average number of cases filed per judgo in each case type for each circuit in the 1978 fiscal year. In it are ranked the forty-two circuits in descending order of total filings, thereby pinpointing those circuits - and judges - faced with handling the greatest number of cases. In other words, Exhibit I isolates those circuits with an excessive caseload volume.

Exhibit II scrutinizes the total criminal caseload of each circuit. In "Superior Court Criminal Filings: FY1978," the actual number of docket entries, defendants and counts filed in the superior courts can be observed. This exhibit also shows the ratio of counts to defendants for each circuit.

In Exhibit III, "Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Felony and Domestic Relations Filings per Judge: FY1978," the circuits are arranged according to the sum of felony and domestic relations filings per judge. It is here that the constraints on judge time are especially evident since

a high felony/domestic relations caseload is a very time-consuming caseload. These two case types must be heard in the superior court at the trial level.

میں *دی کے بیڈی پر میڈی کے بیڈی کے* 

ليتشقآ

From the last exhibit in this chapter, "Average and Observed Rate of Change in Superior Court Filings per Judge: CY1971-FY1978 and FY1977-FY1978," the reader is able to discover whether or not a trend of increasing caseload has developed for the judges in a circuit. The rates of change in per judge filings are given in absolute numbers and as percentages to provide for a rapid evaluation of recent and current filing patterns.

Of course, Chapter II does not purport to give the complete picture of what has happened in the courts in FY1978. However, it does give some explicit information about the volume and types of cases filed during the past year, and whether the caseload has increased, decreased or stabilized from previous years. By paying close attention to the purposes and qualifications of the next four exhibits, the reader can easily grasp the statistical descriptions of the filings in Georgia's superior court.

 $\tilde{f}_{L}^{\ell}$ 

6<sup>9</sup> 0

### EXHIBIT I

### Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Total Caseload per Judge: FY1978

The total caseload per judge and the distribution of caseload among the criminal, civil and juvenile filing categories are presented in Exhibit I for each of Georgia's forty-two judicial circuits. The circuits are ranked in descending order on the basis of total caseload per judge (i.e., the circuit listed last has the lowest total caseload per judge). The caseload per judge figures were calculated for each circuit by simply dividing the total number of cases filed in each of the respective categories by the number of superior court judges. Criminal and civil filings are defined for this exhibit as docket entries and can be interpreted as the number of criminal indictments or accusations, or the number of civil suits filed during FY1978. The criminal figures do not account for defendants or counts listed on the indictment or accusation (Exhibit II in this chapter contains this information), and civil suits do not account for cross-claims, counter-claims or number of parties. Juvenile cases are children who had one or more charges filed against them at one point in time. Only juvenile cases from counties in which the superior court judge has no assistance from either a juvenile court judge or referee are included in the figures for Exhibit I.

The data in Exhibit I can be interpreted as the total per judge caseload in the criminal, civil and juvenile filing categories for each of the forty-two judicial circuits. The presentation of the data in this manner makes an assumption that requires explanation. By dividing the total circuit caseload by the number of superior court judges, it is assumed that the caseload is evenly divided among each of the judges. In multi-judge circuits this may not

in whatever manner they please. For example, the chief judge in a circuit may assign all criminal cases to one judge and all civil cases to another. Also, the chief judge in a multi-judge, multi-county circuit may assign cases so that one judge hears all cases in one county, but none of the cases in another county. Independent of the assignment practices of the various circuits, the data in Exhibit I can be interpreted as the caseload per judge in each circuit, assuming the cases in each filing category are evenly divided among the judges.

and the second

A final interpretative qualification of the data in Exhibit I concerns the rankings of the circuits on the basis of total caseload per judge. While total caseload per judge is important as an indicator of high caseload volume courts and low caseload volume courts, other indicators must be examined to identify the actual workload which confronts any one court. In order to make any inferences regarding the relative workload of the judges in each circuit, one would need to observe the distribution of caseload among the various case types. Overall, the reader should consider the entire distribution of caseload among all the criminal, civil and juvenile case types. Particular attention should be given to those types of cases (felony and domestic relations) generally considered to consume a greater proportion of judge time. Excessive workload is of primary interest; high volume caseload is one of several factors utilized to locate courts with excessive workloads.

 $55^{\circ}$ 

0

£3

### EXHIBIT I: SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1978 TOTAL CASELOAD PER JUDGE

		CRIMINAL FILINGS				CIVIL FILINGS				JUVENILE* FILINGS
CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE
) CHEROKEE	<sup>.</sup> 4328	383.5	479	2319	3181.5	432	416.5	298	1146.5	0 °
2) TOOMBS	4061	276	749	1596	2621	333	447	180	960	480
3) ROME	2333	189.5	809	46.5	1045	450.5	419	418.5	1288	0
4) ALAPAHA	2198	231	721.5	633.5	1586	230	223.5	80.5	534	78
5) CONASAUGA	2165.5	234.5	244.5	91	570	523.5	731	282.5	1537	58.5
6) MOUNTAIN	2133	158	174	66	398	526	694	280	1500	235
7) CORDELE	2104	245	689	33	967	407	451	189	1047	90
8) TIFTON	1971	299	152	21	472	511	602	352	1465	34
9) COWETA	1966	202.5	86	100	388.5	491	742.5	333	1566.5	11
10) OCMULGEE	1948.5	305	378	88.5	771.5	444.5	363	271	1078.5	98.5
]])BLUE RIDGE	1946	228.5	323	568.5	1120	217	522.5	86.5	826	0
2) TALLAPOOSA	1906.7	186.7	296.3	182.7	655.7	592.3	399.7	225.3	1217.3	23.7
13) EASTERN	1857 ·	446	86	22	554	273.3	800	229.7	1303	0
14) PIEDMONT	1852	179	202	378	759	435	364	294	1093	0
15)COBB	1818.5	425.2	2.2	0	427.5	296.8	982.8	111.5	1391	0
16)WAYCROSS	1814	223.5	170	206	599.5	393.5	598	189.5	1181	33.5
17) NOR THEASTERN	1754.5	232.5	157.5	209.5	599.5	367.5	497	229.5	1094	61
18) STONE MTN.	1677.6	282.7	14.6	1.9	299.1	374.7	782	221.7	1378.4	0
19) HOUSTON	1675	228	1	0	229	301	865	280	1446	0
20) CHATTAHOOCHEE	1652.5	275	98.8	88.8	462.5	269.8	749	163.8	1182.5	7.5
21) SOUTHERN	1644	267	112.7	1.3	381	278.3	800.7	181.7	1260.7	2.3

\*WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.

	SUPERIOR					

	CRIMINAL FILINGS					JUVENILE* FILINGS				
<u>_CIRCUIT</u>	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL.	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENIIJE
22) LOOKOUT MTN.	1611.3	227.7	379.3	99.3	706.3	287	465.7	152.3	905	0
23) BRUNSWICK	1577.5	169.5	134	1	304.5	367.5	736.5	169	1273	0
24) PATAULA	1560	283	381	24	688	408	247	181	836	36
25) MACON	1556	297	95.7	5.7	398.3	281.7	659	200.7	1141.3	16.3
26) AUGUSTA	1529.8	185.5	125	1.5	312	269	795.2	143.8	1208	9.8
27) SOUTHWESTERN	1527	172	55	11	238 ·	515	458	236	1209	80
28) GRIFFIN	1498.5	189.5	228	141	558.5	300	459	181	940	0
29) OCONEE	1422	180.5	228	149.5	558	330	228	170.5	728,5	135.5
30) DUBLIN	1411	227	1	0	228	484	422	236	1142	41
31) ATLANTA	1385.1	409.2	2.8	0	412	371.6	498.8	102.6	973.1	D
32) CLAYTON	• 1339.7	210.3	22.7	3	236	226	799	78.7	1103.7	0
33) ALCOVY	1299	263	265	61.5	589.5	282.5	293	134	709.5	0
34) ATLANTIC	1294	224.5	26	6.5	-257	390	439.5	103.5	<u>, 933 🥳</u>	.105.5
35) NORTHERN	1179	132.5	151	36.5	320	341	296.5	182.5	820	39
36) SOUTH GEORGIA	, 1168.5	298.5	134	4.5	437	250	278.5	130.5	659	72.5
37) DOUGHERTY	1168	206.5	0	0	206.5	201	592	168.5	961,5	- 0 · ·
38) FLINT	1111 -	114	94.5	13.5	222	423.5	300.5	144	868	21
39) MIDDLE	1095.5	155	1.5	0.5	157	270	471.5	161.5	903 . <sup>I</sup>	35.5
40) OGEECHEE	1034.5	123	19	2.5	144.5	358	325	104.5	787.5	102.5
41) WESTERN	966	198.5	5.5	1	► 205	256 <sup>c</sup>	360.5	132	748.5	. 12.5
42) GWINNETT	963.7	109.3	0.3	0.3	110	151	531.7	171	853.7	0
CIRCUIT MEAN	1,726.2	235.1	1.97.5	171.8	604.4	355	526.4	194.8	1,076.2	45.7

\* WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.

Υļ,



### EXHIBIT I ANALYSIS

Although Exhibit I ranks the circuits by total caseload per judge, this category is not a sufficient indicator of circuit workload. It identifies circuits with a high volume of cases without considering how demanding in terms of time and difficulty that caseload actually is. The majority of traffic cases is summarily disposed of; so a high volume of these cases may inflate the total filings far out of proportion to actual circuit workload. A good indicator of circuit workload, as opposed to circuit caseload, is the number of filings in the more demanding case types. Generally, the time consuming cases will be felony, domestic relations, general civil and juvenile cases.

The mean number of filings per judge in each case type for all forty-two judicial circuits is shown on the last line of the exhibit. While the exhibit shows seventeen (1-17) circuits ranked above the mean in total filings, only two circuits have extremely high volume caseloads. The two circuits that exceed the mean (1,726) by more than a certain critical value (in this case, one standard deviation) and their total filings are:

### CHEROKEE 4,328 TOOMBS 4,059

When filings in the more demanding case categories are evaluated, it is found that different circuits move into the extreme end of the distribution. Those circuits surpassing the mean for felony filings (235) by more than two standard deviations are:

EASTERN	4	46
COBB	4	25
ATLANTA	4	09

59

In domestic relations filings, the following circuits are more than one standard deviation above the mean of 526:

CONASAUGA	731
COWETA	742
EASTERN	800
COBB	983
STONE MOUNTAIN	782
HOUSTON	865
CHATTAHOOCHEE	749
SOUTHERN	801
BRUNSWICK	736
AUGUSTA	795
CLAYTON	799

The circuits exceeding by more than one standard deviation the general civil mean of 355 are:

CONASAUGA	524
MOUNTAIN	526
TIFTON	511
COWETA	491
TALLAPOOSA	592
SOUTHWESTERN	515
DUBLIN	484

Although not all circuits show juvenile filings in their respective superior courts, it is important to view the juvenile caseload in the context of its effect on the total judicial workload. When a superior court judge must allocate time to hear juvenile cases, judge time is expended that could be spent to process the remainder of his caseload. Two of the twenty-six circuits whose superior court judges hear juvenile cases have a juvenile caseload that exceeds the circuit mean in juvenile filings by more than two standard deviations and are ranked in the top ten circuits in terms of case volume per judge.

TOOME	3S	478
MOUNT	AIN	235

60

 $\{\xi_{i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ 

Although several circuits exhibit a high volume caseload, they are not necessarily the circuits with the most demanding workload. Exhibit I presents the total per judge caseload in the criminal, civil and juvenile filing categories and identifies both those circuits with excessive filings and those circuits with a demanding caseload.

### EXHIBIT II

#### Superior Court Criminal Filings: FY1978

23

Exhibit II has been included in order to provide more detailed information on the superior court criminal caseload. There are three units of the criminal caseload: the number of indictments or accusations filed in superior court, the number of defendants listed on separate indictments or accusations, and the number of counts against each defendant listed on an indictment or accusation. Each unit of a criminal case provides valuable insight into the actual workload of the criminal filing type. This data intends to clarify the entire criminal workload by illustrating the number of indictments or accusations filed in the superior courts, as well as the number of defendants listed on the charging document and the total number of counts filed against the defendants. While considering these numbers, the reader must remember that they are <u>not</u> per judge figures; rather, they are <u>totals</u> of the docket entries, defendants and counts filed in each circuit.

Exhibit II is divided into four major categories: felony, misdemeanor, traffic, and total criminal. Docket entries, defendants, and counts are listed in the appropriate columns under each of the respective subheadings. Note that under the <u>Count</u> subheading in the felony category there are felony, misdemeanor and traffic counts. These misdemeanor and traffic counts are lesser included offenses on a felony docket entry. Similarly, the misdemeanor category separates the traffic counts contained as lesser included offenses on a misdemeanor docket entry. Obviously,

62

there are no lesser included offenses in a traffic case. Finally the <u>Total Criminal</u> category includes the sum of all docket numbers, all defendants, and all counts.

One final piece of information contained in Exhibit II is the ratio of counts to defendants. This is a quantitative indicator of the practices of the district attorney in composing charging documents. A ratio of one would indicate that the district attorney generally brings only one count against each defendant on a charging document. A ratio of two would indicate that on the average, the district attorney files two counts against each defendant on the charging document.

The value of the counts-to-defendants ratio can best be observed by evaluating the extent to which the information on counts increases our understanding of criminal activity. Where the ratio equals one, the information on counts provides no more information than the data on defendants. When the ratio is greater than one, knowledge of the number of counts becomes more valuable in understanding the actual criminal workload.

The final qualification of Exhibit II concerns the instances where the ratio is equal to one. It is then possible that the figures on docket entries and defendants may be somewhat exaggerated. In such instances it may be that the district attorney is separating multiple charges against the same defendant into different indictments.

It is not possible from this data to infer specifically and with confidence what each data element offers about the caseload. Various factors such as those mentioned above can distort the comparison of the

circuits on the basis of the data presented in Exhibit II. Therefore, the reader should consider the values in all categories--docket entries, defendants, and counts--in evaluating the circuits with the most imposing criminal caseload.

 $\overline{n}$ 

¢.

أليث

() in

N.

n.


EXHIBIT	IΓ	:	SUPERIOR	COURT	CRIMINAL	FILINGS:	FY1978

			FELC	NY				MISD	EMEANOR				TRAFF			Т	OTAL CR	IMINAL	
	DOCKET	5. 5.		COUNTS	1	RATIO COUNTS/	DOCKET				RATIO COUNTS/	DOCKET		TRAFFIC	RATIO COUNTS/				RATIO CCUNTS DEFEND
CIRCUIT	ENTRIES	DEFEND	FELONY	MISD.	TRAFFIC	DEFEND.	ENTRIES	DEFEND.	MISD.	TRAFFIC	DEFEND	IENTRIES	DEFEND	COUNTS	DEFEND	ENTRIES	DEFEND	COUNTS	DEFEND
ALAPAHA	462	479	477	17	0	1.0	1,443	1,443	1,457	0	1.0	1,267	1,267	1,267	1.0	3,172	3,189	3,218	1.0
ALCOVY	526	534	581	4	0	<u>1.1</u>	530	531	544	0	1.0	123	123	123	1.0	1,179	1,188	1,252	1.1
ATLANTA	4,501	5,247	7,590	193	0	1.5	. 31	33	71	0	2.2	0	0	0	0	4,532	5,280	7,854	1.5
ATLANTIC	449	493	537	22	10		52	56	77	2	1.4	13	13	14	1.1	514	562	662	1.2
AUGUSTA	742	857	1,428	4	1	1:7	500	503	520	6	1.0	6	6	6	1.0	1,248	1,366	1,965	1.4
BLUE RIDGE	457	564	814	2	0	1.4	646	650	763	3	1.2	1,137	1.137	1,270	1.1	2,240	2,351	2,852	1.2
BRUNSWICK	339	399	481	2	0	1.2	268	280	279	1	1.0	2	2	2	1.0	609	681	765	1.1
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1,100	1,420	1,671	119	24	1.3	395	447	462	2	1.0	355	355	357	1.0	1,850	2,222	2,635	1.2
CHEROKEE	767	854	1,004	14	56	<sup>*</sup> 1.3	958	996	1,033	4	1.0	4,638	4,638	4,726	1.0	6,363	6,488	6,837	1.1
CLAYTON	631	774	1,894	36	2	2.5	68	82	113	3	1.4	9	9	9	1.0	708	865	2,057	2.4
COBB	1,701	1,875	3,301	3	1	1.8	9	9	15	0	1.7	0	0	0	0	1,710	1,884	3,320	1.8
CONASAUGA	469	506	661	2	0	≂1,3 ©	489	503	726	2	.1.4	182	189	288	1.5	1,140	1,198	1,679	1.4
CORDELE	245	284	328	7	0	1.2	689	699	709	0	1.0	33	33	33	1.0	967	1,016	1,077	1.1
COWETA	405	512	716	3	2	1.4	172	180	181	0	1.0	200	200	201	1.0	777	892	1,103	1.2
DOUGHERTY	413	437	695	1	0	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	413	437	696	1.6
DUBLIN	227	303	389	6	0	1.3	1	1	1.	0	1.0	0	0	0	0	228	304	396	1.3
EASTERN	1,338	1,453	1,515	1	0	1.0	258	260	261	0	1.0	66	66	69	1.0	1,662	10,779	1,846	1.0
FLINT	228	291	424	1	3	].5	189	200	230	9	: 1.2	27	27	36	1.3	444	518	703	1.4
GRIFFIN	379	430	569	5	0	1.3	456	466	540	17	1.2	282	282	433	1.5	1,117	1,178	1,564	1.3
GWINNSTT	328	389	557	1	0	4.	1	1	ĺ	0	1.0	1	1	1	1.0	330	391	560	1.4
HOUSTON	228	270	437	0	0	1.6	1	1	1	0	1.0	0	0	0	à	229	271	438	1.6

- 4

- <del></del>		<u></u>	FELC	)NY	<u></u>			MISD	EMEANOR				TRAFF	IC		τ	OTAL CR	IMINAL	
	DOCKET			COUNTS		RATIO COUNTS/	DOCKET		CO	JNTS	RATIO	DOCKET		TRAFET	RATIO	DOCKET			RATIO
CIRCUIT	ENTRIES	DEFEND	FELONY	MISD.	TRAFFIC	DEFEND.	ENTRIES	DEFEND.	MISD.	TRAFFIC	DEFEND	ENTRIES	DEFEND	COUNTS	DEFEND	ENTRIES	DEFEND	COUNTS	COULTS!
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	683	719	790	1	0	1.1	1,138	1,141	1,165	0	1.0	298	298	301	1.0	2,119	2,158		1.0
MACON	891	1,032	1,284	14	1	1.3	287	290	300	0	1.0	17	17	18	1.1	1,195	1,339	1,617	1.2
MIDDLE	310	375	449	0	0	1.2	3	3	3	0	1.0	1	1	1.2	1.0	314	379	453	1.2
MOUNTAIN	158	199	245	1	2	1.2	174	193	226	6	1.2	66	67	100	1.5	398	459	580	1.3
NORTHEASTERN	465	559	653	0	0	1.2	315	320	328	0	1.0	419	419	419	1.0	1,199	1,298	1,400	1.1
NORTHERN	265	336	425	0	0	1.3	302	318	376	5	1.2	73	74	124	].7	640	728	930	1.3
OCMULGEE	610	732	828	1	1	1.1	756	789	797	0	1.0	177	177	183	1.0	1,543	1,698	1,810	1.1
OCONEE	361	398	458	2	0	1.2	456	464	573	4	1.2	299	299	381	1.3	1,116	1,161	1,418	1.2
OGEECHSE	246	285	307	5	8	1.1	38	44	46	1	1.1	5	5	7	1.4	289	334	374	1.1
PATAULA	283	293	305	0	0	1.0	381	381	385	2	1.0	24	24	24	1.0	683	698	716	1.0
PIEDMONT	179	234	256	2	0	1.1	202	202	209	0	1.0	378	378	398	1.1	759	814	865	1.1
ROME	379	385	628	19	0	1.7	1,618	1,618	1,968	1	1.2	93	94	144	1.5	2,090	2,097	2,760	1.3
SOUTH GEORGIA	597	603	619	0	0	1.0	268	268	270	0	1.0	9	9	9	1.0	874	880	898	1.0
SOUTHERN	801	836	1,419	40	2	1.7	338	339	375	0	1.1	4	4	4	1.0	1,143	1,179	1,840	1.6
SOUTHWESTERN	172	221	258	1	1	1.2	55	61	65	0	1.1	11	11	11	1.0 ·	238	293	336	1.1
STONE MOUNTAIN	1,979	2,413	3,389	36	0	1.4	102	102	118	0	1.2	13	14	26	1.9	2,094	2,529	3,569	1.4
TALLAPOOSA	560	694 =	999	48	16	1.5	889	926	1,105	36	1.2	548	564	769	1.4	1,997	2,184	2,973	1.4
TIFTON	299	358	<sup>1</sup> 439	3	0	1.2	152	157	157	0	1.0	21	21	22	1.0	472	536	621	1.2
TOOMBS	276	298	370	5	4	1.3	749	769	795	7	1.0	1,596	1,597	1,761	1.1	2,621	2,664	2.942	1.1
WAYCROSS	447	,539	783	5	0	1.5	340	359	414	0	1.2	412	412	422	1.0	1,199	1,310	1,624	1.2
WESTERN	397	424	627	1	2	1.5	11	11	11	0	1.0	2	2	5	2.5	410	437	646	1.5

EXHIBIT II : SUPERIOR COURT CRIMINAL FILINGS: FY1978

 $\overline{B}$ 

- 60 -(5)

63

ŋ,



#### EXHIBIT II ANALYSIS

In this exhibit the three elements of the criminal caseload are displayed as total figures for each circuit. Since the presented data does not account for the number of superior court judges in each circuit, it should not be used for comparison among circuits. The relevant indicator here is the ratio of counts to defendants, which can be used to better understand the criminal caseload in any one circuit.

The ratio of counts to defendants contributes to our information on criminal workload to the extent that the ratio significantly exceeds one. There are seven circuits in which the ratio of total criminal counts to total criminal defendants is 1.5 or more. The same seven circuits along with six others, have a felony count to felony defendant ratio greater than or equal to 1.5. It also appears that the metropolitan circuits are more likely to have high count/defendant ratios. Six of the eight single-county circuits record 1.5 or more felony counts for each felony defendant. By viewing the data in this manner, it can be seen that the criminal workload in some circuits could be underrepresented if only docket numbers or defendants were considered for analysis.

When caseload per judge figures are calculated for total criminal counts, two circuits have extremely high values in the distribution. With the mean number of total criminal counts per judge as 771, two circuits exceed this mean by more than two standard deviations. They are:

> CHEROKEE TOOMBS

٢

When felony counts per judge are calculated to determine which circuits have a more demanding workload in terms of time required to process their respective cases, the picture alters. Five circuits show a felony (count) caseload higher than one standard deviation above the mean of 357:

Ì

ATLANTA CHEROKEE CLAYTON COBB EASTERN

a

ġ,

28. 28.

e

1. 60 50

Q

بالمن ميكان بالمن ميكان S

 $\mu_{\rm ext} \approx \frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\bigcirc$ 

### EXHIBIT III

# Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Felony and Domestic Relations Filings per Judge: FY1978

The FY1978 circuit caseload per judge by case type is again presented in Exhibit III (see Exhibit I for previous presentation). The circuits in Exhibit III are ranked on the basis of total felony plus domestic relations filings per judge (i.e., the circuit with the highest felony plus domestic relations caseload per judge is ranked number one, while the circuit with the lowest felony plus domestic relations caseload per judge is ranked number forty-two). The data elements, or docket entries, are the same as those in Exhibit I, and the numbers indicate the absolute caseload divided by the number of judges in each circuit.

The format of Exhibit III is designed so the reader can focus on the felony plus domestic relations caseload of each circuit. This format was selected for several reasons. First, felony and domestic relations cases are considered two of the most time-consuming case types in terms of judge time required for disposition. Second, the felony plus domestic relations caseload includes most cases within the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior court. Finally, the caseload in the remaining case types (i.e., misdemeanor, traffic, general civil, independent motions and juvenile) represent caseload that could be shared by a supporting court.

Æ.

There is one general qualification regarding the interpretation of the data in Exhibit III. This is that felony cases and domestic

relation cases do not comprise the entire exclusive jurisdiction of the superior courts; many of the cases that are counted as general civil cases also fall under the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior court. Such cases include those respecting title to land, complaints in equity and appeals from lower courts. Therefore, it should be noted that the sub-totals for the felony plus domestic relations caseloads do not include all cases under the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior courts. These figures do, however, offer the best estimate of the proportion of the superior court's exclusive jurisdiction caseload.

The data in Exhibit III provides a valuable insight into two very important aspects of the consideration of an additional superior court judgeship. Circuits that rank high in felony and domestic relations cases per judge have a heavy caseload in very time-consuming categories that cannot be shared by supporting courts. Therefore, creation of a state court in such a circuit would not help alleviate the heavy volume in the felony and domestic relations categories. Conversely, if most of the caseload volume falls in the other case types, the expanded use of supporting courts may be considered as an alternative to an additional superior court judgeship.



CIRCUIT	FELONY	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	SUBTOTAL	% OF TOTAL	GENERAL CIVIL	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	T MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	JUVENILE*	SUBTOTAL	% OF TOTAL
CORDELE	245	451	696 .	33.1	_407_	189	689	33	90	1,408	66.9
LOOKOUT MTN.	228	466	694	43	287	152	379	99	0	917	57
OCMULGEE	305	363	668	34.3	444	271	378	88	98	1,279	65.7
ATLANTIC	224	440	664	51.3	390	104	26	6	106	632	48.7
DUBLIN	227	422	649	46	484	236	1	0	. 41	762	54
GRIFFIN	190	459	649	43.3	300	181	228	141	0	850	56.7
GWINNETT	109	532	641	66.5	151	171	0.3	0.3	0	323	33.5
SOUTHWESTERN	172	458	630	41.3	515	236	55	11	80	897	58.7
MIDDLE	155	472	627	57.2	270	162	2	0.5	36	470	42.8
ROME	190	419	609	26.1	450	418	809	46	0	1,723	73.9
TALLAPOOSA	187	400	587	30.8	592	225	296	183	24	1,320	69.2
SOUTH GEORGIA	298	2.78	576	49.4	250	130	134	4	72	590	50.6
WESTERN	198	360	558	57.9	256	132	6	1	12	407	42.1
ALCOVY	263	293	556	42.8	282	134	265	62	0	743	57.2
PIEDMONT	179	364	· 543	29.3	435	294	202	378	0	1,309	70.7
PATAULA	283	247	530	34	408	181	381	24	36	1,030	66
ALAPAHA	231	224	455	20.7	230	80	722	634	78	1,744	79.3
OGEECHEE	123	325	448	43.3	358	104	19	. 2	102	585	56.7
NORTHERN	132	296	428	36.4	_341	182	151	36	39	749	63.6
FLINT	114	300	414	-37.3	424	<u> </u>	94	14	21	697	62.7
OCONEE	180	<b>2</b> 28	408	28.7	ຸ 330	170	228	150	136	1,014 ;	71.3
CIRCUIT MEAN *WHE版主THE SUPE	235.1	526.4	761.4	47.3	355	194.8	197.5	171.8	45.7	, 964.9	52.3

EXHIBIT III: SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1978 FELONY AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS FILINGS PER JUDGE

11:

EXHIBIT III: SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1978 FELONY AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS FILINGS PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT	FELONY	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	SUBTOTAL	% OF TOTAL	GENERAL CIVIL	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	HI SDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	JUVENILE*	SUBTOTAL	多 OF TOTAL
COBB	425	983	1,408	77.4	297	112	2	0	0	¢11	22.6
EASTERN	446	800	1,246	67.1	273	230	86	22	0	.611	32.9
HOUSTON	228	865	1,093	65.3	301	280	1	0	0	582	34.7
SOUTHERN	267	801	1,068	64.9	278	182	113	1	2	576	35.1
STONE MTN.	283	782	1,065	63.5	375	222	15	2	. 0	614	36.5
CHATTAHOOCHEE	275	749_	1,024	62	270	164	99	89	8	630	38
CLAYTON	210 *.	799	1,009	75.3	226	79	23	3	0	331	24.7
AUGUSTA	186	<u>~ 795 -</u>	981	64.1	269	144	125	2	10	550	35.9
CONASAUGA	234	731	965	44.6	524	282	244	91	58	1.199	55.4
MACON	297	659	956	61.4	282	201	96	6	16	601	38.6
COWETA	202	742	944	48.1	491	333	86	100	11	1,021	51.9
ATLANTA	409	499	908	65.6	372	103	3	0	0	478	. 34.4
BRUNSWICK	170	736.	906	57.4	368	169	. 134	1	0	672	42.6
TIFTON	299	602	901	45.7	511	352	152	21	34	1,070	54.3
MOUNTAIN	158	694	852	39.9	526	280	174	66	235	1,281	60.1
WAYCROSS	224	598	822	45.3	394	190	170	206	34	994	54.7
CHEROKEE	384	416.*	800 -	18.5	432	298	479	2,319	0	3,528	81.5
DOUGHERTY	206	592	798	<u>68,4</u>	201	168	0	0	0	369	31.6
BLUE RIDGE	-228	522	7.50	38.6	217	86	323	<sup>en</sup> 568	0	1,194	61.4
NORTHEASTERN	232	497	729	41.6	368	230	158	210	61	1,027	58.4
TOOMBS	276	• 447	723	. 17.8	333	180	749	1,596	478	3,336	82.2

\*WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.



#### EXHIBIT III ANALYSIS

In reviewing the subtotals of felony and domestic relations filings per judge, it is clear that the following circuits have higher than average filings in the demanding case categories:

> COBB EASTERN HOUSTON SOUTHERN STONE MOUNTAIN CHATTAHOOCHEE CLAYTON

The general civil category also includes cases that can be very time-consuming as well as cases that may be part of the superior courts' exclusive jurisdiction. If felony, domestic relations, and general civil filings per judge are added together to establish the number of filings per judge in the most demanding categories, the mean for all circuits is 1,116. Circuits which exceed this mean by more than one standard deviation are:

> COBB EASTERN HOUSTON STONE MOUNTAIN CONASAUGA COWETA TIFTON MOUNTAIN

Just as Exhibit I focused on volume without regard to difficulty, Exhibit III highlights circuits with the most cases in the demanding categories without considering the problem of sheer volume. By comparing the above mentioned circuits with those circuits in Exhibit I which had excessive filings, it can be seen which ones have both a demanding and high volume caseload.

Ŵ.

#### EXHIBIT IV

## Average and Observed Rate of Change in Superior Court Filings per Judge: CY1971-FY1978 and FY1977-FY1978

Exhibt IV presents the average rate of change in filings per judge between calendar year 1971 and fiscal year 1978, and the rate of change between fiscal year 1977 and fiscal year 1978. The average rate of change between 1971 and 1978 represents the estimated annual average rate of change in filings per judge between 1971 and 1978. The rate of change between 1977 and 1978 is simply the percent of increase or decrease in case filings as compared to the previous year. The numerical change in caseload per judge is also included in Exhibit IV. The numerical change between 1977 and 1978 is simply the observed difference. The numerical change between 1971 and 1978 is the average annual increase or decrease in caseload for each year between 1971 and 1978.

The unit of the criminal case used in this exhibit is the number of defendants listed on separate charging documents (i.e., indictments or accusations). It should be noted that this is a change from the criminal unit used in Exhibit I which reports the number of indictments or accusations filed.

The number of defendants was selected as the criminal unit for this exhibit because it is the only criminal unit for which data has been gathered for each year. Also, it should be noted that the case type "Independent Motions" is not included in the civil filings on this exhibit. "Independent motions" is a new case type defined for the fiscal

74

9)

year 1977 data collection effort, and therefore no historical data exists for comparison in this category.

There are several interpretative qualifications that should be noted in this exhibit. The rate of change was calculated on the basis of the caseload per judge in each circuit for CY1971, FY1977 and FY1978. The calculations reflect the changes in the number of judges in each circuit over the eight years. Therefore, if Circuit A had one judge in 1971 and two judges in 1978, the filings per judge in 1971 would equal the total caseload divided by one, while the 1978 figures would equal the 1978 caseload divided by two. Consequently, any abrupt decrease in the rates of change as reported in Exhibit IV may not be attributable to a decrease in filings, but may be the result of an increase in the number of judges.

Abrupt changes in caseload per judge may also reflect changes in the distribution of supporting courts. If a state or juvenile court has been created or abolished in the circuit (thereby either subtracting from or adding to the superior court caseload), there would be an abrupt change in the misdemeanor, traffic, general civil, or juvenile figures in Exhibit IV.

Note that appropriate notation has been made in Exhibit IV to identify circuits that have received an additional superior court judge between 1972 and 1978, as well as those in which a state court has been created or abolished during this time period.

Finally, the reader should note not only the percentage change, but also the numerical change in the caseload per judge in each circuit.







When the numerical change is a small number and the initial caseload is low, the percentage change may serve to exaggerate the actual variation in caseload per judge. For example, if there were two misdemeanors filed in Circuit A during 1977 and four misdemeanor cases filed in 1978, the appropriate figure in Exhibit IV would indicate a 100 percent increase in misdemeanor cases per judge. The reader should look for both high percentage changes and high absolute changes.

 $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ 

40

-

76

Ø

Si,

ö

The format for Exhibit IV is designed to locate increases in circuit caseload per judge for the purposes of this year's judgeship study. Therefore, any abrupt decreases in caseload can be functionally disregarded. Any abrupt increases in the number and percentage of caseload per judge should be noted and compared to the actual caseload reported in Exhibit I. The reader should particularly note circuits whose current caseload is high and whose trends indicate that the caseload is increasing. Finally, the data in the exhibit controls for additional judgeships that have been created in the past by dividing by the actual number of judges in each circuit each year.



					<b>1</b>	CRIMI FILIN							CIV FILI	NGS			FILI	
		TAL INGS	FEI	LONY	MISDE	MEANOR	TRAF	FIC	TOT CR1M			ERAL VIL	DOME: RELA		TO CI\		TOT. JUVE	
CIRCUIT	#	06	#	<i>%</i>	#	0%	#	<b>%</b>	#	%	#	%	#	8	#	20	#	U/O
ALAPAHA *	.38	1.9	-0.6	-0.2	51	10	12	2	62	4.6	-26	-8.1	-3	-1.4	-30	-75.2	5	9.6
005. CHANGE 1977-1978	301	16.5	34 .	17.3	70	10.6	148	30.5	251	18.7	52	29.2	22	10.9	74	19.5	76	3,800
ALCOVY *	-58	-4.2	15	7.5	-1	-0.5	-1	-1.7	12	2.3	-66	-12.9	-5	-1.7	/ -71	-8.5	0	0
005. CHANGE 1977-1978	-1,403	-54.5	-204	-43.3	-315	54.2	-61	-49.6	-581	-49.4	-210	-42.7	-267	-47.7	-476	-45.2	0	0
ATLANTA * AVG. CHANCE 1971-1978	-24	1.7	-2	-0.5	-8	-32.4	0	-	-11	-2.1	- 4	-1	-9	-1.7	-13	1.4	0	0
OBS. CHANCE 1977-1978	73	5.7	-3	-0.6	-2	-33.3	0	0	-5	-1	68	22.4	-10	-2	57	7	° 0	0
ATLANTIC	71	7.8	17	9.7	-6	-11.4		17	. 12	5	13	3.7	38	14	50	8.2	9	
085, OWICE 1977-1978	-222	-15.4	-25	-9.3	-43	-58.9	-8	-57.1	-76	-21.3	-64	-14.1	34	8.4	-30	-3.5	7	7.1
AUGUSTA	33	2.6	-8	-3.3	11	14.4	-0.1	-5.6	3	0.9	3	1.1	26	3.7	28	3	1	0
085. OWNCE 1977-1915	140	11	2	0.9	28	28.6	0	0	• 30	9.6	9	3.5	144	22.1	153	16.8	0	0
BLUE RIDGE **	-189	-7.2	20	10.6	-96	-14.8	-123	-12.3	-198	-10.5	-30		47	15.2		2.6	-8	0
OBS. CHANGE 1977-1978	-132	-6.4	48	20.5	217	200.9	-149	-20.8	117	11	-5	-2.3	- 138	35.9	134	22.1	-148	-1.00
BRUNSWICK	-25	-1.6	6	3.6	6	4.9	-61	-53.5		-9.5	-7	-1.7	31	5.1	24	2.4	0	0
	-1,347	-48.3	-127	-39.1	30	27.3	-1,146	-99.8		-78.5	48	15	20	2.8	68	6.6	O	0
CHATTAHOOCHEE *	-1	-0.1	.7	:2.3	-8	-4.9	8	13.5	7:		-4	-1.4	-4	-0.6	-8	-0.8	0.1	
OBS. CHANCE 1977-1978	. 118	8.1	36	12	-49	-27.8	80	666.7	68	13.9	23	9.3	96	14.7	119	13.2	-4	-33.3
CHEROKEE *	-92	-2.1	25	8.1	-40	-6.1	-5,	-0.2	-19	-0.6	-52	-8.4	-20	-4.1	-73	-6.5	Ð	0
AVG. CHANGE 1971-1978 CBS. CHANGE 1977-1978	Sector and the	-25.4	-183	-30.1	-408	-45	516	28.6	-76	-253		-55.4	-323	-43.7	-860	-50.4	0	0
CLAYTON **	22	1.8	105	6.5	-3	-7.9	0	0	10	4.1	-15	5.3	26	3.8	12	1.2	<del>ر</del> ن 0	0
AVG. CHANGE 1971-1978 085. CHANGE 1977-1978	-118	-8.2	-32	-11	-3	-10	2	200	-33	-10.3	6	2.7	101	14.5	107	11.7	0	0
COBB *	<u>-118</u> -4 <sup>2</sup>	-0.2	25	6.8	-8	<u>-10</u> -37.9	0	200	17	4.2	1	0.3	-22	-2.1	-21	-1.6	0	0
AVG. OWIGE 1971-1978 085. OWIGE 1977-1978	-551	-23.9	-11	-2.3	2		0	0 💉	9	-1.9		-15.4	-251	-20.3		-19.2	0	0

						CRIMIN	VAL GS						CIVI FILIN				JUVEN FILIN	NILE***
	TOT FILI	TAL INGS	FEI	LONY	MISDE	MEANOR	TRAF	FIC	TOT/ CRIM		GENE CIV		DOMES RELAT		TOT CIV	AL /IL	TOTA JUVEN	
CIRCUIT	#	8	#	%	#	8	#	%	#	8	#	20	#	0%	#	90 00	#	8
CONASAUGA*	-268	-9.3	10	4.7	- 51	-11.8	-140	-29.4	-181	-15	-100	-11.4	9	1.2	-92	-5.7	5	14.1
005, CHARE 1977-1978	1'54	8.8	123	94.6	-34	-11.9	-25	-21	64	12	114	27.8	251	52.3	364	40.9	23	93.3
CORDELE	2123	8.5	25	14.4	61	14.6	-5	-9.2	82	12.5	4	1	27	8.1	31	4.3	10	24
085, OWKE 1977-1978	173	9.7	-108	-27.6	243	53.3	17	106.3	152	17.6	26	6,8	62	15.9	88	11.4	42_	87.5
COWETA *	-158	-6.9	-32	-8.5	-13	-9.4	-16	-10.1	-60	-9.1	-56	-8	-43	-4.7	-98	- 6.1	0.6	J6.7
085. O WICE 1977-1970	-234	-12.2	-48	-15.8	-91	-50.3	22	28.2	-117	-20.8	43	9.6	38	5.4	82	7,1	5	83.3
DOUGHERTY */**	-173	-10.6	2	0.7	-28		-77	1	+103	-18.8	-34	-10.5	-36	-4.9	-69	-6.6	0.	0.
085, OWICE 1977-1978	-323	-24.2	-80	-26.8	-6	-100	0	0	-86	-28.3	61,	-23.3	-10	-1.7	-71	-8.2	0	0
DUBLIN	20	1.7	23	11.6	-3	-30.3	0	-	20	9.1	-22	-3.9	18	5.2	-4	-0.5	4	19.2
005. OHACE 1977-1978	-110	-8.1	48	18.9	-6	-75	0	0	· 42	16	75	18.3	-46	-9.8	29	3.3	2	5.1
EASTERN ANG. OWNCE 1971-1978	50	3.4	30	8.6	-3	-3.2	3	-	30	6.5	7	2.8	12	1.7	19	1.9	0	0
ODS. OWICE 1977-1978	-482	-22.4	-79	-14	-81	-48.2	22		-138	-18.9	-30	-9.9	-190	-19.2	-220	-17	0	0
FLINT *	-202	-11.8	-22	-9.8	-75	-23.1	-17	-27.7	-115	-18.2	-67	-10.1	-23	-5.9	-90	-8.6	3	0
045. CHUNCE 1977-1978	-29	-2.8	17	13.2	-18	-15.3	-1	-6.7	3	-1.1	32	8.2	50	20	82	12.8	9	75
GRIFFIN *	-86	-5.1	-7	-2.9	-4	-1.6	-17	-8.2	-27	-3.9	-40	-9	-18	-3.5	-59	-6	0	0
065. DWWCE 1977-1978	0	0	47	28	71	43.8	-2	-1.4	116	24.5	12	4.2	9	2	21	2.8	0	0
GWINNETT *	-71	-6.6	-33	-13.5	-18	-49.9	0.7	-33.1	-51	-17.2	-12	-5.9	-8	-1.4	-19	-2.5	0	0
085, OttAGE 1977-1978	<u>~-123</u>	-13.1	-15	-10.4	-5	-83.3	-0.7	-70	-21	-13.9	-8	-5	75	16.4	67	10.9	0	0
HOUSTON	39	3.1	14	6.6	-5	-39.8	0	ł	9	3,9	-23	-5.9	53	8.4	30	2.9	0	0
085. CHANCE 1977-1978	~99	-6.4	-113	-29.5	1	-	0	0	-112	-29.2	-108	-26.4	206	31.3	98	9.2	_0	0
LOOKOUT MTN * . ***	60	4.9	19	12.5	36	16.8	10	19.2	65	15,5	-13	-4	8	1.8	-6	-0.7	0	0
Cas. 044468 1577-1978	-898	-37.9	-48	-16.7	-220	-36.7	13	15.1	-255	-26.2	-160	-35.8	-258	-35.6	-418	-35.7	0	0

. C.F.

9. S

Ê

						CRIMI FîLIN	NAL. GS		••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				CIVI FILIN	IGS			FILIN	
		TAL INGS	FEL	ONY	MISDE	MEANOR	TRAF	FIC	TOT CRIM			ERAL VIL	DOMES RELAT		TOT CIV	1.127		
CIRCUIT	#	%	#	%	#	26	#	%	#	%	#	8	#	%	#	%	#	%
MACON	-23	-115	-52	-9.8	-3	-2.9	-1	-13.]	-54	-8.1	8	3.1	22	3.9	30	3.7;	1	6.9
085, CHANGE 1977-1978	-350	-19.7	-139	-28.9	24	32	-1	-14.3	-97	-17.2	35	14.2	92	16.2	127	15.6	-3	-15.8
MIDDLE*	-66	-5.4	-19	-7.3	-1	-20.5	0.1	***	-20	-7.6	-43	-10.1	-1	-0.2	-44	-4.8	-2	-4.9
005. CHANCE 1977-1978	6 205	26.9	-30	-13.8	-9	-81.8	0.5	-	-39	-17	40	17.4	234	98.3	274	58.5	⊊ <b>−</b> 2,	-5.3
MOUNTAIN AN. CHASE 1971-1978	-,39	-1.9	-10	-4.2	-77	-17.4	-12	-10.7	-98	-12.3	-1,2	-2.1	50	10.7	39	3.6	21	15.1
Cas. Crase 1977-1978	.55,	3.	64	47.8	-2	-1	-40	-36.4	22	5	32	6.5	102	17.2	134	12.3	132	128.2
NORTHEASTERN	47	3.4	13	5.5	-23	-9.5	-0.3	-0.1		-1.6	15	4.9	37	11.2	52	8.1	6	19
085, OWNCE 1977-1978	-25	-1.6	-6	-2.1	6	3.9	6	2.9	5	0.8	10	2.8	46	10.2	55	6.8	35	134.6
NORTHERN *	-32	-2.7.	3	2.1	9	-4.6	-11	-15.2	-17	-4	-19	-4.6	7	2.6	-12	-1.7		-5.5
065. OWNEE 1977-1978	-114	-9.9	34	25.4	34	27.2	-21	-36.2	. 47	14.8	-40	-10.5	-5	-1.7	-44	-6.5	-9	-18.8
OCMULGEE	-119	-5.4	9	2.8	-87	-12.5	-50	-20.4	-128	-9.8	-13	-2.6	18	6.2	5	0.7	3	3.7
Cas. CHINCE 1977-1978	-102	-5.5	-52	-12.4	55	16.2	-26	-22.8	-23	-2.6	54	13.8	-1	-0.3	54	7.2	-2	-2
OCONEE *	-115	-6.8	2	1.2	-45		-46	-15.2	-89	9.9	-19	-4.6	-10	-3.7	-28	-4.3	2	1.6
065, CHANCE 1977-1978	-26	-2	8	4.2	-21	-8.3	-18	-10.7	-32	-5.2	38	13	16	7.5	54	10.7	41	43.2
OGEECHEE *·	463	-5.3	-6	-3.7	-6	-13.6	0.1	10.4	-11	-5.4	-46	-8.7	-1	-0.4	-47	-5.5	-4	-3.7
AVG. CHANCE 1971-1978 085, CHANCE 1977-1978	-1,106	-53.7	-237	-62.5	-58		-9.,	-81.8	-303	-64.5	-228	-38.9	-321	-49.7		-44.6	-127	-55.5
PATAULA	48	4	23		16	5.2	-;2	-5.2	37	6.9	4	0.9	5	2.3	9	1.4	2	8
AVG, CHANGE 1971-1978 OBS. CHANGE 1977-1978	-715	-34	-115	-28.2	46	13.7	-441	-94.8	- 149	-42.2	-1	-0.2	5	2.1	4	0.6	-9	-20
PIEDMONT	-55	-3	11	6	-51	-13.5	-32	6.5	-72	-6.7	-3	-0.7	20	7	17	2.3		0
AVG. CHANGE 1971-1978	-192	-10.6		10.9		3.1	134	54.9	$\mathcal{X}^{(1)}$	25	-56	-11.4	-122	-25.1	-178	-18.2	0	
ROME */**			-5	-2.2	6 115	<u> </u>	4.	13	103	22.7	14	3.7	-18	-3.6	-3	-0.4	_0	ø
AVG. CHANCE 1971-1978 OBS. CHANCE 1977-1978	<u>111</u>	- <u>17,7</u>	- <u>-</u> 5 75	64.1	21	2.7	<u>4</u> . -26			7	-20	-4.3	-21	-4.8	-40	-4.4	0	0

						CRIMIN	VAL GS						CIVI FILIN	NGS		· · · · · ·	FILIN	
		TAL INGS	FEI	LONY	MISDE	MEANOR	TRAF	FIC	TOTA CRIMI			ERAL VIL	DOMES RELAT		TOT		TOTA JUVEN	
CIRCUIT	#	20	#	<i>0</i> %	#	<i>%</i>	#	<u>%</u>	Ħ	00	#	20	#	8	#	%	#	<u>%</u>
SOUTH GEORGIA *	-68	-5.2	0	0	-13	-7	-6	-29	-18	-3.6	-48	-11.5	-2	-0.6	-50	-7	-0.3	-0.4
a a de la companya de	-1,314	-55.8	-262	-46.5	-70	-34.3	-123	-96.9	-455	-50.8	-307	-55.1	-273	-49.5	-580	-52.3	-101	-58.4
SOUTHERN * AVG. CHANGE 1971-1978	14		-9	-2.9	2	2.4	-0.1	-9.4	-7	-1.6	-19	-5.4	39	6.1	20	2	0.3	· -
085. DWNCE 1977-1978	-125	-7.8	-86	-23.6	57	101.8	0	0	-29	-6.9	-41	-12.9	89 `	12.5	48	4.7	-2	-50
SOUTHWESTERN AVG. OWNER 1971-1978	38	3.2	-3	-1.2	-6	-7.2	0.6	6.7	8	-2.6	19	4.2	24 .	6.9	43	5.4	3	5
085. CHAGE 1977-1978	-1)80	-11.8	-10	-4.3	-4	-6.1	10	1,000	-4	-1.3	14	2.8	-30_	-6.1	-16	-1.6	53	196.3
STONE MTN. * AVG. OWIGE 1971-1978	11	0.7	1	1.4	1	12.3	0	0	6	1.7	5	1.3	0.2	0	5	0.4	0	0
055, CHANCE 1977-1978	37	2.5	8	2.4	4	28.6	1	100	13	3.7	45	13.6	63	8.8	108	10.3	0	0
TALLAPOOSA *	-12	-0.7	10	5.6	-13	-3.7	2	1	-1	-0.1	-18	-2.8	8	2.2	-11	-1	-0.6	-2.2
065. CHARGE 1977-1973	-46	-2.6	4	1.8	8 8	2.7	36	23.5	. 49	7.2	11	1.9	37	10.2	48	5.1	8	50
TIFTON AVG. OWNCE 1971-1978	57	4	10	3	5	3.8	0.4	2.2	15	3.2	2	0.5	38	8.8	41	4.3	1	4.5
OBS. DHAGE 1977-1576	-171	-9.2	-79	-18.1	-26	-14.2	2	10.5	-=103	-16.1	48	10.4	70	13.2	118	11.9	5	17.2
TOOMBS AVG. OHINGE 1971-1978	191	6.1	23	12.1	-2	-0.3	70	5.3	91	4	-5	-1.5	39	14.5	34	5.3	66	59.8
085. CHANCE 1977-1978	1.,491	61.3	100	50.5	42	5.8	1,174	277.5	1,316	97.6	23	7.4	-124	-21.7	-101	-11.5	390	443.2
WAYCROSS*	-34	-1.9	1	0.4	1 -9	-4	16	12.4	9	1.5	-24	-4.9	-19	-2.9	-43	-3.7	-0.1	-0.4
085. CHANGE 1977-1978	156	10.2	42	18.6	5 11	6.5	40	24.1	93	16.5	90	29.6	90	17.7	180	22.2	0	0
WESTERN *	-101	-8.3	5	2.7	71 -22	-37.6	-1	-29	-19	-6.5	70	-14.2	-13	-3.3	-84	-9.1	1	21.9
085. CHANGE 1977-1574	-43	-4.8	31	17.1	-8			-50	21	10.7	-14	-5.2	87	31.9	73	13.4	12	0
STATEWIDE	-23	-1.4		0.3	3 -9	-4.7	·:-9	-5.4	-17	-2.6	-14	-3.4	6	1.1	-8	-0.8	2	7.1
AVG. CHANGE 1971-1978 085. CHANGE 1977-1978	-135	-8.2	-19	-6	-4	-2.5	10	8.6	-13	-2.2	-1	-0.3	10	1.8	8	0.9	5	20.8

\*CIRCUITS WHERE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIP HAS BEEN ADDED BETWEEN 1972 AND 1978.

\*\*CIRCUITS THAT HAVE EITHER ABOLISHED OR CREATED A STATE COURT.

\*\*\*WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.



#### EXHIBIT IV ANALYSIS

One way to view the data presented in Exhibit IV is to compare the statewide average changes found on the last line of the last page of this exhibit with any of the individual circuit average changes. These averages show that the creation of additional judgeships over the past several years has actually reduced the average number of filings per judge despite generally increasing caseloads. The two exceptions are domestic relations and juvenile filings, which have risen consistently since 1971 at a rate faster than additional judgeships were created.

While the number of total filings per judge has decreased steadily since 1971 and more rapidly between 1977 and 1978, the caseload in one circuit has steadily risen. The circuit that has shown an increase of more than one standard deviation above the mean average and observed increases is:

#### TOOMBS

Using the same criteria to isolate any circuits whose number of felony filings per judge increased from 1971 to 1978 and 1977 to 1978, the one circuit that is found to be in the extreme range is:

#### TOOMBS

In domestic relations filings, several circuits have greater average increases than the statewide average per year increase since calendar year 1971. The circuits in which the average increase 1971-1978 exceeds the circuit mean increase by more than one standard deviation are:

HOUSTON MOUNTAIN BLUE RIDGE TOOMBS SOUTHERN ATLANTIC TIFTON NORTHEASTERN

The circuits with the greatest increases in domestic relations filings per judge, 1977-1978, are:

CONASAUGA MIDDLE HOUSTON AUGUSTA

There is a qualification for this exhibit that must be made in regard to any consideration of trends in general civil filings. The decrease in general civil filings, particularly in the average change figures, may be due in part to an alteration of the methodology used to gather caseload data since 1977. In 1977 the civil case type, independent motions, was first counted. It is possible that some portion of the filings counted as independent motions in 1977 and 1978 were collected as general civil cases in prior years (see Methodology, pages ). As a result of this methodological change, the 1978 data used to calculate general civil average change and observed change may be low.

In general civil filings, the only circuits that exceed the mean change 1971-1978 by more than one standard deviation are:

SOUTHWESTERN NORTHEASTERN ROME ATLANTIC MACON

82

Cart

There were no circuits that showed both average and observed changes of more than one critical value above the mean, emphasizing the apparent statewide decrease in general civil caseload.

Only two of the circuits displayed extreme increases in juvenile filings per judge from 1971 to 1978 and 1977 to 1978. They are:

#### TOOMBS MOUNTAIN

These abrupt increases should be qualified since a more extensive effort in locating juvenile filings was made in the fiscal year 1978 data collection, and therefore, could have the inflated statewide and each circuit's average change and especially the observed change.

An increasing caseload is not necessarily an excessive caseload. If there are significant increases in both absolute and percentage terms, the caseload may still be relatively low. The circuits which need attention are those in which the caseload is both high and increasing. Exhibit I should be used in conjunction with Exhibit III to identify those circuits whose caseloads are excessive and still increasing.

#### CHAPTER II SUMMARY ANALYSIS

The purpose of the four exhibits in Chapter II has been to identify circuits with excessive workload as defined by filing levels. There have been three criteria of particular concern in this regard: excessive caseload volume, excessive volume in the more demanding case types, and historical trends in caseload indicative of a stable or increasing caseload.

Exhibit I ranks the top ten circuits in total filings per judge as:

CHEROKEE	
TOOMBS	
ROME	
ALAPAHA	
CONASAUGA	
MOUNTAIN	
CORDELE	
TIFTON	
COWETA	
OSMULGES	
and the second	·····

For eight circuits, the criminal caseload becomes more outstanding when counts, instead of docket entries, are considered the filing element. Exhibit II shows these circuits are:

> ALAPAHA ATLANTA BLUE RIDGE CHEROKEE CLAYTON COBB EASTERN TOOMBS

When felony, domestic relations and general civil filings are aggregated to determine excessive caseload volume in the most demanding case types (Exhibit III), the circuits which exceed the mean of 1,116 by more than one standard deviation are: (A)

84

COBB EASTERN HOUSTON STONE MOUNTAIN CONASAUGA COWETA TIFTON MOUNTAIN

A few of the aforementioned circuits displayed trends of increasing caseload (Exhibit IV). Toombs was the only circuit that showed an average (1971-1978) and observed (1977-1978) increase in felony filings and in total filings per judge. Increases in domestic relations filings in Houston, Mountain, Toombs and Tifton circuits exceeded the circuit mean average increase by more than one critical value.

While filing information is of primary concern in the decision to recommend an additional judgeship, the information in this chapter must be viewed together with disposition data (Chapter III), assistance from supporting courts and administrative districts (Chapter V), as well as with the number of counties and the current number of judges in the circuit before firm conclusions can be reached. In addition, several additional Council policies affect the final recommendations. For example, all other things being equal, a multi-county, one-judge circuit included in the above lists would be more favorably considered for an additional judgeship than a single-county, multi-judge circuit.

85

(\_\_\_\_

6.)

47

15)



# **CHAPTER III - Caseload in the Superior**

# **Courts: FY1978 Dispositions**

EXHIBIT V	TOTAL FY1978 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND DISPOSITIONS AS PERCENT OF FILINGS PER JUDGE
EXHIBIT VI	TOTAL FY1978 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PER- CENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD
EXHIBIT VII	FY1978 CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD
EXHIBIT VIII	FY1978 CIVIL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE AND NUMBER DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

Al



#### CHAPTER III - INTRODUCTION

Chapter III presents the data accumulated on FY1978 dispositions in three different ways. In Exhibit V, "Total FY1978 Dispositions per Judge and Dispositions as Percent of Filings per Judge," the reader can observe each circuit's superior court activity in relation to the caseload with which the circuit has been challenged. Special attention should be given to the differences in dispositions as percent of filings figures among the circuits.

Exhibit VI, "Total FY1978 Dispositions per Judge and Percent Disposed by Each Method," goes one step further in breaking down the disposition data. It provides information in percentages for the actual criminal and civil caseloads on the specific methods of disposition. The implications of the exhibit with respect to judge time can be evaluated by observing the percent heard by non-jury trial and by jury trial.

Exhibit VII, "FY1978 Criminal Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Percent Disposed by Each Method," and Exhibit VIII, "FY1978 Civil Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Number Disposed by Each Method," describe dispositions in terms of actual caseload using criminal counts and civil cases disposed. In providing a detailed picture of the methods by which judges dispose of cases, the two exhibits can also be used to compare the differences in amounts of judge time used to handle similar numbers of certain case types.



#### EXHIBIT V

## Total FY1978 Dispositions per Judge and Dispositions as Percent of Filings per Judge

The total FY1978 dispositions per judge and the dispositions as a percent of the total filings per judge are presented in Exhibit V for each of the criminal, civil and juvenile filing types. The figures indicate the total number of criminal and civil docket entries and the number of juvenile cases<sup>1</sup> that were completely disposed of during FY1978 in each circuit.

Total dispositions per judge and dispositions per judge for each case type are presented as percents of total FY1978 filings in the respective case type.

There are several important qualifications required for the interpretation of the data in Exhibit V. First, the criminal and civil dispositions refer to docket entries which were completely disposed as to all parties, all counts and all claims. Criminal and civil cases which were partially closed (e.g., closed as to one defendant but pending as to the other defendants) are not included in these figures (see Exhibits VI, VII, VIII and A-II of this report for more detailed information).

Secondly, these figures include dispositions regardless of the method by which the case was terminated. Here, the emphasis is only on the total volume of dispositions per judge. Dispositions by method are presented in Exhibits VI, VII and VIII.

Y

D. O

i Juvenile case dispositions are presented in this study in terms of children processed through the system.

The purpose of presenting total dispositions in this manner is to enable the reader to appreciate the total volume of cases disposed in one year as a percentage of the cases filed. The disposition figures in Exhibit V refer to cases that were disposed of during the 1978 fiscal year. It should be noted that these cases could have been filed at any time between July 1, 1972 and June 30, 1978, not only during the past fiscal year.

đ

For purposes of comparison the dispositions per judge have been presented as a percent of the caseload per judge for each case type. In this way, the reader can compare the number of cases disposed with filings per judge to determine the demand on the court. For example, if the felony dispositions per judge equal ninety-five percent of the felony filings per judge, one could conclude that, barring any excessive accumulation of open cases, the court can adequately handle its caseload. On the other hand, if this percentage indicates a capacity of the court, one could also expect that there would be an accumulation of open cases of at least a five percent of filings each year.

To locate circuits that are in need of an additional superior court judge, attention should be paid to circuits with low disposition percentages. Low percentages in this exhibit might indicate a current and cumulative problem in processing the caseload. Essentially, however, low percentages here indicate that many more cases are filed in one year than are concluded.

The data in this exhibit must be read with several limitations in mind. First, high disposition rates alone should not be accepted as proof that there is no need for an additional judicial position. The judges may be working nights and weekends in order to keep up with their caseload and may need a judge as much as a circuit with low percentages. Secondly, the percentages in the civil categories can be misleading due to the fact that many civil cases are settled out of court and the clerk is not notified. Therefore, because the possibility of further involvement with the court still exists, many civil cases that are effectively closed remain open upon the court records. One would expect the percentages in the civil categories to be somewhat lower than those in the criminal categories without necessarily indicating a problem with processing cases in the circuit.
EXHIBIT V : TOTAL FY1978 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND DISPOSITIONS AS PERCENT OF FILINGS PER JUDGE

					D	CRIM ISPOS		5		· . · ·				CIVI SPOSI	TIONS				DISPO	NILE*
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TOT/ DISPOSI		FEL	ÓNY	MISDE	MEANO	R TRAF	FIC	TOT CRIM		GENE CIV		DOMES RELAT			ENDEN IONS			TOT JUVE	AL NILE
CIRCUIT	#	0%	#	00	#	%	#	8	#	<i>0</i> %	#	%	#	20	#	%	#	8	#	%
ALAPAHA	1,988	90.4	<u>170</u>	77.5	656	90.9	644	101.6	1,479	93.2	180	78.3	190	84.8	65	81.2	435	81.5	74	94.9
ALCOVY	1,111	85.5	203	77.2	254	95.8	61	98.4	° 518	87.8	212	75.2	263	89.8	118	88	593	83:5	0	<b>-</b> °
ATLANTA	1,538	111	428	104.6	4	133.3	0	-	432	104.8	351	94.4	587	117.6	168	1631	1,106	113.7	0.	
ATLANTIC	1,344	103.9	241	107.6	33	126.9	6	100	280	108.9	· 394	101	474	107.7	97	93.3	965	103	99	93.4
AUGUSTA	1,270	83	176	94.6	104	83,2	1	50	281	90.1	190	70.6	655	82.4	136	94.4	981	81.2	8	80
BLUE RIDGE	1,736	89.2	196	86	283	87.6	521	91.7	1,000	89.3	195	89.9	458	87.7	83	96.5		89.1	0	-
BRUNSWICK	1,357	86	134	78.8	122	91	1	100	257	84.5	276	75	699	95	125	74	1,100	86.4	0	-
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1,239	75	225	81.8	85	85,9	74	83.1	384	83.1	174	64.4	58 0	77.4	97	59.1	851	72	4	50
CHEROKEE	4,560	105.4	294	76.6	420	87.7	2,942	126.9	3,656	114.9	344	79.6	344	82.7	217	72.8	.905	80	0	-
CLAYTON	1,249	93.2	234	111.4	35	152.2	2	66.7	271	114.8	216	95.6	671	84	91	115.2	978	88.6	0	-
COBB	1,594	87.7	376	88.5	2	100	0	-	378	88.3	201	67.7	938	95.4	77	68.8	1,216	87.4	0	
CONASAUGA	2,407	.111.1	234	100	280	114.8	152	167	666	116.8	539	102.9	843	115.2	310	109.9	1,692	110.1	49	84.5
CORDELE	1,950	, 92,7	208	84.9	558	81	31	93.9	797	82.4	426	104.7	481	106.6	158	83.6	1,065	101.7	88	97.8
COWETA	1,640	83.4	206	102	76	88.4	97	97	379	97.7	390	79.4	658	88.7	203	61	1,251	79.9	10	90.9
DOUGHERTY	1,075	92	186	90.3	0	<b>I</b>	0	-	186	90.3	161	80.1	608	102.7/	120	71.4	889	92	Ő	-
DUBLIN	1,074	76.1	178	78.4	1	100	· 0	-	179	78.5	37/3	77.1	340	80.6	149	63.1	862	75.5	33	80.5
EASTERN	-1,683	90.6	446	100	90	104.6	11	50	547	98.7	21.2	77.7	771	96.4	153	66.5	1,136	87.2	0	
FLINT	879	79.1	93	81.6	97	103.2	10	71.4	200	90.1	291	68.6	252	84	120	83.3	663	76.4	16	76.2
GRIFFIN	1;219	81.3	1.76	92.6	207	90.8	117	83	500	89.6	230	76.7	370	80.6	119	65.7	719	76.5	۵	-
GWINNETT	1,027	106.5	122	111.9	1	333.3	0	-	123	111.8	154	102	553	104	197	115.2	904	105.8	0	-
HOUSTON	1,569	93.7	237	104	0	-	0	_	237	163.5	331	110	745	86.1	256	91.4	1,332	92.1	0	-

\*WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.

#### EXHIBIT V : TOTAL FY1978 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND DISPOSITIONS AS PERCENT OF FILINGS PER JUDGE

					D	CRIMI ISPOSI		3						CIVI SPOSI	TIONS				DISPO	NILE*
	TOT/ DISPOS		FELC	ONY	MISDE	MEANO	R TRAF	FIC	TOT CRIM		GENE CIV		DOMES RELAT		INDEP: MOT		TOT CIV		TOT. JUVE	
CIRCUIT	4	%	#	83	#	8	#	00	#	0%	#	0,0		93	#	8	Ħ	00	÷	25
LOOKOUT MTN.	1,529	94.9	194	85.1	411	108.4	61	61.6	666	94.3	279	97.2	455	97.6	129	84.9	863	95.4	0	-
MACON	1,687	108.4	346	116.5	106	110.4	4	66.7	456	114.6	272	96.5	773	117.3	170	84.6	1,215	106.5	16	100
MIDDLE	893	81.5	170	109.7	2	100	0	0	.172	109.6	200	74.1	386	81.8	101	62.3	687	76.1	.34	94.
MOUNTAIN	2,338	109.6*	115	72.8	162	93.1	55	83.3	332	83.4	640	121.7	774	111.5	351	125.4	1,765	117.7	241	102.
NORTHEASTERN	1,942	110.7	231	99.6	178	112.7	258	122.9	667	111.2	404	109.8	559	112.5	269	117	1,232	112.6	43	70.5
NORTHERN	1,272	107.9	106	80.3	108	71.5	46	127.8	260	81.2	441	129.3	328	110.8	206	ի13.2	975	118.9	37	94.9
OCMULGEE	1,626	83.5	255	83.6	342	90.5	75	85.2	672	87	375	84.5	325	89.5	170	62.7	870	80.7	84	85.7
OCONEE	1,235	86.8	154	85.6	224	98.2	183	122	561	100.5	298	90.3	185	81.1	75	44.1	558	76.6	116	185.3
OGEECHEE	877	84.8	110	89.4	16	84.2	1	50	127	88.2	293	81.8	296	91.1	65	62.5	654	83	96	94.1
PATAULA	1,193	76.5	235	83	293	76.9	21	87.5	549	79.8	317	77.7	199	80.6	95	52.5	611	73.1	33	91.7
PIEDMONT	1,522	82.2	202	112.8	187	92.6	340	89.9	729	96	351	80.7	291	79.9	151	51.4	793	72.6	۵	-
ROME	1,942	83.2	125	65.8	796	98.4	57	123.9	978	93.6	374	83.1	350	83.5	240	57.4	964	74.8	0	-
SOUTH GEORGIA	1,043	89.2	230	77.2	100	74.6	2	50	3 32	76	232	92.8	329	118.3	97	74.6	658	99.8	53	73.1
SOUTHERN	1,478	89.9	249	93.3	97	85.8	0	0	346	90.8	250	89.9	755	94.3	126	69.2	1,131	89.7	1	50
SOUTHWESTERN	1,456	95.4	166	96.5	59	107.3	10	90.9	235	98.7	483	93.8	472	103.1	193	81.8	1,148	95	73	91.2
STONE MTN.	1,928	114.9	272	96.1	16	106.7	1	50	289	96.7	388	103.5	1,034	132.2	217	97.7	1,639	118.9	0	-
TALLAPOOSA	1,526	80	163	87.2	352	118.9	194	106	709	1.06.5	410	69.3	269	67.2	125	55.6	804	66,1	13	54.2
TIFTON	.1,530	77.6	228	76.3	118	77.6	17	81	363	76.9	468	91.6	483	80.2	187	53.1	1,138	77.7	29	85.3
TOOMBS	3,296	81.2	237	85.9	622	83	1,181	74	2,040	77.8	282	84.7	357	79.9	142	78.9	781	81.4	475	99.4
WAYCROSS	1,702	93.8	220	98.2	178	104.7	212	102.9	610	101.7	310	78.7	561	93.8	193	101.6	1,064	90.1	28	82.4
WESTERN	1,058	109.5	159	80.3	2	33.3	1	1.00	162	79	327	127.7	364	101.1	192	145.5	883	118	.13	108.3

\*WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.



#### EXHIBIT V ANALYSIS

As expected, civil disposition rates averaged several percentage points below criminal disposition rates. The mean for each of the criminal categories except traffic is over 90% while each of the civil categories except domestic relations averages less than 90%. Total dispositions average 91.9% of total filings.

Although the total dispositions category, like the total filings category, identifies circuits with volume caseloads rather than difficult caseloads, the imposition of high disposition volumes on the judge in such circuits cannot be ignored. Circuits in which the total number of dispositions exceeds the mean by more than one standard deviation are:



A large number of dispositions, however, is not in and of itself a good indication of strain on court capacity. For instance, if the majority of the caseload is composed of certain case types less time may be consumed per case than another court in which the case type composition of the caseload is different. If the majority of the caseload can be processed by methods such as default judgment or guilty plea, less time will be consumed than if a large number of the dispositions were by trial. Thus, in either of the two preceding situations a court could process a larger volume of cases in a given amount of time. Neither does a low disposition rate necessarily signal a strain on the court because the court may not be operating at full capacity. If a circuit has <u>both</u> a high number of dispositions <u>and</u> a low disposition rate, however, it may indicate that the court is operating at full capacity and is still unable to meet the demand. Circuits in which the total number of dispositions is above the mean and the disposition rate is below 90% are the following:

 $\{ \}$ 

BLUE RIDGE COBB COWETA OCMULGEE ROME TOOMBS

Of these circuits Toombs has the highest volume of dispositions (3,296) with one of the lowest disposition rate (81.2%).

Toombs and Alapaha are the only two circuits in which total criminal dispostions per judge are greater than one standard deviation above the mean and for which the disposition rate is less than 90%.

The following table illustrates for each criminal case type the circuits in which dispositions exceed the mean by more than one standard deviation. Those circuits which also have a disposition rate of less than 90% are followed by an asterisk (\*).

FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC
ATLANTA CHEROKEE*	ALAPAHA CHEROKEE*	CHEROKEE TOOMBS*
COBB*	CORDELE*	
EASTERN MACON	LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN ROME	
	TOOMBS*	

There are four circuits for which the total civil dispositions are greater than one standard deviation above the mean. The four circuits are:

1

#### CONASAUGA HOUSTON MOUNTAIN STONE MOUNTAIN

By utilizing the same criteria, it appears that there is one circuit whose domestic relations caseload is causing some strain.

 $\mathbf{D}$ 

12

10-1-1-

#### HOUSTON

The reader should keep in mind that both the number of dispositions and the disposition rates are subject to a number of internal variables that limit the usefulness of this exhibit for identifying circuits needing additional judgeships. Case difficulty, terms of court, filing practices of the district attorney, and judges' methods of operating can all affect the disposition data.

#### EXHIBIT VI

# Total FY1978 Dispositions per Judge and Percent Disposed by Each Method

This exhibit illustrates the percentages of criminal and civil cases disposed by methods for each circuit. They were calculated on the basis of the total number of cases disposed per judge which is located in the second column. The criminal dispositions are listed first on the left side of each column and the civil dispositions are listed second, on the right side of each column.

There are two important qualifications to make on this exhibit. First, the criminal and civil dispositions have not been added together to get a circuit total. This is because the dispositions were collected on criminal "counts" and civil docket entries. The disposition of a criminal count is not strictly comparable to the disposition of a civil case. For example, a civil jury trial almost always refers to one case (i.e., docket entry) where a jury issued a verdict; but in a criminal trial, a jury could render several verdicts on multiple counts on the same indictment against the same defendant at one time.

The second qualification concerns the method of combining all criminal filing categories into the criminal dispositions and all civil categories into the civil dispositions. The criminal dispositions include those of traffic cases and the civil dispositions include those of "independent motions."

Since jury trials in each of these case types are very unusual, the percentage disposed by jury trials, which is higher for felony and general civil cases, will be reduced.

There are three general disposition categories included in this exhibit: non-adjudicated, judgment, and jury trial. To obtain these categories, some of the more specific disposition types were combined.

The civil non-adjudicated category includes all cases that were terminated by a settlement, dismissal, or administrative termination. The civil judgment category includes cases that were terminated before a judgment was entered on evidence heard and cases that were full-blown trials without a jury. The civil jury trial category includes those cases terminated by a jury verdict.

The criminal non-adjudicated disposition category includes cash bonds, dead dockets, nolle prosequi, and dismissals; the judgment dispositions include guilty pleas, "non-trial other"<sup>j</sup> dispositions and full-blown trials without a jury. The judgment column for criminal dispositions includes a special notation for the percent of counts disposed specifically by a non-jury trial. The jury trial category for criminal dispositions is the same as for civil dispositions.

j A non-trial other disposition includes criminal charges for which the defendant was found to be deceased or not guilty by reason of insanity, the defendant was extradited or the case was transferred to another court.

The value of the exhibit is to present the total dispositions of the superior court during FY1978 and to illustrate the methods of disposition. Exhibits VII and VIII detail the distribution of case dispositions by method for each of the criminal and civil filing types. After observing the detail of Exhibits VII and VIII, the reader will have an opportunity to refer to Exhibit VI and observe the total picture of the dispositions.

 $\mathbb{S}$ 

Ø

1,014

EXHIBIT VI : TOTAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIDCUIT	# DISPOSED	8		26
CIRCUIT	DISPUSED	NON-ADJUDICATED	JUDGMENT	JURY TRIAL
ALAPAHA			20 F (0 1)	
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1.491	60.8	38.5 (0.1)	0.7
CIVIL CASES	435	33.4	64	2.5
ALCOVY			(6)	
CRIMINAL COUNTS	<u> </u>	10.8	87.6 (2)	1_6
CIVIL CASES	593	30.9	67.5	1.6
ATLANTA				0
CRIMINAL COUNTS	749	18	76.3 (0.5)	5.7
CIVIL CASES	1,106 🔅	31	66,8	2.2
ATLANTIC	<u></u>			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	357	28.6	66.4 (3.8)	5
CIVIL CASES	965	37.8	60.6	1.6
AUGUSTA	<u></u>			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	426	42.2	48.1 (0.4)	9.7
CIVIL CASES	982 .	15.9	81.3	2.7
BLUE RIDGE	<u>.</u>			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	<u> </u>	11.3	84.9 (1.2)	3.8
CIVIL CASES	736	28.1 <sup>′</sup>	68.8	3.1
BRUNSWICK				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	308, /	40.7	51.3 (0.5)	8
CIVIL CASES	1,100	28.9	68.9	2.2
CHATTAHOOCHEE				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	546	32.2	63.4 (1)	4.4
CIVIL CASES	850	17.7	80.9	1.5
CHEROKEE				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	3,824	76.2	22.8 (0.4)	1
CIVIL CASES	905	17.5	79.7	2.9
CLAYTON	a stade i su		na <b>de Maria de Caractería de</b>	
CRIMINAL COUNTS	525	31.5	65.1 (4.2)	3.4
CIVIL CASES	979	30.1	67.7	2.2
COBB				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	76.9	40.1	57.9 (0.6)	2.1
CIVIL CASES	1,216	28.7	70.5	0.8
CONASAUGA	<u> </u>			<b>~ • •</b>
CRIMINAL COUNTS	924	44.2	53.5 (0.1)	2.3
CIVIL CASES	1.692	40.4	57.6	2
CORDELE	<u>18036</u>			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	901	6.9	90.1 (0.1)	3
CIVIL CASES	1.065	33.3	the second s	2.1
COWETA	15 4 (0 (0) 0)	33.3	64.6	<b></b>
CRIMINAL COUNTS	537	26.4	67 (0)	6,6
CIVIL CASES	1,251	21.5	77	1.4

\* % IN PARENTHESES ARE % OF CRIMINAL COUNTS PER JUDGE DISPOSED BY NON-JURY TRIAL. CIVIL DISPOSITIONS NOTED IN THE % JUDGMENT COLUMN INCLUDE NON-TRIAL AND NON-JURY TRIAL DISPOSITIONS SINCE DATA COLLECTED IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO MAKE AN ACCURATE DIVISION BETWEEN THESE SUBCATEGORIES. EXHIBIT VI : TOTAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

A TRACING		8	%	
CIRCUIT	DISPOSED	NON-ADJUDICATED	JUDGMENT	JURY TRIAL
DOUGHERTY				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	<u>310</u>	25.8	64.9 (0.3)	9.2
CIVIL CASES	889	28.2	70.7	1.1
DUBLIN				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	303	23.1	68.6 (2.3)	8.3
CIVIL CASES	862	30.9	67.2	2
EASTERN				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	605	20.8	72.3 (11)	6.9
CIVIL CASES	1,136	19.1	77.8	3
FLINT				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	316	29.3	58.7 (0.8)	12
CIVIL CASES	662	28.4	70	1.7
GR1FFIN				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	700	58.1	38.1 (0.4)	3.8
CIVIL CASES	719	30.4	67.1	2.5
GWINNETT				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	188	15.2	75.5 (0)	9.2
CIVIL CASES	904	32.9	64	3.1
HOUSTON				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	419	42.7	48.4 (0)	8.8
CIVIL CASES	1,332	29.4	68.7	2
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	716	69.9	27.4 (0.3)	2.7
CIVIL CASES	863	32.4	65.5	2
MACON		<u></u>	<u> </u>	
CRIMINAL COUNTS	609	38.2	56.1 (0.2)	5.7
CIVIL CASES	1,215	38.5	60.4	1.1
MIDDLE				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	256	20.9	69.7 (0)	9.4
CIVIL CASES	687	30.6	67.8	1.7
MOUNTAIN			07.0	
CRIMINAL COUNTS	• 464	25.6	64.4 (1.7)	9.9
CIVIL CASES	1,765	45.9	52.7	1.3
NORTHEASTERN	1,703	+J.J	J <u>Z.</u> 1	1.3
CRIMINAL COUNTS	790	28.5	63.9 (0.1)	7.7
CIVIL CASES			<b>`````````````````````````````````````</b>	
NORTHERN	1,232	38.5	58.2	3.3
CRIMINAL COUNTS	202	20 0		
CIVIL CASES	382	30.6	67.8 (0.8)	1.6
OCMULGEE	975	34.8	64.1	1.2
وسأح مشموليات ومستعد المستعود والمتحافظ المتحافظ أستريت والمتحافظ والمستعد المتحافظ والمستعد والمتحافظ والمستع	and the second			
CRIMINAL COUNTS . CIVIL CASES	<u>778</u> 870	<u>35.9</u> 24.1	<u>60.7 (0.3)</u> 74.4	3.4 1.6

 $\widehat{}$ 

0ª

EXHIBIT VI : TOTAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# DISPOSED	€ NON-ADJUDICATED	% JUDGMENT*	% JURY TRIAL
OCONEE				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	688	40.1	58.5 (1)	1.5
CIVIL CASES	558	34.5	64.5	]
OGEECHEE				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	175	8.6	81.1 (2)	10.3
CIVIL CASES	654	22.2	75.6	2.2
PATAULA				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	577	17.2	70.4 (1.6)	12.5
CIVIL CASES	611	28.8	71	0.2
PIEDMONT				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	855	43	52.3 (0.1)	4.7
CIVIL CASES	793 -	22.3	75.9	1.8
ROME				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1,304	50.4	46.9 (2.8)	2.7
CIVIL CASES	.964	23.9	74.4	1.7
SOUTH GEORGIA				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	344	14.7	82.7 (0)	2.6
CIVIL CASES	658	30.6	68	1.4
SOUTHERN				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	552	37.3	55.3 (0.6)	7.4
CIVIL CASES	1,131	19	80	1
SOUTHWESTERN	<u></u>			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	336	3.9	87.2 (0.6)	8.9
CIVIL CASES	1.148	35.7	61.4	2.9
STONE MOUNTAIN				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	<u>⇒∈512</u>	22.7	75.2 (1.3)	2.1
CIVIL CASES	1,639	29.9	68	2.2
TALLAPOOSA	ra <sup>in</sup> 1958			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	986	69.2	28.4 (0.1)	2.4
CIVIL CASES	804	26.8		2.2
TIFTON				
CRIMINAL COUNTS	450	26	69.6 (1.1)	4.4
CIVIL CASES	<u>1,138</u>	25.7	72.3	2
TOOMBS				
a second s	2,314	73.1	25.5 (1.2)	1.4
CIVIL CASES	781	25.2	71.7	3.1
WAYCROSS .	Real Angels			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	77/5	36.5	59.8 (1)	3.7
CIVIL CASES	1.064	39.4	59.5	1.1
WESTERN	and the second			
CRIMINAL COUNTS	282	27.3	61.6 (2.8)	<u>    11.2                               </u>
CIVIL CASES	883	40.5	55.9	3.6

Ð

#### EXHIBIT VI ANALYSIS

The most salient feature of this exhibit is the last column, percent of dispositions handled by a jury trial. It should be noted that a low percentage of dispositons by jury trial does not necessarily mean that jury trials are few in number; if the total number of dispositions is large, even a large number of jury trials will show up as a small percentage. Circuits with the largest number of criminal counts per judge disposed by jury trial are:<sup>k</sup>

#### PATAULA NORTHEASTERN BLUE RIDGE MOUNTAIN ATLANTA

Circuits with the largest number of civil cases per judge disposed by jury trial are:<sup>k</sup>

> NORTHEASTERN STONE MOUNTAIN EASTERN CONASAUGA SOUTHWESTERN

The total number of dispositions identifies circuits with large volume but not necessarily difficult caseloads. Percent disposed by jury trials identifies circuits with a greater

k Numbers of dispositions by jury trial can be calculated directly from the exhibit by dividing the percentage by 100 and multiplying by the total number disposed. portion of time-consuming dispositions without controlling for small absolute numbers. Particular attention should be paid to those circuits with both a high number of dispositions <u>and</u> a high percentage of jury trial dispositions. Circuits in which both the number of total criminal dispositions and the percent disposed by jury trial are above the mean in criminal counts are:

 $\hat{\Omega}$ 

ATLANTA AUGUSTA COWETA EASTERN FLINT HOUSTON MACON MOUNTAIN NORTHEASTERN PATAULA SOUTHERN SOUTHWESTERN WESTERN

There are seventeen circuits (40%) in which both the number of civil cases disposed and the percent disposed by jury trial are above the mean. In five of these circuits, the number and percent of civil cases disposed by jury trial exceed the circuit mean by more than one standard deviation:

> EASTERN GWINNETT NORTHEASTERN SOUTHWESTERN WESTERN

In criminal cases the data for comparison among circuits of the number of counts disposed by a non-jury trial was available. The number of non-jury trials are important since this method of

disposition requires a considerable amount of judge time and may require almost as much judge time as jury trials. The circuits with the largest number of counts disposed by non-jury trial are:

> EASTERN ROME TOOMBS CLAYTON BLUE RIDGE

Eight circuits are above the circuit mean of both the number and percent of non-jury trial dispositions:

> ALCOVY ATLANTIC CLAYTON EASTERN MOUNTAIN PATAULA ROME WESTERN

#### EXHIBIT VII

# <u>FY1978 Criminal Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and</u> Percent Disposed by Each Method

Exhibit VII provides more detailed information on criminal dispositions by presenting dispositions both by case type and method. The total number of criminal dockets, defendants and counts disposed are listed in the first two columns. The case types are listed under each circuit name, and the totals are listed on the final row for each circuit. The percentages of counts disposed by each method are listed across the top of the page and the methods are noted as: Cash Bonds, Dead Dockets, Nolle Prosequi, Dismissed, Non-trial (i.e., guilty plea), Nonjury and Jury.

There are no major qualifications required for interpreting the data for this exhibit. The total number of dockets listed in the first column indicate the number of indictments and accusations for which all defendants and counts listed on each indictment or accusation are disposed. The total number of defendants listed in the first column indicates the number of defendants which had all counts against them completely disposed. The reader will recall that criminal disposition methods refer to counts disposed and not to defendants or docket entries.

The data in Exhibit VII can be interpreted as the proportional distribution of all criminal dispositions among the major case types (felony, misdemeanor, and traffic) and the individual methods of disposition. Particular attention should be given to high percentages of jury trials in the felony case type, and the reader should keep in mind that the "non-trial" category includes all counts disposed by a guilty plea.

1

Server of

C

£2





	# OF D	I SPOSED :			% OF	COUNTS I	DISPOSED	BY:		
CIRCUIT	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS- MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY
ALAPAHA										
FELONY	179	188	189	0	0	30.2	5.3	58.5	0	5
MISDEMEANOR	656	656	658	31.4	0	15.1	5.3	47.9	0.2	0.2
TRAFFIC	644	644	·644	73.8	0	2.6	0.6	22.8	0.1	
TOTAL	1,479	1,488	1,491	45.7	0	11.6	3.4	38.4	0.1	0.7
ALCOVY		•								
FELONY	203	210	227	0	0.4	15.2	0	78.4	3.5	2.4
MISDEMEANOR	254	255	260	0.4	1	5.8	0.4	90	1.2	1.3
TRAFFIC	61	61	61	0	0	6.6	0	93.4	0	0
TOTAL	518	526	548	0.2	0.6	9.8	0.2	85.6	2	1.6
ATLANTA										
FELONY	428	498	741	0	15.2	2.8	0.1	75.6	0.5	5.8
MISDEMEANOR	4	4	8	1.2	10.8	2.4	0	85.5		0
TRAFFIC		1		0		0	0	0		0
TOTAL	432	502	749	0.01	15.1	2.8	0.1	75.7	0.5	5.7
ATENTTO										
ATLANTIC FELONY	041	0.00	205			- 10 0	<u> </u>			<u> </u>
MISDEMEANOR	241	<u>269</u> 36	<u>305</u> 46	<u> </u>	<u>6.9</u> 12	<u>    19.8  </u> 17.4	2	<u>64.3</u> 57.6	2.6	4.4
TRAFFIC	6	6	40	16.7	0	0	0	16.7	66.7	0
TOTAL	280	311	357	0.3	7.4	19.2	1.7	62.6	3.8	5
AUGUSTA	<u> </u>									
FELONY	176	201	317	0	0.7	25.3	1.1	59.9	0.2	12.8
MISDEMEANOR	104	104	108	82.2	0	1.6	2.8	11.8	0.9	0.7
TRAFFIC TOTAL	281	306	426	0	0.5	0 19.2	25	75	0.4	0 9.7
IUIAL	201		420	20.9	<u> </u>		1.0		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
BLUE RIDGE										
FELONY	196	260	384	0	0	19.9	2.1	63.7	2.5	11.8
MISDEMEANOR	283	289	320	0	0	9.1	3.8	85.3	1.1	0.8
TRAFFIC	521	521	574	0	0	2.8	0.5	96,3	0.4	0
TOTAL	1,000	1,070	1,278	0	0	9.5	1.8	83.7	1.2	3.8
DUNCLITCK										
BRUNSWICK FELONY	134	152	182	0	0.3	22.7	0.8	62.7	0.8	12.6
MISDEMEANOR	122	125	125	14.4	0.5	49.2	2	33.2	0.0	1.2
TRAFFIC	1-125	125		$\frac{14.4}{0}$	0	0	$\frac{2}{0}$	100		1 0
TOTAL	257	278	308	5.8	0.2	33.4	1.3	50.8	0.5	8
OI 18 TT 2 100 C 100										
CHATTAHOOCHEE	205	201	270	<u> </u>	3,2	20.7	0.1	68.7	0.9	6.3
FELONY MISDEMEANOR	<u>285</u> 85	<u>291</u> 96	370 101	<u>     0                               </u>	1.2	32.9	1.2	58.7	1.5	0.5
TRAFFIC	74	74	75	46.2	3.3	13	0.3	36.1	0.7	
TOTAL	. 384	461	546	7	2.8	21.9	0.4	62.4	1	0.3 4.4
CHEROKEE	<u> </u>	207		<u> </u>		00 0		<b>C</b> <i>N</i> <b>F</b>		6.7
FELONY	294 420	<u>327</u> 435	396	0 0	13.1	<u>22.9</u> 19.8	2.1	<u>54.5</u> 64	0.6	
MISDEMEANOR TRAFFIC	2,942	2,942	455 2,973	86.4		<u>-19.8</u> 	0.3	11.8	0.1	2.4
INTELL	1 4 3 × 7 4	1 m g v 7 f 👘	- 1-1 - 1	UV • T		• • •		22.4	0.4	<u> </u>

1	# OF D	ISPOSED		% OF COUNTS DISPOSED BY:									
CIRCUIT	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS- MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY			
CLAYTON		i alan karan Karan											
FELONY	234	283	458	0	6.8	22.9	0.4	61.4	4.7	3.9			
MISDEMEANOR	35	44	65	0	2:1	40	0	56.9	1	0			
TRAFFIC	2	2	2	0	0	16.7	0	83.3	0	0			
TOTAL	271	329	525	0	6.2	25	0.4	61	4.2	3.4			
СОВВ								•					
FELONY	376	423	765	0	7.8	10.2	22.1	57.2	0.6	2.1			
MISDEMEANOR	2	2	4	0	0	<u> </u>	26.7	73.3	0	0			
TRAFFIC	0	0	0.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
TOTAL	- 378	425	769	0	7.8	10.2	22.1	- 57.2	0.6	2.1			
CONASAUGA	2												
FELONY	234	256	339	0	0	28.9	3.2	63.3	0.3	4.3			
MISDEMEANOR	280	288	378	0.1	0	46,6	1.1	51.7	0	0.5			
TRAFFIC TOTAL	152	The second s	207	15.7	0	39.6	2.2	<u>40.3</u> 53.4	0.1	2.2			
	666	699	924	3.6	0	38.5	2.1	53.4	0.1	2.3			
CORDELE		in the second	11 A C 4		+	-7 7		00.7	0.0				
FELONY MISDEMEANOR	208	CTATION AND A STATE OF	294	0		7.1	1.4	<u>82.7</u> 93.6	0.3	8.5			
TRAFFIC	- <u>558</u> - 31	<u>565</u> 31	<u> </u>	1.9		<u>4.3</u> 0	0.2	93.0	0	6.5			
TOTAL	7.97		901	1.2		5.1	0.6	93.5	0.1	3			
				<u> </u>		<u> </u>	0.0	90	0.1				
COWETA	61.00		1. 1. S. 1. L										
FELONY	206	258	360	0	0	10.2	0.1	80.4	0	9.3			
MISDEMEANOR	76	80	80	18.1	0	11.9	0.6	66.9	0	2.5			
TRAFFIC	97	97 -		79	0	3.1	0	17.9	0	0			
TOTAL.	379	435	537	17	0	9.1	0.2	67	0	6.6			
DOUGHERTY													
FELONY	186	200	310.	0	1.6	11.3	12.9	64.6	0.3	9.2			
MISDEMEANOR	0	()	0	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0			
TRAFFIC	0.0	O dest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
TOTAL.	186	200	<u>310</u>	0	1.6	11.3	12.9	64.6	0.3	9.2			
DUBLIN			1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 - 1945 -										
FELONY	17/8	226	302	0	0	22.5	0.7	66.2	2.3	8.3			
MISDEMEANOR	1	า	<b>Lessen</b> ter	0	0	0	0	100	0	0			
TRAFFIC	0	0		0	0	0	Ō	0	Ō	Ō			
TOTAL	179	,227	303	0	0	22.4	0.7	66.3	2.3	8.3			
EASTERN													
FELONY	446	4.82	504	0	6.3	15	0.3	66	4.3	8.2			
MISDEMEANOR	90	90	90	0	0.4	3.3	14.4	33	48.5	0.4			
TRAFFIC				0	3	9.1	0	75.8	12.1	0			
TOTAL	547	5183	605	0	5.3	13.1	2.4	61.2		6.9			
FLINT								an shekiri. Tang tanàng					
FELONY		ENRATES	1:34	<u> </u>		10	0.0	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
MISDEMEANOR	0.7	1112	109	0	0	19	0.3	64.7	0.8	15.2			
TRAFFIC				<u>8</u> 7.7	0	34.5	1.7	46.6	0.8	8.4			
TOTAL	SSES 21 1975		316	1.1	0	23.1-	3.8	65,4	0				

: O.

EXHIBIT VII: FY1978 CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

	+ OF I	DISPOSED :			% OF	COUNTS 1	DISPOSED	BY:		
CIRCUIT	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY
GRIFFIN	· The second	<u></u>								
FELONY	176	202	268	0	0	43.1	0.7	46.6	1.1	8.4
MISDEMEANOR	- 207 .	212	254	29.3	Ō	28	7.5	33.7	0	1.6
TRAFFIC	117	117	178	58	0	3.9	8.2	29.9	0	0
TOTAL.	500	<u>531</u>	700 •	25.4	0	27.7	5.1	37.7	0.4	3.8
we the Value of the standards		24 au			a shinkar Tana a shinkar					
GWINNETT FELONY		140	107	·			<u> </u>	75 6	~	
MISDEMEANOR	_ <u>122</u>	<u>    143    </u>	187	0	0	15.1	0	75.6	0	
TRAFFIC	<u>0</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ō	0		l	0	0	0
TOTAL	<u>0</u>	144	188	0	0	15.2	0	75.5	0	9.2
	-	1 TTT 	UC STATE	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	10.6	<u> </u>	10.0	<u> </u>	<b>7.</b> C
HOUSTON			182 <u>1838</u> 2		ala ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang an					
FELONY	· 3	- <u>4</u>	<u>. 1987. – C</u> ri	0		2.5	0.2	48.4	0	8.8
MISDEMEANOR	<u> </u>	0	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRAFFIC			410.		<b>_</b>					
TOTAL	1	l <u>284</u>	419	0	0	42.5	0.2	48.4	0	8.8
LOOKOUT MT.			<u> </u>	<b>/</b> /	1					
FELONY	- <u> </u>	205	229	0	' <u> </u>	48.11	3.4	40,5	0.9	7.1
MISDEMEANOR		4		7.4	01	39.5		19.9	0.9	0.5
TRAFFIC		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	0	<u> </u>	<u>L.1</u>	19.5	U	<u>V.J</u>
TOTAL	66			24 7	0.05	42 1	3.1	2.	0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	The second secon				- <u></u>				- <u></u>	
MACON				1						
FELONY	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		485	0	6.1	30.2	0.1	57.3	0.1	6.3
MISDEMEANOR			C STARSAR AND STORE	0	4.7	41.6	0	49.7	0.6	3.4
TRAFFIC	4	4	5	0	0	21.4	$-\frac{0}{0}$	71.4	0	<u>7.1</u>
TOTAL						32.3	0.1	55.9	0.2	5.7
MIDDLE									n da an an Angla. An	
FELONY		• 03		0	0	17 4	3	70.	0	9.5
MISDEMEANOR	2		2.9		0	0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
TRAFFIC		<u> 28.655 77</u>	S. Market	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
TOTAL	345 + 3 (	205	255.	0	0	<u>17.8</u> <sup>r</sup>	3.1	69.7	0	9.4
										ی این میں دیکھیں۔ اس ایک میں ایک ایک ایک ایک اور ایک ایک ایک ایک
MOUNTAIN	- State 1977 - 1 - North and East	OR P.	101		<u> </u>	10.2		<u>65 6</u>	1 <u>, 3</u> 8	21.7
FELONY		148	184	0	0	10.3	0.5	63.6 52.8	' <u>3.8</u>	
MISDEMEANOR TRAFFIC	55	<u>175</u>	193 87	<u>30.1</u> 4.6	0 0	14.5 6.9	0.5 2.3	52.8 82.8		$\frac{2.1}{2.3}$
TOTAL	332	379		4.6	0 - 0	11.4	2.3	62.7	$=\frac{1}{1.7}$	9.9
	C REPERENCE									
NORTHEASTERN					an Alla Albana Albana ang <u>Asi</u> ri					
FELONY	231	290	348	0	1.4	22.1	0.7	60.4	0.1	
MISDEMEANOR	178	180	184	27.7	0	18.5	0.5	51 <u>9</u>		1.4
TRAFFIC	58			· 9.1		17	0			.9
TOTAL	667	728	790	9.4	0.6	17.8	0.6	<u>63.8</u> _	1	7.7
	106	130	. 172	0	2.6	14.2	- 0.6	78.8	0.3	3.5
FELONY MISDEMEANOR		1 3		12.7	01.9	28.7	1.9	54.9	0.5	
TRAFFIC	46		7		U.I • 7	20.5	4.6	61.6	3.3	0
TOTAL	260	290		5.1	- 3.1	20.5		67	0.8	1.6
	n in the second s	Sec. B. B. State Sec. Sec. Sec. Sec. Sec. Sec. Sec. Sec	and a second	- Karta						मा विकित्स सम्बद्ध जिल्ह्या के विकित्स के विकि

ς é,

÷

	r			l					<u></u>	<del></del>		
	# OF D	ISPOSED:			۶ OF	COUNTS I	DISPOSED	BY:				
CIRCUIT	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS- MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY		
OCMULGEE	1											
FELONY	255	306	341	0	0	25.6	1.6	65.2	0.4	7.2		
MISDEMEANOR	342	354	359	23.1	1.4	14.5	0.1	60.4	0.1	0.3		
TRAFFIC	75 ,"	75	78	46.2	8.3	4.5	0	39.7	0	1.3		
TOTAL	672	735	778	15.3	1.5	18.3	.0.8	60.5	0.3	3.4		
OCONEE		ц.										
FELONY	<u>154 · </u>	<u>172</u>	192	0	6.5	10.7	0	77.5	1.6	3.7		
MISDEMEANOR	224	<u>229 <sup>1/</sup></u>	283	15.5	6	13.1	2.1	61.4	0.9			
TRAFFIC	183	185	214	57.1	2.3	5.4	0.2	34.2	0.7	$\left  \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ \end{array} \right $		
TOTAL	. 100	586	689	24.1	5	10	0.9	57.4	- 1	1.5		
OGEECHEE			1									
FELONY	110	134	152	0	0	6.3	0.3	79.9	1./	11.9		
MISDEMEANOR	16	20	. 21	7	0	11.6	2.3	76.7	2.3	0		
TRAFFIC	107		2	25		0	0	50	25			
TOTAL	127 .	155	175		0	6.9	0.6	79.1	_2	10.3		
PATAULA	1											
FELONY	235	246	257	0	0	21	0	62.6	0.8	15.6		
MISDEMEANOR	293	293	299		0.	13.4	0	74.9	0.3	10.4		
TRAFFIC	21	21	21	4.8	0	4.8	0	57.1	28.6	4.8		
TOTAL	549	560	577.	0.7	0	16.5	0	68.8	1.6	12.5		
PIEDMONT												
FELONY	202	259	<u>°300</u>	0	10	21		55.7	0	12.3		
MISDEMEANOR	187	187	195	52.8	3.6	8.2	0.5	33.3	0	1.5		
	340	340	360	37.5	0	2.8	<u> </u>	<u>59.4</u>	0.3			
· IUTAL	<u> </u>	786	855	27.8	4.3	10.4	0.5	. 52.2	0.1	4.7		
ROME	1.4											
FELONY.	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	3.4 1 mg . 6 cz. co	247		12.8	9.7	0.6	65.8	5.3	5.9		
MISDEMEANOR TRAFFIC	796 57	198	962	27.5	4.9	27.8	0.2	36	2	1.5		
TOTAL		57	<u>96</u> 1.305	0	5.8	<u>13.6</u> 23.3	0.5	<u>69.1</u> 44.1	4.2	6.8		
	7/0	907	1,000	20.5	1 0.5	23.5	0.3	<u></u>	6.0	<u>                                     </u>		
SOUTH GEORGIA	El al											
FELONY MISDEMEANOR		231		0	0	5	9.5	82.6	<u>0</u>	2.9		
TRAFFIC		- 100		2	0	3.5	9.9	82.7	0	2		
TOTAL		333		0.6	0.;	<u>     0</u> 4.5	0 9.6	100 82.7	0	2.6		
SOUTHERN												
FELONY	249	261	444	0	10		8.3	58.5	0.5	9		
MISDEMEANOR	97	97		0		23.6 27.2	32.4	<u> </u>	0.5	0.6		
TRAFFIC	0	0	0	0		0	0	<u>38_9</u> 0	0.9	0.0		
TOTAL	346	358	552		0	24.3	13,1		0.6	7.4		
_SOUTHWESTERN												
FELONY	UQS.	218	257	0	0	3.9	0	84.4	0.8	10.9		
MISDEMEANOR	39	65	69	0	0	2.9	1.4	95.7	0	0		
TRAFFIC					0	0	0	<u>80</u>	0	20		
TOTAL	235	24k) -	336	0,	0	3.6	0.3	86.6	0.6	8.9		

	# OF	DISPOSE	):	i Alexandria Alexandria	<del></del> ୫ OF	COUNTS	DISPOSED	BY:		
CIRCUIT	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS- MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY
STONE MOUNTAIN		1								
FELONY	272	336	488	0	7	13.8	0.2	75.6	1.2	2.2
MISDEMEANOR	16	16	21	16.8	14.1	29.5	0	38.3	1.3	1 0
TRAFFIC		2	3	0	13.6	18.2	0	59.1	9.1	0
TOTAL	289	354	512	0.7	7.4	14.5	0.2	73,9	1.3	2.1
TALLAPOOSA										
FELONY	1.63	207	278	0	8.4	40.2	0.1	43.9	0.4	7.1
MISDEMEANOR	352	372	450	24.2	5.3	49.8	0.1	19.9	0.4	0.7
TRAFFIC	194	194	258	38.8	3.1	31.4	0.1	26.1	0	0.4
TOTAL	709	773	986	21.2	5.6	42.3	0.1	28.3	0.1	2.4
TIFTON						<i>,</i> ,				
FELONY	228	267	310	0	0	20.6	1.6	69.7	1.6	6.5
MISDEMEANOR	118	123	123	0	0	35.8	0	64.2	0	1 0
TRAFFIC	17	17	17	5.9	0	17.6	0	76.5	0	0
TOTAL	363	407	450	0.2	Ō	24.7	1.1	68.4	1.7	4.4
TOOMBS										
FELONY	237	259	331	0	0	32.3	0	58	1.8	7.9
MISDEMEANOR	622	643	687	14.6		45.7	0	36.1	2.9	0.7
TRAFFIC	11.181	1,182	1.296	81.9	0 I	8.3	0	9.4	0.2	0.2
TOTAL	2.040	2,084	2,314	50.2	0	22.9	0	24.3	1.2	1.4
WAYCROSS								e de la composición 1995 - El composición 1997 - El composición de la composición		
FELONY	220	256	351	0	3.8	12.7	0.1	73.8	1.6	8
MISDEMEANOR	178	185	205	52	0	12.2	0	34.9	0.5	0.5
TRAFFIC	212	212	219	36.3	0 I	5.9	0	57.1	0.7	0
TOTAL	610	653	775	24	1.7	10.6	0.1	58.8	1	3.7
WESTERN										
FELONY	159	172	278	0	0	17.6	9.2	59.1	2.9	11.3
MISDEMEANOR	2	2,	4.	Ō	0	71.4	0	28.6	0	0
TRAFFIC				0	0 I	0	0	100	0	0
TOTAL	162	175	283	0	0	18.2	9	58.8	2.8	11.2

S.

#### EXHIBIT VII ANALYSIS

Since Exhibit VI has already dealt with criminal cases in the aggregate, the reader should focus in Exhibit VII on felony - dispositions by type and number.

The circuits for which the number of felony counts disposed exceeds the mean by more than one standard deviation are:

> ATLANTA CLAYTON COBB EASTERN MACON STONE MOUNTAIN

Notice that these are all one-county circuits except for Macon and Stone Mountain.

The percentage of felony counts disposed by jury trials is more than one standard deviation above the mean percentage in the following circuits:

> AUGUSTA BRUNSWICK FLINT MOUNTAIN NORTHEASTERN PATAULA

Circuits which rank above the mean in both the number of felony counts disposed and the percentage of felony counts disposed by jury trial are:

#### BLUE RIDGE COWETA HOUSTON NORTHEASTERN SOUTHERN

The circuits for which misdemeanor counts disposed exceed the mean by more than two standard deviations show the circuits with an extremely high volume of dispositions for this case type:

#### ALAPAHA ROME TOOMBS

The circuits for which traffic counts disposed are greater than two standard deviations above the mean are:

CHEROKEE TOOMBS

0

102.5

#### EXHIBIT VIII

# <u>FY1978 Civil Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Number</u> Disposed by Each Method

Exhibit VIII presents the civil dispositions per judge by method and case type for each circuit. The different methods of disposition are listed across the top of the page and include settlement, dismissal, five year administrative termination, judgment, and jury. The total numbers of disposed cases are listed in the second column. Under each circuit are listed the case types domestic relations, general civil, independent motions and total civil.

It should be noted that the figures in this exhibit refer to actual cases which were disposed by each method. Collectively, these figures can be interpreted as the total number of civil dispositions per judge during the 1978 fiscal year. As previous disposition exhibits explained, the cases disposed during the fiscal year could have been filed any time between July 1, 1972 and June 30, 1978. These figures should not be interpreted as only the dispositions for the cases filed during fiscal year 1978.

The major qualification of the data in this exhibit concerns the categories "five year administrative termination," and "judgment." Under Georgia Law, the clerk of court is authorized to dismiss administratively those cases in which there has been no activity for five years. In some counties the clerk takes care

to mark these cases in the docket books. In other counties the clerks do not. It can not be assumed that cases are terminated administratively unless the clerk has officially marked the docket books. Therefore, the number of administrative terminations may vary according to the clerks' practices. In general, many more cases could be administratively terminated than the data in Exhibit VIII shows. Two civil disposition methods, before trial judgments and non-jury trial dispositions, have been combined into one category "judgments," for purposes of this study since the data collected in 1978 does not clearly separate the before trial and non-jury trial dispositions.

The number of jury trials per judge is most significant because it is the most time-consuming method of disposition. The settlements, dismissals and administrative terminations are considered the least time-consuming methods. Judgment (before trial and non-jury trial) dispositions are considered intermediate in terms of required judge time.

Inferences regarding the total workload per judge in each circuit on the basis of the data in Exhibit VIII should be avoided. However, the relative number of jury trials is interpreted as an indicator of the demand in the circuit for this very time consuming type of disposition.

8 - 12 B

117

	# OF		#	OF CASES D	ISPOSED BY:		
CIRCUIT	DISPOSED		DISMISSA	ADMIN. TERMINATION	JUDGMENT	JURY	
			10101100AL				
Alapaha DOMESTIC REL.	190	1	42	0	144	3	
		<u> </u>	1 ····	0	144	8	
GENERAL CIVIL	180. 65:	3	<u>61</u> 38	0		0	
INDEP. MOTIONS	And the owner of the owner owner				26		
TOTAL	435	4.5	141	0	278.5		
Alcovy							
DOMESTIC REL.	263	54	12	2	194	0.5	
GENERAL CIVIL	212	63	5	0.5	135	8.5	
INDEP. MOTIONS	118	41	1.5	4	71	0.5	
TOTAL	593	158	18.5	6,5	400	9.5	
•							
Atlanta							
DOMESTIC REL.	587	5.8	85.8	0	493.7	1.4	
GENERAL CIVIL	351	22.6	209.2	0	56.7	22.6	
INDEP. MOTIONS	168	4.6	15	0	148	0.6	
TOTAL	1,106		310	0	738.4	24.6	
Atlantic							
DOMESTIC REL.	474	77	47	0	349.5	0	
GENERAL CIVIL	394	70.5	134.5	0	174	15.5	
INDEP. MOTIONS	97	18	17.5	0	61.5	0	
TOTAL	965	165.5	199	0	585	15.5	
Augusta							
DOMESTIC REL.	655	42	14	0	594	5.2	
GENERAL CIVIL	. 190	89.2	2	0	78	20.8	·····
INDEP. MOTIONS	136	9.2	0	0	126.2	0.8	
TOTAL	981	140.5	16	0	798.2	26.8	
<u> </u>							
Blue Ridge	450		·····				
DOMESTIC REL.	458	33	57	0	366	2.5	
GENERAL CIVIL	195	23.5	68	0	83	20.5	
INDEP. MOTIONS	83. 736	60.5	<u>21.5</u> 146.5	0	57.5		<del></del>
TOTAL	/30	00.5	140.5		506.5	23	
Brunswick							
DOMESTIC REL.	699	49.5	117	0	529	3.5	1
GENERAL CIVIL	276	47.5	72.5	0	135.5	21	
INDEP. MOTIONS	125	17	14	Ō	94	0	
	1,100	114	203.5	0	758.5	24.5	
Chattahoochee		·····					
DOMESTIC REL.	580	4	42.5	0	531.2	1.8	
GENERAL CIVIL	174	4	79.5	0	80.8	9.5	
INDEP. MOTIONS	97	3.2	17	0	75.8	1.2	-
TOTAL	851,	11.2	1 39	0	687.8	12.5	
Cherokee						÷	
		31	20.5	0	289	3.5	
DOMESTIC REL.	344 a 344	20	71	0	289	22.5	
GENERAL CIVIL	217	5	10,5	0	201	0	<u> </u>
INDEP. MOTIONS TOTAL	905	56	102	0	721	26	<u>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>
		<u>_</u>	102		121		
ينيب معاصمته معاصره	Res 5 June		}				

•

	# OF		##	OF CASES D	ISPOSED BY:		
CIRCUIT	DISPOSED CASES	SETTLEMENT	DISMISSAL	ADMIN. TERMINATION	JUDGMENT	JURY	
Clayton							
DOMESTIC REL.	671	54	94.3	0	513.7	9.3	
GENERAL CIVIL	216	9.3	127.3	0	67.3	12.3	
INDEP. MOTIONS	91 🐭	0	9,3	0	81.7	0	
TOTAL	978	63.3	231	0	662.7	21.7	
Cobb							
DOMESTIC REL.	938	0.2	217.5	0	719.2	1	
GENERAL CIVIL	201	3.2	124	0	65.2	8.8	
INDEP. MOTIONS	77	0.2	3.8	0	72.8	0	
TOTAL	1,216	3.8	345.2	0	857.2	.9.8	1
	1,210	<u> </u>	343.2	0	037.2	<u>9,0</u>	1
Conasauga							
DOMESTIC REL.	843	23	275.5	32	511	1	
GENERAL CIVIL	539	52.5	144	61	249	32	
INDEP. MOTIONS	310	13	55	27.5	215	0	1
TOTAL	1,692	88.5	474.5	120.5	975	33	1
Cordele		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			+
DOMESTIC REL.	481	5	118	0	353	5	
GENERAL CIVIL	426	2	168			The second s	╈
	158	7		0	239		
INDEP. MOTIONS TOTAL	1,065	14	<u>55</u> 341	0	<u>96</u> 688	0 22	+
Coweta							
DOMESTIC REL.	658		31	0	553.5	1.5	
GENERAL CIVIL	. 390	79	42.5	0	254	15	4
INDEP. MOTIONS	203	30.5	15	0	156	1.5	
TOTAL	1,251	181	88.5		963.5		
Dougherty							+
DOMESTIC REL.	608	0	142.5	0	462.	3	
GENERAL CIVIL	161	0	79.5	0	74.5	7	1
INDEP. MOTIONS	120	0	28.5	0	92	0	
TOTAL	889	0.	250.5	0	628.5	10	
Dublin	340		<u> </u>				
DOMESTIC REL.	the second s	3	54	0	281	2	
GENERAL CIVIL	373 149	9	121	<u> </u>	228		
INDEP. MOTIONS TOTAL	the second s	12	<u>67</u> 242		70		
IUIAL	862	24	246	V	579	17	+
Eastern							
DOMESTIC REL.	771	96	15	7	653.7	5.3	1
GENERAL CIVIL	212	94.3	7.3	0.3	81.3	29	1
INDEP. MOTIONS	153 .	1.3	2	0	149.3	0	
TOTAL	1,136	191.7	24.3	1.3	884.3	34.3	1
Flint		}					
DOMESTIC REL.	252	10			206 5		+
GENERAL CIVIL	252	40	3.5	0	206.5	2	
	291 120	101.5	. 8	0	172.5	9	
INDEP. MOTIONS	120	33.5	1.5	0	84.5	0	-
TOTAL	663	175	13	0	463.5		
			La contra de la co				

Q

0

3

- T - 5

45. 195

		1.					
	# OF	1	#	OF CASES D	ISPOSED BY:	an a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
CIRCUIT	DISPOSED CASES	SETTLEMENT	DISMISSAL	ADMIN. TERMINATION	JUDGMENT	JURY	
Griffin							
DOMESTIC REL.	370	57	17	0	293.5	2.5	
GENERAL CIVIL	230	88.5	20		106	15	
INDEP. MOTIONS	119	30.5	5.5	0	83	0.5	
TOTAL	719	176	42.5	0	482.5	18	
Gwinnett				,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
DOMESTIC REL.	553	119	31.3	0	387.7	14.7	
GENERAL CIVIL	154	74.7	17.3	1	49.3	11.7	
INDEP, MOTIONS	197	24.7	29.3	0	141.7	1.7	
TOTAL	904	218.3	78	1	578.7	28	
Houston							
DOMESTIC REL.	745	1	146	0	588	10	
GENERAL CIVIL	331	1	173	0	145	12	
INDEP. MOTIONS	256	0	70	0	182	4	
TOTAL	1,332	2	389	0	915	26	· · ·
·····							
Lookout Mountain	<u></u>	1	<u></u>			······································	
DOMESTIC REL.	455	6	115.3	0	332.3	]	
GENERAL CIVIL	279	9.7	109.7	0	143.3	16.3	
INDEP. MOTIONS	129	6.3	32.7	0	89.7	0.3	
TOTAL	863	22	257.7	0	565.3	17.7	
Macon							
DOMESTIC REL.	773	0.3	263.7	0	504.3	4.7	
GENERAL CIVIL	272	2	131	Ō	132	7.3	
INDEP. MOTIONS	170	13	57.3	0	98	1.7	
TOTAL	1,215	15.3	452	0	734.3	13.7	
Middle							
DOMESTIC REL.	386	0	98	0	286.5	1	
GENERAL CIVIL	200	0	74	0	116	10.5	50 B
INDEP. MOTIONS	101	Ŏ	38	0	63	0	a da ya
TOTAL	687	0	210	0	465.5	11.5	
Mountain							
DOMESTIC REL.	774	147	103	43	480	1	
GENERAL CIVIL	640	196	88	39	295	22	
INDEP. MOTIONS	351	92	71	32	156	0	
TOTAL	1,765	435	262	114	931	23	
Northeastern							1
DOMESTIC REL.	559	76	87	4,5	383.5	8	
GENERAL CIVIL	404	139	47.5	3	183.5	31.5	
INDEP. MOTIONS	269	47	66.5	4	150	1	
TOTAL	1,232	262	201	11.5	717	40.5	UN AT
Northern							
DOMESTIC REL.	328	76.5	21.5	0	228	2	
GENERAL CIVIL	441	122.5	53.5	0	256	9.5	
INDEP. MOTIONS	206	53	12	0	140.5	()	
the second s	Contraction of the second s	1 252	87	0	624.5	11.5	1
TOTAL	975	232	. UI				

0

**\$** 

ſ

Ŭ

¢

g g

1.

st.

ú,

ò

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED CASES	# OF CASES DISPOSED BY:						
		SETTLEMENT	DISMISSAL	ADMIN. TERMINATION	JUDGMENT	JURY		
Ocmulgeo								
DOMESTIC REL.	325	0	39.5	0	285.5	ō		
GENERAL CIVIL	375	1.5	110.5		249.5	13.5		
INDEP. MOTIONS	, 170	1.5	56.5	<del>o</del>	112	0		
	870	and the second	206.5	0	647			
TOTAL	<u> </u>	3	200.0		<u> </u>	13.5		
Oconee								
DOMESTIC REL.	185	1.5	41.5	0	141.5	1		
GENERAL CIVIL	298	3	109	0	181	4.5		
INDEP. MOTIONS	75	5.5	32	0	37.5	0	-	
TOTAL	558	10	182.5	0	360	5.5		
Ogeechee	205	17 -	26 E		240 5			
DOMESTIC REL.	296	17.5	26.5	0	248.5	3		
GENERAL CIVIL	293	56.5	31	0	195		<u> </u>	
INDEP. MOTIONS	65	9.5	4	0	51	0.5		
TOTAL	654	83.5	61.5	0	494.5	14.5		
Pataula			 	<u> </u>				
DOMESTIC REL.	199	0	36	0	163	0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
GENERAL CIVIL	317	1 1	78	0	237			
INDEP. MOTIONS	95	0	61	0	34	0		
TOTAL	95 611		175	0		1		
TOTAL	011	<u> </u>	1/5	0	434			
Piedmont								
DOMESTIC REL.	291	30	1	0	260	0		
GENERAL CIVIL	351	105	2	0	231	13		
INDEP. MOTIONS	151	38	1	0	111	1	2	
TOTAL	° 793 °	173	4	0	602	14		
						t	;	
Rome	No. Prove							
DOMESTIC REL.	350ຊຸ	1.5	46	0	303	0		
GENERAL CIVIL	374	38.5	87.5	0	231.5	16.5		
INDEP. MOTIONS	240	31.5	25.5	0	182.5	0		
TOTAL	964.	71.5	159	0	717	16.5		
	and the second							
South Georgia	A Barra Real							
DOMESTIC REL.	5 £ 5129, C / FA	0	75.5	0	253	0.5		
GENERAL CIVIL	2320	0	77.5	0	146	8.5		
INDEP. MOTIONS	9745	0	48.5	0	48.5	0		
	658	0	201.5	0	447.5	9.		
							······	
	Mar a fair							
	7554		65	0	668	2.3		
GENERAL CIVIL	250	4.7	79	0	158	9		
INDEP. MOTIONS	A126		45.7	0	79.3	0	<u></u>	
TOTAL		25 .	189.7	0	905,3	11.3		
Couthurset				li si	ł-			
Southwestern	4725× 34		82	0 1	340	3	<u></u>	
DOMESTIC REL.						+		
	483M		100	0	273	28	<u></u>	
	193 <b>***</b> **		47	0	92	2		
TOTAL	1,148	181	229	0	705	33		
			and the second second					

17

ĥ

T

		# OF CASES DISPOSED BY:					
	# OF DISPOSED			ADMIN.		JURY	
CIRCUIT	CASES	ISET LEMENT	DISMISSAL	I ERMINATION	UUUGMENT		
Stone Mountain	1.004	L	700 4		700 0		
DOMESTIC REL.	1,034	60.7	128.4	40.4	799.6	5	
GENERAL CIVIL	388	90.1	126.6	17.3	125.4	28,9	
INDEP. MOTIONS	217	11	9.9	5	189.3	1.7	
TOTAL	1,639	161.9	264.9	62.7	1,114.3	35.6	
Tallapoosa							
DOMESTIC REL.	269	1	38	0	229.3	0.7	
GENERAL CIVIL	410	5	149.3	0	239	16.3	
INDEP. MOTIONS	125	0	22	0	102.3	0.7	
TOTAL	804	6	209.3	0	570.7	17.7	
Tifton							
DOMESTIC REL.	483	0	95	0	386	2	
GENERAL CIVIL	468	0	132	0	315	21	
INDEP. MOTIONS	187	2	63	0	122	0	
TOTAL	1,138	2	290	0	823	23	·
<del></del>							·
Toombs	267	47					ş÷
DOMESTIC REL.	357	47	]	0	307	2	
	282	93		0	166	2	
INDEP. MOTIONS	<u>142</u> 781	54 194	13	0	<u> </u>	0	
TOTAL	/01	194	3		500	24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Waycross					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
DOMESTIC REL.	561	91.5	108	0	361	0.5	
GENERAL CIVIL	310	98	38	0	162.5	11	
INDEP. MOTIONS	193	23	60.5	0	109.5	0	······································
TOTAL	1,064	212.5	206.5	0	633	11.5	
Western							
DOMESTIC REL.	364	67	26,5	0	266	5	
GENERAL CIVIL	327	159	20	0	122	25.5	
INDEP. MOTIONS	192	50	35.5	0	105.5	1	
TOTAL	883	276	82	0	493.5	31.5	
					<u></u>		
-			<u> </u>	· · · · · ·			
			÷				<u> </u>
							•
							<u> </u>
							<u> </u>
in the second	L	ليجيب الم		L.		L	L

#### EXHIBIT VIII ANALYSIS

}

Exhibit VIII differs from the previous exhibit (Exhibit VII) in that the entries in the disposition categories are actual number of cases rather than percentages. It is similar to the previous exhibit in that the number of disposed cases per judge is one indicator of court workload. In these circuits the number of civil cases disposed exceeds the mean by more than one standard deviation:

#### CONASAUGA HOUSTON MOUNTAIN STONE MOUNTAIN

Since jury trials place much heavier demands on court time than other types of dispositions, a high number of civil cases disposed by jury trial may indicate a strain on court resources. The number of civil cases per judge disposed by jury trial exceeds the mean by more than one standard deviation in these circuits:

> CONASAUGA EASTERN GWINNETT NORTHEASTERN SOUTHWESTERN STONE MOUNTAIN WESTERN

Ç.

The number of dispositions per judge identifies circuits with a high volume caseload while the number of jury trials indicates a more difficult or time-consuming caseload. Circuits with both a high volume and a high number of jury trials are those most likely to need assistance in handling the civil caseload. The following circuits are above the mean in both the number of civil cases disposed and the number of civil cases disposed by jury trial:

ATLANTA AUGUSTA BRUNSWICK CLAYTON CONASAUGA CORDELE EASTERN

 $\odot$ 

15

HOUSTON MOUNTAIN NORTHEASTERN SOUTHWESTERN STONE MOUNTAIN TIFTON WESTERN Ĩ

湖北

#### CHAPTER III SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Chapter III has attempted to place in perspective the current dispositions per judge for each of the forty-two judicial circuits. Dispositions have been evaluated in terms of their demands on court time due to high volume or time-consuming methods of processing (i.e., jury trials). Three criteria have been useful in identifying circuits with excesssive disposition workloads: current dispositions per judge, both as an absolute number and as a percentage of filings, aggregate dispositions by method, and number or percentage of dispositions by each method for each criminal and civil case type.

The following six caseload disposition characteristics are among those that have been used to identify circuits that might be in need of an additional superior court judgeship:

- 1. Above the mean in total number of dispositions;
- 2. Total dispositions less than 90% of filings;
- 3. Above the mean in number of felony counts disposed;
- Above the mean in number of felony counts disposed by jury trial;
- 5. Above the mean in number of civil cases disposed; and
- 6. Above the mean in number of civil cases disposed by jury trial,

11

The following circuits exhibit at least five of the above six caseload disposition characteristics:

BLUE RIDGE COWETA EASTERN NORTHEASTERN TOOMBS
In no circuit should the judicial workload be evaluated in terms of disposition data alone. The number of filings, more than any other single caseload characteristic, is indicative of external demands on judicial resources. Disposition data provides useful estimates of present performance and perhaps even current capacity, but is influenced by a number of internal variables. Disposition data must be examined in the light of filing data and secondary indicators such as population and potential judicial assistance.

### **CHAPTER IV-Circuit Population: 1977**

EXHIBIT IX CIRCUIT POPULATION, RATE OF CHANGE AND POPULATION PER JUDGE

8\* {}

ŝ

, Q

 $\langle 0 \rangle$ 

0

Ê





#### EXHIBIT IX

ස දිදු

0

C:

#### 1970 and 1977 Circuit Population, Rate of Change and 1977 Population Per Judge

In Exhibit IX the 1970 and 1977 circuit populations are presented along with the percent increase or decrease in circuit population between 1970 and 1977. The 1977 circuit population per superior court judge is also included in Exhibit IX and the forty-two circuits are ranked in descending order on the basis of 1977 population per judge (i.e., the circuit with the highest population per judge ranks number one and the circuit with the lowest population per judge ranks forty-two.)

The additional data elements in this exhibit are the 1977 population per judge with an additional judge and the circuit ranking on this variable. The purpose of this data element is to illustrate the effect on the population per judge ratio of adding an additional judge to the circuit. To accomplish this, an additional judge has been added to all circuits and the new population per judge ratios have been recorded.

Before caseload data became generally available, a ratio of approximately 50,000 people per superior court judge was used as a rule of thumb by the General Assembly in creating additional judgeships. Although population per judge is not necessarily strongly correlated with workload, the probability of increasing caseloads with increases in population is recognized. The 1977 population per judge ratio should be compared to both the current ranking, and the 50,000 population per judge standard and to the effect of adding an additional judge. For example, a two-judge circuit may have a current ratio of 60,000 people for each superior court judge, a figure which exceeds the standard of 50,000 people per judge by 10,000. However, if an additional judge were added, the current population to judge ratio would be 40,000 people per judge or 10,000 less than the 50,000 standard. On the other hand, another two-judge circuit may have a population per judge ratio of 78,000 and the effect of an additional judge would reduce the ratio to 52,000, a figure which is more in line with the 50,000 standard.

The major qualification of the exhibit is that the population per judge ratios must be considered in conjunction with the rate of increase or decrease in population as well as in conjunction with the current and historical trends in caseload. An additional judgeship should not be awarded to a circuit solely on the basis of population.

Circuit population would support the recommendation of an additional judgeship in circuits where it was determined that current caseload was • high and increasing while the population was increasing and the population per judge ratio exceeded 50,000.

Sil

Ŷ.

#### EXHIBIT IX : CIRCUIT POPULATION, RATE OF CHANGE, AND POPULATION PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT		OF GES 78	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 70-77	1977 POPULATION PER JUDGE +	RANK	1977 POP. PER JUDGE WITH ADD. JUDGE	RANK
ALAPAHA	1	2	41,000	41,800	1.95	20,900	42	13,933	42
ALCOVY	0	2	49,686	59,700	20.15	29,850	40	19,900	40
ATLANTA	9	11	605,210	576,800	-4.69	52,436	15	48,067	4
ATLANTIC	1	2	59,072	72,000	21.89	36,000	36	24,000	35
AUGUSTA	3	4	203,019	212,100	4.47	53,025	13	42,420	8
BLUE RIDGE	2	2	79,920	102,200	27.88	51,100	18	34,067	13
BRUNSWICK	2	2	101,871	106,600	4.64	53,300	12	35,533	11
CHATTAHOOCHEE	3	4	224,299	214,600	-4.32	53,650	11	42,920	6
CHEROKEE	1	2	56,481	65,200	15.44	32,600	38	21,733	38
CLAYTON	2	3	98,126	129,900	32.38	43,300	27	32,475	. 17
СОВВ	2	4	196,793	263,000	33.64	65,750	5	52,600	3
CONASAUGA	1	2	68,094	80,800	18.66	40,400	29	26,933	27
CORDELE	1	1	48,660	52,300	7.48	52,300	16.5	26,150	31
COWETA	1	2	146,995	162,600	10.62	81,300	1	54,200	2
OUGHERTY	1	2	89,639	99,000	10.44	49,500	20.5	33,000	16
DUBLIN	1	1	54,334	55,200	1.59	55,200	10	27,600	26
EASTERN	3	3	187,816	191,500	1.96	63,833	7	47,875	- 5
FLINT	1	2	55,963	64,500	15.25	32,250	39	21,500	39
GRIFFIN	1	2	81,699	94,200	15.30	47,100	<sup>•</sup> 22	31,400	19
WINNETT	1	3	72,349	134,300	85.63	44,767	25	33,575	15
HOUSTON	0	1	62,924	78,900	25.39	78,900	* 2	39,450	_ 9

(PQ

#### EXHIBIT IX : CIRCUIT POPULATION, RATE OF CHANGE, AND POPULATION PER JUDGE

 $\cap$ 

39

CIRCUIT	# ( JUD( 70	OF GES 78	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 70-77	1977 POPULATION PER JUDGE +	RANK	1977 POP. PER JUDGE WITH ADD. JUDGE	RANK
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	2	3	109,413	120,300	9.95	40,100	31	30,075	22
MACON	3	3	165,104	171,200	3.69	57,067	9	42,800	7
MIDDLE	1	2	78,574	80,600	2.58	40,300	30	26,867	28
MOUNTAIN	1	1	60,725	67,600	11.32	67,600	4	33,800	14
NORTHEASTERN	2	2	79,514	91,000	14.45	45,500	24	30,333	21
NORTHERN	1	2	66,975	72,200	7.80	36,100	35	24,067	34
OCMULGEE	2	2	99,192	104,600	5.45	52,300	16.5	34,867	12
OCONEE	1	2	56,104	57,700	2.84	28,850	41	19,233	41
OGEECHEE	1	2	66,140	72,800	10.07	36,400	34	24,267	33
PATAULA	1	1	52,131	52,600	0.90	52,600	14	26,300	29
PIEDMONT	1	1	44,785	49,500	10.53	49,500	20.5	24,750 ×	32
ROME	1	2	73,742	78,800	6.86	39,400	32	26,267	30
SOUTH GEORGIA	1	2	69,573	71,600	2.91	35,800	37	23,867	36
SOUTHERN	2	3	137,639	152,300	10.65	50,767	19	38,075	10
SOUTHWESTERN	1	1	58,878	58,800	-0.13	58,800	8	29,400	23
STONE MOUNTAIN	5	7	433,539	500,800	15.51	71,543	3	62,600	1
TALLAPOOSA	1	3	91,762	115,500	25.87	38,500	33	28,875	24
TIFTON	1	1	58,884	64,600	9.71	54,600	6	32,300	18
TOOMBS	1	1	42,727	44,700	4.62	44,700	26	0 22,350	37
WAYCROSS	1	2	.85,487	94,000	9.96	47,000	23	31,333	20
WESTERN	1	2	73,092	86,200	17.93	43,100	28	28,733	25

+1977 CIRCUIT POPULATION DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES IN 1978. SOURCE: ANNUAL ESTIMATE OF POPULATION FOR THE STATE OF GEORGIA (OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET, SEPTEMBER, 1978).



#### EXHIBIT IX ANALYSIS

The 1977 population per judge ranges from 20,900 (Alapaha Circuit) to 81,300 (Coweta Circuit). The difference between the two ratios (the range) is 60,400. This difference is less than that observed in 1977 (62,517) and is also the lowest difference observed since 1970.

BA.

The circuit mean of 48,524 people per superior court judge, when compared to the 1970, 1975 and 1976 averages (67,470, 56,408 and 52,201, respectively) shows that the trend of a declining average population per judge continues. This is also the first year in which the statewide average population per superior court judge has been less than 50,000. This decrease in average population per judge is in large part a product of the addition of superior court judgeships from 1973 through 1978.

The 1977 population per judge ratio exceeds the 50,000 standard in nineteen circuits and is higher than the statewide average in twenty-one circuits.

In order to extract the most useful information from this exhibit, the reader should isolate those circuits with both a high population per judge and a rapidly increasing population. These two variables are operationally defined as a population per judge ratio of more than 48,524 and a percentage change in population of at least 10.39%, the statewide average population growth from 1970 to 1977.

Nine circuits display figures higher than the statewide averages on both variables. In descending order of 1977 population per judge, they are:

COWETA HOUSTON STONE MOUNTAIN MOUNTAIN COBB BLUE RIDGE SOUTHERN PIEDMONT DOUGHERTY

U

Despite the fact that the three recommended circuits are not above the statewide circuit mean population per judge and statewide average percentage population change, two of the circuits, Eastern and Ocmulgee, are above both the statewide circuit mean population per judge and the 50,000 standard set by the legislature. All three recommended circuits are experiencing positive population growth.

Exhibit IX alone is not a basis from which any overiding conclusions for recommending superior court judgeships can be drawn. It does, however, have some value when viewed in conjunction with caseload statistics for anticipating the future caseload of a circuit.

Ū

Carolina .

## CHAPTER V - Potential sources of judicial assistance: supporting courts and administrative districts

÷.

J-

9

EXHIBIT X	ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTING COURTS: STATE, COUNTY
	PROBATE, AND JUVENILE: FY1978
n an an Anna an Anna Anna Anna 19 Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Ann	
EXHIBIT XI	SUPERIOR COURT FY1978 CASELOAD BY ADMINISTRA-
	TIVE DISTRICT

31

19 19

G



#### CHAPTER V - INTRODUCTION

 $\Sigma$ 

Chapter V suggests two alternatives to creating an additional superior court judgeship in any circuit. Exhibit X, "Analysis of Supporting Courts: State, Probate and Juvenile: FY1978," displays the number of state, probate and juvenile courts in each circuit which exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the superior court. In addition, it gives the reader an idea of the extent to which the courts provide judicial assistance. These courts alleviate some of the demand on the superior courts, but it is sometimes difficult to determine just where expanded use of supporting courts would be most effective. Exhibit X illustrates potential benefits to be derived from an increased reliance on state, probate or juvenile courts in various circuits.

Exhibit XI, "Superior Court FY1978 Caseload by Administrative District," presents filing and case type data for each district. An analysis of it is important to find out if temporary assistance, the assignment of judges from another circuit in the same district to certain courts in special instances, would be a feasible alternative to the creation of an additional superior court judgeship. It should be noted that temporary assignment of judges within a district would only be suggested in circuits experiencing temporary problems. Temporary assignment of judges would not be suggested in circuits with permanent problems requiring a permanent solution.

140

my!

#### EXHIBIT X

and the second second

1

#### Analysis of Supporting Courts: State, Probate and Juvenile: FY1978

The circuit caseload in the misdemeanor, traffic, general civil, independent motions and juvenile case types is presented in Exhibit X. The absolute figures for each case type are the sums of the caseload figures from the superior, state, probate, and juvenile courts. High percentages (over 50%) indicate that the majority of cases in the respective category are heard by a supporting court. Conversely, low percentages indicate that the superior court receives relatively little assistance from supporting courts in the circuit.

The number of supporting courts is defined as the number of courts in the circuit that exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the superior courts. Therefore, probate courts are not counted in circuits where there are state courts or in counties where, in the absence of a state court, the probate court does not hear criminal cases. In addition, a juvenile court is considered a supporting court in counties where there is a juvenile court judge or referee or where a state court judge hears juvenile cases.

The value of the data in this exhibit is predicated upon the assumption that all cases would be filed in the superior court, in the absence of a supporting court. This is not an unfounded assumption, but it is one that requires some qualification in order to correctly interpret the data. Supporting courts are generally created with the intention of reducing the caseload in the superior court. Exhibit X

is designed to measure, at least proportionately, the potential of supporting courts to reduce the superior court caseload in areas where concurrent jurisdiction is shared among the courts. Many courts which might affect superior court caseload are not included in this analysis of supporting courts. For example, many counties have traffic courts, magistrates' courts, mayors' courts and/or civil courts (to mention a few) that could conceivably be included in this analysis. However, since at present the Administrative Office of the Courts does not have the resources to collect caseload data on all supporting courts, only the four principal trial courts of county jurisdiction are included in Exhibit X. Although only three courts are included on the exhibit, the reader will note that the number of state courts includes county courts.

The interpretation of the data in Exhibit X serves two important purposes regarding the need for additional superior court judgeships. If the superior court hears a high percentage of cases in any of the case types listed in Exhibit X (i.e., supporting courts hear a low percentage), then the expanded use of the supporting courts may be a more efficient solution to the conditions in the circuit. On the other hand, if the superior court is currently receiving a great deal of assistance from supporting courts and is still overburdened, particularly in the felony and domestic relations case types, or there are no supporting courts in the circuit, then the expanded use of the supporting courts can be eliminated as a possible alternative to an additional superior court judgeship.

142

6.5

#### EXHIBIT X : ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTING COURTS: STATE, PROBATE AND JUVENILE: FY1978

Ŕ

	SUPPO	RTING CO	URTS	MISDEN		TRAF	and the second	GENER CIVI		INDEPENDENT MOTIONS		JUVENILE*	
CIRCUIT	JUVENILE	PROBAT	STATE	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP.CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP.CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP.CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP.CT.
ALAPAHA	0	.3	1	2,008	28.1	5,167	75.5	466	1.3	163	1.2	156	0
ALCOVY	2	2	0	787	32.7	3,926	96.9	565	0	268	0	569	100
ATLANTA	<b>1</b>	0	1	7,716	.99.6	15,385	100	52,025	92.1	38,591	97.1	5,853	100
ATLANTIC	0	].	5	1,085	95.2	13,447	99.9	958	18,6	246	15.9	211	0
AUGUSTA	2.	1.	2	7,155	<u>· 93</u>	14,037	∖ 100	.1,219	11.7	612	6	953	95.9
BLUE RIDGE	5	3	.1	2,637	75.5	6,846	83.4	1,158	62.5	337	48.7	626	100-
BRUNSWICK	5	2	3	2,870	90.7	12,763	100	2,250	<sup>40</sup> 67.3	1,795	81.2	1,509	100
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1	5	]	2,830	86	9,144	961	1,338	19.4	663	1:2	2,233	98.7
CHEROKEE	2	]	0	1,021	6.2	8,406	44.8	864	0	596	° 0 ·	1,064	100
CLAYTON	1	0	1	2,768	97.5	8,331	99.9	4,389 <sup>.</sup>	84.6	·1,195	80.3	2,100	100 >
COBB	л. л. <b>Т</b>	0	1	3,138		15,323	100	9,815	87.9	1,548	71.2	2,099	100
CONASAUGA	1	2	0	671	27.1	6,262	97.1	1,047	0	565	0	649	82
CORDELE	1	4	0	754	8.6	9,313	99.6	407	• 0	189	• 0	241	62.7
COWETA	. 4	2	3	3,646	95.3	10,377	98.1	2 094	.53.1	1,044	*36.2	756	97.1
DOUGHERTY	1	0.	) <b>1</b>	3,687	, 100	2,502	<b>\ 100</b>	1,735	76.8	2,481	86.4	634	100
DUBLIN	1	1	3	715	.99.9	8,298	100	. 679	28.7	335	29:6	269	84.8
EASTERN	1	0,	• 1	2,080	. 87.6	1,256	94:7	2,574	68:1	2,373	121	1,755	1.00
FLINT	2	4	0	574	67.1	15,049	99:8	847	0 /.	288	0.0	198	78.8
GRIFFIN	4	3	1	1,417	67,8	8,016	y, 96.5	637	- <u>5/</u> 8	371	2.4 4	377	100
GWINNETT	1	0	1	2,278	.100	980		2,808	8309	1,312	60,9	1,021	100
HOUSTON	1	0	1	2,432	100	4,938	1000	943	68.1	585	52.1	157	100

\* JUVENILE CASES HEARD BY OTHER THAN THE SUPERIOR CT. JUDGE (I.E., STATE CT. JUDGE, PART OR FULL-TIME JUVENILE CT. JUDGE). \*\* NUMBER OF STATE COURTS INCLUDES COUNTY COURTS.

#### EXHIBIT X : ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTING COURTS: STATE, PROBATE AND JUVENILE: FY1978

	SUPPO	RTING CO	OURTS	MISDEN	EANOR	TRAF	TFIC	GENER CIVI			ENDENT IONS	JUVE	NILE *
CIRCUIT	JUVENTLE	PROBAT	E STATE	TOTAL FILINGS	HEARD	TOTAL FILINGS	<pre>% HEARD SUPP.CT.</pre>	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP.CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP.CT	TOTAL FILINGS	3 HEARD SUPP.CT.
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	4	3	1	1,664	31.6	11,332	97.4	915	5.9	488	6.4	474	100
MACON	1	2	1	3,456	91.7	5,523	99.7	1,328	36.4	693	13.1	846	94.0
MIDDLE	3	0	5	2,367	99.9 ·	6,919	100	560	18,2	372	13.2	273	74
MOUNTAIN	0	3	2	1,346	87.1	3,028	.*97.8	698	24.6	343	18.4	235	0
NORTHEASTERN	1	3	1	1,997	84,2	5,773	92.7	1,265	41.9	660	30.5 •	660	81.5
NORTHERN	1	4	1	828	63.5	5,941	98.8	699	2.4	377	3.2	144	45.8
OCMULGEE **	0	. 6	2	2,669	71.7	8,857	98	891	0.2	542	0	197	0
OCONEE	0	6	0	780	41,5	4,904	93.9	660	0	341	0	271	0
OGEECHEE	. 0	0	4	816	95.3	8,301	99.9	1,034	30.8	267	21.7	205	0
PATAULA	_4	5	2	1,643	76.8	5,012	99.5	434	6	187	3.2.	120	70
PIEDMONT	3	2	Ţ	535	62.2	4,546	91.7	541	19.6	360	18.3	205	100
ROME	1	1	0	1,765	8.3	4,223	97.8	901	0.	837	0	825	100
SOUTH GEORGIA	0	2	3	2,059	180	4,798	99.8	543	7,9	291	10.3	145	0
SOUTHERN **	3	1	4	3,757	91	14,531	.100	1,013	17.6	610	10.7	468	98.5
SOUTHWESTERN	1	4	2	1,127	95.1	3,904	99.7	678	24	284	16.9	319	74.9
STONE MOUNTAIN	2	1	1	8,001	98.7	9,707	99.9	17,217	84.8	13,361	88.4	5,293	100
TALLAPOOSA	2	3	1	1,145	22.4	6,914	92.1	1,961	9,4	728	7.1	230	69.1
TIFTON	2	2	2	2,424	93.7	10,444	99.8	715	28.5	402	12.4	186	81.7
TOOMBS	0	6	0	1,106	32.3	7,233	. 77.9	333	• 0	180	0.	478	0
WAYCROSS	2	3	3	2,247	84.9	7,160	94.2	1,111	29.2	454	.16.5	597	88.8
WESTERN	1	1	1	454	97.6	890	99.8.	667	23.2	401	34.2	559	95.5

\* JUVENILE CASES HEARD BY OTHER THAN THE SUPERIOR CT. JUDGE (I.E., STATE CT. JUDGE, PART OR FULL-TIME JUVENILE CT. JUDGE).



#### EXHIBIT X ANALYSIS

The presentation of data in Exhibit X indicates there are several circuits which might benefit from the increased use of existing supporting courts.

Before drawing any conclusions, however, the reader should note that the filing of criminal cases (i.e., misdemeanor and traffic) in supporting courts occurs in greater percentages than the filing of civil cases and motions. This is partly due to the differences in jurisdiction: some supporting courts have no true civil jurisdiction (juvenile courts); some have limited civil jurisdiction (state courts); and some have civil jurisdiction in case types different from those counted in this study (probate courts - estate and guardianship matters). Supporting court jurisdiction of misdemeanor and traffic offenses is generally the same for all courts, whereas the extent of concurrent jurisdiction in the civil area is affected by statutory or customary limitations.

The percent of misdemeanor filings heard by supporting courts ranges from 6.2 to 100. In twenty-seven of the forty-two circuits (64%), more than 75% of the total misdemeanors are filed in a supporting court; in fourteen of those circuits (or 33% of all the circuits), 95-100% of the total misdemeanors are heard in a supporting court. Six of these are one-county circuits with a state court. Four circuits (10%) have less than 25% of total misdemeanors heard in a supporting court:

Cherokee (6.2%), Cordele (8.6%), Rome (8.3%), and Tallapoosa (22.4%). The circuit mean percentage of misdemeanor cases heard by supporting courts is 73.2%.

The high proportion of traffic cases heard by a court other than a superior court in almost every circuit, is evidence of a great deal of assistance from supporting courts. Indeed, in only four circuits are less than 90% of total traffic cases heard by a supporting court, with 44.8% as the low extreme in a range extending to 100%. Twenty-two circuits (52%) have supporting courts which hear the entire traffic cases heard by supporting courts is 95.5%.

λų.

LO

The majority of general civil cases are filed in superior court. In matters involving equity or title to land the superior court has exclusive jurisdiction, and the case cannot be filed in a supporting court. In matters involving personal injury, contracts, or torts, the state court has concurrent jurisdiction but this may be limited jurisdiction. Cases that exceed the maximum jurisdictional amount for the state court must be filed in superior court. In many counties with part-time state court judges, a higher percentage of general civil cases are filed in superior court, even though the state court may have concurrent jurisdiction. Only eleven circuits (26%) have 50% or more of total general civil cases filed in a state court:

> ATLANTA - 92.1% BLUE RIDGE - 62.5% BRUNSWICK - 67.3% CLAYTON - 84.6%

COBB<sup>1</sup> - 87.9% COWETA - 53.1% DOUGHERTY<sup>1</sup> - 76.8% EASTERN<sup>1</sup> - 68.1% GWINNETT<sup>1</sup> - 83.9% HOUSTON<sup>1</sup> - 68.1% STONE MOUNTAIN - 84.8%

<sup>1</sup>One-county circuit having a state court.

At the other extreme there are eight circuits (19%) which have no state court and in which all general civil cases are filed in the superior court. A total of twenty-five circuits (60%) have less than 25% of their total general civil caseload heard in a supporting court. The circuit mean percentage of general civil cases heard by a supporting court (state court) is 29.5%

The independent motions case type, which includes such independent actions as garnishments—and foreclosures as well as motions filed in conjunction with cases previously filed (e.g., contempt), is somewhat difficult to assess. A strong possibility exists that many independent motions will be filed in the same court as the original case. Of the nine circuits in which state courts hear more than 50% of total independent motions, all are among the above-mentioned circuits where state courts hear the majority of general civil cases. There are twenty-eight circuits in which state courts hear 25% of total independent motions, and twenty-four of these circuits were those which also heard less than 25% of the general civil caseload. The circuit mean percentage of independent motions heard by the supporting courts (state courts) is 25°4%.

The data in Exhibit X indicates that appointed juvenile court judges and referees<sup>1</sup> hear a high percentage of the state's juvenile caseload. Twenty-seven circuits (64%) utilize them to assist the superior courts with at least 80% of the total juvenile cases filed. However, in eight circuits, the superior court judges handle all the juvenile cases. In only one circuit where there is some assistance is more than 50% of the juvenile cases heard by the superior court judge. This is understandable since it is a multi-county circuit in which the assistance is available from only one referee. The circuit mean percentage of the juvenile caseload heard by supporting courts is 73.2%.

(.) }

£7==

13

<sup>1</sup>The term "appointed judges and referees" includes state court judges appointed to hear juvenile cases. There are six state court judges in five circuits serving in this capacity. Eight referees assist superior court judges in processing juvenile caseload in four circuits.

Ð

11

148

#### EXHIBIT XI

#### Superior Court FY1978 Caseload by Administrative District

102

Ø

The superior court caseload of the ten administrative districts is presented by circuit in Exhibit X. The distribution of filings among the case types, as well as among the circuits in each district, can be observed for each district. Also, the average caseload per judge for each district is calculated on the basis of the total caseload and the total number of superior court judges in the district.

The purpose of this exhibit is to demonstrate the potential for intra-district judicial assistance. If the caseload per judge is very demanding in all circuits in the district, it cannot reasonably be expected that the judges will be able to assist each other. Also, for circuits that may be experiencing only temporary problems, it may be suggested that judges from other circuits in the district can fill in until the temporary problems are eliminated.

It should be noted that the primary value of Exhibit XI is as a supplement to other exhibits. The analyses of current circuit caseload, historical trends in caseload, and assistance from supporting courts are all prerequisites to the proper use of Exhibit XI. Essentially, the exchange of judges within a district should be limited to temporary problems, while permanent problems require an additional judgeship in the circuit.

	NUMBER OF			CRIMIN FILING				JUVENILE FILINGS			
CIRCUIT	SUPERIOR CT. JUDGES	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEANO	R TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	NDEPENDE	NT TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL
DISTR	RICT I										
ATLANTIC	2	2,591	449	52	13	514	780	879 •	207	1,866	211
OGEECHEE	2	2,069	246	-38	5	289	716	650	209	1,575	205
EASTERN	3	5,571	1,338	258	66	1,662	820	2,400	689	3,909	0
BRUNSWICK	2	3,155	339	268	2	609	735	1,473	338	2,546	0
WAYCROSS	2	3,628	447	340	412	1.199	787	1,196	379	2,362	67
TOTAL	11	17.014	2.819	956 😒	498	4.273	3,838	6,598	1.822	12,258	483
AVG. PER JUDGE	en e	1.547	256	; 87	45	388	349	600	166	1.114	44
DISTR	ICT II										
PATAULA	e serie de segue serie <b>l</b> 'Assars	1,560	283	381	24	688	408	247	181	836	36
SOUTH GEORGIA	2	2,337	597	268	9	874	500	557	261	1,318	145
DOUGHERTY	2	2,336	413	0	0	413	402	1,184	337	1,923	0
ALAPAHA	2	4,396	462	1,443	1,267	3,172	460	447	161	1,068	156
TIFTON	1	1,971	299	152	21	472	511	<u>,</u> 602	352	1,465	34
SOUTHERN	3	4,932	801	338	4	1,143	835	2,402	545	3,782	7
TOTAL	11	17,532	2,855	2,582	1,325	6,762	3,116	5,439	1.837	10,392	378
AVG. PER JUDGE		1, 594	260	235	120	615	283	494	167	945	34
						°,			4 <u>N</u>		
											*
							41 (* 1997) 1997 - State State (* 1997) 1997 - State State (* 1997)				

EXHIBIT XI : SUPERIOR COURT FY1978 CASELOAD BY ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT

1

Q 🍋

€4 <sub>6</sub> é	NUMBER OF			CRIMIN FILINO				CIV FILI			JUVENILE FILINGS TOTAL JUVENILE
	SUPERIOR CT. JUDGES	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEAN	R TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	
DISTRI	CT III										
CHATTAHOOCHEE	4	6,610	1.100	395	355	1,850	1,079	2,996	655	4,730	30
MACON	3	4,668	891	287	17	1,195	845	1,977	602	3,424	49
HOUSTON	1	1,675	228	1	C	229	301	865	280	1.446	0
SOUTHWESTERN	1	1,527	172	55	11	238	515	458	236	1,209	80
TOTAL	9	14,480	2,391	738	383 -	3,512	2,740	6,296	1,773	10,809	159
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,609	266	82	43	390	304	700	197 .	1,201	18
DISTRI	CT IV			•							
STONE MOUNTAIN	7	11,743	1,979	102	13	2,094	2,623	5,474	1,552	9,649	0
AVG. PER JUDGE		1.678	283	15	<u>°</u> 2	. 299	375	782	222	<b>1',378</b>	Ň.O
DISTRI	CT V										
ATLANTA	11	15,236	4,501	31	0	4,532	4,088	5,487	1,129	10,704	0
AVG. PER JUDGE	S	1,385	409	3	0	412	372	499	103	973	0
DISTRI	ICT VI										
FLINT	2	2,222	228	189	27	444	847	601	288	1,736	42
GRIFFIN	2	2,997	379	456	282	1,117	600	918	362	1,880	0
COWETA	2	3,932	405	172	200	777	982	1,485	666	3,133	22
CLAYTON	3	4,019	631	68	9	708	678	2,397	236	3,311	0
TOTAL	9	13,170	1,643	885	518	3,046	3,107	5,401	1,552	10,060	64
AVG. PER JUDGE	ن خشت الدين	1,463	183	98	58 👳	,338	345	600	172	1,118	7

Ø

ΰ

ų.

#### EXHIBIT XI : SUPERIOR COURT FY1978 CASELOAD BY ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT

" WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.

#### EXHIBIT X1 : SUPERIOR COURT FY1978 CASELOAD BY ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT

	NUMBER OF			CRIMIN FILINO				CIV FILIN			JUVENILE
CIRCUIT	SUPERIOR CT. JUDGES	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEAN	R TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	T TOTAL	TOTAL JUVENILE
DISTRI	CT VII						· · · ·				
TALLAPOOSA	3	5,720	560	889	548	1,997	1,777	1,199	676	3,652	71
LOOKOUT MTN.	3	4,834	683	1,138	298	2,119	861	1,397	457	2,715	0
CHEROKEE.	2	8,656	767	958	4,638	6,363	864	833	596	2,293	0
ROME	2	4,666	379	1,618	93	2,090	901	838	837	2,576	0
СОВВ	4	7,274	1,701	9	0	1,710	1,187	3,931	446	5,564	0
TOTAL	14	31,150	4,090	4,612	5,577	14,279	5,590	8,198	3,012	16,800	71
AVG. PER JUDGE		2,225	292	329	398	1,020		586	215	1,200	5
DISTRI	CT VIII										
CORDELE	1	2,104	245	689	33	957	407	451	189	1,047	90
DUBLIN	1	1,411	227	1	0	228	484	422	236	1,142	41
OCMULGEE	2	3,897	610	756	177	1,543	889	726	542	2,157	197
OCONEE	2	2,844	361	456	299	1,116	660	456	341	1,457	271
MIDDLE	2	2,191	310	3	1	314	540	943	323	1,806	71
TOTAL	8	12.447	1,753	1,905	510	4,168	2,980	2,998	1,631	7,609	670
AVG. PER-JUDGE	ter series and the series of t	1556	<u>5.219</u>	238	<u></u>	521.	372	375	204 ×.	<u></u>	<u>94</u>
										¢	
		2							8		
									9		
	0										
				Ģ							

77----

\* WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.

a a a



# **CONTINUED**

# 2 OF 3

			and in the	1	· · · · · ·	(c) a set of a single state	the second second second second
TTL 11 T C 8 99	×/ ¥				- nv	ADMINISTRATIVE	DICTDICT
	- X L			PY IN/A	. <b>B</b> I		
	111	3 <b>•</b> • •		1 1 4 370			

100

	NUMBER OF			CRIMIN FILING				CIV FILI			JUVENILE FILINGS
CIRCUIT	SUPERIOR CT. JUDGES	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEANC	R TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE
DISTRI	CT IX										
CONASAUGA	2	4,331	469	489	182	1,140	1,047	1,462	565	3,074	117
BLUE RIDGE	2	3,892	457	646	1,137	2,240	434	1,045	173	1,652	0
GWINNETT	3	2,891	328	<b>1</b>	1	330	453	1,595	513	2,561	0
MOUNTAIN	1	2,133	158	174	66	398	526	694 ·	280	1,500	235
NORTHEASTERN	2	3,509	465	315	419	1,199	735	994	459	2,188	122
TOTAL	10	16,756	1,877	1,625	1,805	5,307	3,195	5,790	1,990	10,975	474
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,676	188	162	180	531	320	579	199	1,098	47
DISTRI	ст х										<b>\$</b>
ALCOVY	2	2,598	526	530	123	1,179	565	586	268	1,419	0
WESTERN	2	1,932	397	11	2	410	512	721	264	1,497	. 25
PIEDMONT		1,852	179	202	378	759	435	364	294	1,093	0
NORTHERN	2	2,358	265	302	73	640	682	593	365	1,640	78
AUGUSTA	4	6,119	742	500	6	1,248	T,076	3,181	575	4,832	39
TOOMBS	1	4,059	276	749	1,596	2,621	333	447	180	960	478
TOTAL	12	18,918	2,385	2,294	2,178	6,857.	3,603	5,892	1,946	11,441	620
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,576	199	191	182	571	300	491	162	953	52
											а А А
										<i>u</i>	

\* WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.



#### EXHIBIT XI ANALYSIS

Fiscal year 1978 marks the second year in which the efforts of Georgia's Administrative Judges and their assistants in providing intra-district judicial assistance can be studied. Their success in managing their respective judicial resources can only be evaluated, however, in terms of the distribution of filings among circuits in any one district. Should the average filings per judge be approximately equal for all circuits in a district, the administrative judge and the court administrator may be assured that the district caseload is evenly distributed. Temporary reassignment of judges can help alleviate uneven distribution in caseload.

A problem arises, however, when the average caseload per judge is high for all judges in a district. Exhibit XI pinpoints such a problem. The important indicator is the last row of figures for each district (average per judge). The reader should be particularly aware of the average total filings per judge, which range from a low of 1,385 for District V to a high of 2,225 for District VII. Those districts with the largest number of filings per judge are evident when the reader considers each district's total per judge caseload in relation to the district mean of 1,630.9. Only three districts record a higher per judge caseload:

DISTRICT	IV - 1,	678
DISTRICT	VII - 2,	225
DISTRICT	IX - 1,	676

Seven of the ten districts have average total filings per judge within one hundred cases of the district mean.

1

It might appear that the placement of additional judgeships would be most effective in those districts with average caseloads per judge above the mean. However, a judge from one circuit may be loaned to another circuit or the services of a senior judge may be used to solve a temporary problem of a high per judge caseload.

ŧ

a

 ø

0

. .

#### CHAPTER V SUMMARY ANALYSIS

In evaluating the judicial assistance from supporting courts and the likelihood of sharing judges, Chapter V locates those circuits whose excessive caseload warrants either temporary or permanent aid.

Exhibit X shows the circuits which could benefit from an increased reliance on supporting courts for the disposition of misdemeanors (i.e., those whose supporting courts hear less than 25% of total misdemeanors):

> CHEROKEE CORDELE ROME TALLAPOOSA

The four circuits which have less than 90% of total traffic cases heard in a supporting court are:

#### ALAPAHA BLUE RIDGE CHEROKEE TOOMBS

- 4- 5

To perceive the overall picture, however, the reader must pinpoint those circuits whose supporting courts offer the least possible assistance. For example, of the four circuits listed above as having little misdemeanor caseload assistance, only one circuit, Tallapoosa, has a state court available to hear such cases. For traffic caseload assistance it appears the Cherokee circuit could rely more heavily on its probate courts. Circuits without state courts also rank 1bw in assistance in the civil case categories. These circuits are:

ALCOVY CHEROKEE CONASAUGA CORDELE FLINT OCONEE ROME TOOMBS

Although these circuits rank low in assistance the volume and difficulty of the caseload in each circuit must be reviewed along with the figures in this exhibit before a recommendation for an additional judgeship would be valid.

Exhibit XI is helpful in determining whether caseload pressures are district-wide or could be resolved through intra-district temporary assistance measures such as a temporary loan of a judge from one circuit to another. In 1978, the range of the average caseload per judge by district (1,385-2,225) was not especially large. Only in three districts (Districts IV, VII, and IX) did the average per judge figure exceed the district mean. Of these three only one district, District VII, seems to have substantial district caseload pressures.

Exhibit XI should be read as a secondary criterion to be used in conjunction with circuit-level caseload data before a judgment can be made that an additional judgeship rather than temporary assistance, is necessary.




### APPENDIX ONE

## DUTIES OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL/ ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

The Judicial Council of Georgia and the Administrative Office of the Courts were created by <u>Ga. Laws</u> 1973, p. 288, upon recommendation of a blue ribbon judicial processes study commission appointed by Governor Jimmy Carter in 1971 called the Governor's Commission on Judicial Processes. Most recently, on June 12, 1978, the Judicial Council was established as an administrative arm of the Georgia Supreme Court by judicial order.

The responsibilities and duties of the Judicial Council and the Administrative Office of the Courts, as set out in Act Number 178 of the 1973 General Assembly, are as follows:

<u>Section 5</u>. Under the supervision and direction of the Judicial Council, the Administrative Office of the Courts shall perform the following duties:

(a) Consult with and assist judges, administrators, clerks of court and other officers and employees of the court pertaining to matters relating to court administration and provide such services as are requested.

(b) Examine the administrative and business methods and systems employed in the offices related to and serving the courts and make recommendations for necessary improvement.

(c) Compile statistical and financial data and other information on the judicial work of the courts and on the

160

2.9

work of other offices related to and serving the courts, which shall be provided by the courts.

(d) Examine the state of the dockets and practices and procedures of the courts and make recommendations for the expedition of litigation.

(e) Act as fiscal officer and prepare and submit budget estimates of state appropriations necessary for the maintenance and operation of the judicial system.

(f) Formulate and submit recommendations for the improvement of the judicial system.

(g) Perform such additional duties as may be assigned by the Judicial Council.

(h) Prepare and publish an annual report on the work of the courts and on the activities of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

The first members of the Judicial Council were sworn in during May, 1973, and the Administrative Office of the Courts began operations on July 1, 1973, although a Director and most of the staff were not employed until October, 1973. Before and during the 1974 Session of the General Assembly, the Judicial Council received several requests in various judicial circuits across the State to determine the need for additional judicial manpower, whether the circuits should be divided, or whether any other appropriate change was needed. These requests came from the Governor's office, judges, and legislators, and were made pursuant to <u>Ga. Laws</u> 1973, p. 288, paragraphs 5(c) and 5(f), which charge the Judicial Council of Georgia and the Administrative

Office of the Courts with the responsibility of compiling statistical data and other information on the judicial work of the courts, and with formulating and submitting recommendations for the improvement of the judicial system. The Council performed the requested studies and five new superior court judgeships were created by the General Assembly in 1974. Since that first study in 1974, the Council and Administrative Office of the Courts has annually conducted a study of the need for additional superior court judgeships and the following number of judicial positions have been created: 1975 - two, 1976 - two, 1977 - eight, and 1978 - six. Since 1977 the caseload data included in the judicial manpower study has been collected on a statewide basis.

5

Ŷ

Q.º

C1-

A.



## APPENDIX TWO

## JURISDICTION OF THE SUPERIOR, STATE, PROBATE AND JUVENILE COURTS OF GEORGIA

In recommending additional superior court judgeships, the Judicial Council takes into consideration the concurrent jurisdiction and mutual interdependences of the superior, state, probate and juvenile courts. For ease of reference and for clarity, the general constitutional and statutory provisions which define the jurisdiction of the superior, state, probate and juvenile courts are briefly described.

## SUPERIOR COURT

The superior court is a constitutionally established court. This is the trial court of general jurisdiction in Georgia, and there is a superior court in each of the one hundred fifty-nine (159) counties (<u>Ga. Code Ann</u>.  $\S2-3301$ ).

<u>Exclusive Jurisdiction</u>: The superior court has exclusive jurisdiction in the following subject areas: divorce, equity, title to land and felonies. (Ga. Code Ann.  $\S2-3301$  and  $\S2-3304$ ).

Exclusive statutory jurisdiction: This is a type of jurisdiction which, at the present time, is placed exclusively in the superior court by statute. There would probably be no constitutional objection to the extension of all or a part of it to other courts, but this has not been done. Such matters as declaratory judgments, mandamus, quo warranto and prohibition

would appear to fall within this category, but rather by virtue of Code provisions creating the remedies than by any constitutional requirement that they be confined to the superior court. (see Davis and Shulman, <u>Ga. Practice and Procedure</u>  $\S5-4$ ).

<u>Concurrent Jurisdiction</u>: The superior court can hear all cases not specifically reserved to other courts. Thus, the superior court generally has concurrent trial jurisdiction with all the limited jurisdiction trial courts in the state. Juvenile matters and probate and estate matters are an exception to the rule. The juvenile court and probate court, respectively, have exclusive original jurisdiction in these subject matters.

<u>Appellate Jurisdiction</u>: The superior court is an appellate body as well as a trial court. Its review power extends to all the "inferior judicatories," those trial courts of limited jurisdiction which have not been provided by statute or by the Constitution with a right of direct review to the court of appeals or supreme court.

The application for a writ of certiorari from the superior court is a constitutional right general to all such "inferior judicatories" (<u>Ga. Code Ann.</u> §2-3304). On the other hand, the Constitution requires that specific legislation must define the right of <u>direct appeal</u> to the superior court, if any, from these lower trial courts. Various statutes have provided direct appeal: <u>Ga. Code Ann.</u> §6-201, the probate courts; <u>Ga. Code</u> <u>Ann.</u> §6-101 and §6-301, justices of the peace; and <u>Ga. Code</u> <u>Ann.</u> §92A-510, police and recorder's courts. Appeal proceedings in the superior court arising from cases initiated in one of the

"inferior judicatories" are generally de novo proceedings.

0

In addition, the superior court has the authority to review decisions by certain administrative bodies (<u>Ga. Code Ann</u>.  $\S$ 3A-120 and \$114-710). These proceedings are in the nature of an appeal although they are not designated as such.

## STATE COURT

Original Concurrent Jurisdiction: In 1970, Ga. Code Ann. Chap. 24-21a was enacted for the purpose of unifying a group of courts of similar jurisdiction. Originally many of these courts were created as city courts by local legislation to relieve the caseload pressures of a particular superior court. They were not established statewide. <u>Ga. Code Ann</u>. Chap. 24-21a states that these courts are of county-wide jurisdiction and share concurrent subject matter jurisdiction with the superior court in most civil cases and misdemeanors. There is no uniformity of jurisdiction of these courts in <u>ex delicto</u> (tort) actions. The local act creating each court and any amendments thereto control the extent of <u>ex delicto</u> jurisdiction. These courts have no original exclusive jurisdiction and generally no appellate jurisdiction.

<u>Right of Review of Decision of State Courts</u>: Petitioners in the state courts have the right of direct review by the court of appeals and supreme court (<u>Ga. Code Ann</u>. §24-2107a). The 1970 legislation designated the state courts as "other like courts," which refers to that term in the Judicial Article of the Constitution (Ga. Code <u>Ann</u>. §2-3108). The state courts

are courts below the level of and having specified concurrent jurisdiction with the superjor courts.

ß

<u>County Courts</u>: Although the three county courts in Georgia (Baldwin, Echols and Putnam counties) do not, strictly speaking, fall within the class of state courts, these courts have similar jurisdiction and were created for similar purposes as the state courts. They are counted as state courts for the purposes of this study. In contrast to the state courts, an appeal must be taken to the superior court from these county courts.

### JUVENILE COURT

The juvenile court is a statutory court (<u>Ga. Code Ann</u>. §24-2401) and purely a trial court. Technically, there is one court per county. In actuality, the majority of these courts are not truly separate judicial bodies. Only in counties having a population of fifty thousand (50,000) persons or more and in a few other counties upon special recommendation of two successive grand juries are these courts created as separate bodies.

- A

In 1977 there were forty-two counties which had thirty-six (36) independent juvenile courts; in the remaining counties a superior court judge, or a state court judge appointed by a superior court judge, heard the juvenile cases.

Whatever the structure of the court, the jurisdiction of each court is identical.

Exclusive Jurisdiction: All proceedings involving any individual under the age of seventeen years and alleged to be

德

delinquent (except when the delinquent act is considered a capital crime when committed by an adult), unruly or in need of treatment for mental illness, or under sixteen years of age and alleged to have committed a traffic offense are heard by the juvenile court. The court has the authority to hear actions for termination of parental rights and other special proceedings. The juvenile court also has exclusive jurisdiction in proceedings alleging any individual under the age of eighteen to be a deprived child (<u>Ga.</u> <u>Code Ann.</u> §24A-301).

<u>Concurrent Original Jurisdiction</u>: The juvenile court has concurrent jurisdiction with the superior court to hear alleged delinquent acts which constitute capital offenses when committed by an adult. The juvenile court may transfer a case involving conduct designated a crime to the appropriate trial court if the juvenile was fifteen (15) years old at the time the alleged crime was committed or if the child was thirteen (13) years or older and is charged with a capital felony.

In custody cases, concurrent jurisdiction is said to exist since a juvenile court can<sup>()</sup> determine the custody and support issues of a case when it is transferred to the juvenile court by an order of the superior court.

Right of Review of Decisions of Juvenile Courts: By virtue of specific constitutional provisions, the decisions of the juvenile courts are reviewed directly by the court of appeals or supreme court. The case of <u>Whitman v. State</u>, <u>96 Ga</u>. <u>App</u>. 731 (1957), resolved a conflict concerning appellate review from the juvenile courts. This case struck down the validity

of <u>Ga. L.1956</u>, p. 69, as in conflict with a 1956 constitutional amendment (<u>Ga. L.</u> 1956, p. 652). The decision assured that juvenile court decisions would follow the same route of appellate review whether the juvenile court is a separate court or an arm of the superior court.

### PROBATE COURT

The probate court is a limited jurisdiction trial court established by the Constitution in each county (<u>Ga. Code Ann.</u> \$2-3501).

<u>Exclusive Original Jurisdiction</u>: The probate court has <u>exclusive</u> original jurisdiction; such jurisdiction refers to probate and estate matters.

<u>Concurrent Original Jurisdiction</u>: The probate court is empowered to hear cases arising from violations of law relating to traffic upon public roads (including litter violations) and violations of game and fish laws. This traffic subject matter jurisdiction is concurrent with that of the superior court, but there is no traffic jurisdiction exercised in the probate court if a state court is located in that county. Traffic jurisdiction is then exercised by the state court (<u>Ga. Code Ann</u>. §92A-501, §92A-502 and §92A-511).

For the purposes of this study only the criminal jurisdiction of the probate court which is concurrent with the superior courts (misdemeanor and traffic jurisdiction) is presented.

#### APPENDIX THREE

#### EXPENDITURES FOR AN ADDITIONAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIP

The Judicial Council also directed the Administrative Office of the Courts to collect expenditure information concerning the costs associated with the addition of a superior court judgeship. For purposes of clarity, the types of costs associated with the addition of superior court judgeships can be categorized using the following simple typology:

- -- State fixed costs
- -- State variable costs
- -- County fixed costs
- -- County variable costs

In this instance, fixed costs are defined as those costs which will be incurred by the addition of a superior court judgeship and do not fluctuate with the volume of activity. Variable costs, as herein defined, are those costs incurred by the addition of a superior court judgeship which fluctuate according to change in the volume of activity or local preference.

The primary concern of this section is the identification of state fixed and variable costs. As a secondary goal, types of county specific court cost information are listed. The costs are as follows:

### STATE FIXED COSTS

3

171

Salary

S &

Superior Court Judge Secretary, Superior Court Judge \*Assistant District Attorney \$38,500.00 8,967.00 14,500.00

Fringe Benefits	Superior Court Judge @ 22.18%	8,539.30
	**Secretary, Superior Court Judge @ 10.90%	977.40
	Assistant District Attorney @ 4.00%	580.00
***Contingent Fee	Court Reporters	1,200.00
****Library		3,570.00

TOTAL RANGE 76,833.70

\* This is a maximum statutory salary figure, but represents the actual figure in virtually all cases.

\*\* This is an approximate figure and may vary.

\*\*\* Varies according to the number of counties in the circuit served.
\*\*\*\* This represents a one-time fixed cost.

### STATE VARIABLE COSTS

	<u>Range</u>	Average
Judge's Travel Expenses	\$0.00 - \$2,600.00	\$ 730.00
Assistant District Attorney's Travel Expenses	<u>\$0.00 - \$2,028.00</u>	<u>\$ 848.00</u>
	\$0.00 - \$4,628.00	\$1,578.00
TOTAL RANGE OF STATE COSTS:	\$76,833.70 - \$81	,461.70

As previously noted, county costs may vary greatly and are difficult to compute. Some of the costs attributable to the addition of a superior court judgeship include:

#### COUNTY FIXED COSTS

### Salaries:

÷

County Salary Supplement - Superior Court Judge County Salary Supplement - Secretary, Superior Court Judge County Salary Supplement - Assistant District Attorney County Salary Supplement - Court Reporter County Salary and Fringe Benefits - Investigator County Salary and Fringe Benefits (or Federal Match) - Law Clerk County Salary and Fringe Benefits - Secretary, Assistant District Attorney County Salary and Fringe Benefits - Bailiffs

## Equipment:

de t

11.14

l,

George State

	Office	Equipment and	Furniture -	Superior Court Judge
	Office	Equipment and	Furniture -	Secretary, Superior Court Judge
	Office	Equipment and	Furniture -	Court Reporter
57	Office	Equipment and	Furniture -	Assistant District Attorney
	Office	Equipment and	Furniture -	Law Clerk
	Office	Equipment and	Furniture -	Investigator
, 2	Office	Equipment and	Furniture -	Jury Holding Room
		Equipment and		
				Witness Holding Room

.

1

Ś

 $d_{1}$ 

 Ð

×.

1. L.L.

<u>\_</u>\_\_\_\_

-

## COUNTY VARIABLE COSTS

<u>Travel</u> :	Superior Court Judges - Expenses to Seminars, etc. Court Reporter Travel Expenses Law Clerk Travel Expenses Investigator's Travel Expenses
<u>Operating Expenses</u> :	Telephone and Telegraph Electricity Cost of Additional Office and Courtroom Space

Reproduction Costs Office Supplies

÷

1.1.1

(Ç.

<u>.</u>

10

ŝ

ų,

#### APPENDIX FOUR

### ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS

The exhibits presented in this appendix are intended to serve as a source of additional information and reference concerning Georgia's forty-two (42) circuits. Each has its own particular merit as follows:

Exhibit A-I is "Total FY1978 Superior Court Caseload by Filing Type." Since most of the circuit caseload figures included in the text of the report are per judge figures, this exhibit provides a reference for the total caseload in each circuit regardless of the number of judges.

Similarly, data concerning state, probate and juvenile courts' caseloads (Exhibits A-III, A-IV, and A-V respectively) is provided for reference to the absolute caseload in each court. Juvenile caseload provided in Exhibit A-V includes all juvenile cases whether heard by a superior or juvenile court judge or referee.

Exhibit A-II, "Superior Court Open Cases by Filing Type: FY1978," provides useful information about pending cases in the superior courts; the data located here is used by the Judicial Council as a secondary criterion in recommending judgeships. Because it is considered to be a temporary condition, the accumulation of pending cases in each circuit cannot alone justify the creation of an additional judgeship." Exhibits A-VII and A-VIII, "Assistance from Senior Judges: FY1978" and "Resident Active Attorneys: November,1978," are also considered as secondary criteria,"

174

as they do not directly relate to case workload. However, they do contribute to the total picture in each circuit.

4

Finally, "Population and Population Change by Circuit and County" and "Judicial Personnel: Superior, State and Juvenile Courts by Circuit and County: December 31, 1978" (Exhibits A-VI and A-IX) have been provided for general reference on any given county. If the reader wishes to observe the variation in county population within a circuit, then Exhibit A-VI is the proper reference. For information on county and circuit judicial positions, Exhibit A-IX is the proper place to reference state court judges (full and part-time), juvenile court judges (full and part-time) and juvenile referees. Exhibit A-IX is also the centralized source of the number of superior court judges by circuit.

S.E.

and the

# EXHIBIT A-I: TOTAL FY1978 SUPERIOR COURT CASELOAD BY FILING TYPE

£3)

Ø

			CRIMI FILIN	NAL IGS				VIL INGS		JUVENILE
CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE
ALAPAHA	4,396	462	1,443	1,267	3,172	460	447	161	1,068	156
ALCOVY	2,598	526	530	123	1,179	565	586	268	1,419	0
ATLANTA	15,236	4,501	31.	0	4,532	4,088	5,487	1,129	10,704	0
ATLANTIC	2,591	449	52	13	5.14	780	879	207	1,866	211
AUGUSTA	6,119	742	500	6	1,248	1,076	3,181	575	4,832	39
BLUE RIDGE	3,892	457	646	1,137	2,240	434	1,045	173	1,652	0
BRUNSWICK	3,155	339	268	2	609	735	1,473	338	2,546	0
CHATTAHOOCHEE	6,610	1,100	395	355	1,850	1,079	2,996	655	4,730	30
CHEROKEE	8,656	767	958	4,638	6,363	864	833	596	2,293	0
CLAYTON	4,019	631	68	9	708	678	2 397	236	3,311	<u> </u>
COBB	7,274	1,701	9	0	1,710	1:187	3 931	446	5:564	à <u>.</u>
CONASAUGA	4,331	469	489	182	1,140	1,047	1,462	565	3.074	117
CORDELE	2,104	245	689	33	967	407	451	189	1,047	90
COWETA	3,932	405	172	200	777	982	1.485	666	3,133	22_
DOUGHERTY	2,336	413	0	0	413	402	1,184	337	1,923	0
DUBLIN	1,411	227	1	0	228	484	422	236	1,142	41
EASTERN	5;571	1,338	258	66	1,662	820	2,400	689	3,909	0
FLINT	2,222	228	189	27	444	847	601	288	1,736	42
GRIFFIN	2,997	379	456	282	1,117	600	978	362	1,880	Ő
GWINNETT	2,891	328	1	1	330	453	1,595	513	2,561	0
HOUSTON	1,675	228		0	229	301	···· 865 ·	280	1,446	0

 $\mathbb{C}_{k}$ 

Ð

# EXHIBIT A-I: TOTAL FY1978 SUPERIOR COURT CASELOAD BY FILING TYPE

-33

			CRIMI FILIN					IVIL _INGS		JUVENILE FILINGS
CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS	FELONY	MISDEMEANO	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE
LOOKOUT MTN.	4.834	683	1,138-	298	2,119	861	1,397	457	2,715	0
MACON	4,668	891	287	17	1,195	845	1,977	602	3,424	49
MIDDLE	2,191	310	3	1	314	540	943	323	1,806	71
MOUNTAIN	2,133	158	174	66	398	.526	694	280	1,500	235
NORTHEASTERN	3,509	465	315	419	1,199	735	994	459	2,188	122
NORTHERN	2,358	265	302	73	640	682	593	365	1,640	78
OCMULGEE	3,897	610	756	177	1,543	889	726	542	2,157	197
OCONEE	2,844	361	456	299	1,116	660	456	341	1,457	271
OGEECHEE	2,069	246	38	5	289	716	650	209	1,575	205
PATAULA	1,560	. 283	381	24	688	408	247	181	836	36
PIEDMONT	1.852	179	202	378	759	435	364	294	1.093	· 0
ROME	4,666	379	1,618	93	2,090	901	⇔ 838	837	2,576	0
SOUTH GEORGIA	2,337	597	268	9	874	500	557	261	1,318	145
SOUTHERN	4,932	801	338	4	1.143	835	2,402	545	3,782	7
SOUTHWESTERN	1,527	172	55	11	238	515	458	236	1,209	80
STONE MTN.	11,743	1,979	102	13	2,094	2,623	5,474	1,552	9,649	0
TALLAPOOSA	5,720	560	889	548	1,997	1,777	1,199	676	3,652	71
TIFTON	1,971	299	152	21	472	511	602	352	1,465	34
TOOMBS	4,059	276	749	1,596	2,621	333	447	180	960	4.78
WAYCROSS	3,628	447	340	412	1,199	787	1,196	379	2.362	67
WESTERN	1,932	397	11	2	410 (	512	721	264	"1,497	25
TOTALS	168, 446	26,293	15,730	12,807	54,830	34,880	57,573	18,244	110,697	2,919

\*WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE COURT JUDGE.

 $\mathcal{J}_{\circ}$ 

## EXHIBIT A-II: SUPERIOR COURT OPEN CASES BY FILING TYPE: FY1978

			CRIMI OPE	INAL N			C) OF	VIL PEN		JUVENILE
CIRCUIT	TOTAL OPEN	FELONY	MISDEMEANOR		TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL
ALAPAHA	2,145	319	771	.145	1,235	545	232	126	903	17
ALCOVY	2,252	287	227	<u>31</u>	545	797	485	425	1,707	0 0
ATLANTA	9,373	1,580	27	0	1,607	4,937	2,231	598	7,766	0
ATLANTIC	1,081	155	24	2	181	508	<sub>o</sub> 283 ·	92	883	17
AUGUSTA	7,005	.419	288	7	714	2,230	3,053	1,002	6,285	6
BLUE RIDGE	2,212	429	382	294	1,105	417	598	92	1,107	0
BRUNSWICK	3,037	660	133		794	889	971	383	2,243	0
CHATTAHOOCHEE	7,852	719	254	147	1,120	1,902	3,834	954	6,690	42
CHEROKEE	5,512	425 ·	612	450 )	1,487	1,815	1,280	930	4,025	ı 0
CLAYTON	2,966	364	44	6	414	650	1,770	132	2,552	0
COBB	6,938	633	1	0	634	2,573	3,397	334	6,304	0
CONASAUGA	2,126	156	253	95	504	727	613	256	1,596	26
CORDELE	1,379	181	449	<sup>c)</sup> 24	654	304	209	203	716	9
COWETA	4,111	28	23	<b>8</b> e	59	1,497	1,413	1,141	4,051	
DOUGHERTY	1,382	142	0	· 0. · · · ·	142	406	406	428	1,240	0
DUBLIN	2,126	407	. 4	<u>}</u> 0	411	706	566	434	1,706	9
EASTERN	6,780	1,517	473	. 35	2,025	• 1,387	2,028	1,340	4,755	0
FLINT	2,834	294	594	60	948	989	448	420 <sup>110</sup>	1,857	29
GRIFFIN	2,909	164	110	95	369	947	949	644	2,540	0
GWINNETT	1,241	185		1	187	504	398	152	1,054	0
HOUSTON	1,679	153	5	0	158	309	898	314	1,521	0

()

\* WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.

**⊙** ·

			CR IMI OPE				CI OP	VIL EN		JUVENILE <sup>3</sup> OPEN
CIRCUIT	TOTAL OPEN	FELONY	MISDEMEANO	R TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDEN MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL
LOOKOUT MTN.	3,898	348	554	235	1,137	.973	1,161	627	2,761	0
MACON	4,260	531	156	35	722	979	1,818	678	3,475	63
MIDDLE	2,299	219	1	1	221	852	750	463	2,065	13
MOUNTAIN	1,150	118	145	67	330	349	285	172	806	14
NORTHEASTERN	1,337	142	84	100	326	497	308	164	969	42
NORTHERN	1,717	142	193	79	414	484	361	411	1,256	47
OCMULGEE	3,486	558	472	116	1,146	841	613	853	2,307	33
OCONEE	1,749	179	164	77	420	465	280	545	1,290	39
OGEECHEE	2,076	180	70	7	257	871	552	370	1,793	26°
PATAULA	1,383	146	363	11	520	437	173	250	860	3
PIEDMONT	2,717	105	75	81	261	645	467	1,344	2,456	0
ROME	4,457	377	. 593	. 88	1,058	1,296	1,058	1,045	3,399	0
SOUTH GEORGIA	1,255	332	327	30	689	196	146	148	490	76
SOUTHERN	3,202	346	112	4	462	669	1,447	621	2,737	3
SOUTHWESTERN	931	65	8	2	75	402	253	194	849	7
STONE MTN.	11,439	945	32	4	981	4,007	5,031	1,420	10,458	0.
TALLAPOOSÁ	8,935	762	978	545	2,285	3,414	1,819	1,367	6,600	50
TIFTON	1,794	408	167	11	586	352	416	431	1,199	9
TOOMBS	2,189	190	412	591	1,193	296	425	267	988	.8
WAYCROSS	1,757	237	95	6	338	492	706	211	1,409	10
WESTERN	1,501	530	11	7	548	400	353	198	951	2

## EXHIBIT A-II: SUPERIOR COURT OPEN CASES BY FILING TYPE: FY1978

\* WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE JUDGE OR REFEREE.

		1999) 1999 - 1999 1999 - 1999		an ta shi sa					tan setta dan Setta setta dan		a di senti setta di Senti setta di Senti
	#_STATE	MISDEM	EANOR	TRA	FFIC	GENERAL	CIVIL	INDEPENDEN	IT MOTIONS	TOTAL	CASES
CIRCUIT	ĈTS, IN CIRCUIT	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED
ALAPAHA		256	256	644	644	6	6	2	1	908	.907
ATLANTA	1	7,685	7,198	15,385	13,428	47,937	49,389	37,462	37,388	108,469	107,403
ATLANTIC	5	1,033	1,012	11,423	11,456	178	123	39	22	12,673	12,613
AUGUSTA	2	6.556	4,534	10.847	9,061	143	98	37	64	17,583	13,757
BLUE RIDGE	2	1,876	1,734	4,430	4,052	724	512	164	73	7,194	6,371
BRUNSWICK	3	2,441	2,046	8,023	7,897	1,515	1,234	1,457	1,344	13,436	12,521
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1	2,219	1,749	2,740	2,592	259	181	8	0	5,226	4,522
CLAYTON	1	2,700	3,376	8;322	8,174	3,711	2,747	959	523	15,692	14,820
COBB	1	3,129	3,202	15,323	13,621	8,628	7;902	1,102	1,256	28,182	25,981
COWETA	3	3,359	3,177	7,102	6,992	1,112	839	378	73	11,951	11,081
DOUGHERTY	1	3,687	3,633	2,502	2,445	1,333	1,316	2,144	1,593	9,666	8,987
DUBLIN	3	678	562	6,958	6,662	195	146	99	49	7,930	7,419
EASTERN	1	1,822	2,136	1,190	1,672	1,754	1,215	1,684	730	6,450	5,753
GRIFFIN	1	858	862	2,429	2,434	37	27	9.	4	3,333	3,327
GWINNETT	1	2,277	2,219	979	695	2,355	1,898	799	226	6,410	5,038
HOUSTON	1	2,431	2,308	4,938	5,144	642	464	305	233	8,316	8,149
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	1	462	478	2,354	2,404	54	100	31	25	2,901	3,007
MACON	1	3,048	3,031	2,469	2,445	483	461	91	56	6.091	5 993
MIDDLE	5	2,364	2,086	6,918	6,439	120	107	49	21	9,451	8,653
MOUNTAIN	2	1,004	816	1,847	1,731	172	119	63	42	3,086	2,708

4,663

530

537

201

174

6,434

7.264

## EXHIBIT A-III : STATE COURT CASELOAD BY CASE TYPE : FY1978

1,602

1

NORTHEASTERN

1,890

4,101

## EXHIBIT A-III : STATE COURT CASELOAD BY CASE TYPE : FY1978

	#_STATE	MISDEM	EANOR	ŤRAI	FFIC	GENERAL	CIVIL	INDEPENDEN	NT MOTIONS	TOTAL	CASES
CIRCUIT	ĈTS. IN CIRCUIT	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED
NORTHERN	1	305	270	632	753	17	20	12	10	966	1.053
OCMULGEE	2	1,800	1,800	2,189	2,188	2	0	0	0	3,991	3,988
OGEECHEE	4	778	568	8,296	7,811	318	187	58	16	9,450	8,582
PATAULA	2	670	529	1,059	868	26	26	6	4	1,761	1.427
PIEDMONT	]	326	249	2,937	2,575	106	93	66	29	3,435	2,946
SOUTH GEORGIA	3	1,671	1,690	4,237	4,259	43	33	30	20	5,981	6,002
SOUTHERN	4	3,328	3,319	13,003	12,430	178	138	65	22	16,574	15,909
SOUTHWESTERN	2	964	914	2,046	2,008	163	157	48	26	3,221	3,105
STONE MOUNTAIN*	1	7,749	6,835	6,387	5,533	14,594	14,051	11,809	10,948	40,539	37,367
TALLAPOOSA	1	188	175	433	421	184	175	52	12	857	783
TIFTON	2	1,868	1,482	6,303	6,091	204	175	50	9	8,425	7,757
WAYCROSS	3	1,876	1,454	4,663	4,418	324	265	75	56	6,938	6,193
WESTERN	1	392	410	112	92	155	180	137	105	796	787

\*SOME DISPOSITIONS FOR DEKALB COUNTY ESTIMATED BASED ON STATE AVERAGES.



	MISDEM	IEANOR	TRAI	FFIC	Т	DTAL
CIRCUIT	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED
ALAPAHA	309	315	3,256	3,314	3,565	3,629
ALCOVY	257	256	3,803	3,780	4,060	4,036
ATLANTIC	0	0	2,011	2,011	2,011	2,011
AUGUSTA	99	99	3,184	3,184	3,283	3,283
BLUE RIDGE	115	92	1,279	1,258	1,394	1,350
BRUNSWICK	161	161	4,738	4,862	4.899	5,023
CHATTAHOOCHEE	216	216	6,049	5,955	6,265	6,171
CHEROKEE	63	61	3,768	3,875	3,831	3,936
CONASAUGA	182	167	6,080	5,864	6,262	6,031
CORDELE	65	52	9,280	7,853	9,345	7,905
COWETA	115	122	3,075	2,843	3,190	2,965
DUBLIN	36	36	1,340	1,339	1,376	1,375
FLINT	385	401	15,022	15,154	15,407	15,555
GRIFFIN	103	106	5,305	5,186	5,408	5,292
LOOKOUT MTN.	64	73	8,680	8,539	8,744	8,612
MACON	121	121	3,037	3,037	3,158	3,158
MOUNTAIN	168	171	1,115	1,096	1,283	1,267
NORTHEASTERN	80	80	1,253	1,241	1,333	1,321
NORTHERN	221	231	5,236	5,344	5,457	5,575
OCMULGEE	113	113	6,491	6,470	6,604	6,583
OCONEE	324	324	4,605	4,604	4,929	4,928
PATAULA	592	590	3,929	3,927	4,521	4,517
PIEDMONT	7	9	1,231	1,272	1,238	1,281
ROME	147	119	4,130	3,934	4,277	4,053
SOUTH GEORGIA	120	120	552	552	672	672
SOUTHERN	91	93	1,524	1,532	1,615	1,625
SOUTHWESTERN	108	104	1,847	1,738	1,955	1,842
STONE MTN.	150	168	3,307	3,263	3,457	3,431
TALLAPOOSA	68	56	5,933	5,453	6,001	5,509
TIFTON	.404	404	4,120	4,120	4,524	4,524
TOOMBS	357	354	5,637	5,692	5,994	6,046
WAYCROSS	31	31	2,085	2,115	2,116	2,146
WESTERN	51	46	776	699	827	745

# EXHIBIT A-IV: PROBATE COURT CRIMINAL CASELOAD BY FILING TYPE: FY1978

					•							
	DEL.IN	QUENT	UNR	ULY	TRAFF	IC .	DEPR	IVED	SPEC PROCE	IAL EDING	TOT	
CIRCUIT	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED
Alapaha	150	143	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	149
Alcovy	268	261	121	123	57	53	115	106	8	8	569	551
Atlanta	3,968	3,407	1,019	855	292	254	540	494	34	28	5,853	5,038
Atlantic	153	139	39	41	3	2	9	9	7	7	211	198
Augusta	535	526	218	220	5	5	182	179	13	13	953	943
Blue Ridge	251	241	183	141	50	51	141	138	1	0	626	571
Brunswick	640	599	483	473	188	153	131	121	67	65	1,509	1,411 .
Chattahoochee	1,131	1,203	605	620	162	171	191	193	144	153	2,233	2,340
Cherokee	470	452	249	247	141	134	198	182	6	5	1,064	1,020
Clayton	958	896	565	552	133	120	434	474	10	10	2,100	2,052
Сорр	1,170	1,296	551	572	118	135.	189	201	71	64	2,099	2,268
Conasauga	362	351	161	146	5	5	120	106	1	1	649	609
Cordele	172	155	39	34	2	2	23	26	5	• 5	241	222
Coweta	410	369	76	70	37	35	230	214	3	2	756	690
Dougherty	480	480	36	36	35	35	3	3	80	80	634	634
Dublin	149	129	38	32	9	9	71	55	2	3	269	228
Eastern	1,206	1,174	235	217	156	152	99	82	59	56	1,755	1,681
Flint	124	107	15	11	4	3	54	28	1	1	198	150
Griffin	180	169.	59	54	2		134	125	2	2	377	351
Gwinnett	595	534	265	245	86	78	75	82	0	0	1,021	939
Houston	125	119	6	5	'O	0	26	19	0	0	157	143

# EXHIBIT A-V: JUVENILE COURT CASELOAD BY FILING TYPE: FY1978

		·		•.				· · · · ·				
	DELIN	QUENT	UNR	ULY	TRAFI	IC	DEPRI	VED	SPEC PROCEI	IAL EDING	тот	AL
CIRCUIT	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED	# CHILDREN	CHD. DISPOSED
Lookout Mt.	284	244	77	73	43	45	46	48	24	23	474	433
Macon	483	421	102	. 99	10	10	124	107	127	128	846	765
Middle	178	158	22	17	0	0	72	63	1	1	273	239
Mountain	145	148	43	42	27	29	20	22	0	0	235	241
Northeastern	397	403	189	155	26	25	47	49	1	1	660	633
Northern	96	79	18	18	5	3	21	21	4	11	144	132
Ocmulgee	95	86	40	27	5	5	46	38	11	11	197	167
Oconee	154	141	62	53	6	5	29	19	20	14	271	.232
Ogeechee	158	145	22	24	3	. 3	21	18	1	1	205	191
Pataula	107	100	3	3	0	0	10	10	0	0	120	113
Piedmont	118	116	44	51	5	4	31	26	7	10	205	207
Rome	347	340	256	254	33	30	188	189	1	1	825	814
South Georgia	118	83	9	б	1	1	11	11	6	1	145	102
Southern	254	235	68	64	16	14	37	33	93 ·	99	468	445
Southwestern	199	161	76	70	3	3	21	10	20	20	319	264
Stone Mountain	2,852	2,801	1,427	1,465	414	387	454	430	146	148	5,293	5,231
Tallapoosa	117	82	53	35	3	3	50	27	7	4	230	151
Tifton	156	140	11	9	4	4	5	2	10	5	186	160
Toombs	66	64	394	395	0	0	16	13	2	3	478	475
Waycross*	300	280	122 '	116	12	31	145	137	18	18	597	562
Western	272	268	34	31	216	201	28	30	9	8	559	538

## EXHIBIT A-V: JUVENILE COURT CASELOAD BY FILING TYPE: FY1978

\*NUMBER OF CHILDREN DISPOSED FOR WARE COUNTY ESTIMATED, BASED ON STATEWIDE AVERAGE OF CHILDREN DISPOSED/CHILDREN FILED.

Star I

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1977	1980 POPULATION PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1977-1980
ALAPAHA	ATKINSON	5,879	5,800	-1.34	6,200	6.90
	BERRIEN	11,556	12,600	9.03	12,700	0.79
	CLINCH	6,405	6,500	1.48	6,900	6.15
	СООК	12,129	11,300	-6.83	13,900	23.01
	LANIER	5.031	5,600	11.31	5,600	0.00
	TOTAL	41,000	41,800	1.95	45,300	8.37
ALCOVY	NEWTON	26,282	31,700	20.61	34,400	8.52
	WALTON	23,404	28,000	19.64	30,700	9.64
	TOTAL	49,686	59,700	20.15	65,100	9.05
ATLANTA	FULTON	605.210	576.800	-4.69	583,400	1.14
	TOTAL	605,210	576,800	-4.69	583,400	1.14
ATLANTIC	BRYAN	6,539	7,800_	19.28	8,500	8.97
	EVANS	7,290	8,100	11.11	9,000	11.11
	LIBERTY	17,569	27,300	55.31	27,200	-0.37
	LONG	3,746	3,700	-1.23	3,900	5.41
	MCINTOSH	7,371	7,400	0.39	9,100	22.97
	TATTNALL	16,557	17,700	6.90	18,100	2.26
	TOTAL	59.072	72,000	21.89	75,800	5.28
UGUSTA	BURKE	18.255	18,300	0.25	19,100	4.37
	COLUMBIA	22.327	30,800	37.95	31,600	2.60
	RICHMOND	162.437	163,000	0.35	179,500	10.12
	TOTAL	203,019	212,100	4.47	230,200	8.53
LUE RIDGE	CHEROKEE	31,059	42,100	35.55	45,100	7.13
	FANNIN	13,357	15,300	14.55	15,400	0.65
	FORSYTH	16,928	22,800	34.69	24,900	9.21
a Africa a constant an ang an an	GILMER	8,956	11,100	23.94	10,600	-4.50
	PICKENS	9,620	10,900	13.31	11,800	8.26
	TOTAL	79,920	102,200	27.88	107,800	5.48
RUNSWICK	APPLING	12.726	13,900	9.23.	14,600	5.04
	CAMDEN 🛇	11.334	11,200	-1.18	13,300	18.75
	GLYNN	50,528	51,400	1.73	59,200	15,18
	· JEFF DAVIS	9,425	11.100	17.77	11,600	4.50
	WAYNE	17,858	19.000	6.39	20,600	8.42
	TOTAL	<u>17.858</u> 101 <b>,</b> 871	106,600	4.64	119,300	11.91

	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1977	1980 POPULATION PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1977-1980
CHATTAHOOCHEE	CHATTAHOOCHEE	25,813	10,500	-59.32	15,200	44.76
	HARRIS	11,520	13,100	13.72	13,100	0.00
	MARION	5,099	5,000	-1.94	5,300	6.00
	MUSCOGEE	167,377	171,800	2.64	175,000	1.86
	TALBOT	6,625	6,800	2.64	6,600	-2.94
	TAYLOR	7,865	7,400	-5.91	7,800	5.41
	TOTAL	224,299	214,600	-4.32	223,000	3.91
CHEROKEE	BARTOW	32,911	37,300	13.34	44,500	19.30
	GORDON	23,570	27,900	18.37	28.900	3.58
	TOTAL	56,481	65,200	15.44	73,400	12.58
CLAYTON	CLAYTON	98,126	129,900	32.38	147,100	13.24
	TOTAL	98,126	129,900	32.38	147,100	13.24
COBB	COBB	196,793	263,000	33.64	274,100	4,22
	TOTAL	196,793	263,000	33.64	274,000	4.22
CONASAUGA	MURRAY	12,986	17,100	31.68	17,500	2.34
	WHITFIELD	55,108	63,700	15.59	70,400	10.52
	TOTAL	68,094	80,800	18.66	87,900	8.79
CORDELE	BEN HILL	13,171	14,200	7.81	14,600	2.82
in the second	CRISP	18,087	19,400	7.26	21,300	9.79
	DOOLY	10,404	11,300	8.6]	11,100	-1.77
	WILCOX	6,998	7,400	5.74	7,200	-2.70
	TOTAL	48,660	52,300	7.48	54,200	3.63
COWETA	CARROLL	45,404	56,400	24.22	59,300	5.14
	COWETA	32,310	37,400	15.75	38,900	4.01
	HEARD	5,354	5,700	6.46	6,000	5.26
	MERIWETHER	19,461	20,600	5.85	24,100	16.99
	TROUP	44,466	42,500	-4.42	46,400	9.18
	TOTAL	146,995	162,600	10.62	174,700	7.44
DOUGHERTY	DOUGHERTY	89,639	99,000	10.44	110,300	11.41
	TOTAL	89,639	99,000	10.44	110,300	11.41

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1977	1980 POPULATION PROJECTION	<sup>9</sup> CHANGE 1977 −1980
DUBLIN	JOHNSON	7,727	7,700	-0.35	8,000	3,90
	LAURENS	32,738	33,400	2.02	35,600	6.59
	TREUTLIN	5,647	6,100	8.02	6,000	-1.64
	TWIGGS	8,222	8,000	-2.70	8,700	8.75
	TOTAL	54,334	55,200	1.59	58,300	5.62
EASTERN	CHATHAM	187,816	191,500	1.96	202,000	5.48
	TOTAL	187,816	191,500	1.96	202,000	5.48
FLINT	BUTTS	10,560	12,800	21.21	14,200	10.94
	HENRY	23,724	28,300	19.29	31,900	12.72
	LAMAR	10,688	11,000	2.92	10,700	-2.73
	MONROE	10,991	12,400	12.82	13,300	7.26
	TOTAL	55,963	64,500	15.25	70,100	8.68
GRIFFIN	FAYETTE	11,364	18,400	61.91	19,800	7.61
	PIKE	7,316	8,200	12.08	8,000	-2.44
	SPALDING	39,514	43,600	10.34	44,100	1.15
	UPSON	23,505	24,000	2.11	26,800	11.67
	TOTAL	81,699	94,200	15.30	98,700	4.78
SWINNETT	GWINNETT	72,349	134,300	85.63	166,700	24.13
	TOTAL	72,349	134,300	85.63	166,700	24.13
HOUSTON	HOUSTON	62,924	78,900	25.39	. 85,500	8.37
	TOTAL	62,924	78,900	25.39	85,500	8.37
LOOKOUT MTN.	CATOOSA	28,271	35,200	24.51	36,700	4.26
	CHATTOOGA	20,541	21,700	5.64	23,200	6.91
	DADE	9,910	11,500	16.04	12,100	5.22
	WALKER	50,691	51,900	2.39	58,200	12.14
	TOTAL	109,413	120,300	9.95	130,200	8.23
MACON	BIBB	143,366	146,000	• 1.84	156,400	7.12
	CRAWFORD	5,748	6,400	11.34	6,600	3.13
	PEACH	15,990	18,800	17.59	21,800	15.96
a da anti-	TOTAL	165,104	171,200	3.69	184,800	7.94

يانجن يسيه

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1977	1980 POPULATION PROJECTION	% CHANGE 197 <b>7</b> -1980
MIDDLE	CANDLER	.6,412	6.300	-1.75	6,800	7.94
	EMANUEL	18,357	19,400	5.68	20,700	. 6.70
	JEFFERSON	17,174	16,900	-1.60	18,500	. 9.47
	TOOMBS	19,151	21,100	10.18	22,500	6.64
	WASHINGTON	17,480	16,900	-3.32	17,600	4.14
*	TOTAL	78,574	80,600	2.58	86,100	6.82
MOUNTAIN	HABERSHAM	20,691	23,000	11.16	23,700	3.04
	RABUN	8,327	. 8,700	4.48	10,500	20.69
	STEPHENS	20,331	22,400	10,18	23,200	3.57
	TOWNS .	4,565	5,300	16.10	5,200	-1.89
	· UNION	6,811	8,200	20.39	8,300	1.22
	TOTAL	60,725	67,600	11.32	70,900	
NORTHEASTERN	DAWSON	3,639	. 4,900	34.65	4,600	-6.12
	I HALL	59,405	67,700	13.96	74,300	9.75
	LUMPKIN	8,728	• 9,400	7.70	10,600	12.77
a the second	WHITE	7,742	9,000	16.25	9,400	4.44
	TOTAL	79,514	91,000	14,45	98,900	8,68
NORTHERN	ELBERT	17,262	17,600	1.96	18,700	6.25
	FRANKLIN	12,784	13,700	7.17	14,200	3.65
• 12	HART	15,814	16;200	2.44	.17,800	9.88
	MADISON	13,517	15,800	16.89	1.7,500	. 10.76
	OGLETHORPE	7,598	8,900	17.14	8,500	-4.49
and the second	TOTAL	66,975	72,200	7.80	76,700	6.23
OCMULGEE	BALDWIN	34,240	32,500	-5.08	36,600	• 12.62
	GREENE	10,212	10,600	3.80	11,200	.5.66
	HANCOCK	9,019	9,200	2.01	9,300	1.09
	JASPER	5,760 :	6,800	18.06	7,100	4.41
	JONES	12,270	15,700	27.95	17,000	8.28 .
		. 9,904	.9,800	-1.05		12.24
	• PUTNAM		9,700	15.56	10,000	3.09
	L'ANTI KINICONI S	9,393	10,300	9.66	10,200	. <b>0.</b> 97
	TOTAL	. 99.192	104:600	5.45	- 112,400	7.46 +

100

49

Ð

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1977	1980 POPULATION PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1977 -1980
OCONEE	BLECKLEY	10,291	10,800	4.95	11,100	2.78
	DODGE	15,658	15,900	1.55	17,400	9.43
	MONTGOMERY	6,099	6,500	6.57	6,800	4.62
	PULASKI	8,066	7,600	-5.78	8,600	13,16
	TELFAIR	11,394	11,800	3.56	12,900	9,32
	WHEELER	4,596	5,100	10.97	5,200	1.96
	TOTAL	56,104	57,700	2.84	62,000	7.45
OGEECHEE	BULLOCH	31,585	34,400	8.91	38,800	12.79
	EFFINGHAM	13,632	16,300	19.57	18,300	12.27
	JENKINS	8,332	8,300	-0.38	8,400	1.20
	'SCREVEN	12,591	13,800	9.60	12,300	-10.87
	TOTAL	66,140	72,800	10.07	77,800	6.87
PATAULA	CLAY	3,636	3,800	4.51	_3,000	-21.05
	EARLY	12,682	12,600	-0.65	13,200	4.76
	MILLER	6,424	6,500	1.18	6,500	0.00
	QUITMAN	2,180	1,900	-12.84	2,100	10.53
	RANDOLPH	8,734	9,200	5.34	8,900	-3.26
	SEMINOLE	7,059	7,900	11.91	8,900	12.66
	TERRELL	11,416	10,700	-6.27	11,500	7.48
	TOTAL	52,131	52,600	0.90	54,100	2,85
IEDMONT	BANKS	6,833	8,000	17.08	7,200	-10.00
	BARROW	16,859	18,500	9.73	21,100	14.05
	JACKSON	21,093-	23,000	9.04	25,600	11.30
	TOTAL	44,785	49,500	10.53	53,900	8.89
OME	FLOYD	73,742	78,800	6.86	84,400	7.11
	TOTAL	73,742	78,800	6.86	84,400	7.11
OUTH GEORGIA	BAKER	3,875	4,200	8.39	3,600	-14.29
	CALHOUN	6,606	6,300	-4.63	6,900	9.52
	DECATUR	22,310	23,100	3.54	23,500	1.73
	GRADY	17,826	19,500	9,39	19,400	-0.5]
	MITCHELL	18,956	18,500	-2.41	20,800	12.43
	TOTAL	69,573	71,600	2.91	74,200	3.63

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1977	1980 POPULATION PROJECTION	% CHANGE 197 <b>7</b> -1980
SOUTHERN	BROOKS	13,743	13,700	-0.31	14,100	2.92
	COLOUITT	32,298	33,200	2.79	34,700	4.52
	ECHOLS	1,924	1,900	-1.25	2,200	15.79
	LOWNDES	55,112	67,400	22.30	72,700	7.86
	THOMAS	34,562	36,100	4.45	39,900	10.53
	TOTAL	134,639	152,300	10.65	163,600	7.42
SOUTHWESTERN	LEE	7,044	8,900	26.35	9,900	11.24
	MACON	12,933	12,400	-4.12	13,900	12.10
	SCHLEY	3,097	2,900	-6.36	3,200	10.34
	STEWART	6,511	5,800	-10.92	6,000	3.45
	SUMTER	26,931	26,800	-0.49	31,500	17.54
	WEBSTER	2,362	2,000	-15.33	2,700	35.00
	TOTAL	58,878	58,800	-0.13	67,200	14.29
TONE MOUNTAIN	DEKALB	415,387	473,200	13.92	500,200	5.71
	ROCKDALE	18,152	27,600	52.05	29,600	7.25
	TOTAL	433,539	500,800	15.51	529,800	5.79
ALLAPOOSA	DOUGLAS	28,659	44,300	54.58	61,200	38.15
	HARALSON	15,927	18,000	13.02	18,000	0.00
	PAULDING	17,520	22,400	27.85	25,000	11.61
	POLK	29,656	30,800	3.86	34,200	11.04
	TOTAL	91,762	115,500	25.87	138,400	19.83
IFTON	IRWIN	8,036	8,500	5.77	8,900	4.71
	TIFT	27,288	30,900	13.24	34,200	10.68
······································	TURNER	8,790	8,700	-1.02	9,600	10.34
	WORTH	14,770	16,500	11.71	17,700	7.27
	TOTAL	58,884	64,600	9.71	70,400	8.98
FOOMBS	GLASCOCK	2,280	2,600	14.04	2,300	<b>⊸</b> -11.54
	LINCOLN	5,895	6,600	11.96	6,800	3.03
	MCDUFFIE	15,276	16,800	9.98	17,900	6.55
	TALIAFERRO	2,423	2,500	3.18	1,900	-24.00
	WARREN	6,669	6,000	-10.03	6,600	10.00
	WILKES	10,184	10,200	0.16	10,700	4.90
	TOTAL	42,727	44,700	4.62	46,200	3.36

Ó

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1977 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1977	1980 POPULATION PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1977-1980
WAYCROSS	BACON	8,233	9,600	16.60	9,100	-5.21
	BRANTLEY	5,940	8,300	39.73	7,700	-7.23
	CHARLTON	5,680	6,300	10.92	6,700	6.35
	COFFEE	22,828	24,300	6.45	27,000	11.11
	PIERCE	9,281	11,200	20,68	10.600	-5.36
	WARE	33,525	34,300	2.31	36,100	5.25
	TOTAL	85,487	94,000	9.96	97,200	3.40
WESTERN	CLARKE	65,177	76,400	17.22	86,900	13.74
	OCONEE	7,915	9,800	. 23.82 .	10,000	2.04
	TOTAL	73,092	86,200	17.93	96,900	12.41
	•					
STATEWIDE TOTAL		4,587,930	5,064,600	10.39	5,429,000	. 7.20

SOURCE: ANNUAL ESTIMATE OF POPULATION FOR THE STATE OF GEORGIA 1977 (OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET, SEPTEMBER 1978) AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR GEORGIA COUNTIES 1980-2010 (OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET, SEPTEMBER, 1977).



## SOURCE: GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

3

000 Descinor

Carrier .

CIRCUIT	# OF DAYS	RANK
ALAPAHA	15	21
ALCOVY	5	26.3
ATLANTA	399	1
ATLANTIC	40	14.5
AUGUSTA	18	18.5
BLUE RIDGE	75	7
BRUNSWICK	302	2
CHATTAHOOCHEE	2	30
CHEROKEE	63	9
CLAYTON	50	12
COBB	193	3
CONASAUGA	12	22
CORDELE	27	16
COWETA	0	32.1
DOUGHERTY	0	32.1
DUBLIN	23	17
EASTERN	54	10.5
FLINT	54	10.5
GRIFFIN	5	26.3
GWINNETT	16	20
HOUSTON	18	18.5
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	0	32.1
MACON	76	б
MIDDLE	0	32.1
MOUNTAIN	9	24
NORTHEASTERN	40	14.5
NORTHERN	7	25
OCMULGEE	0	32.1
OCONEE	0	32.1
OGEECHEE	1	31
PATAULA	4	29
PIEDMONT	0	32.1
ROME	49	13
SOUTH GEORGIA	5	26.3
SOUTHERN	11	23
SOUTHWESTERN	0	32.1
STONE MOUNTAIN	155	4
TALLAPOOSA	73	8
TIFTON	104	5
TOOMBS	0	32.1
WAYCROSS	0	32.1
WESTERN	0	32.1
TOTAL	1,905	
AVERAGE OF ALL CIRCUITS AVERAGE OF 31 CIRCUITS		

EXHIBIT A-VII: ASSISTANCE FROM SENIOR JUDGES BY CIRCUIT: FY1978

					1971-		
CIRCUIT	1971	RANK	1978	RANK	CHANGE	00 0	RANK
ALAPAHA	23	40	28	41	5	21.7	40
ALCOVY	30	34.5	54	31	.24	80	13
ATLANTA	2,326	1 1	4,346	1	2,020	86.8	10
ATLANTIC	34	30.5	48	33	14	41.2	32
AUGUSTA	186	5	268	6	82	44 ; 1	29
BLUE RIDGE	32	32	72	22	40	125	2
BRUNSWICK	84	10.5	_139	10	55	65.5	18
CHATTAHOOCHEE	176	7	243	7	67	38,1	34
CHEROKEE	39	25	59	28	20	51.3	24
CLAYTON	59 ·	14	132	11	73	123.7	3
COBB	180	6	392	4	212	117.8	4
CONASAUGA	41	24	74	20.5	33	80.5	11
CORDELE	24 🖓	39	34	37.5	10	41.7	31
COWETA	86	9	127	14.5	41	47.7	26
DOUGHERTY	77	12	127	14.5	50	64.9	19
DUBLIN	27	38	34	37.5	7	25.9	37
EASTERN	262	3	404	3	142	54.2	21
FLINT	30	34.5	60	26.5	30	100	7.5
GRIFFIN	45	20	90	18	45	100	7.5
GWINNETT	43	22	131	12	88	204.7	1
HOUSTON	37	26.5	60	26.5	23	62.2	20
LOOKOUT MTN.	44	21	66	25	22	50	25
MACON	221	4	336	5	115	52	23
MIDDLE	51	17.5	71	23	20	39.2	33
MOUNTAIN	34	30.5	67	24	33	97.1	9
NORTHEASTERN	71	13	128	13	57	80.3	12
NORTHERN	42	23	56	30	14	33.3	35
OCMULGEE	51	17.5	74	20.5	23	45.1	27
OCONEE	29	36.5	38	35.5	9	31	36
OGEECHEE	36	28	45	34	9	25	38
PATAULA	29	36.5	33	39.5	4	13.8	42
PIEDMONT	19	42	33	39.5	14	73.7	16
ROME	54	15	97	16	43	79.6	14
SOUTH GEORGIA	35	29	50	32	15	42.9.	30
SOUTHERN	87	8	146	9	59	67.8	17
SOUTHWESTERN	31	33	38	35.5	7	22.6	39
STONE MTN,	342	2	723	2	381	111.4	5
TALLAPOOSA	47	19	96	17	49	104.3	6
TIFTON	37	26.5	57	29	20	54.1	22
TOOMBS	22	41	26	42	4	18.2	41
WAYCROSS	52	16	75	19	23	44.2	28
WESTERN	84	10.5	148	8	64	76.2	15

## EXHIBIT A-VIII: RESIDENT ACTIVE ATTORNEYS BY CIRCUIT: NOVEMBER, 1978

Ø

SOURCE: GEORGIA BAR ASSOCIATION DIRECTORY LISTING OF ACTIVE ATTORNEYS

		SUPERIOR	ST	ATE		JUVENIL	Ε
otpout T			FULL	PART	FULL	PART	
CIRCUIT	COUNTY		TIME	TIME	TIME	TIME	REFEREE
Alapaha	Atkinson						
	Berrien						
	Clinch			1			
at en la set	Cook						
	Lanier						
	Circuit Total	2		1			
Alcovy	Newton				1. an 1. an 1. An 1. an 1. an 1. an 1. an 1. an 1. an 1.	1	
	Walton					1	
	Circuit Total	2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			2	
Atlanta	Ful ton	11	8		2		2
Atlantic	Bryan			1			
	Evans			]			
	Liberty			1			
	Long	n <del>a faile ann an an an an an an an an a</del> nn. An ann an Anna	<u>a an an</u>		<del>na ing panganan a</del> ng panganan na panga Panganan panganan na pangan Panganan panganan na pangana		
	McIntosh						<del>a ser a s</del> Ser a ser
	Tattnall			1			
	Circuit Total	2		5			
Augusta	Burke			1			1
	Columbia						<del>nian gegeneration.</del> Second
	Richmond		1				1
	Circuit Total	4	<u> </u>	1			<u>ż</u>
Blue Ridge	Cherokee		1/2*			1/5*	
Dide Kluge	Fannin					1/5*	
	Forsyth		1/2*			1/5*	
	Gilmer		1/2			1/5*	
	Pickens						
10 10	Circuit Total					<u>1/5*</u> 1	
		2	1				
Brunswick	Appling			1		**	
	Camden		a da la composición de la composición d Composición de la composición de la comp				
	Glynn		1		ng ng sigit na sa S Sang sigit ng sang sa S	ŀ	1
	Jeff Davis						1
	Wayne Circuit Total	2		<u>1</u> 2		1 3	

## EXHIBIT A-IX: JUDICIAL PERSONNEL: SUPERIOR, STATE AND JUVENILE COURTS BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1978

 $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$  .

+ COUNTY COURT

\* FRACTIONS INDICATE THAT A SINGLE JUDGE SERVES MORE THAN ONE COUNTY.

\*\* STATE COURT JUDGE HEARING JUVENILE CASES.

\*\*\* JUDGES PRO HAC VICE.

EXHIBIT A-IX: JUDICIAL PERSONNEL: SUPERIOR, STATE AND JUVENILE COURTS BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1978

		SUPERIOR		ATE		JUVENIL	<u>.</u>
CIRCUIT	COUNTY		FULL TIME	PART	FULL TIME	PART	REFEREE
Chattahooch	ee Chattahoochee						
	Harris			<u></u>			
	Marion					<u> </u>	
	Muscogee						
	Talbot		<u></u>				
	Taylor						
	Circuit Total	4	1			1	
Cherokee	Bartow					1	
	Gordon					]	
	Circuit Total	2				2	
<b>Cl</b> ayton	Clayton	3	1		1		
<u>viuj (011</u>		<u> </u>	and the second	·····			
Cobb	Cobb	4	4		1		n seta da l Nga <b>t</b> ing
<u>0000</u>	0050						<b>•</b>
Conasauga	Murray						
	Whitfield		5			<u> </u>	an a
	Circuit Total	2				1	
Cordele	Ben Hill						
<u></u>	Crisp		4.4			1	
	Dooly					•	
	Wilcox						
	Circuit Total	1		<del>a da ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang an</del>		1	
Coweta	Carroll			1		**	
	Coweta			1	x + y + y + y + y + y + y + y + y + y +	**	
	Heard						
	Meriwether					1	
na na sana na sain na sain na sain na sain na sain	Troup	A4	1			1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Circuit Total	2	1	2		2	
Dougherty	Dougherty	2	1	2***		1	1
Dublin	Johnson			1			
	Laurens			1		1	
	Treutlen			<u> </u>			
	Twiggs						
	Circuit Total		<u></u>	3			
	GERTER AND AND A STREET AND A ST			3		- <b>-</b>	
	Chatham						

+COUNTY COURT

11

\*FRACTIONS INDICATE THAT A SINGLE JUDGE SERVES MORE THAN ONE COUNTY. \*\*STATE COURT JUDGE HEARING JUVENILE CASES. \*\*\*JUDGES PRO HAC VICE.

	an a sana ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang	SUPERIOR	STATE		JUVENILE		
CIRCUIT	COUNTY		FULL	PART	FULL TIME	PART TIME	REFEREE
Flint	Butts					1	اليوني من من الله المراجع المراجع
	Henry					1	
	Lamar						
	Monroe						
	Circuit Total	2				2	
Griffin	Fayette					1/4*	
	Pike					1/4*	
	Spalding			1		1/4*	
	Upson					1/4*	
	Circuit Total	2		1		1	
Gwinnett	Gwinnett	3		1		1	
Houston	Houston		1			**	
Lookout Mt	m. Catoosa					1	
	Chattooga				1		
	Dade					1	
	Walker			- 1.		1	
	Circuit Total	3		1		3	1
Macon	Bibb		1			1	
<u>inacon</u>	Crawford	<u></u>					
	Peach	and a state of the s The state of the state		a an	*		in the second
4	Circuit Total	3	1			1	
Middle	Candler			1			
	Emanuel		1				1
den hada	Jefferson			1			
	Toombs			1		مان الأقر	
	Washington			]			1
	Circuit Total	2	1	4			3
<u>Mountain</u>	Habersham	a fan de server a la construction de la construction de la construction de la construction de la construction d La construction de la construction d		1			
	Rabun						
	Stephens			1			
	Towns						
	Union						
	Circuit Total			2			

EXHIBIT A-IX: JUDICIAL PERSONNEL: SUPERIOR, STATE AND JUVENILE COURTS. BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1978

\*COUNTY COURT // \*FRACTIONS INDICATE THAT A SINGLE JUDGE SERVES MORE THAN ONE COUNTY. \*\*STATE COURT JUDGE HEARING JUVENILE CASES. \*\*\*JUDGES PRO HAC VICE.

		SUPERIOR	STATE		JUVENILE		
CIRCUIT	COUNTY		FULL TIME	PART TIME	FULL TIME	PART TIME	REFEREE
Northeaste	rn Dawson						
	Hall		1			1	
	Lumpkin						
	White						
	Circuit Total	2	1			1	
Northern	Elbert		stantin dan Salah	1			]
	Franklin						
	Hart						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Madison						
	Oglethorpe						
	Circuit Total	2		1			1
<b>Ocmu1</b> gee	Baldwin			1+			
	Greene						
	Hancock						
	Jasper						
	Jones						
and a star of the second s	Morgan						
	Putnam						
	Wilkinson						- <u> </u>
	Circuit Total	2		2			
Oconee	Bleckley						
	Nodge						-
	Montgomery						
	Pulaski						
	Telfair						
	Wheeler						
j.	Circuit Total	2	<u>in an an</u>	<del> </del>			
Ogeechee	Bulloch			1			
	Effingham			1			
	Jenkins		angan angan sa	1			
	Screven			1			
	Circuit Total	2		<u> </u>			
	CITCUIL IOLAL	2		4			ana an taon 1 Pana Ang taon 1

EXHIBIT A-IX: JUDICIAL PERSONNEL: SUPERIOR, STATE AND JUVENILE COURTS BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1978

ð

1

\*COUNTY COURT \*FRACTIONS INDICATE THAT A SINGLE JUDGE SERVES MORE THAN ONE COUNTY. \*\*STATE COURT JUDGE HEARING JUVENILE CASES. \*\*\*JUDGES PRO HAC VICE.

		SUPERIOR	. STATE		JUVENILE		
CIRCUIT	COUNTY		FULL TIME	PART	FULL	PART	REFEREE
Pataula	Clay					1/3*	
	Early			1		1/3*	
	Miller			1			
	Quitman		- <del></del>				<del>شينتې دي. د ريوند شيو</del> تر مېښې رو
	Randolph					1/3*	
	Seminole						
	Terrell					1	
na transformation d' An transformation	Circuit Total	1		2		2	
Piedmont	Banks	*				1/2*	
	Barrow					1/2*	<del>na ang kang kang kang kang kang kang kan</del>
	Jackson			1		**	
	Circuit Total	1		1		1	
Rome	Floyd	2		de tart 1 teor per de 1 teor per de		1	<u> </u>
South Georg	ia Baker						
couch acory	Calhoun						
	Decatur				<del>alan di serangan di serang kan</del>	<b>مرد بلی اور ایر این این مرد میرد.</b> اور این	<u> </u>
	Grady			<u> </u>			
	Mitchell					and a second	<mark>a sense an sin ser sense ser ser ser ser ser ser ser ser ser s</mark>
	Circuit Total	2		3			
Southern	Brooks						
	Colquitt			1		1	
	Echols			7+			
	Lowndes			1		1	
	Thomas			1		1	
	Circuit Total	3		4		3	
Southwester							
	Macon			1			
	Schley		Na jaara			an a	
	Stewart						
	Sumter						
	Webster						
	Circuit Total	1		2		1	
Stone Mounta	ain DeKalb		3		2		1
	Rockdale					1	1
	Circuit Total		3		2		

EXHIBIT A-IX: JUDICIAL PERSONNEL: SUPERIOR, STATE AND JUVENILE COURTS BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1978

+ COUNTY COURT

11

FRACTIONS INDICATE THAT A SINGLE JUDGE SERVES MORE THAN ONE COUNTY.

\*\*\* STATE COURT JUDGE HEARING JUVENILE CASES. JUDGES PRO HAC VICE.

		SUPERIOR	STATE		JUVENILE		
CIRCUIT	COUNTY		FULL TIME	PART TIME	FULL TIME	PART TIME	REFEREE
Tallapoosa	Douglas						1
	Haralson						
	Paulding						
	Polk	**************************************	1			**	
	Circuit Total	3	1				1
Tifton	Irwin		na da como de la como En como de la como de la En como de la				
	Tift			1			1
	Turner						
	Worth			1			1
	Circuit Total	1		2			2
Toombs	Glascock		÷9				
	Lincoln						
	McDuffie						
	Taliaferro						
	Warren						
	Wilkes		internet de la constante la filo de la constante la filo de la constante de la constante de la constante de la constante de la constante la filo de la constante de la co			1 <b></b>	
an a	Circuit Total	1					- <u></u> -
Waycross	Bacon						
	Brantley						<u>e</u> :
	Charlton				<del>,</del>		<u> </u>
	Coffee	<u></u>	and the second second	1			1
	Pierce	•••		<u> </u>			
	Ware		***	<u> </u>		1	
	Circuit Total	2	•• •	3		i	1
<u>Western</u>	Clarke			1	• 1	anta generativa Statuto de Carlos Alternativa	
	Oconee						
	Circuit Total	2		1	1		
							en de la composition de la composition En la composition de l
TOTAL		102	29	50	8	. 34	21

EXHIBIT.A-IX: JUDICIAL PERSONNEL: SUPERIOR, STATE AND JUVENILE COURTS BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1978

COUNTY COURT

\*\* FRACTIONS INDICATE THAT A SINGLE JUDGE SERVES MORE THAN ONE COUNTY. \*\*\* STATE COURT JUDGE HEARING JUVENILE CASES. JUDGES PRO HAC VICE.



