

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



1972

NCJRS

JUL 14 1970

ADDITIONS

**SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING  
THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL  
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIPS IN GEORGIA**

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 James B. O'Connor, Chairman  
Judge Charles L. Weltner, Vice Chairman  
Judge Norman L. Underwood, Sec - Treasurer  
Judge Francis W. Allen  
Judge Joseph J. Gaines  
Judge W. Marion Guess, Jr.  
Charles H. Hyatt, Esq.  
Justice Robert H. Jordan  
Kirk M. McAlpin, Esq.  
Judge Paul W. Painter  
Judge Andrew J. Whalen, Jr.

DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Robert L. Doss, Jr.

The Seventh Annual Report Regarding the Need for Additional Superior Court Judgeships in Georgia was approved by the Judicial Council of Georgia on December 5, 1979, and is provided for the information of Governor George D. Busbee and members of the Georgia General Assembly pursuant to Ga. Laws 1973, p. 288.

Funding for publication of this report was provided by Grant No. 79A-32-7905-0001 awarded by the State Crime Commission under a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice.

This document was prepared under the auspices of the Administrative 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. Nicholas E. Bloom Ms. Veronica Houston Ms. Nancy MacDonald Ms. Molly McPhillamy
Graphics:	Ms. Patty Bisbort
Typists:	Ms. Yvonne Mays Ms. Deborrah Parker Ms. Norma Wells
Programmer Analyst:	Mr. Curtis Mitchell
Data Entry Clerk:	Ms. Martha Wilder

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

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	i
INTRODUCTION .....	3
Statement of Policy .....	5
The Judicial Council Recommendations for 1980 .....	7
Past Recommendations of the Judicial Council .....	10
Methodology .....	16
Report Design .....	37
 CHAPTER I - ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1980 .....	 41
Circuit Reports: .....	43
Toombs .....	45
Tifton .....	48
Rome .....	50
Cordele.....	51
Coweta .....	56
Brunswick .....	58
Dublin .....	61
 CHAPTER II - CASELOAD IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS: FY1979 FILINGS..	 65
Exhibit I    Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Total Caseload per Judge: FY1979.....	 68
Exhibit II   Superior Court Criminal Filings: FY1979 .....	76
Exhibit III  Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Felony and Domestic Relations Filings per Judge: FY1979..	 82
Exhibit IV   Average and Observed Rate of Change in Superior Court Filings per Judge: FY1976 - FY1979 and FY1978 - FY1979.....	 87

	Page
CHAPTER III - CASELOAD IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS: FY1979 DISPOSITIONS .....	101
Exhibit V    Total FY1979 Dispositions per Judge and Dispositions as a Percent of Filings per Judge.....	103
Exhibit VI   Total FY1979 Dispositions per Judge and Percent Disposed by Each Method .....	112
Exhibit VII  FY1979 Criminal Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Percent Disposed by Each Method .....	121
Exhibit VIII FY1979 Civil Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Number Disposed by Each Method .....	128
 CHAPTER IV - CIRCUIT POPULATION: 1978 .....	 137
Exhibit IX   1970 and 1978 Circuit Population, Rate of Change and 1978 Population per Judge .....	138
 CHAPTER V - POTENTIAL SOURCES OF JUDICIAL ASSISTANCE: SUPPORTING COURTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS .....	 145
Exhibit X    Analysis of Supporting Courts: State, Probate and Juvenile: FY1979 .....	148
Exhibit XI   Superior Court FY1979 Caseload by Administrative District .....	155
 APPENDIX ONE - DUTIES OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL/ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS .....	 165
 APPENDIX TWO - JURISDICTION OF SUPERIOR, STATE, PROBATE AND JUVENILE COURTS .....	 167
 APPENDIX THREE -EXPENDITURES FOR AN ADDITIONAL SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIP.....	 173

APPENDIX FOUR - ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS .....	177
A-I Total FY1979 Superior Court Caseload by Filing Type .....	180
A-II Superior Court Open Cases by Filing Type: FY1979 .....	182
A-III State Court Caseload: FY1979.....	184
A-IV Probate Court Criminal Caseload: FY1979.....	185
A-V Juvenile Court Caseload: FY1979 .....	186
A-VI Population and Population Change by County and Circuit: 1970, 1978, 1985 Projected.....	188
A-VII Assistance from Senior Judges: FY1979 .....	192
A-VIII Resident Active Attorneys: 1978-1979 .....	193
A-IX Judicial Personnel: Superior, State and Juvenile Courts by Circuit and County December 31, 1979 .....	194

# INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF POLICY  
JUDICIAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1980  
PAST RECOMMENDATIONS  
METHODOLOGY  
REPORT DESIGN

## INTRODUCTION

The following pages represent the seventh 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 Seventh Annual Report Regarding the Need for Additional Superior Court Judgeships in Georgia<sup>c</sup> is offered to the 1980 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 1980 Judgeship Study was collected by the nine District Administrative Assistants 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.

The present study includes a comprehensive evaluation of the need for additional superior court judgeships in all forty-two judicial circuits in Georgia. All data

---

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

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

<sup>c</sup> See p. 7 for a summary of the 1980 Judicial Council recommendations concerning the need for additional superior court judgeships.

was collected for the 1979 fiscal year in the superior, state, probate and juvenile courts of Georgia. The 1979 fiscal year was selected as the time period for this study so that the recommendations to the 1980 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 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.

## STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Judicial Council of Georgia has a policy concerning judicial assistance which states that no new part-time judgeships should be created and that multi-judge circuits should be established whenever possible to capture the benefits associated with multi-judge courts--that is, improved court administration, caseload and jury management efficiencies and economies of personnel and administrative costs.

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.

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

the appearance that the local judge is avoiding responsibility.

5. Improves court administration--multi-judge circuits tend to promote impartiality and uniformity of administrative practices and procedures. 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.

THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1980

The Judicial Council of Georgia recommends that additional judgeships be created in seven of Georgia's forty-two judicial circuits. In order of priority, these circuits are:

TOOMBS  
TIFTON  
ROME  
CORDELE  
COWETA  
BRUNSWICK  
DUBLIN<sup>d</sup>

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

The following pages of this report include the results of a detailed survey of caseload and demographic characteristics of all forty-two judicial circuits in Georgia. Each circuit is evaluated on the basis of an established set of criteria (see Report Design p.37) and the seven circuits receiving recommendations generally exceeded the other 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 in 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 provide the judicial assistance necessary to keep pace with increasing caseloads, but that these recommendations allocate judgeships to circuits in which the existing judges are presently forced to assume a disproportionate share of the state's workload.

---

<sup>d</sup> Conditioned on the abolition of the State Court of Laurens County.

One method of evaluating the current recommendations of the Judicial Council is to compare the circuit mean caseload per judge<sup>e</sup> for the seven circuits receiving recommendations with the statewide circuit mean per judge.<sup>f</sup> Below is a comparison of the circuit mean caseload per judge of the seven circuits receiving recommendations to the circuit mean caseload per judge for the entire state:

	<u>RECOMMENDED CIRCUITS</u>	<u>STATEWIDE CIRCUIT MEAN</u>
FELONY	255	253
MISDEMEANOR	457	215
TRAFFIC	167	191
TOTAL CRIMINAL	879	658
GENERAL CIVIL	516	359
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	587	552
INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	305	198
TOTAL CIVIL	1408	1109
JUVENILE	166	79
TOTAL FILINGS	2453	1842

Note that in each filing category except traffic, the circuit mean of the recommended circuits exceeds the statewide circuit mean. The effect of creating additional judgeships in these seven circuits will reduce the caseload of these circuits so as to approach more closely 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."

<sup>e</sup>The circuit mean caseload per judge is the sum of the caseload per judge for each of the recommended circuits divided by the number of these circuits (7).

<sup>f</sup> The statewide circuit mean per judge is the sum of the caseload per judge for each circuit divided by the total number of circuits in the state (42).

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

PAST RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For the past seven 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:

<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
ATLANTA*	COBB	CHEROKEE	CHEROKEE	CHEROKEE*	EASTERN*
CONASAUGA*	SOUTHERN*	CLAYTON	MIDDLE*	SOUTH GEORGIA*	OCMULGEE*
COWETA*	FLINT*	COBB	GRIFFIN*	ALCOVY*	TOOMBS
DOUGHERTY*		GWINNETT	TALLAPOOSA*	COBB*	
WAYCROSS*		MIDDLE	ALAPAHA*	LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN*	
		NORTHERN	NORTHERN*	OGEECHEE*	
		OCONEE*	CLAYTON*		
		TALLAPOOSA	COBB		
		WESTERN*	GWINNETT*		
			CHATTAHOOCHEE*		

\* Circuits in which an additional judgeship was actually created

Over this seven-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.

There is no single statistical indicator of judicial workload. Although caseload data provides the primary criteria for evaluating the need for additional judgeships, it 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 effectiveness of placement of additional judgeships is by 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>9</sup>

From the table on the next page it can be seen that the recommended circuits have considerably higher average total caseloads per judge than the state as a whole. Generally this difference has been manifested in each case type. The seven circuits receiving recommendations for 1979 judgeships have averages higher than the state circuit average for all case types except traffic.

The following table demonstrates trends in statewide caseload as well as providing a comparison figure for the recommended circuits. The circuit mean figure for each case type has increased since 1979. This is a reversal of the trend in per judge caseload for all case types except juvenile.

---

<sup>9</sup> Averages for 1975 and 1976 recommendations are omitted because statewide data is not available for those years.

	<u>1974</u>		<u>1977</u>		<u>1978</u>		<u>1979</u>		<u>1980</u>	
	RECOM. CIRCUITS AVG. PER JUDGE	STATE AVERAGE <sup>3</sup> PER JUDGE								
FELONY	318	266	343	269	465	301	383	269	307	288
MISDEMEANOR	354	343	356	289	395	215	417	203	490	220
TRAFFIC	192	216	471	224	359	169	569	172	167	191
TOTAL CRIMINAL <sup>1</sup>	864	825	1,170	781	1,219	686	1,369	645	965	699
GENERAL CIVIL	734	520	592	482	567	379	350	355	520	359
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	904	536	692	540	742	528	537	526	587	552
TOTAL CIVIL <sup>2</sup>	1,638	1,056	1,284	1,023	1,309	907	887	881		911
JUVENILE	9	34	26	35	67	35	192	46	166	75
TOTAL FILINGS	2,511	1,915	2,480	1,839	2,595	1,628	2,448	1,572	2,238	1,685

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

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

<sup>3</sup>State circuit average per judge is adjusted for additional judgeships created.

Total filings per judge increased by 113 cases since 1979. Nevertheless, the circuit mean total filings per judge in 1980 is 230 cases per judge less than it had been in 1974.

Prior to this year, there has been a trend toward a more equal distribution of caseload among superior court judges in the state. In other words, more of the circuits have exhibited per judge caseloads that were closer to the circuit mean. This "clustering" about the mean, or reduced dispersion around the mean, has been shown in the generally decreasing standard deviations in the distributions of per judge filings for each case type except traffic. The 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 the standard deviations for the caseload distributions for each of the case types.

	<u>CY1973<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>FY1976</u>	<u>FY1977</u>	<u>FY1978</u>	<u>FY1979</u>
FELONY	101	105	130	84	92
MISDEMEANOR	356	277	232	218	241
TRAFFIC	390	578	339	431	478
TOTAL CRIMINAL <sup>1</sup>	685	757	536	596	641
GENERAL CIVIL	223	195	141	102	124
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	231	196	204	196	190
TOTAL CIVIL <sup>2</sup>	375	298	264	211	224
TOTAL FILINGS	808	897	681	633	672

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

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

<sup>3</sup>Caseload was collected for the calendar year 1973.

This table shows that since fiscal year 1978, the dispersion around circuit mean, as measured by the standard deviation, has increased for each

case type with the exception of domestic relations. Note that the standard deviations for each case type except traffic remain lower than they had been in calendar year 1973.

The following table displays the mean circuit population per judge and the associated standard deviations for 1973, 1975, 1977, 1978 and 1979. The data shows that the circuit mean populations per judge have markedly declined each period from 1973 to 1978. The standard deviations have also declined, but the decline occurred largely between 1973 and 1975. The data for 1979 indicates slight increases in both the mean circuit population per judge and the standard deviation. The 1979 circuit mean is 78.9% of the 1973 circuit mean and the 1979 standard deviation is 67.8% of the 1973 standard deviation. The mean population per judge has been reduced by almost 13,000 since 1973.

	<u>1973</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>1975</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>1977</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>1978</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>1979</u> <sup>1</sup>
MEAN	61,512	58,076	52,010	48,524	48,548
STANDARD DEVIATION	19,632	13,608	13,690	13,067	13,317

<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 the number of superior court judges.

The decrease in the circuit means and standard deviations for both total caseload per judge and population per judge since 1973 indicates a greater equalization of the workload imposed on each judge and population

served by each judge. The slight increase in the circuit means and standard deviation since 1978 shows that consideration of recommendations for new judgeships will continue to be necessary in order to keep pace with caseload and population growth trends and distribution patterns.

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.

## 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 ten Judicial Districts. The data was collected by the District 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 and part-time assistants 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 the Case Definition Committee.

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 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 26-27, 1979. 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, 1979, and officially ended on August 30, 1979. Each District Administrative Assistant was responsible for the data collection in the 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 63 of the 64 state courts in Georgia.<sup>h</sup> Data collection in the 159 juvenile courts is complete in all but one county.<sup>i</sup> The courts which are represented in this study are:

159 superior courts

92 probate courts

63 state courts

159 juvenile courts

473

The entire universe of courts is 473. This study benefits from useable data from all of these trial courts. The only data that was unobtainable was

---

<sup>h</sup> County courts have been treated as state courts in this study. There are county courts in Baldwin, Echols and Putnam counties. Caseload data for the State Court of DeKalb County is not available at this time.

<sup>i</sup> Disposition data is unavailable for Ware County.

certain state court and juvenile data (See footnotes h and i p.17).

#### 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 1979 fiscal year (July 1, 1978 through June 30, 1979). 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, 1978 and June 30, 1979, inclusive, were considered within the counting period. All cases disposed between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979, or remaining open as of June 30, 1979, were also considered within the counting period. In order to locate all dispositions during fiscal year 1979 and open cases as of June 30, 1979, the case counters were instructed to search all docket books as far back 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 FY1979 filings as of June 30, 1979.

#### 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

Filing Types: There are three general filing categories: criminal, civil and juvenile.

Case Types: Each filing is sub-divided into a number of case types.

The criminal case types are:

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

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

Traffic: 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:

Domestic Relations: 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.

General Civil: 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.

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 Ga. Code Ann. §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, but 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 comprehensive effort was made in fiscal year 1979 to locate all complaints.

Additional Categories: 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.

Caseload: 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.

Filings: 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, all 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.

Concurrent Jurisdiction Category: In general, concurrent jurisdiction is "the jurisdiction of several 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 these actions are 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 as general civil.

Criminal: 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 since fiscal year 1977, it has collected this data in terms of docket entries,

defendants, and counts. All comparisons of criminal data in this study will be in terms of docket entries unless otherwise specified.

Civil: 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 recorded in the docket book with a related 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.

Juvenile: 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 similarity in the method used to count cases in the criminal category and 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 a lesser included offense 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 is 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, the juvenile counts listed on one petition may fall within more than one case type. Unruly, deprived, traffic, and special proceedings counts may be separate, associated with a delinquent filing, or interchanged among themselves. Like the criminal data, this data was also collected according to how the courts were filed.

### Dispositions

Separate operational definitions are again required for criminal, civil and juvenile disposition 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.

Criminal: 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 subdivision, each disposed count was simply recorded appropriately.

Methods of Disposition: 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:

Cash Bond: 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. 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.

Dead Docket: 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 prosecutorial 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 dockets may be reopened at a later time.

Nolle Prosequi: A nolle prosequi 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." (Black's Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition, p. 1198, 1968). It is important to note that a nolle prosequi must be initiated by the prosecutor and accepted by the court.

Dismissal: 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." (Black's Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition, p. 555, 1968). Dismissals are distinguished from a nolle prosequi in that a nolle prosequi is initiated by the prosecuting attorney.

Non-trial Judgment: A non-trial judgment refers to the disposition of a count 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.

Non-jury Trial: 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.

Jury Trial: Cases that were heard by a jury and terminated by a jury verdict were considered jury trials. In fiscal year 1979, jury trial defendants were also counted. This provides the number of criminal defendants who had at least one count disposed by jury trial.

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

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

Methods of Disposition: 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.

Settled: Cases in which the issues were resolved out of court by the parties themselves without judicial determination of the issues were considered settled.

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

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

Before Trial: 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, default judgments, confessions of judgment, and judgments on the pleadings.

Non-jury Trial: Cases that were disposed by full trials on the issues before a judge without a jury were considered non-jury trial dispositions. Terminology often used to describe actions that were included in this category are judgment and decrees, judgments for the plaintiff or defendant, and final judgment.

Jury Trial: Cases disposed by a jury verdict were considered as jury trial dispositions.

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

There is some overlap among several of the civil dispositions categories which requires 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/without prejudice" order from the court. Also, in many counties, distinctions between these two types of disposition are not made in the docket books; a clerk may enter "dismissed" whether the case was settled or dismissed. There is also some overlap between the "before trial" and "non-jury" categories. As a general rule, the case counters were instructed to count a civil case as disposed by a non-jury trial only if it was clearly designated as such on the court records. Settled and dismissed are presented together as "non-adjudicated," in Exhibit VI, but before trial and non-jury trial dispositions are presented as separate disposition methods.

Juvenile: Juvenile dispositions appearing in this study are aggregate numbers of children for which all charges stated in the petition or complaint have been processed by the juvenile court. Although there are specific method categories for juvenile dispositions, they do not appear in this report. For the purpose 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 generally 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.

### Statistical Tools of Analysis and Weighted Caseload

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

Range - 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 filings per judge and the lowest had 100 filings per judge, the range would be 500-100 or 400.

Rank - Circuits are often ranked in descending order. The circuit with the highest observed value is ranked number one and the circuit with the lowest is number forty-two. Ties are indicated by fractional ranks, for example, 21.5 means tied for twenty-first and twenty-second place.

Mean - 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 statewide 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 statewide circuit mean differs from the statewide average per judge. The latter is obtained by dividing the state's caseload by the number of judges.

Standard Deviation - The standard deviation is a measure of dispersion around 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 479. In felony filings per judge, however, there is much less difference among the circuits and the standard deviation is much smaller - about 85. 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 under "5", the previous digit was rounded off to the nearest number, as appropriate; if the digit to be rounded was "5", or above then the 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 27 and 27.5 is rounded to 28.

Another statistical tool currently used by the Judicial Council to analyze caseload data is the weighted caseload concept. The purpose of a weighted caseload system is to provide a basis from which to compare judicial time necessary to process circuit caseloads differing not only in volumes of caseload but differing in caseload composition.

In previous years, the Judicial Council has employed a Ratio Weighted Caseload System. Based on the average responses to interviews of a small sample of superior court judges, a weight factor was determined for each case type. These weights were expressed in terms of felony equivalents since felony cases are generally considered the most time consuming case category. For example, in this system each felony case equals one and each misdemeanor is seven. This means that seven misdemeanors are equivalent to one felony case. The equivalence factors for the remaining case types are shown below.

Equivalence Factors for Superior Court Weights

<u>1</u>	Felony	=	
<u>7</u>	Misdemeanors	=	
<u>41</u>	Traffic Cases	=	
<u>1.50</u>	General Civil Cases	=	<u>1</u> WEIGHTED CASES
<u>2.25</u>	Domestic Relations Cases	=	(Felony - Equivalent)
<u>4.20</u>	Independent Motions	=	
<u>2</u>	Juvenile Cases	=	

The fiscal year 1979 caseload per judge of each of the forty-two judicial circuits weighted according to this Ratio System ranged from 590 to 1318 felony units. The statewide circuit mean ratio weighted caseload was 895.

In fiscal year 1979, in addition to the Ratio Weighted System, the Judicial Council conducted a Delphi Weighted Caseload Survey. A series of questionnaires were directed to each of the superior court judges requesting their response concerning the average time necessary to process different case types in their courts. This system is similar to the Ratio System in that both surveys are subjective studies utilizing the opinions of case processing experts-judges. The Delphi System does differ from the Ratio System in three important particulars:

- 1) All Superior Court judges were given an opportunity to participate in development of the weights;
- 2) Circuit variations in the frequency of different methods of case disposition as well as filing patterns were taken into consideration in calculation of the weights; and
- 3) The weights are the median responses of the judges expressed in terms of time (i.e., hours) not felony equivalents.

Listed below are the median time estimates for each case type. These time estimates include: all judicial time expended in case preparation, in research and in discussions or hearings with the parties.

## Delphi Weighted Caseload System

### Case Types/Disposition Methods Median Time Estimates

	Hours
1. felony cases, jury trial	<u>12.0</u>
2. felony cases, non-jury trial	<u>4.6</u>
3. felony cases, non-trial	<u>0.5</u>
4. misdemeanor cases, jury trial	<u>5.0</u>
5. misdemeanor cases, non-jury trial	<u>2.5</u>
6. misdemeanor cases, non-trial	<u>0.5</u>
7. traffic cases, jury trial	<u>4.0</u>
8. traffic cases, non-jury trial	<u>2.0</u>
9. traffic cases, non-trial	<u>0.25</u>
10. general civil cases, jury trial	<u>12.0</u>
11. general civil cases, non-jury trial	<u>6.5</u>
12. general civil cases, non-trial	<u>1.0</u>
13. domestic relations cases, jury trial	<u>9.5</u>
14. domestic relations cases, non-jury trial	<u>4.0</u>
15. domestic relations cases, non-trial	<u>0.58</u>
16. independent motions, jury trial	<u>4.0</u>
17. independent motions, non-jury trial	<u>2.0</u>
18. independent motions, non-trial	<u>0.83</u>
19. juvenile cases, petition, trial	<u>2.0</u>
20. juvenile cases, non-trial	<u>1.0</u>
21. juvenile cases, informal adjustment	<u>0.63</u>

To determine if a circuit is in need of additional judicial assistance, under the Delphi Weighted Caseload System caseload, filings projected for FY1980 are grouped according to the percentages of FY1979 cases disposed by different disposition methods. These filings are then multiplied by the appropriate median time estimate. The sum of these values for all case type/dispositions methods is equivalent to the total hours needed to process the circuit caseload. The total hours are then divided by a judge year value. The number of hours in a judge year was based on a 220 day year and ranged from 1,430 to 1,650 hours. This range is set to vary in small amounts by grouping circuits into four categories according to the number of counties and superior court judges in the circuit. The final judge year figure is divided by 1.5 judge years which is the threshold point set by the Judicial Council for considering a circuit for an additional judgeship.

DELPHI WEIGHTED CASELOAD FORMULA WITH SAMPLE JUDICIAL CIRCUIT AS AN EXAMPLE

FORMULA

Step One: 
$$\text{FY1979 filings by case type} \times \frac{\text{\#disposed cases by method for FY1979}}{\text{total \# of dispositions for FY1979}} =$$
  
 Projected number of filings disposed by method in FY1980.

Step Two: 
$$\frac{\text{Projected number of filings disposed by method} \times \text{median number of judge hours spent per case type/disposition method (Delphi time estimates)}}{=} =$$
  
 Number of hours required for each case type/disposition method.

Step Three: 
$$\frac{\text{Sum total of the number of hours for each case type/disposition method}}{=} =$$
  
 Total judge hours required to process projected FY1980 filings.

Step Four: 
$$\frac{\text{Total judge hours required to process projected FY1980 filings} \div \text{judge year value}}{=} =$$
  
 Number of judge years necessary for caseload.

Step Five: 
$$\frac{\text{Number of judge years necessary for caseload} \div \text{threshold factor for consideration for judgeship recommendation}}{=} =$$
  
 The Delphi Weighted Circuit caseload.

---

<sup>j</sup> Judge year value = days worked per year X hours worked per day.

EXAMPLE: SAMPLE JUDICIAL CIRCUIT: FY1979

Case type	# Superior Court FY1979 Filings	% Disposed by Jury Trial	Projected # of Filings Disposed by Jury Trial	Delphi Weights (Median # of Judge Hours Spent)	Hours for Jury-trial Dispositions	Hours for Non-trial Dispositions	Hours for Non-jury Trial Dispositions	Total # of Hours
FELONY	458	X 2.5%	= 11	X 12.0	= 132	+ (447x0.5) 224	(0 x 4.6) 0	= 356
MISDEMEANOR	593	X 0.3%	= 2	X 5.0	= 10	+ (590x0.5) 295	(1 x 2.5) 3	= 308
TRAFFIC	107	X 0%	= 0	X 4.0	= 0	+ (107x0.25) 27	(0 x 2.0) 0	= 27
GENERAL CIVIL	572	X 3.4%	= 19	X 120	= 228	+ (515 x 1.0) 515	(38 x 6.5) 247	= 990
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	654	X 1.1%	= 7	X 9.5	= 67	+ (615x0.58) 357	(32 x 4.0) 128	= 552
INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	411	X 0.3%	= 1	X 4.0	= 4	+ (245x0.83) 203	(165 x 2.0) 330	= 537
JUVENILE	0	X 0%	= 0	X 2.0	= 0	+ (0 x 1.0) 0	(0 x 0.63) 0	= 0
Total Judge Hours required to process all cases filed (sum of all case type totals)								2,770

220 (days per year) x 7.5(hrs.per day) = 1,650 hours  
1,650 is the Alcovy Judge Year Value

2,770 (Judge hrs required) ÷ 1,650(Judge year value)=1.7

1.5 judge years per judge is the threshold for consideration for an additional Judgeship recommendation

1.7 ÷ 1.5 = 1.1 Delphi Weighted Caseload Alcovy Circuit

If the Delphi Weighted Caseload System shows a value of greater than one for a one judge circuit, additional judicial resources may be needed. If the Delphi value is one or less present judicial manpower is sufficient in the circuit. If a two judge circuit has a value of greater than two, judicial assistance may be needed.

It must be noted that Weighted Caseload Systems are useful tools in analysis of caseload, but are subjective systems and only in experimental stages.

## 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 1980 Judicial Council recommendations followed by brief circuit reports on each of the seven 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 FY1979 circuit filings levels and increases or decreases in circuit filings from 1976 through 1979.

Chapter II 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 1979) 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.

Chapter IV presents the demographic characteristics of the circuits. Circuit population for 1970 and 1978 and percent change in circuit population is illustrated in Exhibit IX. In addition, Exhibit IX ranks the forty-two circuits on the basis of 1978 population per judge and the hypothetical 1978 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 as a component of one of the ten Judicial 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 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 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.

**CHAPTER I - Analysis of Judicial Council  
recommendations for 1980**

CIRCUIT REPORTS:

TOOMBS  
TIFTON  
ROME  
CORDELE  
COWETA  
BRUNSWICK  
DUBLIN

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 seven circuits. Listed in descending order of priority the circuits are:

TOOMBS  
TIFTON  
ROME  
CORDELE  
COWETA  
BRUNSWICK  
DUBLIN<sup>k</sup>

This chapter contains separate circuit reports for each of the seven 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. 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.

---

<sup>k</sup> Conditioned on the abolition of the State Court of Laurens County.

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 filings, misdemeanor filings, traffic filings, 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."

## TOOMBS JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The geographic jurisdiction of the Toombs Judicial Circuit includes the six counties of Glascock, Lincoln, McDuffie, Taliaferro, Warren and Wilkes. The 1978 population was 45,600 and is expected to increase to 47,500 by the year 1985. The current judicial resources in the circuit consist of one superior court judge and six probate court judges who hear misdemeanor and traffic cases.

In fiscal year 1979, the Toombs Circuit had the second highest number of total filings per judge (3,605) in the state. Toombs has had comparable rankings in previous years. On the basis of total filings per judge, it was ranked second in 1978, fourth in 1977 and sixth in 1976.

The Toombs Circuit has an extremely high filing rate per judge in both total criminal (2,001) and total juvenile (673) filing types. With these filing rates, Toombs ranks second in each of the two categories. Although the case types for which Toombs Circuit recorded the greatest number of filings (misdemeanor, traffic and juvenile) are not the most time-consuming case types, the sheer volume of total filings imposes a heavy burden on the sole superior court judge.

Trends in caseload over the three year period, fiscal years 1976 through 1979, indicate that the superior court filings per judge are increasing in both the criminal and juvenile categories (Exhibit IV). In total criminal filings per judge, the average increase per year is over 13% despite a statewide average decrease. Criminal case types have increased particularly in felonies (18%). On the whole, although total statewide filings per judge have decreased at an average of approximately 1% per year, the Toombs Circuit has sustained an average increase in total filings of greater than 12%.

The Weighted Caseload System shows that there is a need for a greater amount of judicial time to process caseload than is presently available in the Toombs Judicial Circuit. When the Ratio Weights are applied to the circuit caseload, Toombs Circuit ranks second with 1,242 felony units. The Delphi Weight of 1.6 also reveals a substantial need for additional judicial assistance.

The Toombs Circuit is ranked 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 86%. The 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 14%. Toombs is ranked fifth in percent of civil filings heard by the most time-consuming disposition method, jury trial (3.2%). Although the Toombs Circuit does not have an equally large percentage (1.9%) of criminal jury trial dispositions, it is ranked ninth in criminal non-jury trial dispositions which also consume much of a judge's time.

In the Toombs Judicial Circuit the greatest proportion of the caseload falls upon one superior court judge. Probate court judges, one from each county, represent the only available judicial assistance in the circuit. These supporting courts hear 31.6% of the misdemeanor cases and 89.5% 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 1,700 misdemeanor and traffic cases were incorporated into the superior court judge's fiscal year 1979 caseload. Since there are no state or juvenile courts, the sole superior court judge must hear all civil and juvenile cases.

In summary, the Toombs Judicial Circuit is a one-judge, multi-county circuit for which there is a high volume caseload and little potential for expanded use of supporting courts' assistance. Toombs circuit has an increasing per judge case-

load which is presently the second highest in the state. For two years it has had an accumulation of open cases which is increasing and there seems no potential for additional relief from existing supporting courts. In light of these findings, the Judicial Council recommends that an additional superior court judgeship be created in the Toombs Judicial Circuit.

## TIFTON JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The geographic jurisdiction of the Tifton Judicial Council includes the four counties of Irwin, Tift, Turner and Worth. The 1978 population was 64,800<sup>l</sup> and is expected to increase to 74,600 by the year 1985. The current judicial resources in the circuit consist of one superior court judge, two part-time state court judges, four probate court judges,<sup>m</sup> and two juvenile court referees.

In fiscal year 1979, the Tifton Circuit was ranked fifth (along with the Cordele Circuit) of the forty-two circuits in the state in total filings per judge (2,372). The FY1979 per judge filings and ranking show a marked increase when compared to the FY1978 and FY1977 filings and rankings. In FY1978 the Tifton Circuit was ranked eighth with 1,971 total filings per judge and in FY1977 the circuit was ranked sixteenth with 1,854 total per judge filings.

The Tifton Circuit ranks among the highest circuits in the number of filings per judge in six case categories: eleventh in felony dockets, third in general civil filings, ninth in domestic relations filings, third in independent motions filings, second in total civil filings and fourth in juvenile filings. Analyzing those cases which are most time-consuming to process, felonies and domestic relation cases, the Tifton Circuit ranks eighth of the forty-two circuits (Exhibit III). Felony and domestic relations cases are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior court and, therefore, the burden of these cases on the sole superior court judge cannot be relieved by supporting courts. In fact, the supporting courts in Tifton Circuit do not provide a great deal of relief in any of the categories for which the circuit shows total per judge filings above the statewide mean. Supporting courts hear 22% of general civil cases, 5% of independent motions cases and no juvenile cases. Their main assistance is in hearing misdemeanor (91%) and traffic (almost 100%) cases.

<sup>l</sup> Ranked sixth in population per superior court judge.

<sup>m</sup> Two of whom hear misdemeanor and traffic cases.

While the total number of cases disposed (1,939) is above statewide mean of 1,682 per judge the disposition rate<sup>n</sup> is 81.7%. This means that although the superior court judge is disposing of a great number of cases, pending cases are accumulating at a rate of 18.3% each year. This accumulation rate is ranked fifth in the state.

Trends in caseload over the three year period, fiscal years 1976 through 1979, indicate that superior court filings are increasing in all major case types (criminal, civil and juvenile). Juvenile filings, especially, show an increase of 89% between 1976 and 1979, and an even greater increase of 497% between the years 1978 and 1979.<sup>o</sup> Despite statewide average decreases in total filings, the Tifton Circuit has sustained an average increase of almost 10% per year in total filings. When the total filings of the Tifton Circuit are viewed in terms of judicial workload as determined by the Weighted Ratio System, Tifton Circuit ranks first with 1,318 felony units. The Delphi Weighted Caseload is a system which puts emphasis on disposition time and judge time. When Tifton Circuit is viewed through this system, a Delphi measure of 1.4 reveals the need for a significant amount of additional judge time.

In summary, Tifton Judicial Circuit is a one-judge, multi-county circuit for which there is a high volume caseload, particularly in the most demanding case types, felony and domestic relations. Supporting courts hear a large percentage of misdemeanor and traffic cases but the most time consuming case types must be handled by a single superior court judge. The high rate of open case accumulation (18%) combined with an above average disposition rate points to the fact that the present, increasing caseload is too great to be handled by one judge. 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 Tifton Judicial Circuit.

---

<sup>n</sup> Dispositions as percent of filings per judge

<sup>o</sup> These unusually large increases in juvenile filings may be due in part to improved record keeping.

## ROME JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The Rome Judicial Circuit is coextensive with Floyd County. Its 1978 estimated population was 79,100, a 7.27% increase from 1970. The projected 1985 population is 88,900, an expected 12.39% increase over the 1978 population estimate. The current population per judge is 39,550, which ranks thirty-second among Georgia's forty-two circuits. If an additional superior court judge was added, the population per judge would become 26,367, which would rank forty-first. However, the caseload data presented below indicates that the workload is much too great for only two superior court judges.

The Rome Judicial Circuit recorded 2,487 total filings per judge in fiscal year 1979. This figure is the fourth highest in the state. The Rome Circuit ranks only thirty-fourth in the combined felony and domestic relations filings, 611 cases per judge. However, the inclusion of general civil cases increases the circuit's rank in this new combined category to nineteenth. The importance of these case categories is that felony and domestic relations cases lie within the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior courts and that certain sub-categories of general civil cases, i.e., equity and title cases, also lie within the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior courts. The Rome Circuit ranked fourth in the number of general civil cases per judge (553), first in independent motions per judge (364), and first in misdemeanor cases per judge (1,100).

Filings in the most time-consuming case categories have increased rapidly in recent years. The number of felony defendants has more than doubled since FY1976 despite a 7.8% decrease from FY1978 to FY1979. General civil filings have increased by 22.6% and domestic relations filings by 4.1% in the last year.

The two Superior Court Judges in the Rome Circuit have disposed of a very high proportion of filings in the more time-consuming case types: felonies - 97.7%; general civil cases - 95.1%; and domestic relations cases - 100.9%. The statewide circuit means are 92.7%, 88.2% and 93.6%, respectively.

The distribution of dispositions within the criminal case types magnifies the demand for judge time. Within the felony case type, 17.5% of the counts were disposed by jury trial, the most time-consuming method. An additional 20.7% of felony counts were disposed by non-jury trials.

The estimated demand for judge time based on the FY1979 filings and the Ratio Weights shows that Rome Judicial Circuit has a need for additional judicial assistance. Rome has a Ratio Weight of 957 felony units per judge which is considerably greater than the statewide circuit mean per judge of 895 felony units. When the distribution of disposition methods is also considered under the Delphi Weighted Caseload System an even more significant need is shown. The Delphi Weight for Rome Judicial Circuit is 2.8.

The superior court judges receive substantial assistance from supporting courts in traffic and juvenile cases: the probate court hears 97.6% of all traffic cases and there is a separate juvenile court which hears all juvenile cases. However, there is little support in misdemeanor cases (10.5% of the 1979 filings) and none in civil case types. This difference in support among case types is due to the absence of a supporting court with jurisdiction to hear these cases(i.e., a state court).

In summary, the Rome Judicial Circuit has a high and increasing volume of cases. The rate of increases from FY1976 to FY1979 in felony filings is significantly greater than the statewide average increase. General civil and domestic relations cases are also increasing at a substantial rate. The two judges dispose of a very high proportion of cases in the most time-consuming case type categories, and the judges have an extremely high demand for jury and non-jury trials, particularly in felony cases. There is no potential for an increase in assistance from existing supporting courts. The demand for judge time to process the caseload is so great that the two superior court judges cannot meet the demand without an additional judge. Therefore, the Judicial Council recommends the creation of an additional Superior Court judgeship in the Rome Judicial Circuit.

## CORDELE JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The geographic jurisdiction of the Cordele Judicial Circuit includes the four counties of Ben Hill, Crisp, Dooly and Wilcox. The 1978 population was 53,200 and it ranks 13th out of forty-two circuits in population per superior court judge. By the year 1985 the population is expected to increase to 56,000. The current judicial resources in the circuit include one superior court judge, four probate court judges and one part-time juvenile judge.

In fiscal year 1979, the Cordele Circuit had the fifth highest (along with the Tifton Circuit) number of total filings per judge in the state (2,372). In the two previous years, FY1977 and FY1978, Cordele Circuit was ranked nineteenth (2,104) and seventh (1,791), respectively, in total filings per judge.

The Cordele Circuit ranks among the top third of the circuits in filings per judge in four case categories: first in misdemeanor filings, sixth in total criminal filings, fifth in juvenile filings and eleventh in general civil filings. In domestic relations filings per judge (477), Cordele Circuit is close to the statewide circuit mean (552) and has shown marked increases in past years.

Trends in caseload over the three year period, fiscal years 1976 through 1979, show that superior court filings per judge are increasing in all major case types (criminal, civil and juvenile). In total criminal filings, the average increase has been over 19% per year despite the fact that the statewide average per judge has decreased. Total civil filings per judge have increased at an average rate of 3% and total juvenile at an average rate of 79% per year since FY1976. The most time consuming cases, felonies and domestic relations filings, have increased over 16% and 3%, respectively. The statewide average change for total filings reveals a 1% decrease between the years FY1976 and FY1979. The Cordele Circuit, however,

has sustained more than a 13% average increase in total filings per judge.

Supporting courts in the Cordele Circuit provide assistance in hearing traffic cases (99.6%), juvenile cases (58.9%), and misdemeanor cases (11.1%). This means that in addition to all felony cases and all civil cases in each of the four counties, 1,074 misdemeanor, traffic, and juvenile cases were incorporated into the superior court judge's FY1979 caseload. The limited jurisdiction of the supporting courts in the circuit prevents these courts from providing greater assistance to a superior court burdened by an overall increasing caseload.

On the whole, significant additional assistance adequate for relieving the superior court's caseload volume is unlikely to be forthcoming from the present supporting courts in Cordele Circuit. The superior court is the sole court with jurisdiction to hear most civil case types and, thus, no assistance is possible in hearing those cases. Cordele Judicial Circuit is ranked seventh (51.3%) in percent of civil filings (Exhibit VI) disposed by the time-consuming method of non-jury trial. The sole part-time juvenile court judge hears almost 60% of all juvenile cases. The current volume of juvenile filings in the circuit ranks fifth highest in the state, and there is no available additional assistance from the supporting courts.

When the total filings for Cordele Judicial Circuit are viewed under application of the Weighted Ratio System, it ranks eleventh with 1,077 felony units per judge. The Delphi Weighted Caseload puts emphasis on disposition time and judge time. When Cordele Circuit is viewed through this system it has a delphi measure of 1.4 which reveals the need for additional judge time.

In summary, the Cordele Judicial Circuit is a one-judge, multi-county, circuit for which there is a high volume caseload that has been increasing at an average rate of 13% each year since FY1976. Supporting courts provide substantial assistance in hearing juvenile and traffic cases but they provide little assistance to the superior court judge in hearing the misdemeanor cases and no assistance in hearing civil cases. The Cordele Circuit has an increasing volume of cases within the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior court and of cases within the concurrent jurisdiction of the supporting and superior courts. In view of the circuit's thirteenth-ranking population per judge, fifth-ranking number of total filings per judge, increasing caseload, and limited assistance available from supporting courts, the Judicial Council recommends the creation of a second Superior Court judgeship in the Cordele Judicial Circuit.

## COWETA JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The Coweta Judicial Circuit is composed of five counties: Carroll, Coweta, Heard, Meriwether and Troup. The 1978 population of the circuit was 166,800 and ranks number one of all Georgia circuits in population per judge. The population is expected to increase by 11.4% and reach 185,800 by 1985. The judicial resources of the circuit include: two superior court judges, three state court judges,<sup>P</sup> five probate judges<sup>Q</sup> and two part-time juvenile court judges.

In 1979, Coweta Judicial Circuit ranked eighth (2,190 cases) in total caseload per judge. In the two previous years, 1978 and 1977, Coweta Judicial Circuit ranked ninth and thirteenth, respectively. In the combined total of felony and domestic relations cases, Coweta is fourth. Over fifty percent of the circuit's filings are felony or domestic relations cases, which are case types heard exclusively in the superior courts. Coweta Judicial Circuit has a very heavy civil caseload per judge. In fact, it has a caseload in excess of the statewide circuit mean in every civil case category.

The Coweta Judicial Circuit ranked very high in the weighted caseload systems utilized by the Judicial Council. On the Ratio Weighted System the circuit ranked third with a value of 1,200 felony units. The Delphi Weighted System value, in which disposition methods are considered, was 2.9. This shows that more than two judges are necessary to adequately process the caseload.

Overall the caseload in this circuit is increasing. Despite the fact that the average rate of change for fiscal years 1976 through 1979 shows a statewide decreasing caseload per judge, Coweta Judicial Circuit had an increasing caseload.

---

<sup>P</sup> One full-time and two part-time judges.

<sup>Q</sup> Two of five probate judges handle traffic and misdemeanor cases.

Between fiscal year 1978 and 1979 the rate of change in Coweta Judicial Circuit has been greater than the statewide average.

Total dispositions expressed as a percent of filings in fiscal year 1979 was 84.4%. Although the total number of dispositions per judge (1,848) is greater than the statewide circuit mean, it appears that pending and open cases are accumulating at a rate of 15.6% of filings a year.

The Superior Court receives a substantial amount of assistance from supporting courts. Over 95% of all misdemeanors and traffic violations are heard by the supporting courts. In addition, these courts provide a significant amount of caseload assistance in the civil area. They handle over one-half of the circuit's general civil caseload and one-third of the independent motion filings. Almost all juvenile caseload is processed by the supporting courts.

In summary, the Coweta Judicial Circuit has a high volume caseload particularly in the most demanding case types, felony and domestic relations. The caseload growth and population growth trends suggest an even greater volume of caseload in the future. Although the superior court receives substantial assistance from supporting courts in the circuit, caseload is accumulating at a significant rate. While dispositions in total numbers are above the statewide circuit mean, the disposition rate in civil cases remains low. So that the Coweta Judicial Circuit can effectively process a high-volume, complex, and increasing caseload, the Judicial Council of Georgia recommends the creation of an additional superior court judgeship in the Coweta Judicial Circuit.

## BRUNSWICK JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

The Brunswick Judicial Circuit consists of five counties - Appling, Camden, Glynn, Jeff Davis, and Wayne. The 1978 estimated population is 107,900, an increase of 5.92% from the 1970 census figure, 101,871. By 1985, the circuit population is expected to be 126,400, an increase of 17.15%. The Brunswick Circuit is served by two Superior Court Judges. The population per judge is 53,950, twelfth in the state.

The two Superior Court judges each faced 1838 total filings, sixteenth highest in Georgia. The circuit has relatively few criminal filings per judge: 181 felony, 110 misdemeanor, and 6 traffic as compared to statewide circuit means of 253, 215, and 191, respectively. However, the number of civil filings per judge are all markedly higher than the respective statewide circuit means: general civil - 414 versus 359; domestic relations - 814 versus 552; and independent motions - 315 versus 198. The Brunswick Circuit ranked tenth in combined felony and domestic relations cases with 995 cases per judge; the statewide circuit mean is 805. Over fifty percent of the circuit caseload filings were domestic relations or felony cases.

In addition to its current high caseload per judge, the Brunswick Circuit has also experienced a rapid increase in its civil caseload. General civil cases per judge have increased by 29% per year averaged over the four year period FY1976-FY1979 and by an observed rate of 12.5% since FY1978; the corresponding figures for domestic relations cases are 14% and 10.4% and for independent motions 33% and 86.4%. Felony counts per judge declined by an average rate of 34% per year since FY1976, but increased by 0.6% from FY1978. Misdemeanor counts per judge decreased by 15.1% since FY1978 although the average rate of increase since FY1976 is 6% per year. The net effect is an increase of 16.5% in total filings per judge in one year.

The ratios of dispositions to filings are below the statewide circuit means in all case types. The disposition rates for the Brunswick Circuit and the statewide circuit means are: felony - 85.1% versus 92.7%; misdemeanor - 66.4% versus 110.9%; general civil - 66.4% versus 88.2%; and domestic relations - 87.8% versus 93.6%. This may be in part due to the high proportion of the caseload which is comprised of time-consuming felonies and domestic relations cases.

Brunswick Judicial Circuit has a fairly high proportion of cases disposed of by trial. The proportion of felony counts disposed by jury trial is 8.3% and by non-jury trial 1.6%. The statewide circuit means for these categories are 7.5% and 2.7%, respectively. The percentages of general civil cases and independent motions disposed of by non-jury trials in the Brunswick Judicial Circuit are 18.7% and 26.4%, respectively. The corresponding statewide circuit means are 16.5% and 23.1%.

The Weighted Caseload concept provides an additional means of analyzing judicial workload. The Brunswick Judicial Circuit caseload per judge ranks fifteenth of the forty-two circuits in the Ratio Weighted Caseload System with a weight of 957 felony units. The Delphi Weight of 2.3 shows a greater need for additional judicial assistance than the Ratio Weight.

The two Superior Court judges currently receive substantial assistance from supporting courts and, therefore, a greater reliance on these courts to reduce superior court caseload demands is probably not feasible. The three state courts and two probate courts in the circuit hear 92.3% of the 2,835 misdemeanor filings, 99.9% of the 15,579 traffic filings, 61.1% of the 2,124 general civil cases, and 68.3% of the 1,987 independent motions. In addition, there is an independent

Juvenile Court in each county; as a result, the Superior Court judges hear no juvenile cases.

In summary, the Brunswick Judicial Circuit faces a higher-than-average level of total filings per judge, 16th in Georgia, and ranks 10th in the exclusive jurisdiction case types of felony and domestic relations. The caseload increased by 16.5% since FY1978, due almost entirely to the increase in the civil case types. There is also a significant proportion of trial dispositions, particularly in the civil case types. Thus, despite substantial assistance from supporting courts there is a demand for judge time well beyond the level which two Superior Court judges can supply. Therefore, the Judicial Council recommends the creation of an additional Superior Court Judgeship in the Brunswick Judicial Circuit.

## DUBLIN JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Four counties--Johnson, Laurens, Treutlen and Twiggs--comprise the Dublin Judicial Circuit. The 1978 circuit population estimate was 56,300. The population of the circuit is increasing, and is expected to reach 60,200 by 1985. The population per judge presently ranks ninth in the state. The judicial personnel serving this circuit include: one superior court judge, four state court judges<sup>r</sup> one part-time juvenile court judge and four probate judges.

At the request of the superior court judge from this circuit, the Judicial Council was requested to analyze the data from this circuit with the assumption that the State Court of Laurens County be abolished. Without the inclusion of the state court caseload, Dublin Judicial Circuit ranks twenty-second in total filings and the weighted caseload measures are not extremely favorable for a judgeship recommendation by the Judicial Council. But if the State Court of Laurens County is abolished, additional judicial resources will be needed in the superior court.

With the abolition of the State Court of Laurens County, additional cases would be filed in the superior court.<sup>s</sup> Without the addition of another Superior court judge, the number of filings per judge in Dublin Circuit ranks seventh in the state. In both felony and general civil filings per superior court judge, Dublin already exceeds the statewide circuit mean. Dublin Judicial Circuit ranks first in general civil cases, sixth in independent motions and twelfth in felonies.

---

<sup>r</sup> One full-time and three part-time judges.

<sup>s</sup> Presumably almost all traffic cases filed in the state court will be filed in a limited jurisdiction court such as the probate court if the state court is abolished. There were 7,599 traffic cases handled by the state court in fiscal year 1979. Less than one percent involved non-jury and jury trials and, therefore, even if the limited jurisdiction court does not hear contested cases, these few additional cases will not impose a burden upon the Superior Court. But legislation abolishing the State Court should address the issue of how traffic cases will be disposed so that judicial resources are adequately allocated to permit overall improvement of the circuit's judicial organization and performance.

The average rate of increase in caseload per judge 1976-1979 is 6.2% for the Superior Court. In the last fiscal year there was a 20.9% increase. Dublin Circuit has had a particularly high increase in felony (25.8%) and domestic relations (6.6%) between 1978 and 1979. In both the aforementioned categories the rate of change exceeds the statewide percentage change. When the caseload of the State Court of Laurens County is included in the analysis, the average and observed rate of change for the circuit still exceeds the statewide percentage change in caseload filings per judge.

At present, the disposition rate<sup>t</sup> in the Superior Court is 80.7% which indicates filings are accumulating at a rate of 19.3% this year. The criminal caseload is being dealt with at a disposition rate of greater than 120% which exceeds the statewide circuit mean of 95.9%. On the other hand, civil caseload has a significantly lower disposition rate (69.5%). In fact, the circuit's civil disposition rate is substantially less than the statewide civil circuit mean (88.4%).

Although Dublin Circuit does receive a large amount of assistance from supporting courts in criminal case processing, supporting courts handle only a small percentage of circuit civil caseload. Presently only 32.8% of general civil cases and 28.7% of independent motions are processed by the state courts. Thus, the low disposition rate and the low percentage of supporting court assistance in civil caseload illustrates the circuit's need for additional judicial resources to improve efficient processing of civil caseload.

---

<sup>t</sup> For purposes of this study, the disposition rate refers to the number of case dispositions expressed as a percent of fiscal year 1979 filings.

On the Ratio Weighted Caseload System, Dublin Circuit ranks seventh with 1063 felony based units per judge. On the Delphi System, a weight of 1.16 shows that there is a very small need for additional judicial resources. A much stronger case for additional judicial resources is made when the caseload of the State Court of Laurens County is included in weighted caseload calculations for the circuit. The circuit then ranks second in Ratio Weights with 1,291 felony units. The Delphi Weight would be 1.45 which indicates a substantial need for an additional judgeship.

Caseload and population show increasing trends in Dublin Circuit. Overall, Dublin Judicial Circuit's caseload analysis shows only a small need for additional judicial personnel; but both the disposition rate and supporting courts analysis indicate that Dublin Circuit is unable to adequately process its civil caseload. If the State Court of Laurens County is abolished, there will be a much greater need for additional judicial resources. Therefore, the Judicial Council of Georgia recommends that if the State Court of Laurens County is abolished an additional Superior Court judgeship be designated for the Dublin Judicial Circuit.

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

### **Courts: FY1979 Filings**

- EXHIBIT I SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1979  
TOTAL CASELOAD PER JUDGE
- EXHIBIT II SUPERIOR COURT CRIMINAL FILINGS: FY1979
- EXHIBIT III SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FELONY AND  
DOMESTIC RELATIONS FILINGS PER JUDGE: FY1979
- EXHIBIT IV AVERAGE AND OBSERVED RATE OF CHANGE IN SUPERIOR  
COURT FILINGS PER JUDGE FY1976 - FY1979 AND  
FY1978 - FY1979

*Preceding page blank*

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: FY1979," displays the number of cases filed per judge in each case type for each circuit in the 1979 fiscal year. The forty-two circuits are ranked 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 a high total caseload volume.

Exhibit II, "Superior Court Criminal Filings: FY1979," presents the total criminal caseload of each circuit. This exhibit shows the reader the actual numbers of docket entries, defendants and counts filed in the superior courts. The ratios of counts to defendants for the three criminal case types and the total criminal category are also displayed. These ratios highlight those circuits in which there are numerous counts per defendant and in which greater amounts of time are necessary to process criminal cases than in other circuits with equal numbers of defendants.

In Exhibit III, "Superior Court Circuit Rankings by Felony and Domestic Relations Filings per Judge: FY1979," the circuits are arranged in descending order of their sums 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 shows a time-consuming caseload and since these two case types

are exclusive jurisdiction case types which must be heard in the superior court at the trial level.

From the last exhibit in this chapter, "Average and Observed Rate of Change in Superior Court Filings per Judge: FY1976-FY1979 and FY1978-FY1979," the reader is able to discover whether or not a trend of increasing caseload exists 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 FY1979. However, it does provide some explicit information about the volume and types of cases filed during the past fiscal year and whether the caseload has increased, decreased or stabilized from previous years. The information on filings in the superior court supplies a picture of the demand on the judges' time required by these new filings.

## EXHIBIT I

### Superior Court Circuit Rankings by FY1979 Total Caseload per Judge

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 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 FY1979. The criminal figures do not account for defendants or counts listed on the indictment or accusation (Exhibit II of this chapter contains this information), and civil suits do not account for cross-claims, counter-claims or number of parties. Juvenile cases are actions in which children have one or more charges filed against them. Only juvenile cases from counties in which the superior court judge has no assistance from a juvenile court judge are included in the figures for Exhibit I.

The data in Exhibit I can be interpreted as the total caseload per judge 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 actually be the case, since the judges are free to divide the caseload as they determine is best. 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.

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. Particular attention should be given to those types of cases (felony, general civil and domestic relations) generally considered to consume the largest proportion of judge time. Excessive workload is of primary interest; high volume caseload is one of several factors utilized to identify circuits with excessive workloads.

EXHIBIT I: SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1979 TOTAL FILINGS PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT	FILINGS	CRIMINAL FILINGS				CIVIL FILINGS				JUVENILE FILINGS
		FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE
1 CHEROKEE	5130	347	736	2862	3944	426	485	280	1191	0
2 TOOMBS	3605	302	786	913	2001	304	405	222	931	673
3 ALAPAHA	2515	286	543	1011	1839	223	231	100	553	123
4 ROME	2487	175	895	64	1134	553	436	364	1353	0
5 CORDELE	2372	190	829	52	1071	429	477	205	1111	190
6 TIFTON	2372	308	172	39	519	559	743	348	1650	203
7 ATLANTIC	2199	224	64	809	1097	324	540	137	1001	102
8 COWETA	2190	326	80	95	501	540	787	358	1685	5
9 MOUNTAIN	2168	181	174	80	435	527	703	339	1569	164
10 CONASAUGA	2079	230	200	74	503	507	697	337	1540	37
11 PIEDMONT	2014	157	255	364	776	512	481	245	1238	0
12 TALLAPOOSA	1949	171	313	136	620	693	447	160	1300	29
13 COBB	1946	478	36	4	517	270	1025	134	1429	0
14 NORTHEASTERN	1891	237	172	311	720	378	482	264	1124	48
15 PATAULA	1864	361	459	35	855	420	401	138	959	50
16 BRUNSWICK	1838	181	110	6	296	414	814	315	1542	0
17 CHATTAHOOCHEE	1823	422	143	60	625	258	763	151	1171	27
18 BLUE RIDGE	1817	241	403	256	900	257	538	123	917	0
19 AUGUSTA	1783	147	70	9	226	231	796	180	1207	350
20 GRIFFIN	1766	243	185	163	591	366	623	187	1175	0
21 HOUSTON	1715	281	2	0	283	285	927	220	1432	0

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

EXHIBIT I: SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1979 TOTAL FILINGS PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT	FILINGS	CRIMINAL FILINGS				CIVIL FILINGS				JUVENILE FILINGS
		FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE
22 DUBLIN	1673	302	28	0	330	565	450	239	1254	89
23 STONE MTN.	1633	265	12	4	281	352	796	204	1352	0
24 MACON	1630	383	55	20	458	307	687	166	1159	13
25 LOOKOUT MTN.	1629	259	313	70	642	292	513	160	965	21
26 WAYCROSS	1594	216	189	143	548	256	580	131	967	79
27 OCMULGEE	1566	250	346	81	676	281	262	166	710	180
28 CLAYTON	1546	236	1	2	240	270	850	187	1306	0
29 OCONEE	1530	156	333	172	660	342	281	119	741	129
30 SOUTHWESTERN	1525	160	57	2	219	544	450	200	1194	112
31 ATLANTA	1503	405	1	0	405	385	604	108	1097	0
32 SOUTHERN	1431	233	104	2	338	288	641	161	1090	3
33 ALCOVY	1393	225	296	54	574	286	327	206	819	0
34 NORTHERN	1377	135	327	53	515	293	303	174	769	94
35 MIDDLE	1349	211	1	0	212	270	503	146	918	219
36 EASTERN	1346	403	0	0	403	134	551	258	943	0
37 DOUGHERTY	1315	313	3	0	315	212	620	169	1000	0
38 FLINT	1251	107	142	20	269	438	326	183	947	36
39 WESTERN	1214	219	94	25	338	300	403	166	869	8
40 SOUTH GEORGIA	1158	329	76	14	419	254	319	102	674	65
41 GWINNETT	1090	148	1	0	149	175	588	178	941	0
42 OGEECHEE	1071	168	14	9	191	357	338	102	797	84
CIRCUIT MEAN	1842	253	215	191	658	359	552	198	1109	79

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

## EXHIBIT I ANALYSIS

Although Exhibit I ranks the circuits by total caseload per judge, this category is only one 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. In general, the majority of traffic cases is summarily disposed of; so a high volume of these cases may inflate the total filings out of proportion to 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 and general civil 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 fifteen (1-15) circuits ranked above the mean in total filings, only two circuits have extremely high volume caseloads. The two circuits that exceed the mean (1,842) by more than one standard deviation are listed here with their total number of filings:

CHEROKEE	5,134
TOOMBS	3,605

In fact, these circuits exceed the mean by 4.74 and 2.54 standard deviations, respectively.

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 (253) by more than one and one-half standard deviations are:

COBB	478
CHATTAHOOCHEE	422
ATLANTA	405
EASTERN	403
MACON	383

In domestic relations filings, the following circuits are more than one standard deviation above the mean of 552:

COBB	1025
HOUSTON	927
CLAYTON	850
BRUNSWICK	814
AUGUSTA	796
STONE MOUNTAIN	796
COWETA	787
CHATTAHOOCHEE	763
TIFTON	743

The circuits exceeding by more than one standard deviation the general civil mean of 359 are:

TALLAPOOSA	693
DUBLIN	565
TIFTON	559
ROME	553
SOUTHWESTERN	544
COWETA	540
MOUNTAIN	527
PIEDMONT	512
CONASAUGA	507

Four circuits have high levels of filings in two of the most time-consuming case types: Cobb and Chattahoochee - felony and domestic relations cases; and Coweta and Tifton - general civil and domestic relations cases.

Although not all circuits have 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 which could be spent to process the remainder of the caseload. Only one of the twenty-seven circuits whose superior court judge hears juvenile cases has a juvenile caseload that exceeds the circuit mean in juvenile filings by more than two standard deviations and is ranked in the top ten circuits in terms of case volume per judge.

TOOMBS	673
--------	-----

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 criminal, civil and juvenile filing categories and as such, is used as one indicator in the evaluation of circuit workload. In the exhibit, those circuits with the greatest number of filings and the most demanding caseloads may be identified.

## EXHIBIT II

### Superior Court Criminal Filings: FY1979

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 required by the criminal filings. This data is presented to illustrate the criminal workload by recording 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 not per judge figures; rather, they are totals 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 Count 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, in the misdemeanor category the traffic counts contained as lesser included offenses on a misdemeanor docket entry are separated from other traffic docket entries. There are no lesser included offenses in a traffic case. Finally, the Total Criminal 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 exactly one would indicate that the district attorney 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 case 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. In such instances it may be that the district attorney has separated multiple charges against the same defendant on 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.

EXHIBIT II: SUPERIOR COURT CRIMINAL FILINGS: FY1979

CIRCUIT	FELONY						MISDEMEANOR					TRAFFIC				TOTAL CRIMINAL			
	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS			RATIO COUNTS/DEF.	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS		RATIO COUNTS/DEF.	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS TRAFFIC	RATIO COUNTS/DEF.	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS	RATIO COUNTS/DEF.
			FELONY	MISD.	TRAFFIC				MISD.	TRAFFIC									
ALAPAHA	571	573	579	1	0	1.0	1085	1085	1091	1	1.0	2021	2021	2021	1.0	3677	3679	3693	1.0
ALCOVY	450	458	687	42	27	1.7	591	593	736	14	1.3	107	107	119	1.1	1148	1158	1625	1.4
ATLANTA	4450	4933	5480	33	0	1.1	8	8	9	0	1.1	0	0	0	-	4458	4941	5522	1.1
ATLANTIC	448	486	751	35	13	1.6	128	137	206	17	1.6	1617	1617	1620	1.0	2193	2240	2642	1.2
AUGUSTA	587	740	1177	2	0	1.6	281	281	326	4	1.2	36	36	80	2.2	904	1057	1583	1.5
BLUE RIDGE	482	605	1125	57	93	2.1	806	813	910	10	1.1	511	511	685	1.3	1799	1929	2880	1.5
BRUNSWICK	361	455	485	0	0	1.1	219	228	237	2	1.1	11	11	11	1.0	591	694	735	1.1
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1689	1706	1715	0	3	1.9	573	579	594	1	1.0	238	238	240	1.0	2500	2523	2553	1.0
CHEROKEE	693	769	856	42	145	1.4	1471	1490	1599	1	1.1	5723	5723	5752	1.0	7887	7982	8395	1.1
CLAYTON	709	883	1555	18	16	1.8	4	4	6	0	1.5	6	6	7	1.2	719	893	1602	1.8
COBB	1910	2078	3162	166	42	1.6	144	144	246	4	1.7	14	14	32	2.3	2068	2236	3652	1.6
CONASAUGA	459	564	815	20	44	1.6	399	429	782	10	1.9	147	148	226	1.5	1005	1141	1897	1.7
CORDELE	190	242	281	8	3	1.2	829	852	855	0	1.0	52	52	52	1.0	1071	1146	1199	1.1
COWETA	651	778	1003	19	19	1.3	160	169	170	0	1.0	190	190	190	1.0	1001	1137	1401	1.2
DOUGHERTY	625	765	1135	26	33	1.6	5	6	6	0	1.0	0	0	0	-	630	771	1190	1.5
DUBLIN	302	380	435	7	0	1.2	28	29	34	0	1.2	0	0	0	-	330	409	476	1.2
EASTERN	1613	1790	1837	3	114	1.1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	1613	1790	1954	1.1
FLINT	214	281	364	10	0	1.3	284	295	352	5	1.2	40	40	61	1.5	538	616	792	1.3
GRIFFIN	486	527	891	15	6	1.7	370	373	461	11	1.3	326	327	528	1.6	1182	1227	1912	1.6
GWINNETT	443	509	745	2	1	1.5	4	4	4	0	1.0	1	1	1	1.0	448	514	753	1.5
HOUSTON	281	331	416	0	0	1.3	2	2	2	0	1.0	0	0	0	-	293	333	418	1.3

EXHIBIT II: SUPERIOR COURT CRIMINAL FILINGS: FY1979

CIRCUIT	FELONY						MISDEMEANOR					TRAFFIC				TOTAL CRIMINAL			
	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS			RATIO COUNTS/DEF.	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS		RATIO COUNTS/DEF.	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS	RATIO COUNTS/DEF.	DOCKET ENTRIES	DEF.	COUNTS	RATIO COUNTS/DEF.
			FELONY	MISD.	TRAFFIC				MISD.	TRAFFIC									
LOOKOUT MTN.	776	793	836	9	0	1.1	940	940	1026	0	1.1	210	210	210	1.0	1926	1943	2081	1.1
MACON	1148	1355	1885	10	1	1.4	165	167	186	0	1.1	60	60	71	1.2	1373	1582	2153	1.4
MIDDLE	422	547	674	1	5	1.2	2	3	7	0	2.3	0	0	0	-	424	550	687	1.3
MOUNTAIN	181	219	354	4	6	1.7	174	188	283	11	1.6	80	80	126	1.6	435	487	784	1.6
NORTHEASTERN	474	562	702	0	2	1.3	344	351	360	0	1.0	622	622	634	1.0	1440	1535	1698	1.4
NORTHERN	269	317	583	10	4	1.9	654	709	805	6	1.1	106	107	163	1.5	1029	1133	1571	1.4
OCCULGEE	750	876	1061	29	49	1.3	1037	1166	1211	4	1.0	242	242	276	1.1	2029	2284	2630	1.2
OCCONEE	312	342	405	3	6	1.2	665	682	814	31	1.2	343	343	447	1.3	1320	1367	1706	1.3
OGRECHEE	336	381	411	1	13	1.1	28	39	40	2	1.1	17	17	19	1.1	381	437	486	1.1
PATAULA	361	361	366	0	1	1.0	459	459	462	0	1.0	35	35	35	1.0	855	855	864	1.0
PIEDMONT	157	189	236	3	3	1.3	255	259	288	0	1.1	364	364	378	1.0	776	812	908	1.1
RUME	350	354	701	16	5	2.0	1790	1791	2184	2	1.2	128	128	216	1.7	2268	2273	3124	1.4
SOUTH GEORGIA	658	658	659	0	0	1.0	152	152	153	0	1.0	28	28	28	1.0	838	838	840	1.0
SOUTHERN	698	773	1047	52	3	1.4	311	312	366	0	1.2	5	5	7	1.4	1014	1090	1475	1.4
SOUTHWESTERN	160	192	234	2	0	1.2	57	58	68	0	1.2	2	2	4	2.0	219	252	308	1.2
STONE MTN.	1052	2028	2558	92	1	1.3	83	87	130	1	1.5	31	31	46	1.5	1966	2146	2828	1.3
TALLAPOOSA	513	652	935	42	81	1.6	940	976	1144	47	1.2	407	407	609	1.5	1860	2035	2856	1.4
TIFTON	308	403	514	13	0	1.3	172	179	183	0	1.0	39	39	39	1.0	519	621	749	1.2
TOOMBS	302	332	463	18	2	1.5	786	804	839	5	1.1	913	914	1064	1.2	2001	2050	2391	1.2
WAYCROSS	432	489	812	11	2	1.7	377	383	474	0	1.2	286	286	286	1.0	1095	1158	1585	1.4
WESTERN	438	452	549	10	1	1.2	187	188	198	2	1.1	50	50	79	1.6	675	690	839	1.2

## EXHIBIT II ANALYSIS

In this exhibit the three elements of the criminal caseload are displayed as total figures for each circuit. The most important factor here is the ratio of counts to defendants; this ratio can be used to gain an understanding of 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 five circuits in which the ratio of total criminal counts to total criminal defendants is greater than 1.5:

CLAYTON  
COBB  
CONASAUGA  
GRIFFIN  
MOUNTAIN

The same five circuits and nine others have a felony count to felony defendant ratio greater than 1.5. By viewing the data in this manner, it can be seen that the criminal workload in some circuits could be under-represented if only docket numbers or defendants were considered for analysis.

When caseload per judge figures are calculated for total criminal counts, four circuits have extremely high values in the distribution. Four circuits exceed the circuit mean number of total criminal counts per judge (852) by more than one standard deviation. They are:

CHEROKEE	4,198
TOOMBS	2,391
ALAPAHA	1,847
ROME	1,562

Two of these circuits, Cherokee and Toombs, exceed the mean by more than two standard deviations.

When felony counts per judge are calculated to determine which circuits have the most demanding workloads in terms of time required to process their respective cases, the picture alters. Seven circuits show a felony (count) caseload higher than one standard deviation above the mean of 379. In descending order, they are:

COBB	791
MACON	628
DOUGHERTY	568
BLUE RIDGE	563
CLAYTON	518
TIFTON	514

## EXHIBIT III

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

Judge: FY1979

The FY1979 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 are the dockets entries which were presented in Exhibit I, and the numbers indicate the absolute caseload divided by the number of judges in each circuit.

The format of Exhibit III enables the reader to 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 many of the 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.

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

The data in Exhibit III provides valuable insight into two important aspects in the consideration of an additional superior court judgeship. Circuits that rank high in felony and domestic relations cases per judge have heavy caseloads in time-consuming categories which cannot be shared by supporting courts. Therefore, creation of a limited jurisdiction 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.

EXHIBIT III: SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1979 FELONY AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS FILINGS PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT	FELONY	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	SUBTOTAL	% OF TOTAL	GENERAL CIVIL	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	JUVENILE *	SUBTOTAL	% OF TOTAL
1 COBB	478	1025	1503	77.2	270	134	36	4	0	444	22.8
2 HOUSTON	281	927	1208	70.4	285	220	2	0	0	507	29.6
3 CHATTAHOOCHEE	422	763	1185	65.0	258	151	143	60	27	639	35.1
4 COWETA	326	787	1113	50.8	540	358	80	95	5	1078	49.2
5 CLAYTON	236	850	1086	70.2	270	187	1	2	0	460	29.8
6 MACON	383	687	1070	65.6	307	166	55	20	13	561	34.4
7 STONE MTN.	265	796	1061	65.0	352	204	12	4	0	572	35.0
8 TIFTON	308	743	1051	44.3	559	348	172	39	203	1321	55.7
9 ATLANTA	405	604	1009	67.1	385	108	1	0	0	494	32.9
10 BRUNSWICK	181	814	995	54.1	414	315	110	6	0	845	45.9
11 EASTERN	403	551	954	70.9	134	258	0	0	0	392	29.1
12 AUGUSTA	147	796	943	52.9	231	180	70	9	350	840	47.1
13 DOUGHERTY	313	620	933	71.0	212	169	3	0	0	384	29.2
14 CONASAUGA	230	697	927	44.6	507	337	200	74	37	1155	55.6
15 MOUNTAIN	181	703	884	40.8	527	339	174	80	164	1284	59.2
16 SOUTHERN	233	641	874	61.1	288	161	104	2	3	558	39.0
17 GRIFFIN	243	623	866	49.0	366	187	185	163	0	901	51.0
18 CHEROKEE	347	485	832	16.2	426	280	736	2862	0	4304	83.8
19 WAYCROSS	216	580	796	49.9	256	131	189	143	79	798	50.1
20 BLUE RIDGE	241	538	779	42.9	257	123	403	256	0	1039	
21 LOOKOUT MTN.	259	513	772	47.4	292	160	313	70	21	856	52.5

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

**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 3**

EXHIBIT III: SUPERIOR COURT CIRCUIT RANKINGS BY FY1979 FELONY AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS FILINGS PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT	FELONY	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	SUBTOTAL	% OF TOTAL	GENERAL CIVIL	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	JUVENILE *	SUBTOTAL	% OF TOTAL
22 ATLANTIC	224	540	764	34.7	324	137	64	809	102	1436	65.3
23 PATAULA	361	401	762	40.9	420	138	459	35	50	1102	59.1
24 DUBLIN	302	450	752	45.0	565	239	28	0	89	921	55.1
25 GWINNETT	148	588	736	67.5	175	178	1	0	0	354	32.5
26 NORTHEASTERN	237	482	719	38.0	378	264	172	111	48	1173	62.0
27 MIDDLE	211	503	714	52.9	270	146	1	0	219	636	47.2
28 TOOMBS	302	405	707	19.6	304	222	785	913	673	2898	80.4
29 CORDELE	190	477	667	28.1	429	205	829	52	190	1705	71.9
30 SOUTH GEORGIA	329	319	648	56.0	254	102	76	14	65	511	44.1
31 PIEDMONT	157	481	638	31.7	512	245	255	364	0	1376	68.3
32 WESTERN	219	403	622	51.2	300	166	94	25	8	593	48.8
33 TALLAPOOSA	171	447	618	31.7	693	160	313	136	29	1331	68.3
34 ROME	175	436	611	24.6	553	364	895	64	0	1876	75.4
35 SOUTHWESTERN	160	450	610	40.0	544	200	57	2	112	915	60.0
36 ALCOVY	225	327	552	39.6	286	206	296	54	0	842	60.4
37 ALAPAHA	286	231	517	20.5	223	100	543	1011	123	2000	79.5
38 OCMULGEE	250	262	512	32.7	281	166	346	81	180	1054	67.3
39 OGEECHEE	168	338	506	47.2	357	102	14	9	84	566	52.8
40 NORTHERN	135	303	438	31.8	293	174	327	53	94	941	68.3
41 OCONEE	156	281	437	28.6	342	119	333	172	129	1095	71.6
42 FLINT	107	326	433	34.6	438	183	142	20	36	819	65.5
CIRCUIT MEAN	253	552	805	46.8	359	198	215	191	79	1042	53.2

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

### EXHIBIT III ANALYSIS

After calculating the circuit mean and standard deviation for the subtotals of felony and domestic relations filings per judge, it was found that the following circuits exceed the mean (805) by at least one standard deviation:

COBB  
HOUSTON  
CHATTAHOOCHEE  
COWETA  
CLAYTON  
MACON  
STONE MOUNTAIN  
TIFTON

The general civil category also includes time-consuming cases which 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, then the circuit mean for this subtotal would be 1,164. Circuits which exceed this mean by more than one standard deviation are:

COBB  
COWETA  
TIFTON  
HOUSTON  
CHATTAHOOCHEE  
CONASAUGA

In contrast to Exhibit I which focused on volume without regard to difficulty, Exhibit III highlights circuits with the greatest number of filings in the most complex case types. By comparing the above mentioned circuits with those circuits, in Exhibit I, which had excessive filings, it can be seen which circuits have both a demanding and high volume caseload.

## EXHIBIT IV

### Average and Observed Rate of Change in Superior Court Filings per Judge:

#### FY1976-FY1979 and FY1978-1979

Exhibit IV presents the average rate of change in filings per judge between fiscal year 1976 and fiscal year 1979, and the rate of change between fiscal year 1978 and fiscal year 1979. The average rate of change between 1976 and 1979 represents the estimated annual average rate of change in filings per judge between 1976 and 1979. The observed rate of change between 1978 and 1979 is simply the percent of increase or decrease in case filings as compared to the previous year. The numerical change between 1978 and 1979 is simply the observed difference. The numerical change between 1976 and 1979 is one-third of the increase or decrease in caseload between 1976 and 1979.

The unit of the criminal case use 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 the 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 case type first defined for the fiscal year 1977 data collection effort and, therefore, no previous data exists for comparison in this category.

There are several interpretative qualifications to be noted in this exhibit. The rate of change was calculated on the basis of the caseload per judge in each circuit for FY1976, FY1978 and FY1979. The calculations reflects the changes in

the number of judges in each circuit over the four years. Therefore, if Circuit A had one judge in 1976 and two judges in 1979, the filings per judge in 1976 would equal the total caseload divided by one, while the 1979 figures would equal the 1979 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 could be an abrupt change in the misdemeanor, traffic, general civil, or juvenile figures in Exhibit IV.

Two other causes of sudden changes in caseload are changes in jurisdiction of a supporting court and changes in local practice concerning the courts in which certain cases are filed. For example, if the dollar limit of the civil jurisdiction of a state court was increased from \$5,000 to \$15,000 at the beginning of the fiscal year, then a decrease in general civil filings per judge in the superior court and an increase in the proportion of general civil cases heard by supporting courts in the circuit may result. Another example might be a change in local court practice or rules. This hypothetical change in court practice could, also, produce a decrease in filings per judge in the superior courts and an increase in the proportion of these cases heard by supporting courts.

A notation has been made in Exhibit IV to identify circuits that have received an additional superior court judge between 1976 and 1979, 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 1978 and four misdemeanor cases filed in 1979, 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.

For the purposes of this year's judgeship study, Exhibit IV has been designed so that increases and decreases in circuit caseload per judge could be isolated and analyzed. Of particular importance, in this exhibit, are those circuits with large FY1979 caseloads and figures which indicate that the caseloads have been 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.

EXHIBIT IV: AVERAGE AND OBSERVED RATE OF CHANGE IN SUPERIOR COURT FILINGS  
PER JUDGE, FY1976 - FY1979 AND FY1978 - FY1979

CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS		CRIMINAL FILINGS								CIVIL FILINGS						JUVENILE FILINGS		
			FELONY		MISD.		TRAFFIC		TOTAL CRIMINAL		GENERAL CIVIL		DOMESTIC RELATIONS		TOTAL CIVIL		TOTAL JUVENILE †		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
ALAPAHA *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-192	-6.9	-20	-6.0	-145	-17.8	83	9.8	-83	-4.1	-70	-19.9	-58	-17.0	-128	-18.5	19	23.1	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	290	13.6	56	24.2	-187	-25.6	377	59.5	246	15.4	-7	-3.0	7	3.1	0	0	45	57.7	
ALCOVY *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-395	-20.5	-18	-6.8	-73	-16.9	-14	-17.2	-105	-13.5	-183	-30.1	-106	-20.3	-290	-25.5	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	21	1.8	-38	-14.2	30	11.3	-8	-12.9	-15	-2.5	3	1.1	34	11.6	37	6.4	0	-	
ATLANTA																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	12	0.8	18	4.4	0.3	-	0	-	18	4.5	-26	-6.0	20	3.5	-6	-0.6	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	87	6.4	-28	-5.9	-3	-75.0	0	-	-31	-6.5	13	3.5	105	21.0	118	13.5	0	-	
ATLANTIC																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	424	36.8	13	6.0	-6	7.8	264	369.8	271	153.8	43	18.6	102	32.1	145	26.4	8	9.4	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	869	71.4	-2	-0.8	39	30.0	803	13383	839	298.6	-66	-16.9	100	22.7	34	4.1	-4	-3.8	
AUGUSTA																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	145	10.8	-25	-10.6	-1	-0.9	0.3	4.0	-25	-8.0	-5	-2.1	59	8.7	54	5.8	117	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	225	15.9	-29	-13.6	-56	-44.4	7	350.0	-78	-22.8	-38	-14.1	1	0.1	-37	-3.5	340	3400.0	
BLUE RIDGE																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-88	-4.5	24	9.6	18	5.0	-145	-28.2	-103	-8.9	-10	-3.5	65	16.1	55	8.1	-39	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-156	-8.1	21	7.4	82	25.2	-312	-54.9	-212	-18.0	40	18.4	15	2.9	55	7.4	0	-	
BRUNSWICK																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-591	-22.2	28	16.8	-41	-21.5	-634	-85.3	-647	-16.7	12	3.0	44	6.1	56	5.0	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	131	9.1	30	15.2	-26	-18.6	5	500.0	7	2.1	46	12.5	77	10.4	123	11.1	0	-	
CHATTAHOOCHEE *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-75	-4.1	-47	-9.1	-7	-4.6	-1	-1.6	-56	-7.5	-38	-11.5	13	1.8	-25	-2.3	5	34.9	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	96	6.1	91	27.1	18	14.2	-29	-32.6	75	13.5	-12	-4.4	14	1.9	2	0.2	19	237.5	
CHEROKEE *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-499	-8.5	-4	-1.0	-89	-9.7	-144	-4.6	-237	-5.3	-181	-23.9	-82	-12.8	-263	-18.8	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	809	19.8	-39	-9.2	246	49.3	543	23.4	747	23.0	-6	-1.4	68	16.3	62	7.3	0	-	
CLAYTON *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-64	-4.2	-12	-3.7	-26	-76.6	1	-	-36	-9.9	-31	-9.5	3	0.4	-28	-2.4	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	105	8.0	36	14.0	-26	-96.3	-1	-33.3	10	3.5	44	19.5	51	6.4	95	9.3	0	-	
COBB *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-29	-1.5	20	4.2	12	-	1	-	33	6.7	-42	-12.1	-20	-1.9	-62	-4.4	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	103	5.9	51	10.9	34	1700	4	-	88	18.7	-27	-9.1	42	4.3	15	1.2	0	-	

\* CIRCUITS WHERE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIP HAS BEEN ADDED BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979  
 \*\* CIRCUITS WHICH EITHER ADDED OR ABOLISHED A STATE COURT BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979  
 † WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

EXHIBIT IV: AVERAGE AND OBSERVED RATE OF CHANGE IN SUPERIOR COURT FILINGS  
PER JUDGE: FY1976 - FY1979 AND FY1978 - FY1979

CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS		CRIMINAL FILINGS								CIVIL FILINGS						JUVENILE FILINGS		
			FELONY		MISD.		TRAFFIC		TOTAL CRIMINAL		GENERAL CIVIL		DOMESTIC RELATIONS		TOTAL CIVIL		TOTAL JUVENILE †		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
CONASAUGA																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	127	8.2	59	39.4	-7	-3.1	-8	-8.9	44	9.2	3	0.6	77	14.4	80	7.7	3	9.7	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-101	-5.3	29	11.5	-37	-14.7	-20	-21.3	-28	-4.7	-17	-3.2	-34	-4.7	-51	-4.1	-22	-37.3	
CORDELE																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	236	13.5	30	16.8	111	17.9	17	373.3	158	19.4	8	2.0	18	4.1	26	3.1	52	79.2	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	278	14.2	-42	-14.8	153	21.9	19	57.6	130	12.8	22	5.4	26	5.8	48	5.6	100	111.1	
COWETA																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	31	1.7	34	10.5	-9	-9.1	4	4.2	28	5.5	28	5.8	-24	-2.9	4	0.3	-1	-14.5	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	210	12.4	133	52.0	-5	-5.6	-5	-5.0	123	27.6	49	10.0	44	5.9	93	7.5	-6	-54.5	
DOUGHERTY																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	21	1.8	46	15.9	-1	-20.6	-0.3	-	45	15.3	-58	-18.0	34	6.2	-23	-2.7	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	207	20.5	165	75.7	3	-	0	-	168	77.1	11	5.5	28	4.7	39	4.9	0	-	
DUBLIN																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	83	6.2	71	31.8	1	2.4	0	-	72	28.4	24	4.6	-31	-6.1	-8	-0.7	19	39.2	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	262	20.9	78	25.8	27	135.0	0	-	105	34.5	81	16.7	28	6.6	109	12.0	48	17.1	
EASTERN*																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-127	-9.2	38	10.4	-5	-	0	-	34	8.9	-60	-24.7	-101	-13.6	-161	-16.3	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-533	-32.0	-36	-7.4	-87	-100	-22	-100	-145	-24.5	-139	-50.9	-249	-31.1	-388	-36.2	0	-	
FLINT																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-44	-3.7	1	0.5	-25	-12.9	-9	-25.3	-34	-9.2	-35	-7.0	17	6.0	-18	-2.3	8	44.2	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	102	10.1	-5	-3.4	48	48.0	6	42.9	49	18.9	14	3.3	25	8.3	39	5.4	15	71.4	
GRIFFIN*																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-315	-14.3	-12	-4.2	-89	-25.6	-13	-6.7	-114	-13.7	-94	-17.3	-107	-12.9	-201	-14.7	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	255	18.9	49	22.8	-46	-19.7	23	16.3	25	4.2	66	22.0	164	35.7	230	30.3	0	-	
GWINNETT*																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-55	-5.3	1	0.4	-14	-71.2	-1	-46.9	-14	-6.9	-44	-17.0	2	0.3	-42	-4.9	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	121	14.9	41	31.8	0	0	0	0	41	31.5	24	15.9	56	10.5	80	11.7	0	-	
HOUSTON																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-3	-0.2	15	4.9	-9	-59.5	0	-	5	1.7	-82	-18.8	74	9.6	-8	-0.7	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	108	7.5	61	22.6	1	50.0	0	-	62	22.9	-16	-5.3	62	7.2	46	3.9	0	-	
LOOKOUT MTN.* / **																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-174	-9.6	13	5.5	-123	-22.9	9	18.6	-101	-12.0	-29	-8.3	-51	-8.3	-80	-8.3	7	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	2	0.1	24	10.0	-67	-17.6	-29	-29.3	-71	-9.9	5	1.7	47	10.1	52	6.9	21	-	

\* CIRCUITS WHERE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIP HAS BEEN ADDED BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979  
 \*\* CIRCUITS WHICH EITHER ADDED OR ABOLISHED A STATE COURT BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979  
 † WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

EXHIBIT IV, AVERAGE AND OBSERVED RATE OF CHANGE IN SUPERIOR COURT FILINGS  
PER JUDGE: FY1976 - FY1979 AND FY1978 - FY1979

CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS		CRIMINAL FILINGS								CIVIL FILINGS						JUVENILE FILINGS		
			FELONY		MISD.		TRAFFIC		TOTAL CRIMINAL		GENERAL CIVIL		DOMESTIC RELATIONS		TOTAL CIVIL		TOTAL JUVENILE		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
MACON																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	44	3.1	41	11.2	-28	-26.5	-3	-12.6	9	1.8	2	0.7	36	5.9	38	4.2	-3	-16.1	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	130	9.3	110	32.2	-43	-43.4	14	233.3	80	17.9	25	8.9	28	4.2	53	5.6	-3	-18.8	
MIDDLE *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-121	-8.1	-37	-10.8	-1	-20.6	-0.3	-	-39	-11.1	-103	-22.5	-40	-6.8	-143	-13.7	61	80.9	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	298	30.8	86	45.7	0	0	-0.5	-100	85	44.7	0	0	31	6.6	31	4.2	183	508.3	
MOUNTAIN																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-168	-7.6	2	0.8	-46	-16.8	-59	-32.1	-103	-15.1	-130	-16.8	32	5.0	-98	-6.9	33	35.4	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-33	-1.7	21	10.6	-3	-1.6	13	19.4	28	6.1	1	0.2	9	1.3	10	0.8	-71	-30.2	
NORTHEASTERN																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-14	-8.0	11	4.4	-32	-13.5	-26	-7.1	-46	-5.4	1	0.4	23	5.4	25	3.0	8	26.0	
OBS CHANGE 1976-1979	100	6.3	1	0.4	16	10.0	101	48.1	119	18.3	10	2.7	-15	-3.0	-5	-0.6	-13	-21.3	
NORTHERN *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-279	-15.6	-23	-11.3	1	0.4	-27	-26.1	-49	-7.4	-169	-28.5	-57	-13.9	-226	-22.4	-4	-4.2	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	216	20.7	-9	-5.4	196	123.3	17	45.9	203	55.8	-48	-14.1	6	2.0	-42	-6.6	55	141.0	
OCMULGEE *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-192	-10.4	-31	-8.7	-65	-12.7	2	2.1	-95	-10.0	-100	-21.5	-31	-9.5	-131	-16.6	33	31.0	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-272	-15.5	-74	-20.2	-6	-1.5	-7	-8.0	-88	-10.4	-164	-36.9	-101	-27.8	-265	-32.8	81	81.8	
OCONEE *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	61	4.6	23	18.8	-20	-5.3	5	3.3	8	1.2	4	1.2	24	10.2	28	4.9	25	33.7	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	161	12.6	-28	-14.1	109	47.0	22	14.7	104	17.9	12	3.6	53	23.2	65	11.6	-7	-5.1	
OGEECHEE *																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-367	-22.0	-63	-20.4	-74	-56.4	-3	-19.1	-140	-30.1	-104	-18.9	-94	-18.3	-198	-18.6	-29	-20.9	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	45	4.7	49	34.5	-2	-9.1	7	350.0	51	30.5	-1	-0.3	13	4.0	12	1.8	-19	-18.4	
PATAULA																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	10	0.6	8	2.2	-2	-0.4	-11	-19.5	-5	-0.6	-17	-3.8	48	15.8	30	4.0	-15	-19.5	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	337	24.3	68	23.2	78	20.5	11	45.8	157	22.5	12	2.9	154	62.3	166	25.3	14	38.9	
PIEDMONT																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	79	4.8	23	16.0	-29	-9.2	20	6.1	13	1.7	20	4.2	46	11.9	66	7.6	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	192	11.9	-45	-19.2	57	28.2	-14	-3.7	-2	-0.2	77	17.7	117	32.1	194	24.3	0	-	
ROME **																			
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	94	4.9	30	26.2	29	3.4	-2	-2.9	56	5.5	26	5.1	12	3.0	38	4.2	0	-	
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	207	10.8	-15	-7.8	86	10.6	17	36.2	88	8.4	102	22.6	17	4.1	119	13.7	0	-	

\* CIRCUITS WHERE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIP HAS BEEN ADDED BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979

\*\* CIRCUITS WHICH EITHER ADDED OR ABOLISHED A STATE COURT BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979

‡ WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

EXHIBIT IV: AVERAGE AND OBSERVED RATE OF CHANGE IN SUPERIOR COURT FILINGS  
PER JUDGE: FY1976 - FY1979 AND FY1978 - FY1979

CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS		CRIMINAL FILINGS								CIVIL FILINGS						JUVENILE FILINGS	
			FELONY		MISD.		TRAFFIC		TOTAL CRIMINAL		GENERAL CIVIL		DOMESTIC RELATIONS		TOTAL CIVIL		TOTAL JUVENILE	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
SOUTH GEORGIA *																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-288	-18.1	-29	-7.5	-69	-35.4	4	67.1	-94	-15.8	-100	-22.8	-63	-14.3	-162	-18.5	-32	-26.1
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	15	1.4	27	8.9	-58	-43.3	10	250.0	-21	-4.8	4	1.6	40	14.3	44	8.3	-8	-11.0
SOUTHERN																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	77	6.7	-2	-1.0	6	6.1	0	0	3	0.8	-2	-0.6	77	16.2	76	9.8	-2	-30.7
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-179	-12.1	-21	-7.5	-9	-8.0	1	100.0	-30	-7.6	10	3.6	-160	-20.0	-150	-13.9	1	50.0
SOUTHWESTERN																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-32	-2.3	-21	-8.9	-10	-12.6	-1	-20.6	-31	-9.9	-34	-5.6	6	1.3	-28	-2.7	27	55.1
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	12	0.9	-28	-12.7	-4	-6.5	-9	-81.8	-41	-14.0	29	5.6	-8	-1.7	21	2.2	32	40.0
STONE MTN.																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	88	6.9	21	8.7	-1	-7.2	1	-	22	8.4	-1	-0.2	67	10.1	66	6.5	0	-
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-63	-4.2	-51	-15.0	-6	-33.3	2	100.0	-54	-15.0	-23	-6.1	14	1.8	-9	-0.8	0	-
TALLAPOOSA *																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-242	-10.5	-10	-4.4	-51	-12.1	-38	-18.4	-99	-11.4	-119	-13.0	-21	-4.4	-141	-10.0	-2	-7.0
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	104	6.0	-14	-6.1	18	5.9	-53	-28.0	-50	-6.9	101	17.1	47	11.8	148	14.9	5	20.8
TIFTON																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	169	9.5	5	1.3	-1	-0.7	13	-	17	2.8	24	4.7	71	11.9	95	8.6	58	89.1
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	443	26.3	45	12.6	22	14.0	18	85.7	85	15.9	48	9.4	141	23.4	189	17.0	169	497.1
TOOMBS																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	342	12.6	44	18.2	-50	-5.5	221	53.8	215	13.4	-45	-11.5	-18	-4.0	-62	-7.5	189	85.8
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-492	-12.5	34	11.4	35	4.6	-683	-42.8	-614	-23.0	-29	-8.7	-42	-9.4	-71	-9.1	193	40.2
WAYCROSS																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	71	5.2	14	6.6	-6	-3.1	25	28.1	33	6.4	-19	-6.4	41	8.2	22	2.8	16	36.6
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	-187	-11.1	-23	-8.6	11	6.1	-63	-30.6	-76	-11.6	-138	-35.0	-18	-3.0	-156	-15.7	45	132.4
WESTERN *																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	88	10.0	-5	-2.3	17	30.8	8	232.1	20	6.5	12	4.2	58	20.6	69	12.4	-1	-12.6
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	207	24.4	14	6.6	88	146.7	24	2400	127	58.3	44	17.2	42	11.6	86	13.9	-5	-38.5
STATEWIDE																		
AVG CHANGE 1976-1979	-22	-1.3	9	3.1	-13	-6.8	-3	-2.2	-7	-1.1	-32	-7.9	10	1.8	-21	-2.2	7	15.9
OBS CHANGE 1978-1979	87	5.7	12	4.0	9	5.7	18	14.3	40	6.9	-3	-0.9	23	4.1	20	2.2	27	93.1

\* CIRCUIT WHERE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGESHIP HAS BEEN ADDED BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979

\*\* CIRCUIT WHICH EITHER ADDED OR ABOLISHED A STATE COURT BETWEEN 1976 AND 1979

† WHERE THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAS NO ASSISTANCE FROM A JUVENILE COURT JUDGE

## 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 the average changes of individual circuits. 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. Three exceptions are felony, domestic relations, and juvenile filings.

Despite the decline in most case categories and in total filings between 1976 and 1979, there has been a significant increase, 87 cases per judge (5.7%) in total filings between 1978 and 1979. All case types except general civil exhibited an increase during the last year; the decrease in general civil cases was only three cases per judge (-0.9%). The two case types within the exclusive jurisdiction of the superior courts, felony and domestic relations, increased by 12 (4.0%) and 23 (4.1%), respectively. The largest increase was in juvenile filings, 27 (93.1%).

Two circuits are characterized by increases in total filings of at least one standard deviation above the mean average and observed numerical and percentage increases for both periods. The two circuits are:

ATLANTIC  
TIFTON

Both Cordele and Toombs had increases in total filings greater than one standard deviation above the mean average and observed numerical increases, for FY1976-FY1979 and FY1978-FY1979.

---

<sup>u</sup>This increase is due, in part, to improved record keeping methods.

There were no circuits which met the same criteria for felony filings per judge. However, Dougherty and Dublin, were very close to meeting these criteria. Circuits whose felony filings increased by more than one standard deviation above the mean since 1978 included:

COWETA  
DOUGHERTY  
MACON  
MIDDLE

In domestic relations filings, several circuits have greater average increases than the statewide average increase per year since calendar year 1976. The circuits in which the average increase 1976-1979 exceeds the circuit mean increase by more than one standard deviation are:

ATLANTIC  
BLUE RIDGE  
CONASAUGA  
SOUTHERN

The circuits with increases which exceed the circuit mean by more than one standard deviation in domestic relations filings per judge, FY1978-FY1979, are:

GRIFFIN  
PATAULA  
TIFTON  
PIEDMONT

No circuit appears on both lists; Tifton however, was extremely close to the cutoff point for the 1976 to 1979 time period and was on the list for the 1978 to 1979 time period.

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, page 18). As a result of this change in data collection procedure, the FY1979 general civil average and observed change may seem low when compared to pre-FY1977 changes.

Three circuits show numerical increases in general civil filings at least one standard deviation above the mean for both 1976-1979 and 1978-1979. They are:

DUBLIN  
PIEDMONT  
ROME

Circuits which have experienced the largest numerical increases in general civil filings between 1978 and 1979 include:

DUBLIN  
PIEDMONT  
ROME  
TALLAPOOSA

Atlantic, Coweta, and Tifton circuits showed an increase in general civil filings between 1976 and 1979 greater than one standard deviation above the mean. However, the general civil caseload per judge in the Atlantic Circuit declined by a significant amount between 1978 and 1979.

When domestic relations and general civil cases are combined into the total civil category and analyzed, one can see that only one circuit is characterized by numerical increases in total civil cases of at least one standard deviation above the mean for both time periods. That circuit is:

TIFTON

Those circuits with high numerical increases in total civil filings between 1978 and 1979 include:

GRIFFIN	230
PIEDMONT	194
TIFTON	189
PATAULA	166
TALLAPOOSA	148

Only two circuits displayed extreme numerical increases in juvenile filings per judge from 1976 to 1979 and from 1978 to 1979. They are:

AUGUSTA  
TOOMBS

Two other circuits show high increases from 1978 to 1979. They are:

MIDDLE  
TIFTON

These abrupt increases should be qualified since a more extensive effort in locating juvenile filings was made in the fiscal years 1978 and 1979 data collection and, therefore, could have inflated both the statewide and the circuit's average and 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 IV to identify those circuits whose caseloads are large 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: high caseload volume, high volume in the most 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	5134
TOOMBS	3605
ALAPAHA	2515
ROME	2487
CORDELE	2372
TIFTON	2372
ATLANTIC	2199
COWETA	2190
MOUNTAIN	2168
CONASAUGA	2079

The data in Exhibit II indicates that there are five circuits with ratios of counts-to-defendants greater than 1.5. In alphabetical order, these circuits are:

CLAYTON  
COBB  
CONASAUGA  
GRIFFIN  
MOUNTAIN

However, the circuits with the highest ratios of counts-to-defendants on felony indictments, (greater than 1.5) produce the following list:

ALCOVY	DOUGHERTY
ATLANTIC	GRIFFIN
AUGUSTA	MOUNTAIN
BLUE RIDGE	NORTHERN
CLAYTON	ROME
COBB	TALLAPOOSA
CONASAUGA	WAYCROSS

The felony ratio is more significant since felonies require the greatest portion of judge time among the criminal case types. These circuits' workloads may be underestimated when defendants, rather than counts, are used to estimate workload.

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 1,164 by more than one standard deviation are:

COBB  
COWETA  
TIFTON  
HOUSTON  
CHATTAHOOCHEE

Many circuits have experienced large increases in one or more case types for one of the time periods, 1976-1979 or 1978-1979. The principal interest of Exhibit IV lies in those circuits with increased filings during both time periods.

The Atlantic and Tifton Circuits have much larger average and observed increases in total filings than the statewide increases per judge. No circuit shows numerical increases in felony filings greater than one standard deviation above the mean for both 1976 to 1979 and 1978 to 1979. In the civil case categories, the circuits which meet this latter criteria are: Dublin, Piedmont, and Rome in general civil; and Tifton in total civil. The Augusta and Toombs Circuits evidence large increases in juvenile filings in these two time periods.

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.

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

### **Courts: FY1979 Dispositions**

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| EXHIBIT V    | TOTAL FY1979 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND DISPOSITIONS AS PERCENT OF FILINGS PER JUDGE   |
| EXHIBIT VI   | TOTAL FY1979 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD                |
| EXHIBIT VII  | FY1979 CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE AND NUMBER DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD |
| EXHIBIT VIII | FY1979 CIVIL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE AND NUMBER DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD    |

### CHAPTER III - INTRODUCTION

Chapter III presents the data on FY1979 dispositions compiled in three different manners. In Exhibit V, "Total FY1979 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 and between the circuits and the statewide circuit mean.

Exhibit VI, "Total FY1979 Dispositions per Judge and Percent Disposed by Each Method," details further the disposition data. It provides information in percentages for the total criminal and civil caseloads by the specific method 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, "FY1979 Criminal Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Number Disposed by Each Method," and Exhibit VIII, "FY1979 Civil Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Number Disposed by Each Method," describe dispositions in terms of criminal counts and civil cases by case-type and methods of disposition. In providing a detailed picture of the methods of 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 FY1979 Dispositions per Judge and Dispositions as Percent of Filings per Judge

The total FY1979 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 case types. The figures indicate the total number of criminal and civil docket entries and the number of juvenile cases<sup>V</sup> that were disposed of during FY1979 in each circuit. Total dispositions per judge and dispositions per judge for each case type are presented as percents of total FY1979 filings in each 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 the 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 without regard to 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.

---

<sup>V</sup>Juvenile case dispositions are presented in this study in terms of the number 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 1979 fiscal year. It should be noted that these cases could have been filed at any time between July 1, 1973 and June 30, 1979, not only during the past fiscal year.

For purposes of comparison the dispositions per judge have been presented as a percent of the cases filed per judge for each case type. In this way, the reader can compare the number of cases disposed with filings per judge to determine whether dispositions are keeping pace with filing demand. Care must be used in interpreting the results. For example, if the felony dispositions per judge equal ninety-five percent of the felony filings per judge, one could conclude that barring any previous excessive accumulation of open cases, the court may be able to adequately handle its caseload by increasing its disposition rate. On the other hand, if this court is disposing of its cases at capacity, one could expect that there would be an accumulation of open cases of at least five percent of filings each year.

To locate circuits that should be examined to determine if an additional superior court judge is needed, 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 cases should be viewed critically since the civil case records often do not account for all dispositions of civil cases. In some instances cases are settled by the parties without notification to the clerk, and often, cases automatically closed under the five year administrative termination statute are not clearly designated as disposed. Therefore, one might expect the civil category percentages to be somewhat lower than the criminal percentages without necessarily indicating a problem in case processing.

EXHIBIT V: TOTAL FY1979 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND DISPOSITIONS AS PERCENT OF FILINGS PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS		CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS								CIVIL DISPOSITIONS								JUV. DSPN.	
			FELONY		MISDEMEANOR		TRAFFIC		TOT. CRIM.		GEN. CIVIL		DOM. REL.		IND. MOTIONS		TOT. CIVIL		TOT. JUV.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ALAPAHA	2074	82.5	193	67.5	427	78.6	950	94.0	1570	85.4	170	76.2	172	74.5	39	39.0	381	68.9	123	100.0
ALCOVY	1165	83.6	186	82.7	232	78.4	49	90.7	466	81.2	221	77.3	318	97.2	160	77.7	699	85.3	-	-
ATLANTA	1405	93.5	405	100.0	1	100.0	0	-	406	100.0	332	86.2	582	96.4	95	78.7	999	91.1	-	-
ATLANTIC	2150	97.8	180	80.4	48	75.0	807	99.8	1034	94.3	366	113.0	537	99.4	115	83.9	1018	101.7	98	96.5
AUGUSTA	1505	84.4	149	101.4	67	95.7	7	77.8	223	98.7	193	83.5	643	80.8	147	81.7	983	81.4	299	85.3
BLUE RIDGE	1779	97.9	241	100.0	390	96.8	248	96.9	878	97.6	213	82.9	570	105.9	118	95.9	901	98.3	-	-
BRUNSWICK	1447	78.7	154	85.1	73	66.4	5	83.3	232	78.4	275	66.4	715	87.8	225	71.4	1215	78.8	-	-
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1397	76.6	490	116.1	125	87.4	56	93.3	672	107.5	142	55.0	468	61.3	80	53.0	690	58.9	35	128.4
CHEROKEE	5331	103.8	294	84.7	690	93.8	3210	112.2	4194	106.3	405	95.1	488	100.6	244	87.1	1137	95.5	-	-
CLAYTON	1545	99.9	203	86.0	5	500.0	1	50.0	210	87.5	227	84.1	810	95.3	298	159.4	1335	102.2	-	-
COBB	1816	93.3	521	109.0	37	102.8	3	75.0	561	108.5	197	73.0	924	90.1	134	100.0	1255	87.8	-	-
CONASAUGA	1975	95.0	191	83.0	202	101.0	76	102.7	468	93.0	456	89.9	716	102.7	299	88.7	1471	95.5	36	95.5
CORDELE	2285	96.3	208	109.5	806	97.2	43	82.7	1057	98.7	422	98.4	460	96.4	155	75.6	1037	93.3	191	100.5
COWETA	1848	84.4	321	98.5	79	98.8	101	106.3	501	100.0	427	79.1	711	90.3	204	57.0	1342	79.6	5	111.1
DOUGHERTY	1275	97.0	299	95.5	6	200.0	0	-	304	96.5	233	109.9	633	102.1	105	62.1	971	97.1	-	-
DUBLIN	1350	80.7	350	115.9	47	167.9	0	-	397	120.3	371	65.7	385	85.6	115	48.1	871	69.5	82	92.1
EASTERN	1159	86.1	396	98.3	0	-	8	-	404	100.0	107	79.9	484	87.8	164	63.6	755	80.1	-	-
FLINT	1151	92.0	133	124.3	139	97.9	27	135.0	298	110.8	375	85.6	282	86.5	143	78.1	800	84.5	53	74.6
GRIFFIN	1561	88.4	219	90.1	171	92.4	145	89.0	534	90.4	297	81.1	575	92.3	155	82.9	1027	87.4	-	-
GWINNETT	1018	93.4	125	84.5	2	200.0	0	-	127	85.2	160	91.4	557	94.7	174	97.8	891	94.7	-	-
HOUSTON	1539	89.7	274	97.5	2	100.0	0	-	276	97.5	299	104.9	827	89.2	137	62.3	1263	88.2	-	-

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

EXHIBIT V: TOTAL FY1979 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND DISPOSITIONS AS PERCENT OF FILINGS PER JUDGE

CIRCUIT	TOTAL DISPOSITIONS		CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS								CIVIL DISPOSITIONS								JUV. DSPN.	
			FELONY		MISDEMEANOR		TRAFFIC		TOT. CRIM.		GEN. CIVIL		DOM. REL.		IND. MOTIONS		TOT. CIVIL		TOT. JUV.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
LOOKOUT MTN.	1447	88.8	199	76.8	327	104.5	61	87.1	587	91.4	293	100.3	527	102.7	28	17.5	846	87.7	14	67.2
MACON	1420	87.1	352	91.9	56	101.8	17	85.0	425	92.8	250	81.4	614	89.4	123	74.1	987	85.2	8	57.5
MIDDLE	1115	82.7	186	88.2	1	100.0	1	-	187	88.2	239	88.5	400	79.5	77	52.7	716	78.0	212	96.6
MOUNTAIN	2210	101.9	152	84.0	185	106.3	85	106.3	422	97.0	539	102.3	763	108.5	331	97.6	1633	104.1	155	94.5
NORTHEASTERN	1927	101.9	217	91.5	185	107.6	269	86.5	670	93.1	410	108.5	529	109.8	265	100.4	1204	107.1	53	111.6
NORTHERN	1264	91.8	123	91.1	305	93.3	74	139.6	501	97.3	253	86.3	268	88.4	149	85.6	670	87.1	93	98.9
OCMULGEE	1356	86.6	229	91.6	316	91.3	73	90.1	618	91.4	230	81.9	229	87.4	107	64.5	566	79.7	172	95.4
OCONEE	1444	94.4	178	114.1	310	93.1	178	103.5	665	100.8	312	91.2	278	98.9	67	56.3	657	88.7	122	94.2
OGEECHEE	988	92.3	164	97.6	17	121.4	14	155.6	194	101.6	338	94.7	307	90.8	69	67.6	714	89.6	80	95.2
PATAULA	1727	92.7	312	86.4	365	79.5	29	82.9	706	82.6	483	115.0	404	100.7	93	67.4	980	102.2	41	82.0
PIEDMONT	2102	104.4	156	99.4	260	102.0	368	101.1	784	101.0	551	107.6	581	120.8	186	75.9	1318	106.5	-	-
ROME	2341	94.1	171	97.7	907	101.3	58	90.5	1136	100.2	526	95.1	440	100.9	239	65.6	1205	89.1	-	-
SOUTH GEORGIA	1153	99.6	290	88.2	80	105.3	12	85.7	381	90.9	297	116.9	339	106.3	83	81.4	719	106.7	53	80.8
SOUTHERN	1202	84.0	194	83.3	105	101.0	2	100.0	301	89.1	218	75.7	564	88.0	115	71.4	897	82.3	4	122.2
SOUTHWESTERN	1501	98.4	209	130.6	56	98.3	2	100.0	267	121.9	533	98.0	492	109.3	143	71.5	1168	97.8	66	58.9
STONE MTN.	1613	98.8	243	91.7	7	58.3	3	75.0	253	90.0	325	92.3	860	108.0	175	85.8	1360	100.6	-	-
TALLAPOOSA	1493	76.6	185	108.2	295	94.3	153	112.5	632	101.9	436	62.9	323	72.3	84	52.5	843	64.8	18	63.1
TIFTON	1939	81.7	168	54.6	170	98.8	17	43.6	355	68.4	459	82.1	725	97.6	203	58.3	1387	84.1	197	97.0
TOOMBS	3076	85.3	252	83.4	638	81.2	805	88.2	1695	84.7	229	75.3	325	80.2	161	72.5	715	76.8	666	99.0
WAYCROSS	1332	83.6	177	81.9	170	90.0	143	100.0	490	89.4	194	75.8	460	79.3	109	83.2	763	78.9	79	100.6
WESTERN	1225	101.9	284	129.7	84	89.4	21	84.0	389	115.1	277	92.3	390	96.8	158	95.2	825	94.9	11	131.3
CIRCUIT MEAN	1682	91.0	237	92.7	200	110.9	193	94.5	630	95.9	316	88.2	516	93.6	149	74.8	981	88.4	70.6	60.2

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

## EXHIBIT V ANALYSIS

As expected, civil disposition rates averaged several percentage points below criminal disposition rates. The statewide mean for each of the criminal categories is over 90% while each of the civil categories except domestic relations have averages less than 90%. Total dispositions average 91.0% of total filings.

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

CHEROKEE	5,331
TOOMBS	3,076

Although Cordele and Rome do not exceed the statewide circuit mean of 1,682 by as much as one standard deviation their total per judge dispositions are significantly higher than the statewide circuit mean.

A larger number of dispositions, however, is not in and of itself a good indicator 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 in another court in which the 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.

A low disposition rate does not necessarily signal a strain on the court because the court may not be operating at full capacity. If a circuit has both a high number of dispositions and a low disposition rate, 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:

ALAPAHA  
COWETA  
TIFTON  
TOOMBS

Of these circuits Toombs has the highest volume of dispositions (3,076) with one of the lowest disposition rates (85.3%).

Alapaha and Toombs are the only two circuits in which the total criminal dispositions 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 per judge 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 (\*).

<u>FELONY</u>	<u>MISDEMEANOR</u>	<u>TRAFFIC</u>
ATLANTA	ALAPAHA*	ALAPAHA
CHATTAHOOCHEE	CHEROKEE	ATLANTIC
COBB	CORDELE	CHEROKEE
DUBLIN	ROME	TOOMBS*
EASTERN	TOOMBS*	
MACON		

There are nine circuits for which the total civil dispositions per judge are greater than one standard deviation above the statewide mean (98.1%).

Four of these also have a disposition rate of less than 90%.

COBB  
COWETA  
HOUSTON  
TIFTON

By utilizing the same criteria, it appears that there are two circuits whose domestic relations caseloads are causing some strain.

BRUNSWICK  
HOUSTON

One 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. Caseload complexity, terms of court, filing practices of the district attorney, and judges' methods of operation may vary and, therefore, affect the disposition data.

## EXHIBIT VI

### Total FY1979 Dispositions per Judge and Percent Disposed by Each Method

This exhibit illustrates the percentages of criminal and civil cases disposed by method 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 and the civil dispositions, second, in each column.

There are two important qualifications to make in relation to 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 with 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 four general disposition categories included in this exhibit: non-adjudicated, non-trial, non-jury trial and jury trial. To obtain these categories, some of the more specific disposition types were combined.

The civil non-trial category is composed of cases terminated without adjudication at the conclusion of the full presentation of issues and evidence. This includes default judgments, consent judgments and judgments on the pleadings. The non-jury trial category is limited to those cases in which evidence was presented to a judge and a judgment was rendered on the merits of the case. 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 non-trial disposition includes guilty pleas and "non-trial other"<sup>w</sup> dispositions. The non-jury trial categories for criminal dispositions are the same as for civil dispositions.

The value of the exhibit is to present the total dispositions of the superior court during FY1979 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.

---

<sup>w</sup> 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.

EXHIBIT VI: TOTAL FY1979 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PERCENT DISPOSED  
BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# DISPOSED	% NON-ADJUDICATED	% NON-TRIAL	% NON- JURY TRIAL	% JURY TRIAL
ALAPAHA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1575	56.9	42.4	0.3	0.4
CIVIL CASES	381	25.5	69.7	1.3	3.5
ALCOVY					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	654	3.7	95.0	0.1	1.2
CIVIL CASES	655	24.0	47.1	27.3	1.7
ATLANTA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	498	14.7	80.1	0.2	5.0
CIVIL CASES	999	31.9	54.3	11.9	1.8
ATLANTIC					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1224	76.4	21.6	0.3	1.7
CIVIL CASES	1080	24.7	16.7	57.0	1.6
AUGUSTA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	383	35.7	54.0	1.4	8.9
CIVIL CASES	983	15.4	58.0	23.8	2.7
BLUE RIDGE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1342	11.6	82.3	1.6	4.5
CIVIL CASES	901	36.7	24.4	36.6	2.4
BRUNSWICK					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	302	38.2	54.6	1.2	6.0
CIVIL CASES	1215	28.4	18.2	51.6	1.8
CHATTAHOOCHEE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	677	36.9	58.5	1.9	2.7
CIVIL CASES	690	15.9	9.2	73.9	1.0
CHEROKEE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	4393	73.7	24.1	0.9	1.4
CIVIL CASES	1137	34.0	35.4	28.6	2.0
CLAYTON					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	553	20.1	53.2	1.9	24.8
CIVIL CASES	1334	25.8	30.1	42.6	1.5
COBB					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1014	59.5	37.8	0.1	2.6
CIVIL CASES	1254	23.4	14.8	61.0	0.8
CONASAUGA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	880	20.7	74.8	0.1	4.4
CIVIL CASES	1471	33.6	30.8	34.0	1.6
CORDELE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1196	19.2	77.4	0.3	3.0
CIVIL CASES	1037	34.4	12.8	51.3	1.4
COWETA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	691	24.1	67.6	0.5	7.8
CIVIL CASES	1341	23.0	40.6	35.2	1.2

EXHIBIT VI: TOTAL FY1979 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# DISPOSED	% NON-ADJUDICATED	% NON-TRIAL	% NON-JURY TRIAL	% JURY TRIAL
DOUGHERTY					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	573	13.4	77.3	0	9.3
CIVIL CASES	971	33.3	64.9	0	1.8
DUBLIN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	647	54.4	37.1	4.3	4.2
CIVIL CASES	871	38.0	18.4	42.4	1.3
EASTERN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	473	24.4	70.0	0.2	5.4
CIVIL CASES	755	23.8	6.7	67.5	2.1
FLINT					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	415	42.5	45.7	3.6	8.2
CIVIL CASES	799	27.9	64.8	4.8	2.6
GRIFFIN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	784	51.1	46.6	0.3	1.9
CIVIL CASES	1027	32.2	49.6	16.7	1.5
GWINNETT					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	245	10.1	78.3	0	11.6
CIVIL CASES	892	27.3	24.0	45.8	3.0
HOUSTON					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	427	17.1	65.3	5.4	12.2
CIVIL CASES	1263	71.7	0	24.6	3.7
LOOKOUT MTN.					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	645	61.2	35.4	0.4	3.1
CIVIL CASES	968	34.2	16.6	48.1	1.1
MACON					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	644	40.7	54.2	0.2	5.0
CIVIL CASES	987	29.3	12.3	56.2	2.1
MIDDLE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	303	20.2	73.9	1.2	4.8
CIVIL CASES	716	29.6	6.2	62.5	1.7
MOUNTAIN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	725	33.0	63.4	0	3.6
CIVIL CASES	1633	38.1	26.2	33.8	1.9
NORTHEASTERN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	794	26.4	67.1	0.1	6.4
CIVIL CASES	1203	38.2	22.7	35.7	3.4
NORTHERN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	706	33.2	64.3	1.0	1.5
CIVIL CASES	670	25.8	51.8	19.6	2.8
DCMULGEE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	775	35.0	60.6	0.4	4.0
CIVIL CASES	566	26.3	20.0	52.8	0.9

EXHIBIT VI: TOTAL FY1979 DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE AND PERCENT DISPOSED  
BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# DISPOSED	% NON-ADJUDICATED	% NON-TRIAL	% NON- JURY TRIAL	% JURY TRIAL
OCONEE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	868	38.3	55.7	4.6	1.4
CIVIL CASES	656	35.3	17.1	46.0	1.7
OGEECHEE					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	252	14.5	60.9	19.0	5.6
CIVIL CASES	714	30.1	30.0	38.0	1.9
PATAULA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	713	18.5	72.4	0.4	8.7
CIVIL CASES	980	39.5	59.7	0	0.8
PIEDMONT					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	912	40.5	55.9	0	3.6
CIVIL CASES	1318	44.1	42.0	12.4	1.5
ROME					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1466	49.6	34.7	9.3	6.4
CIVIL CASES	1205	36.4	19.3	42.2	2.0
SOUTH GEORGIA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	382	17.3	79.1	0	3.7
CIVIL CASES	719	36.0	61.8	0.1	2.2
SOUTHERN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	435	37.7	53.4	0.6	8.3
CIVIL CASES	898	20.5	78.3	0.4	0.8
SOUTHWESTERN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	366	3.0	83.1	9.0	4.9
CIVIL CASES	1168	34.6	12.9	50.0	2.5
STONE MTN.					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	378	23.1	75.1	0.4	1.4
CIVIL CASES	1360	36.3	54.9	6.8	2.0
TALLAPOOSA					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	983	62.4	19.4	16.2	1.9
CIVIL CASES	843	27.4	35.1	35.4	2.1
TIFTON					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	446	39.9	54.0	0	6.1
CIVIL CASES	1387	32.2	65.5	1.2	1.1
TOOMBS					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	1984	68.3	27.5	2.3	1.9
CIVIL CASES	715	27.7	52.2	16.9	3.2
WAYCROSS					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	677	45.9	49.6	1.3	3.3
CIVIL CASES	762	31.9	23.3	42.5	2.4
WESTERN					
CRIMINAL COUNTS	476	30.1	56.9	0.8	12.1
CIVIL CASES	825	31.6	34.5	29.6	4.4

## 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 dispositions 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>x</sup>

CLAYTON	137
ROME	94
PATAULA	62
CHEROKEE	61
BLUE RIDGE	60

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

HOUSTON	47
NORTHEASTERN	40.5
WESTERN	36
MOUNTAIN	31
SOUTHWESTERN	29

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 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 and 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:

AUGUSTA  
BRUNSWICK  
CLAYTON

---

<sup>x</sup> 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.

FLINT  
GWINNETT  
HOUSTON  
NORTHEASTERN  
ROME  
WESTERN

There are ten circuits (24%) in which both the number of civil cases disposed and the percent disposed by jury trial are above the mean.

AUGUSTA  
BLUE RIDGE  
FLINT  
GWINNETT  
HOUSTON  
MACON  
NORTHEASTERN  
SOUTHWESTERN  
TOOMBS  
WESTERN

In three of these circuits, the number and percent of civil cases disposed by jury trial exceed the circuit mean by more than one standard deviation:

HOUSTON  
NORTHEASTERN  
WESTERN

In criminal cases, the data for comparison among circuits of the number of counts disposed by a non-jury trial is important since this method of disposition requires a considerable amount of judge time and (almost as much judge time as is required by jury trials). The circuits with the largest number of counts disposed by non-jury trial are:

TALLAPOOSA	159.7
ROME	136.5
OGEECHEE	48
TOOMBS	46
OCONEE	39.5

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

DUBLIN  
HOUSTON  
OCONEE  
OGEECHEE  
ROME

SOUTHWESTERN  
TALLAPOOSA  
TOOMBS

Comparison of circuits relating to civil non-jury trial dispositions have not been made because court records often do not clearly differentiate between non-jury trial dispositions and before-trial dispositions particularly in domestic relations cases; therefore, this data is not totally reliable.

## EXHIBIT VII

### FY1979 Criminal Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Percent Disposed by Each Method

Exhibit VII provides more detailed information on criminal dispositions by presenting dispositions by both 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), Non-Jury and Jury.

There are no major qualifications required for interpreting the data in this exhibit. The total number of dockets listed in the first column indicates this 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 of. 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.

EXHIBIT VII: FY1979 CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED:			# OF COUNTS DISPOSED BY:						
	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS- MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY
ALAPAHA										
FELONY	193	193	196	0	0	56	4.5	128	3	4.5
MISDEMEANOR	427	428	429	26.5	0	59	8	332.5	1	2
TRAFFIC	950	950	950	717.5	0	23	1.5	208	0	0
TOTAL	1570	1571	1575	744	0	138	14	668.5	4	6.5
ALCOVY										
FELONY	186	187	282	0	0	16	0	258.5	0	7
MISDEMEANOR	232	232	305	0	0	6	1	296.5	0.5	1
TRAFFIC	49	51	68	0	0	1.5	0	66	0	0
TOTAL	466	469	654	0	0	23.5	1	621	0.5	8
ATLANTA										
FELONY	405	441	495	0	62.4	10	0.4	396.3	0.9	24.9
MISDEMEANOR	1	2	3	0	0.3	0.1	0	2.3	0	0.1
TRAFFIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	406	443	498	0	62.6	10.1	0.4	398.5	0.9	25
ATLANTIC										
FELONY	180	195	308	0	3.5	74	37.5	175	3	14.5
MISDEMEANOR	48	53	95	2	2	12	0	75	0.5	4
TRAFFIC	807	807	821	801.5	0	1.5	0.5	14.5	0	2.5
TOTAL	1034	1055	1224	803.5	5.5	87.5	38	264.5	3.5	21
AUGUSTA										
FELONY	149	186	287	0	14.8	49	4.8	181.5	3.5	33.8
MISDEMEANOR	67	67	79	51.5	0	3.3	11	11.8	1.3	0.5
TRAFFIC	7	7	16	0	0	2	0.3	13.3	0.8	0
TOTAL	223	260	383	51.5	14.8	54.3	16	206.5	5.5	34.3
BLUE RIDGE										
FELONY	241	294	512	0	10.5	70.5	21.5	370.5	4.5	34.5
MISDEMEANOR	390	392	454	0	0	18.5	13.5	405	7.5	9.5
TRAFFIC	248	248	375	0	0	13	8.5	328.5	10	16
TOTAL	878	934	1342	0	10.5	102	43.5	1104	22	60
BRUNSWICK										
FELONY	154	182	217	0	5	42.5	3.5	144.5	3.5	18
MISDEMEANOR	73	79	80	34	0	27.5	0	18	0	0
TRAFFIC	5	5	6	3	0	0	0	2.5	0	0
TOTAL	232	265	302	37	5	70	3.5	165	3.5	18
CHATTAHOOCHEE										
FELONY	490	494	494	0	43.3	128.3	0	297.3	9.8	15.3
MISDEMEANOR	125	125	126	3.8	5.3	41	0.3	70.8	2.5	2.8
TRAFFIC	56	57	57	18	2.3	7	0.3	28.3	0.8	0
TOTAL	672	676	677	21.8	51.3	176.3	0.5	396.3	13	18
CHEROKEE										
FELONY	294	331	360	0	31	145	7	140	6	31
MISDEMEANOR	690	701	745	128	31.5	239	27	278.5	16.5	24
TRAFFIC	3210	3210	3288	2491.5	4	112	21	638.5	15	6
TOTAL	4194	4242	4393	2619.5	66.5	496	55	1057	37.5	61
CLAYTON										
FELONY	203	252	536	0	1.7	103	3.3	281.3	9.7	137
MISDEMEANOR	5	6	14	0	0	3.3	0	10.3	0.3	0
TRAFFIC	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	2.7	0.3	0
TOTAL	210	260	553	0	1.7	106.3	3.3	294.3	10.3	137
COBB										
FELONY	521	572	897	0	94.3	142.3	302.3	331	0.8	26
MISDEMEANOR	37	37	100	16	1	4.3	31	47.5	0	0.5
TRAFFIC	3	3	17	0	0.8	2.5	9.5	4.5	0	0
TOTAL	561	612	1014	16	96	149	342.8	383	0.8	26.5

EXHIBIT VII: FY1979 CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED:			# OF COUNTS DISPOSED BY:						
	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS- MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY
<b>CONASAUGA</b>										
FELONY	191	227	349	0	4.5	56	11.5	246.5	0.5	29.5
MISDEMEANOR	202	221	396	0	1.5	63.5	10	313	0.5	5
TRAFFIC	76	93	136	19.5	0	7.5	6	98	0	4.5
TOTAL	468	541	880	19.5	6	129	27.5	657.5	1	39
<b>CORDELE</b>										
FELONY	208	262	309	0	26	12	0	244	0	27
MISDEMEANOR	806	828	841	6	133	44	3	645	2	8
TRAFFIC	43	43	46	1	0	5	0	37	2	1
TOTAL	1057	1133	1196	7	159	61	3	926	4	36
<b>COWETA</b>										
FELONY	321	376	487	0	0	48.5	3.5	384	3	48
MISDEMEANOR	79	86	93	10.5	0	11.5	1.5	65.5	0	4
TRAFFIC	101	103	111	85	0	6	0	17	0.5	2
TOTAL	501	564	691	95.5	0	66	5	466.5	3.5	54
<b>DOUGHERTY</b>										
FELONY	299	348	547	0	14.5	61.5	0.5	423	0	47.5
MISDEMEANOR	6	12	18	0	0	0.5	0	12	0	5.5
TRAFFIC	0	6	8	0	0	0	0	7.5	0	0
TOTAL	304	366	573	0	14.5	62	0.5	442.5	0	53
<b>DUBLIN</b>										
FELONY	350	466	574	0	94	218	11	203	23	25
MISDEMEANOR	47	56	73	0	8	15	6	37	5	2
TRAFFIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	397	522	647	0	102	233	17	240	28	27
<b>EASTERN</b>										
FELONY	396	424	447	0	102.8	10	0.3	307.5	1	25.5
MISDEMEANOR	0	1	1	0	0.8	0	0	0	0	0
TRAFFIC	8	25	26	0	1.5	0	0	24	0	0
TOTAL	404	450	473	0	105	10	0.3	331.5	1	25.5
<b>FLINT</b>										
FELONY	133	171	206	0	69.5	30	0	76.5	5	25
MISDEMEANOR	139	149	173	1.5	26	31.5	0	97	9	3
TRAFFIC	27	28	36	5.5	6	6.5	0	16	1	1
TOTAL	298	348	415	7	101.5	68	0	189.5	15	34
<b>GRIFFIN</b>										
FELONY	219	233	333	0	0	130.5	5.5	185	1.5	10.5
MISDEMEANOR	171	176	215	37	4.5	34.5	31.5	105.5	0	1.5
TRAFFIC	145	147	237	111.5	0	10	36	75	1	3
TOTAL	534	556	784	148.5	4.5	175	73	365.5	2.5	15
<b>GWINNETT</b>										
FELONY	125	142	239	0	0	22.3	1.7	186.7	0	28.3
MISDEMEANOR	2	2	5	0	0	0.7	0	4	0	0
TRAFFIC	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	127	144	245	0	0	23	1.7	191.7	0	28.3
<b>HOUSTON</b>										
FELONY	274	306	425	0	0	70	3	277	23	52
MISDEMEANOR	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
TRAFFIC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	276	308	427	0	0	70	3	279	23	52
<b>LOOK OUT MOUNTAIN</b>										
FELONY	199	207	223	0	5.7	74.7	28.3	96.7	1.7	16.3
MISDEMEANOR	327	327	360	101.7	0	91.7	54.7	108.3	0.3	3
TRAFFIC	61	61	62	12.3	0	18.3	7.3	23.3	0.3	0.7
TOTAL	587	596	645	114	5.7	184.7	90.3	228.3	2.3	20

EXHIBIT VII: FY1979 CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED:			# OF COUNTS DISPOSED BY:						
	DOCKETS	DEFENDANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS-MISSED	NON-TRIAL	NON-JURY	JURY
<b>MACON</b>										
FELONY	352	414	561	0	45.3	178.7	0	306.3	1	30
MISDEMEANOR	56	58	64	0	6.3	18	0	37.7	0	2
TRAFFIC	17	17	18	0	5.3	7.7	0.3	4.7	0.3	0
TOTAL	425	489	644	0	57	204.3	0.3	348.7	1.3	32
<b>MIDDLE</b>										
FELONY	186	240	296	0	0	48	12.5	217.5	3	14.5
MISDEMEANOR	1	2	4	0	0	0.5	0	3.5	0	0
TRAFFIC	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	2.5	0.5	0
TOTAL	187	242	303	0	0	48.5	12.5	223.5	3.5	14.5
<b>MOUNTAIN</b>										
FELONY	152	193	291	0	0	68	37	162	0	24
MISDEMEANOR	185	199	296	47	0	50	7	191	0	1
TRAFFIC	85	85	138	12	0	18	0	107	0	1
TOTAL	422	477	725	59	0	136	44	460	0	26
<b>NORTHEASTERN</b>										
FELONY	217	253	326	0	14.5	35	25.5	210	0	41
MISDEMEANOR	185	188	193	44	19	20	8.5	94.5	0	6.5
TRAFFIC	269	269	276	15.5	5	21	2	228	0.5	3.5
TOTAL	670	710	794	59.5	38.5	76	36	532.5	0.5	51
<b>NORTHERN</b>										
FELONY	123	148	194	0	5	23	5	152.5	0.5	8
MISDEMEANOR	305	338	399	0	10	146.5	19.5	213.5	6.5	2.5
TRAFFIC	74	76	114	0	10.5	14	1	88	0	0
TOTAL	501	561	706	0	25.5	183.5	25.5	454	7	10.5
<b>OCMULGEE</b>										
FELONY	229	267	325	0	3.7	51	10.7	235.3	3	21.7
MISDEMEANOR	316	331	358	65.3	3	64	8.3	211	0	6.7
TRAFFIC	73	73	91	53.3	0	8.7	3.3	23.3	0	2.3
TOTAL	618	671	775	118.7	6.7	123.7	22.3	469.7	3	30.7
<b>OCONEE</b>										
FELONY	178	198	238	0	13.5	26.5	2	179.5	8.5	8
MISDEMEANOR	310	319	385	78	21.5	48	3	206.5	23.5	4
TRAFFIC	178	178	245	123	6.5	10.5	0	97.5	7.5	0
TOTAL	665	695	868	201	41.5	85	5	483.5	39.5	12
<b>OGEECHEE</b>										
FELONY	164	179	202	0	0	30.5	3	120	36.5	11.5
MISDEMEANOR	17	21	23	0	0	2.5	0	12.5	5.5	2
TRAFFIC	14	21	28	0	0	0.5	0	21	6	0.5
TOTAL	194	221	252	0	0	33.5	3	153.5	48	14
<b>PATAULA</b>										
FELONY	312	314	316	0	0	48	1	219	2	46
MISDEMEANOR	365	365	368	9	0	67	1	274	1	16
TRAFFIC	29	29	29	0	0	6	0	23	0	0
TOTAL	706	708	713	9	0	121	2	516	3	62
<b>PIEDMONT</b>										
FELONY	156	194	240	0	9	63	0	135	0	33
MISDEMEANOR	260	263	289	93	3	45	0	148	0	0
TRAFFIC	368	368	383	132	3	20	1	227	0	0
TOTAL	784	825	912	225	15	128	1	510	0	33
<b>ROME</b>										
FELONY	171	178	295	0	15.5	35	0.5	131.5	61	51.5
MISDEMEANOR	907	908	1079	296	102	253	0.5	326.5	67	34.5
TRAFFIC	58	58	92	0.5	13.5	9.5	1.5	50	8.5	8
TOTAL	1136	1144	1466	296	131	297.5	2.5	508	136.5	94

EXHIBIT VII: FY1979 CRIMINAL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND PERCENT DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED:			# OF COUNTS DISPOSED BY:						
	DOCKETS	DEFEN- DANTS	COUNTS	CASH BOND	DEAD DOCKET	NOL PROS	DIS- MISSED	NON- TRIAL	NON- JURY	JURY
<b>SOUTH GEORGIA</b>										
FELONY	290	290	290	0	0	19.5	25.5	233	0	13
MISDEMEANOR	80	80	80	0	0	10	11.5	57.5	0	1
TRAFFIC	12	12	12	0	0	0	0.5	11.5	0	0
TOTAL	381	381	382	0	0	28.5	37.5	302	0	14
<b>SOUTHERN</b>										
FELONY	194	204	291	0	0	62.3	16.7	176	1.3	34.3
MISDEMEANOR	105	117	141	0.3	0	48	35	55	1.3	1.7
TRAFFIC	2	3	3	0	0	1	0.7	1.7	0	0
TOTAL	301	324	435	0.3	0	111.3	52.3	232.7	2.7	36
<b>SOUTHWESTERN</b>										
FELONY	209	247	293	0	0	4	1	254	22	12
MISDEMEANOR	56	59	69	1	0	2	0	50	11	5
TRAFFIC	2	2	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	267	308	366	1	0	9	1	304	33	18
<b>STONE MOUNTAIN</b>										
FELONY	243	262	343	0	19.4	61.3	1.4	255.6	1.3	4.4
MISDEMEANOR	7	23	29	0	1.4	0.7	0.7	25.6	0.1	0.7
TRAFFIC	3	3	5	0	0	1.9	0.3	2.6	0.1	0.1
TOTAL	253	287	378	0	20.9	63.9	2.4	283.7	1.6	5.3
<b>TALLAPOOSA</b>										
FELONY	185	245	343	0	0.3	188	0.3	65.3	73	16.3
MISDEMEANOR	295	316	383	93	0	164.7	0.3	66	56	2.7
TRAFFIC	153	154	257	85.7	0	79.7	1.3	59.3	30.7	0
TOTAL	632	715	983	178.7	0.3	432.3	2	190.7	159.7	19
<b>TIFTON</b>										
FELONY	168	208	250	0	0	45	3	176	0	26
MISDEMEANOR	170	177	179	0	0	90	28	60	0	1
TRAFFIC	17	17	17	2	0	10	0	5	0	0
TOTAL	355	402	446	2	0	145	31	241	0	27
<b>TOOMBS</b>										
FELONY	252	278	375	0	0	133	0	202	15	25
MISDEMEANOR	638	652	684	85	1	326	0	234	27	11
TRAFFIC	805	806	925	728	0	83	0	109	4	1
TOTAL	1695	1736	1984	813	1	542	0	545	46	37
<b>WAYCROSS</b>										
FELONY	177	200	321	0	1	25	1.5	264.5	7.5	21
MISDEMEANOR	170	172	213	103.5	1	35	2	69	0.5	1.5
TRAFFIC	143	143	144	141.5	0	0	0	2	0.5	0
TOTAL	490	515	677	245	2	60	3.5	335.5	8.5	22.5
<b>WESTERN</b>										
FELONY	284	291	345	0	0	60	56	189.5	1	38
MISDEMEANOR	84	85	96	0	0	10	9.5	58.5	3	14.5
TRAFFIC	21	21	36	0	0	3	5	23	0	5
TOTAL	389	397	476	0	0	73	70.5	271	4	57.5

## EXHIBIT VII ANALYSIS

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

The felony case type disposition data is most important since felonies, in general, comprise the most time-consuming criminal case category. The circuits for which the number of felony counts disposed exceeds the mean by more than one standard deviation are:

COBB*	897
DUBLIN	574
MACON	561
DOUGHERTY*	547
CLAYTON*	536
BLUE RIDGE	512
ATLANTA*	495
CHATTAHOOCHEE	494

\*One county circuits

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

CLAYTON	137
HOUSTON	52
ROME	51.5

The only circuit which ranks above the mean in both the number of felony counts disposed and the number of felony counts disposed by jury trial is Clayton Judicial Circuit.

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

CHEROKEE  
CORDELE  
ROME

The only circuit for which traffic counts disposed are greater than two standard deviations above the mean is Cherokee Judicial Circuit.

## EXHIBIT VIII

### FY1979 Civil Dispositions per Judge by Case Type and Number 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, before trial judgment, non-jury trial and jury trial. The total numbers of disposed cases are listed in the second column. Under each circuit are listed the case types - domestic relations, general civil and 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 1979 fiscal year. As previous disposition exhibits explained, the cases disposed during the fiscal year could have been filed any time between July 1, 1978 and June 30, 1979. Therefore, these figures should not be interpreted as the dispositions for the cases filed only during fiscal year 1979.

The major qualification of the data in this exhibit concerns the categories "five year administrative termination" and "before-trial judgments" and "non-jury trials". 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 clerk does not. It cannot 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, are not always clearly separated on court records. Therefore, inferences concerning these methods of disposition should be studied carefully.

The number of jury trials per judge is most significant because it is the most time-consuming method of disposition. Settlements, dismissals and administrative terminations are considered the least time-consuming methods. Before trial judgments 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.

EXHIBIT VIII: FY1979 CIVIL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND NUMBER DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED CASES	# OF CASES DISPOSED BY:					
		SETTLEMENT	DISHMISAL	ADMIN. TERMINATION	BEFORE TRIAL	NON-JURY TRIAL	JURY
<b>ALAPAHA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	172	1.0	31.0	0	136.0	1.0	2.5
GENERAL CIVIL	170	9.5	41.5	0	104.0	4.0	11.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	39	0	13.5	0	25.5	0	0
TOTAL	381	10.5	86.5	0	265.5	5.0	13.5
<b>ALCOVY</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	274	44.5	3.0	0	123.5	100.0	3.0
GENERAL CIVIL	221	78.0	5.0	0	116.0	14.5	7.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	160	23.5	3.0	0	68.5	64.0	0.5
TOTAL	655	146.0	11.0	0	308.0	178.5	11.0
<b>ATLANTA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	582	1.5	87.7	0	453.4	38.1	0.9
GENERAL CIVIL	332	14.1	208.3	0	28.2	64.1	17.1
INDEP. MOTIONS	85	2.6	4.7	0	60.8	17.0	0.2
TOTAL	999	18.2	300.7	0	542.4	119.2	18.2
<b>ATLANTIC</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	537	40.0	60.5	0	34.5	397.5	4.0
GENERAL CIVIL	366	30.0	101.0	0	94.5	127.0	13.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	177	13.0	22.0	0	51.5	90.5	0
TOTAL	1080	83.0	183.5	0	180.5	615.0	17.5
<b>AUGUSTA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	643	41.3	10.3	0	465.5	122.3	3.8
GENERAL CIVIL	193	89.8	0.8	0.3	63.8	16.0	22.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	147	9.0	0.3	0	41.0	96.0	0.3
TOTAL	983	140.1	11.4	0.3	570.3	234.3	26.6
<b>BLUE RIDGE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	570	10.5	178.0	0	84.5	292.5	4.5
GENERAL CIVIL	213	13.5	90.0	0	74.5	19.0	15.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	118	2.0	36.0	0	60.5	18.0	1.0
TOTAL	901	26.0	304.0	0	219.5	329.5	21.0
<b>BRUNSWICK</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	715	31.5	118.0	0	46.0	517.5	2.0
GENERAL CIVIL	275	29.5	99.5	0	76.5	49.5	19.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	225	26.0	40.0	0	99.0	59.5	0.5
TOTAL	1215	87.0	257.5	0	221.5	626.5	22.0
<b>CHATTAHOOCHEE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	468	7.3	39.5	0	12.0	407.5	1.5
GENERAL CIVIL	142	3.0	41.8	2.5	9.8	80.5	4.3
INDEP. MOTIONS	80	3.3	12.3	0	42.0	22.3	0.5
TOTAL	690	13.6	93.6	2.5	63.8	510.3	6.8
<b>CHEROKEE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	488	21.5	57.0	47.0	65.5	295.5	1.5
GENERAL CIVIL	405	65.5	58.0	40.0	204.0	16.5	21.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	244	24.5	60.5	13.0	133.0	13.0	0
TOTAL	1137	111.5	175.5	100.0	402.5	325.0	22.5
<b>CLAYTON</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	810	34.7	152.0	0	72.3	539.3	11.3
GENERAL CIVIL	227	114.3	31.7	0	49.0	24.0	7.7
INDEP. MOTIONS	298	6.0	6.0	0	280.0	5.0	1.0
TOTAL	1335	155.0	189.7	0	401.3	568.3	20.0
<b>COBB</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	924	137.0	20.0	0	51.0	713.0	2.5
GENERAL CIVIL	197	114.0	6.3	0	36.8	31.5	7.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	134	10.8	5.5	0	97.3	20.8	0
TOTAL	1255	261.8	32.3	0	185.1	765.3	10.0

EXHIBIT VIII: FY1979 CIVIL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND NUMBER DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED CASES	# OF CASES DISPOSED BY:					
		SETTLEMENT	DISMISSAL	ADMIN. TERMINATION	BEFORE TRIAL	NON-JURY TRIAL	JURY
<b>CONASAUGA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	716	15.5	197.0	0	80.0	422.0	1.5
GENERAL CIVIL	456	20.5	150.0	2.0	215.5	46.5	21.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	299	11.5	97.0	1.0	157.0	31.0	1.0
TOTAL	1471	48.0	444.0	3.0	453.0	500.0	24.0
<b>CORDELE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	460	14.0	96.0	0	11.0	339.0	0
GENERAL CIVIL	422	12.0	133.0	4.0	115.0	143.0	15.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	155	11.0	87.0	0	7.0	50.0	0
TOTAL	1037	37.0	316.0	4.0	133.0	532.0	15.0
<b>COWETA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	711	50.0	33.5	38.5	235.0	353.0	0.5
GENERAL CIVIL	427	52.0	49.5	35.5	170.0	105.5	14.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	204	24.5	18.5	6.5	139.5	13.5	1.5
TOTAL	1342	126.5	101.5	80.5	544.5	472.0	16.0
<b>DOUGHERTY</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	633	0.5	145.5	0	481.5	0	5.5
GENERAL CIVIL	233	3.5	140.0	0	79.0	0	10.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	105	0	34.0	0	69.5	0	1.5
TOTAL	971	4.0	319.5	0	630.0	0	17.5
<b>DUBLIN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	385	11.0	60.0	33.0	15.0	261.0	5.0
GENERAL CIVIL	371	26.0	81.0	48.0	129.0	82.0	5.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	115	27.0	34.0	11.0	16.0	26.0	1.0
TOTAL	871	64.0	175.0	92.0	160.0	369.0	11.0
<b>EASTERN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	484	55.8	8.8	0	24.5	393.3	1.5
GENERAL CIVIL	107	21.5	37.8	0	9.3	26.0	12.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	164	0	56.0	0	16.8	90.0	1.5
TOTAL	755	77.3	102.6	0	50.6	509.3	15.5
<b>FLINT</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	282	41.5	20.0	0	194.5	22.5	3.0
GENERAL CIVIL	375	55.5	67.0	0	226.5	9.5	16.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	143	30.5	8.5	0	96.5	6.0	1.5
TOTAL	800	127.5	95.5	0	517.5	38.0	20.5
<b>GRIFFIN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	575	47.5	52.0	47.5	302.0	123.0	3.0
GENERAL CIVIL	297	54.5	31.0	33.5	127.5	38.5	12.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	155	18.5	11.5	35.0	79.5	10.0	0
TOTAL	1027	120.5	94.5	116.0	509.0	171.5	15.0
<b>GWINNETT</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	557	68.7	51.0	0.3	63.0	363.0	11.3
GENERAL CIVIL	160	48.7	43.0	0	42.7	11.3	14.7
INDEP. MOTIONS	174	11.3	20.3	0	108.3	34.0	0.3
TOTAL	891	128.7	114.3	0.3	214.0	408.3	26.3
<b>HOUSTON</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	827	483.0	201.0	0	0	127.0	16.0
GENERAL CIVIL	299	1.0	145.0	0	0	142.0	11.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	137	1.0	74.0	0	0	42.0	20.0
TOTAL	1263	485.0	420.0	0	0	311.0	47.0
<b>LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	527	11.3	129.3	15.7	25.7	345.3	0
GENERAL CIVIL	293	13.0	106.7	10.3	45.3	107.0	10.7
INDEP. MOTIONS	28	0.7	10.3	0.3	14.0	2.7	0
TOTAL	848	25.0	246.3	26.3	85.0	455.0	10.7

EXHIBIT VIII: FY1979 CIVIL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND NUMBER DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED CASES	# OF CASES DISPOSED BY:					
		SETTLEMENT	DISMISSAL	ADMIN. TERMINATION	BEFORE TRIAL	NON-JURY TRIAL	JURY
<b>MACON</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	614	0.7	144.7	8.7	3.0	446.7	10.0
GENERAL CIVIL	250	1.0	91.7	10.0	69.3	68.3	10.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	123	1.7	30.3	1.0	49.3	40.0	0.7
TOTAL	987	3.4	266.7	19.7	121.6	555.0	20.7
<b>MIDDLE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	400	17.0	69.5	0	2.0	310.5	1.0
GENERAL CIVIL	239	23.0	61.5	0	36.5	108.5	9.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	77	11.0	29.5	0	6.0	28.5	2.0
TOTAL	716	51.0	160.5	0	44.5	447.5	12.0
<b>MOUNTAIN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	763	37.0	157.0	0	70.0	497.0	2.0
GENERAL CIVIL	539	75.0	192.0	0	215.0	28.0	29.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	331	47.0	114.0	0	143.0	27.0	0
TOTAL	1633	159.0	463.0	0	428.0	552.0	31.0
<b>NORTHEASTERN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	529	2.5	130.0	0	27.5	366.0	3.0
GENERAL CIVIL	410	15.0	188.5	0	147.5	23.0	35.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	265	2.5	121.5	0	97.5	41.0	2.0
TOTAL	1204	20.0	440.0	0	272.5	430.0	40.5
<b>NORTHERN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	268	45.5	3.5	0	159.5	59.0	0.5
GENERAL CIVIL	253	81.5	2.5	0	141.5	11.0	16.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	149	38.5	0.5	0.5	45.5	61.5	2.0
TOTAL	670	165.5	6.5	0.5	346.5	131.5	19.0
<b>OCMULGEE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	229	9.7	16.7	0	0.3	202.3	0
GENERAL CIVIL	230	18.3	54.7	0	88.7	63.7	4.7
INDEP. MOTIONS	107	23.3	26.3	0	24.3	33.0	0.3
TOTAL	566	51.3	97.7	0	113.3	299.0	5.0
<b>OCONEE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	278	21.5	45.0	0	13.5	194.0	4.0
GENERAL CIVIL	312	61.0	62.0	0	90.0	92.0	6.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	67	9.5	32.5	0	8.5	15.5	0.5
TOTAL	657	92.0	139.5	0	112.0	301.5	11.0
<b>OGEECHEE</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	307	22.5	28.0	5.5	27.0	220.0	4.0
GENERAL CIVIL	338	25.0	72.5	41.0	156.5	33.5	9.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	69	2.5	12.5	5.5	30.5	18.0	0
TOTAL	714	50.0	113.0	52.0	214.0	271.5	13.5
<b>PATAULA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	404	0	149.0	0	254.0	0	1.0
GENERAL CIVIL	483	12.0	174.0	0	290.0	0	7.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	93	1.0	51.0	0	41.0	0	0
TOTAL	980	13.0	374.0	0	585.0	0	8.0
<b>PIEDMONT</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	581	142.0	93.0	0	261.0	82.0	3.0
GENERAL CIVIL	551	211.0	89.0	0	216.0	18.0	17.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	186	41.0	5.0	0	76.0	64.0	0
TOTAL	1318	394.0	187.0	0	553.0	164.0	20.0
<b>ROME</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	440	49.0	71.0	18.0	4.0	295.0	3.0
GENERAL CIVIL	526	130.0	99.0	18.5	173.5	84.5	20.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	239	23.5	29.0	1.0	55.5	129.0	0.5
TOTAL	1205	202.5	199.0	37.5	233.0	508.5	24.0

EXHIBIT VIII: FY1979 CIVIL DISPOSITIONS PER JUDGE BY CASE TYPE  
AND NUMBER DISPOSED BY EACH METHOD

CIRCUIT	# OF DISPOSED CASES	# OF CASES DISPOSED BY:					
		SETTLEMENT	DISMISSAL	ADMIN. TERMINATION	BEFORE TRIAL	NON-JURY TRIAL	JURY
<b>SOUTH GEORGIA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	339	0.5	92.0	0	243.0	0	3.5
GENERAL CIVIL	297	2.5	123.5	0	158.0	0.5	12.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	83	0	40.0	0	43.0	0	0
TOTAL	719	3.0	255.5	0	444.0	0.5	15.5
<b>SOUTHERN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	564	0.3	67.7	0	493.7	1.3	1.3
GENERAL CIVIL	218	2.3	74.7	0	134.0	1.7	5.7
INDEP. MOTIONS	115	0.7	38.7	0	75.7	0.3	0
TOTAL	897	3.3	181.1	0	703.4	3.3	7.0
<b>SOUTHWESTERN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	492	3.0	121.0	0	2.0	363.0	3.0
GENERAL CIVIL	533	19.0	179.0	0	142.0	167.0	26.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	143	6.0	76.0	0	7.0	54.0	0
TOTAL	1168	28.0	376.0	0	151.0	584.0	29.0
<b>STONE MOUNTAIN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	860	14.1	265.3	0.1	516.0	60.0	4.0
GENERAL CIVIL	325	54.7	138.3	0.1	83.7	26.1	22.1
INDEP. MOTIONS	175	10.1	11.1	0	146.3	6.4	1.3
TOTAL	1360	78.9	414.7	0.2	746.0	92.5	27.4
<b>TALLAPOOSA</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	323	13.3	44.3	0	20.3	245.0	0.3
GENERAL CIVIL	436	25.0	129.3	0	231.7	32.7	17.3
INDEP. MOTIONS	84	3.7	15.7	0	44.0	20.3	0
TOTAL	843	42.0	189.3	0	296.0	298.0	17.6
<b>TIFTON</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	725	2.0	187.0	0	518.0	17.0	1.0
GENERAL CIVIL	459	2.0	173.0	0	271.0	0	13.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	203	0	82.0	0	120.0	0	1.0
TOTAL	1387	4.0	442.0	0	909.0	17.0	15.0
<b>TOOMBS</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	325	64.0	1.0	0	199.0	59.0	2.0
GENERAL CIVIL	229	87.0	2.0	0	107.0	12.0	21.0
INDEP. MOTIONS	161	44.0	0	0	67.0	50.0	0
TOTAL	715	195.0	3.0	0	373.0	121.0	23.0
<b>WAYCROSS</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	460	30.0	78.0	0	50.0	298.5	3.5
GENERAL CIVIL	194	10.5	70.0	0	81.0	17.5	14.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	109	5.5	49.0	0	46.5	7.5	0
TOTAL	763	46.0	197.0	0	177.5	323.5	18.0
<b>WESTERN</b>							
DOMESTIC REL.	390	64.5	6.0	0	174.5	136.5	8.5
GENERAL CIVIL	277	126.0	13.5	0	67.0	44.5	25.5
INDEP. MOTIONS	158	37.0	13.5	0	42.5	63.0	2.0
TOTAL	825	227.5	33.0	0	284.0	244.0	36.0

## EXHIBIT VIII ANALYSIS

In Exhibit VIII the entries in the disposition categories are the 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:

MOUNTAIN	1633
CONASAUGA	1471
TIFTON	1387
STONE MOUNTAIN	1360
COWETA	1342
CLAYTON	1335
PIEDMONT	1318
HOUSTON	1263
COBB	1255

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:

HOUSTON	47.0
NORTHEASTERN	40.5
WESTERN	36.0
MOUNTAIN	31.0
SOUTHWESTERN	29.0

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 localities 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:

AUGUSTA	MOUNTAIN
BRUNSWICK	NORTHEASTERN
CHEROKEE	PIEDMONT
CLAYTON	ROME
CONASAUGA	SOUTHWESTERN
HOUSTON	STONE MOUNTAIN

## CHAPTER III SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Chapter III has attempted to put into 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 used in identifying circuits with excessive 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;
4. 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.

The following circuits exhibit at least four of the above six caseload disposition characteristics listed above:<sup>y</sup>

AUGUSTA  
CLAYTON  
CONASAUGA  
HOUSTON  
MACON  
NORTHEASTERN  
PIEDMONT  
ROME  
TOOMBS

---

<sup>y</sup> Tifton Judicial Circuit displays three of these six caseload disposition characteristics and is very close to the mean of felony counts disposed by jury (26 counts as compared 27.6 counts the circuit mean.)

In no circuit should the judicial workload be evaluated in terms of disposition data alone. Filings, more than any other single caseload characteristic, is indicative of demand on judicial resources. Disposition data provides useful estimates of present performance and perhaps even current capacity, but it 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: 1978**

EXHIBIT IX

CIRCUIT POPULATION, RATE OF CHANGE AND  
POPULATION PER JUDGE

## EXHIBIT IX

### 1970 and 1978 Circuit Population, Rate of Change and 1978 Population Per Judge

In Exhibit IX the 1970 and 1978 circuit population are presented with the percent increase or decrease in circuit populations between 1970 and 1978. The 1978 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 the 1978 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 1978 population per judge with an additional judge and the circuit ranking on this variable. The purpose of this data element is to illustrate the impact on the population per judge figure 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 figures 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. Now, however, caseload data analysis is the focal point in determining the need for additional judgeships. Although population per judge is not necessarily correlated with workload, the probability of increases in caseload accompanying increases in population is recognized. The average statewide increase in population should be viewed in conjunction with caseload increases for an overall view of Georgia's potential case workload as well as individual circuit population increases and caseload increases. The 1970 population per judge should also be compared to the current ranking and 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 when the statewide circuit mean was 45,000. The effect of creating a third judgeship would reduce the population per superior court judge to 40,000 -- a figure closer to the mean.

The major qualification of the exhibit is that the population per judge figure 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 data would support the recommendation of an additional judgeship in circuits where it was determined that current caseload was high and increasing while the population per judge was increasing.

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

CIRCUIT	# OF JUDGES 70-79	1970 POPULATION	1978 POPULATION	% CHANGE 70-78	1978 POPULATION PER JUDGE*	RANK	1978 POP. PER JUDGE WITH ADD. JUDGE	RANK
ALAPAHA	1 2	41,018	42,000	2.39	21,000	42	14,000	42
ALCDVY	0 2	49,686	60,300	21.36	30,150	40	20,100	40
ATLANTA	9 11	605,210	581,000	-4.00	52,818	14	48,417	4
ATLANTIC	1 2	59,072	79,500	34.58	39,750	31	26,500	30
AUGUSTA	3 4	203,019	217,600	7.18	54,400	11	43,250	6
BLUE RIDGE	2 2	79,920	103,400	29.38	51,700	17	34,467	13
BRUNSWICK	2 2	101,871	107,900	5.92	53,950	12	35,967	12
CHATTAHOOCHEE	3 4	224,299	221,700	-1.16	55,425	10	44,340	5
CHEROKEE	1 2	56,481	65,300	15.61	32,650	39	21,767	39
CLAYTON	2 3	98,126	132,100	34.62	44,033	26	33,025	16
COBB	2 4	196,793	271,400	37.91	67,850	5	54,280	3
CONASAUGA	1 2	68,094	83,600	22.77	41,800	28	27,867	26
CORDELE	1 1	48,660	53,200	9.33	53,200	13	26,600	29
COWETA	1 2	146,995	166,800	13.47	83,400	1	55,600	2
DOUGHERTY	1 2	89,639	100,100	11.67	50,050	19	33,367	15
DUBLIN	1 1	54,334	56,300	3.62	56,300	9	28,150	25
EASTERN	3 4	187,816	192,100	2.28	48,025	22	38,420	10
FLINT	1 2	55,963	65,400	16.86	32,700	38	21,800	38
GRIFFIN	1 2	81,699	96,700	18.36	48,350	21	32,233	18
GWINNETT	1 3	72,349	145,500	101.11	48,500	20	36,375	11
HOUSTON	0 1	62,924	81,800	30.00	81,800	2	40,900	8

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

CIRCUIT	# OF JUDGES 70-79	1970 POPULATION	1978 POPULATION	% CHANGE 70-78	POPULATION PER JUDGE*	RANK	1978 POP. PER JUDGE WITH ADD. JUDGE	RANK
LOOKOUT MTN.	2 3	109,413	119,500	9.22	39,833	30	29,875	21
MACON	3 3	165,104	170,700	3.39	56,900	8	42,675	7
MIDDLE	1 2	78,574	80,500	2.45	40,250	29	26,833	28
MOUNTAIN	1 1	60,725	67,900	11.82	67,900	4	33,950	14
NORTHEASTERN	2 2	79,514	93,000	16.96	46,500	24	31,000	20
NORTHERN	1 2	66,975	71,400	6.61	35,700	37	23,800	36
OCMULGEE	2 3	99,192	109,600	10.49	36,533	35	27,400	27
OCONEE	1 2	56,104	57,900	3.20	28,950	41	19,300	41
OGEECHEE	1 2	66,140	73,500	11.13	36,750	34	24,500	34
PATAULA	1 1	52,131	52,400	0.52	52,400	15	26,200	32
PIEDMONT	1 1	44,785	50,100	11.87	50,100	18	25,050	33
ROME	1 2	73,742	79,100	7.27	39,550	32	26,367	31
SOUTH GEORGIA	1 2	69,573	71,700	3.06	35,850	36	23,900	35
SOUTHERN	2 3	137,639	156,500	13.70	52,167	16	39,125	9
SOUTHWESTERN	1 1	58,878	59,500	1.06	59,500	7	29,750	22
STONE MTN.	5 7	433,539	507,900	17.15	72,557	3	63,488	1
TALLAPOOSA	1 3	91,762	117,200	27.72	39,067	33	29,300	23
TIFTON	1 1	58,884	64,800	10.05	64,800	6	32,400	17
TOOMBS	1 1	42,727	45,600	6.72	45,600	25	22,800	37
WAYCROSS	1 2	85,487	94,000	9.96	47,000	23	31,333	19
WESTERN	1 2	73,092	86,500	18.34	43,250	27	28,833	24

\* 1978 CIRCUIT POPULATION DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES IN 1979.

SOURCE: ANNUAL ESTIMATE OF POPULATION FOR THE STATE OF GA. (OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET, SEPT. 1979).

## EXHIBIT IX ANALYSIS

The 1978 population per judge ranges from 21,000 (Alpaha Circuit) to 83,400 (Coweta Circuit). The difference between the two ratios (the range) is 62,400. This difference is higher than that observed in 1977 (60,400) and 1974 (56,850) but lower than all other per judge population ranges since 1970. The statewide circuit mean is 48,548<sup>z</sup> people per superior court judge -- a figure which shows an increase over the 1977 mean of 48,524.

The statewide average of 49,549<sup>aa</sup> people per superior court judge, when compared to the 1970, 1975, 1976, and 1977 average (67,470; 56,408; 52,201; and 49,653, respectively) shows that the trend of a declining average population per judge continues. This decline in average population per superior court judge does not seem highly significant when it is contrasted with the statewide observed increase in population of 5.7 percent between FY1978 and FY1979. In large part, the decrease in average population per judge is due to the creation of new superior court judgeships between 1973 and 1978; those judgeships were created partially in response to the statewide population increase (1970-1977) of over 12 percent.

In order to extract the most useful information from this exhibit, those circuits with both a high population per judge and a rapidly increasing population should be isolated for study. These two variables are operationally defined as a population-per-judge ratio of greater than 48,548 and a percentage change in population of at least 12.32%, the statewide average population growth from 1970 to 1978.

<sup>z</sup> The circuit mean is calculated by dividing the sum of the populations per judge of each circuit by forty-two, the number of judicial circuits in Georgia.

<sup>aa</sup> The statewide average population per judge is computed by dividing the state population by 104, the total number of superior court judges in Georgia.

Six circuits display figures higher than the statewide averages on both variables. In descending order of 1978 population per judge, they are:

COWETA	83,400	13.47%
HOUSTON	81,800	30.00%
STONE MOUNTAIN	72,557	17.15%
COBB	67,850	37.91%
SOUTHERN	52,167	13.70%
BLUE RIDGE	51,700	29.38%

Coweta is the only recommended circuit which is above the statewide circuit mean population per judge and statewide average percentage population change. However, four out of the remaining six recommended circuits (Tifton, Dublin, Brunswick and Cordele) have population per judge figures which exceed the statewide circuit mean, the statewide average, and the 50,000 standard. Although these seven circuits do not have a population growth exceeding the statewide average population change from 1970 to 1978, they are experiencing positive population growth.

Exhibit IX should not be the sole basis from which decisions are made on additional superior court judgeship recommendations. The exhibit, however, is of value when viewed in conjunction with caseload statistics for anticipating the future caseload of a circuit.

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

- EXHIBIT X            ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTING COURTS: STATE,  
                              PROBATE, AND JUVENILE: FY1979
- EXHIBIT XI           SUPERIOR COURT FY1979 CASELOAD BY ADMINI-  
                              STRATIVE DISTRICT

## CHAPTER V - INTRODUCTION

In chapter V, two exhibits are presented which aid analysis of circuit caseload data by suggesting two alternatives to creating additional superior court judgeships: (1) expanded use of supporting courts and (2) temporary assistance from judges in districts where the caseload is not unduly burdensome.

Exhibit X, "Analysis of Supporting Courts: State, Probate and Juvenile: FY1979," shows the number of supporting courts exercising concurrent jurisdiction with the superior court in each circuit and the extent of current assistance made available from these courts.<sup>bb</sup> This exhibit is used to assess the feasibility of increased reliance on the supporting courts as an alternative to the addition of new superior court judgeships. Each group of these courts, state courts, probate courts and juvenile courts, alleviates some of the caseload demands on the superior courts. But it is difficult to determine if expanded use of supporting courts would be effective unless one first investigates the number of courts in each circuit, the status of the judges (i.e., full-time or part-time) and the jurisdictional limits of these courts.

Exhibit XI, "Superior Court FY1979 Caseload by Administrative Districts," displays the present filing and case type data for each of the ten judicial districts. The exhibit is helpful in determining whether the temporary reassignment of judges within a district would ease the burden of uneven caseload distribution. The temporary assignment of judges to other courts in the district may be used as an alternative to the creation of an additional judgeship in circuits experiencing temporary problems. On the other hand, permanent problems require permanent solutions such as the addition of another judgeship. To gain insight into the temporary or permanent nature of caseload pressures, this exhibit may be read in conjunction with Exhibit IV. Trends in caseload filings are an important factor in determining whether judicial assistance or a new judgeship is the answer to circuit caseload problems.

---

<sup>bb</sup> Data from DeKalb County State Court (Stone Mountain Circuit) was unavailable at the time of this study. Therefore, circuit means and percentages presented may be slightly smaller this year than in previous years.

## EXHIBIT X

### Analysis of Supporting Courts: State, Probate and Juvenile: FY1979

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 counties 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 where a state court judge hears juvenile cases.

The circuit caseload in the misdemeanor, traffic, general civil, independent motions, and juvenile case types is presented in Exhibit X. The total filing figures for each case type are the sums of the caseload figures from the superior, state, probate, and juvenile courts. The "Percentage Heard by Supporting Courts" is the number of cases disposed by the supporting courts divided by the total circuit filings. A high percentage (over 50%) indicates that the majority of cases in the circuit in the respective category is heard by a supporting court. Conversely, a low percentage indicates that the superior court receives relatively little assistance from supporting courts in the circuit.

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, magistrate's courts, mayor's courts or civil courts (to mention a few) that conceivably could 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-wide jurisdiction are included in Exhibit X. Although only three courts are included on the exhibit it should be noted 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 concurrent jurisdiction 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 still overburdened (particularly in its exclusive jurisdiction 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. One other factor influencing the availability of assistance is the full-time versus part-time status of the supporting court judges. Expanded use of the supporting courts may be limited by this employment status, and it is only through legislation that the part-time status may be changed.

EXHIBIT X: ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTING COURTS: STATE, PROBATE AND JUVENILE: FY1979

CIRCUIT	SUPPORTING COURTS			MISDEMEANOR		TRAFFIC		GENERAL CIVIL		INDEPENDENT MOTIONS		JUVENILE *	
	STATE	PROBATE	JUV.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.
ALAPAHA	1	3	0	1258	13.8	7093	71.5	448	0.7	199	0	245	0
ALCOVY	0	2	2	827	28.5	5784	98.2	572	0	411	0	922	100.0
ATLANTA	1	0	1	7867	99.9	16,704	100.0	47,671	91.1	37,030	96.8	5640	100.0
ATLANTIC	5	1	0	1514	91.5	24,132	93.3	648	0	274	0	203	0
AUGUSTA	2	1	0	7320	96.2	20,643	99.8	1,142	19.1	785	8.4	1401	0
BLUE RIDGE	1+	3	5	2977	72.9	8,811	94.2	1,312	60.9	409	40.1	865	100.0
BRUNSWICK	3	2	5	2835	92.3	15,519	99.9	2,124	61.1	1987	68.3	1212	100.0
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1	5	1	5200	89.0	12,510	98.1	1,751	41.2	638	5.3		
CHEROKEE	0	1	2	1508	2.5	11,222	49.0	852	0	560	0	899	100.0
CLAYTON	1	0	1	3175	99.9	11,395	99.9	4,897	83.4	1694	66.9	2188	100.0
COBB	1	0	1	6117	97.6	21,711	99.9	7,874	86.3	4058	86.8	2310	100.0
CONASAUGA	0	2	1	712	44.0	8,551	98.3	1,013	0	673	0	700	89.4
CORDELE	0	4	1	934	11.1	13,432	99.6	429	0	205	0	462	58.9
COWETA	3	2	4	3927	95.9	14,639	98.7	2,250	52.0	1099	34.9	863	99.0
DOUGHERTY	1	0	1	3893	99.9	4,844	100.0	1,797	76.5	2859	88.2	667	100.0
DUBLIN	3	1	1	577	95.1	11,083	100.0	841	32.8	335	28.7	308	71.1
EASTERN	1	0	1	2212	100.0	1,537	100.0	3,537	84.9	2475	58.3		100.0
FLINT	0	4	1	584	51.4	34,095	99.9	876	0	366	0	225	68.4
GRIFFIN	1	3	4	1346	72.5	9,563	96.6	796	8.2	385	3.1	474	100.0
GWINNETT	1	0	1	2571	99.8	726	99.9	3,078	83.0	1536	65.2	1285	100.0
HOUSTON	1	0	1	1876	99.9	7,043	100.0	1,074	73.5	515	57.3	167	100.0

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

\*\* NUMBER OF STATE COURTS INCLUDES COUNTY COURTS.

\*\*\* DATA FOR DEKALB COUNTY IS UNAVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF THIS STUDY.

+ ONE STATE COURT SERVES BOTH CHEROKEE AND FORSYTH COUNTIES.

EXHIBIT X: ANALYSIS OF SUPPORTING COURTS: STATE, PROBATE AND JUVENILE: FY1979

CIRCUIT	SUPPORTING COURTS			MISDEMEANOR		TRAFFIC		GENERAL CIVIL		INDEPENDENT MOTIONS		JUVENILE *	
	STATE	PROBATE	JUV.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.	TOTAL FILINGS	% HEARD SUPP. CT.
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	1	3	3	1653	43.1	11,529	98.2	914	4.0	511	6.1	447	85.7
MACON	1	2	1	3692	95.5	7,170	99.2	1471	37.5	605	17.7	1010	96.0
MIDDLE	5	0	0	2644	99.9	8,617	100.0	696	22.6	366	20.5	438	0
MOUNTAIN	2	3	0	1484	88.3	3,094	97.4	658	19.9	402	15.7	164	0
NORTHEASTERN	1	3	1	2958	88.4	8,218	92.4	1498	49.6	769	31.3	739	87.1
NORTHERN	1	4	0	1347	51.4	8,910	98.8	611	4.3	373	7.0	187	0
OCMULGEE **	2	6	0	3241	68.0	16,443	98.5	845	0.1	498	0	540	0
OCONEE	0	6	0	938	29.1	5,588	93.9	683	0	237	0	258	0
OGEECHEE	4	0	0	1278	97.8	8,117	99.8	1082	34.0	348	41.4	167	0
PATAULA	2	5	5	1083	57.6	5,812	99.4	449	6.5	151	8.6	132	62.1
PIEDMONT	1	2	3	626	59.3	5,962	93.9	645	20.6	310	21.0	197	100.0
ROME	0	1	1	1999	10.5	5,287	97.6	1106	0	728	0		100.0
SOUTH GEORGIA	3	2	0	1737	91.2	5,275	99.5	545	6.8	227	10.6	130	0
SOUTHERN **	4	1	3	3561	91.3	18,210	100.0	1096	21.1	535	9.9	498	98.2
SOUTHWESTERN	2	4	1	1241	95.4	4,586	100.0	717	24.1	394	49.2	369	69.6
STONE MOUNTAIN ***	1	1	2									4659	100.0
TALLAPOOSA	1	3	2	1205	22.0	9,836	95.9	2338	11.1	550	12.5	317	72.6
TIFTON	2	2	0	1806	90.5	15,032	99.7	714	21.7	366	4.9	203	0
TOOMBS	0	6	0	1149	31.6	8,720	89.5	304	0	222	0	673	0
WAYCROSS	3	3	1	2743	86.3	7,339	96.1	818	37.4	323	18.9	592	73.5
WESTERN	1	1	1	547	65.8	1,016	95.1	769	22.0	428	22.7	548	97.1

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

\*\* NUMBER OF STATE COURTS INCLUDES COUNTY COURTS.

\*\*\* DATA FOR DEKALB COUNTY IS UNAVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF THIS STUDY.

+ ONE STATE COURT SERVES BOTH CHEROKEE AND FORSYTH COUNTIES.

## 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, notice should be taken of the fact 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 disparate of 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 percentage of misdemeanor filings heard by supporting courts ranges from 2.5 to 100. In twenty-three of the circuits more than 75% of the total misdemeanors are filed in a supporting court; in fourteen of those circuits over 95% of the total misdemeanors are heard in supporting courts. Of these fourteen circuits, six are single-county circuits which have state courts. There are only five circuits with supporting courts which hear less than 25% of the total misdemeanors. They are in descending order: Tallapoosa (22.0%), Alapaha (13.8%), Cordele (11.1%), Rome (10.5%), and Cherokee (2.5%). Cordele and Rome Circuits, which have been recommended for additional judgeships, are among those circuits in which supporting courts hear less than 25% of mis-

demeanor filings. The circuit mean percentage of misdemeanor cases heard by supporting courts is 71.1%.

In viewing the high proportion of traffic cases heard by supporting courts, it is evident that there is a great amount of assistance in this criminal case type category. There are only three circuits in which supporting courts heard less than 90% of all traffic cases: Toombs (89.5%), Alapaha (71.5%) and Cherokee (49.0%). Toombs is among the circuits recommended for an additional judgeship. Twenty circuits have supporting courts which hear 99 to 100% of the entire traffic caseload. The circuit mean percentage of traffic cases heard by supporting courts is 96.1%.

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. State courts have concurrent jurisdiction in matters involving contracts and torts. This jurisdiction, however, may be limited - especially in personal injury and personal reputation cases - in two ways: either in legislation setting maximum dollar amounts on the cases which may be filed in state court or by excluding wholly jurisdiction in these areas.

In many counties there are only part-time state court judges and, therefore, there is less time available to process cases. Often, as a result, a higher percentage of general civil cases are filed in superior court even though the state court may have concurrent jurisdiction. Only ten circuits have 50% or more of total general civil cases filed in a state court. In descending order they are:

ATLANTA <sup>1</sup>	91.1%	HOUSTON <sup>1</sup>	73.5%
COBB <sup>1</sup>	86.3%	BRUNSWICK	61.1%
EASTERN <sup>1</sup>	84.9%	BLUE RIDGE	60.9%
CLAYTON <sup>1</sup>	83.4%	COWETA	52.0%
GWINNETT <sup>1</sup>	83.0%		
DOUGHERTY <sup>1</sup>	76.5%		

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

At the other extreme, there are eight circuits which have no state court and in which all general civil cases are filed in the superior court. Among those eight are Cordele, Rome and Toombs which have been recommended for additional judgeships. A total of twenty-five circuits have less than 25% of their total general civil caseload heard in a supporting court, with eleven of those having 0 to 1% heard in a supporting court. The circuit mean percentage of general civil cases heard by a supporting court (state court) is 29.2%.

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. Most independent motion cases are filed in the same court as the original case. For this reason, the percent of independent motions filed in state court is usually very close to the percentage of general civil cases filed in state court. Of the eight 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-seven circuits in which state courts hear less than 25% of total independent motions, and twenty-three 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 is 24.5%. The data in Exhibit X indicates that appointed juvenile court judges<sup>CC</sup> hear a high percentage of the state's juvenile caseload. Twenty-two circuits utilize them to assist the superior courts with at least 85% of the total juvenile cases filed. However, in twelve circuits the superior court judges handle all the juvenile cases and in fifteen circuits the juvenile judges handle 100% of the juvenile cases. The circuit mean percentage of the juvenile caseload heard by supporting courts is 64.1%.

---

<sup>CC</sup> The term "appointed judges" includes state court judges appointed to hear juvenile cases. There are six state court judges in five circuits serving in this capacity.

## EXHIBIT XI

### Superior Court FY1979 Caseload by Administrative District

The superior court caseload of the ten administrative districts is presented by circuit in Exhibit XI. The distribution of filings among the case types, as well as among the circuits in each district, can be observed.

The Exhibit includes the average caseload per judge for each district which 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 judges will be able to assist one another. Also, for circuits that may be experiencing only temporary problems, it may be suggested that judges from other circuits in the district assist until these temporary problems are resolved.

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 is limited to temporary problems, while permanent problems will require an additional judgeship in the circuit.

EXHIBIT XI: SUPERIOR COURT FY1979 CASELOAD BY ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT

CIRCUIT	# OF SUPERIOR CT. JUDGES	TOTAL FILINGS	CRIMINAL FILINGS				CIVIL FILINGS				JUVENILE FILINGS
			FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE *
DISTRICT 1											
ATLANTIC	2	4398	448	128	1617	2193	648	1080	274	2002	203
OGEECHEE	2	2142	336	28	17	381	714	676	204	1594	167
EASTERN	4	5385	1613	0	0	1613	535	2204	1033	3772	0
BRUNSWICK	2	3675	361	219	11	591	827	1628	629	3084	0*
WAYCROSS	2	3185	432	377	286	1095	512	1159	262	1933	157
TOTAL	12	18,785	3,190	752	1,931	5,873	3,236	6,747	2,402	12,385	527
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,565	266	63	161	489	270	562	200	1,032	44
DISTRICT 2											
PATAULA	1	1864	361	459	35	855	420	401	138	959	50
SOUTH GEORGIA	2	2316	658	152	28	838	508	637	203	1348	130
DOUGHERTY	2	2629	625	5	0	630	423	1239	337	1999	0
ALAPAHA	2	5027	571	1085	2021	3677	445	461	199	1105	245
TIFTON	1	2372	308	172	39	519	559	743	348	1650	203
SOUTHERN	3	4294	698	311	5	1014	865	1924	482	3271	9
TOTAL	11	18,502	3,221	2,184	2,128	7,533	3,220	5,405	1,707	10,332	637
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,682	293	199	193	685	293	491	155	939	58
DISTRICT 3											
CHATTAHOOCHEE	4	7293	1689	573	238	2500	1030	3050	604	4684	109
MACON	3	4891	1148	165	60	1373	920	2060	498	3478	40
HOUSTON	1	1715	281	2	0	283	285	927	220	1432	0
SOUTHWESTERN	1	1525	160	57	2	219	544	450	200	1194	112
TOTAL	9	15,424	3,278	797	300	4,375	2,779	6,487	1,522	10,788	261
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,714	364	89	33	486	309	721	169	1,199	29
DISTRICT 4											
STONE MOUNTAIN	7	11,432	1852	83	31	1966	2463	5573	1430	9466	0
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,633	265	12	4	281	352	796	204	1,352	0
DISTRICT 5											
ATLANTA	11	16,528	4450	8	0	4458	4230	6649	1191	12,070	0
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,503	405	1	0	40	385	604	108	1,097	0
DISTRICT 6											
FLINT	2	2502	214	284	40	538	876	651	366	1893	71
GRIFFIN	2	3531	486	370	326	1182	731	1245	373	2349	0
COWETA	2	4379	651	160	190	1001	1080	1574	715	3369	9
CLAYTON	3	4638	709	4	6	719	810	2549	560	3919	0
TOTAL	9	15,050	2,060	818	562	3,440	3,497	6,019	2,014	11,530	80
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,672	229	91	62	382	389	669	224	1,281	9

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

EXHIBIT XI: SUPERIOR COURT FY1979 CASELOAD BY ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT

CIRCUIT	# OF SUPERIOR CT. JUDGES	TOTAL FILINGS	CRIMINAL FILINGS				CIVIL FILINGS				JUVENILE FILINGS
			FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE *
DISTRICT 7											
TALLAPOOSA	3	5846	513	940	407	1860	2078	1340	481	3899	87*
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	3	4886	776	940	210	1926	877	1539	480	2896	64
CHEROKEE	2	10,268	693	1471	5723	7887	852	969	560	2381	0
ROME	2	4973	350	1790	128	2268	1106	871	728	2705	0
COBB	4	7782	1910	144	14	2068	1079	4099	536	5714	0
TOTAL	14	33,755	4,242	5,285	6,482	16,009	5,992	8,818	2,785	17,595	151
AVG. PER JUDGE		2,411	303	378	463	1,144	428	630	199	1,257	11
DISTRICT 8											
CORDELE	1	2372	190	829	52	1071	429	477	205	1111	190
DUBLIN	1	1673	302	28	0	330	565	450	239	1254	89
OCMULGEE	3	4698	750	1037	242	2029	844	787	498	2129	540
OCONEE	2	3060	312	665	343	1320	683	562	237	1482	258
MIDDLE	2	2697	422	2	0	424	539	1005	291	1835	438
TOTAL	9	14,500	1,976	2,561	637	5,174	3,060	3,281	1,470	7,811	1,515
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,611	220	285	71	575	340	365	163	868	168
DISTRICT 9											
CONASAUGA	2	4158	459	399	147	1005	1013	1393	673	3079	74
BLUE RIDGE	2	3633	482	806	511	1799	513	1076	245	1834	0
GWINNETT	3	3271	443	4	1	448	524	1764	535	2823	0
MOUNTAIN	1	2168	181	174	80	435	527	703	339	1569	164
NORTHEASTERN	2	3782	474	344	622	1440	755	964	528	2247	95
TOTAL	10	17,012	2,039	1,727	1,361	5,127	3,332	5,900	2,320	11,552	333
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,701	204	173	136	513	333	590	232	1,155	33
DISTRICT 10											
ALCOVY	2	2785	450	591	107	1148	572	654	411	1637	0
WESTERN	2	2428	438	187	50	675	600	806	331	1737	16
PIEDMONT	1	2014	157	255	364	776	512	481	245	1238	0
NORTHERN	2	2754	269	654	106	1029	585	606	347	1538	187
AUGUSTA	4	7133	587	281	36	904	924	3185	719	4828	1401
TOOMBS	1	3605	302	786	913	2001	304	405	222	931	673
TOTAL	12	20,719	2,203	2,754	1,576	6,533	3,497	6,137	2,275	11,909	2,277
AVG. PER JUDGE		1,727	184	230	131	544	291	511	190	992	190

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

## EXHIBIT XI ANALYSIS

Exhibit XI illustrates the potential for intra-judicial assistance within any one district. If the average filings per judge are approximately equal for all circuits within a district then the district caseload is evenly distributed. The distribution of district caseload should not be evaluated solely on the basis of an even or uneven per judge caseload, but also on the total number of cases per judge in the most time-consuming case type categories and the circuit caseload trends. Temporary reassignment of judges can help alleviate uneven distribution in caseload but problems arise when the average caseload per judge is high for all judges in a district. Exhibit XI is utilized to pinpoint such a situation.

The important indicator in the Exhibit is the last row of figures for each district (average per judge). Particular note should be made of the average total filings per judge, which range from a low of 1,503 for District V to a high of 2,411 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 1,722. Only two districts record a high per judge caseload:

District VII - 2,411

District IX - 1,727

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

If the caseload within a district is unevenly distributed due to a temporary problem of a high per judge caseload, it may be solved by judicial assistance from one circuit to another circuit, or by utilization of the services of a senior judge. These alternatives may be preferable to the

creation of a new judgeship in relieving the burden of a temporarily excessive caseload.

## CHAPTER V SUMMARY ANALYSIS

In evaluating the judicial assistance from supporting courts and the likelihood of sharing judges, Chapter V helps locate those circuits which may benefit from either temporary or permanent aid.

Exhibit X shows the circuits which might benefit from an increased reliance on supporting courts for the disposition of caseload. In misdemeanor cases, the supporting courts in these circuits hear less than 25% of total misdemeanors:

ALAPAHA  
CHEROKEE  
CORDELE  
ROME  
TALLAPOOSA

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

ALAPAHA  
CHEROKEE  
TOOMBS

To perceive an overall picture, those circuits whose supporting courts offer the least amount of assistance should be isolated. For example, of the five circuits listed above as having little misdemeanor caseload assistance it seems only Alapaha with one part-time state court judge, and Tallapoosa with one full-time state court judge, would be able to increase the number of misdemeanor cases heard in the state court. For traffic caseload assistance, Cherokee with only 49% of traffic cases heard by supporting courts might rely more heavily on the probate courts.

The circuits without state courts which also rank low in assistance in the civil case categories are:

ALCOVY	FLINT
CHEROKEE	OCONEE
CONASAUGA	ROME
CORDELE	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 is considered.

Exhibit XI is helpful in determining whether caseload pressures, as measured by total volume, 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 FY1979, the range of the average caseload per judge by district (1,503-2,411) is not especially large. Only in two districts (District VII and District IX) did the average per judge figure exceed the district mean. Of these two, 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.

## **APPENDICES**

**Preceding page blank**

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 Ga. Laws 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:

Section 5. 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 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 on whether additional judicial manpower was needed in any of the circuits or whether the circuits should be divided, and whether any other appropriate change was needed. These requests came from the Governor's office, judges, and legislators, and were made pursuant to Ga. Laws 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 numbers of judicial positions have been created: 1975-two, 1976-two, 1977-eight, 1978-six, and 1979-two. Since 1977 the caseload data included in the judicial manpower study has been collected on a statewide basis.

## 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 (Ga. Code Ann. §2-3301).

Exclusive Jurisdiction: The superior court has exclusive jurisdiction in the following subject areas: divorce, equity, title to land and felonies. (Ga. Code Ann. §2-3301 and §2-3304).

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, Ga. Practice and Procedure §5-4).

Concurrent Jurisdiction: 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, probate matters, and estate matters are exceptions to the rule. The juvenile court and probate court, respectively, have exclusive original jurisdiction in these subject areas.

Appellate Jurisdiction: 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" (Ga. Code Ann. §2-3304). On the other hand, the Constitution requires that specific legislation must define the right of direct appeal to the superior court, if any, from these lower trial courts. Various statutes have provided direct appeal: Ga. Code Ann. §6-201, the probate courts; Ga. Code Ann. §6-101 and §6-301, justices of the peace; and Ga. Code Ann. §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.

In addition, the superior court has the authority to review decisions by certain administrative bodies (Ga. Code Ann. §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. Ga. Code Ann. 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 and misdemeanor cases. There is no uniformity of jurisdiction of these courts in ex delicto (tort) actions. The local act creating each court and any amendments thereto control the extent of ex delicto jurisdiction. These courts have no original exclusive jurisdiction and generally no appellate jurisdiction.

Right of Review of Decision of State Courts: Petitioners in the state courts have the right of direct review by the court of appeals and supreme court (Ga. Code Ann. §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 Ann. §2-3108). The state courts

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

County Courts: Although the three county courts in Georgia (Baldwin, Echols, and Putnam counties) do not, strictly speaking, fall within the class of state courts, these were created for purposes similar to those of state courts. For this reason, the county courts have jurisdiction comparable to that of the state courts. They are counted as state courts in 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 (Ga. Code Ann. §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.

In 1979 there were fifty-two counties which had separate 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

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 (Ga. Code Ann. §24A-301).

Concurrent Original Jurisdiction: The juvenile court has concurrent jurisdiction with the superior court to hear alleged delinquent cases 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 is fifteen (15) years old at the time of the alleged crime or if the child is 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 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 Whitman v. State, 96 Ga. App. 731 (1957), resolved a conflict concerning appellate review from the juvenile courts. The case struck down the validity

of Ga. L. 1956, p. 69, as in conflict with a 1956 constitutional amendment (Ga. L. 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 (Ga. Code Ann. §2-3501).

Exclusive Original Jurisdiction: The probate court has exclusive original jurisdiction in probate and estate matters.

Concurrent Original Jurisdiction: 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. The 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 (Ga. Code Ann. §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 simple typology which follows:

- 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 cost are as follows:

#### STATE FIXED COSTS

Salary	Superior Court Judge	\$40,617.50
	Secretary, Superior Court Judge	9,640.20
	*Assistant District Attorney	15,500.00
Fringe Benefits	Superior Court Judge @22.43%	9,110.51

	**Secretary, Superior Court Judge @ 11.15%	1,074.88
	Assistant District Attorney @ 4.25%	658.75
***Contingent Fee	Court Reporters	\$600.00 - 2,400.00
****Library		<u>3,570.00</u>
	TOTAL RANGE	\$80,771.84 - \$82,571.84

\* 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>	<u>Average</u>
Judge's Travel Expenses	\$0.00 - \$2,856.00	\$ 915.00
Assistant District Attorney's Travel Expenses	<u>\$0.00 - \$2,672.00</u>	<u>\$ 876.00</u>
	\$0.00 - \$5,528.00	\$1, 791.00
TOTAL RANGE OF STATE COSTS:	\$80,771.84 - \$88,099.84	

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

**CONTINUED**

**2 OF 3**

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:

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

COUNTY VARIABLE COSTS

Travel:

Superior Court Judges - Expenses to Seminars, etc.  
Court Reporter Travel Expenses  
Law Clerk Travel Expenses  
Investigator's Travel Expenses

Operating

Expenses:

Telephone and Telegraph  
Electricity  
Cost of Additional Office and Courtroom Space  
Reproduction Costs  
Office Supplies

## APPENDIX FOUR

### ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS

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

Exhibit A-I is "Total FY1979 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 as portrayed in Exhibit A-V, includes all juvenile cases whether heard by a superior or juvenile court judge.

Exhibit A-II, "Superior Court Open Cases by Filing Type: FY1979," 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 the accumulation of pending cases is considered to be a temporary condition, the open caseload in a circuit cannot, alone, justify the creation of an additional judgeship. Exhibits A-VII and A-VIII, "Assistance from Senior Judges: FY1979," and "Resident Active Attorneys: 1978-1979," are also considered as secondary criteria, because they do not relate directly to case workload. However, they do contribute to the total picture of judicial assistance and potential demand for litigation in each circuit.

Finally, "Population and Population Change by Circuit and County" and "Judicial Personnel: Superior, State and Juvenile Courts by Circuit and County: December 31, 1979" (Exhibits A-VI and A-IX) have been provided for general reference on any given county. The variation in county population within a circuit, is displayed in Exhibit A-VI. For information on county and circuit judicial positions, Exhibit A-IX is the 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 for the number of superior court judges by circuit.

EXHIBIT A-1: TOTAL FY1979 SUPERIOR COURT CASELOAD BY FILING TYPE

CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS	CRIMINAL FILINGS				CIVIL FILINGS				JUVENILE FILINGS
		FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE*
ALAPAHA	5027	571	1085	2021	3677	445	461	199	1105	245
ALCOVY	2785	450	591	107	1148	572	654	411	1637	0
ATLANTA	16528	4450	8	0	4458	4230	6649	1191	12070	0
ATLANTIC	4398	448	128	1617	2193	648	1080	274	2002	203
AUGUSTA	7133	587	281	36	904	924	3185	719	4828	1401
BLUE RIDGE	3633	482	806	511	1799	513	1076	245	1834	0
BRUNSWICK **	3675	361	219	11	591	827	1628	629	3084	0
CHIATTAHOOCHEE	7293	1689	573	238	2500	1030	3050	604	4684	109
CHEROKEE	10268	693	1471	5723	7887	852	969	560	2381	0
CLAYTON	4638	709	4	6	719	810	2549	560	3919	0
COBB	7782	1910	144	14	2068	1079	4099	536	5714	0
CONASAUGA	4158	459	399	147	1005	1013	1393	673	3079	74
CORDELE	2372	190	829	52	1071	429	477	205	1111	190
COWETA	4379	651	160	190	1001	1080	1574	715	3369	9
DOUGHERTY	2629	625	5	0	630	423	1239	337	1999	0
DUBLIN	1673	302	28	0	330	565	450	239	1254	89
EASTERN	5385	1613	0	0	1613	535	2204	1033	3772	0
FLINT	2502	214	284	40	538	876	651	366	1893	71
GRIFFIN	3531	486	370	326	1182	731	1245	373	2349	0
GWINNETT	3271	443	4	1	448	524	1764	535	2823	0
HOUSTON	1715	281	2	0	283	285	927	220	1432	0

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

\*\* JEFF DAVIS COUNTY FILINGS NOT INCLUDED AFTER 9/1/79. SUPERIOR CT. JUDGE NO LONGER HEARS JUVENILE CASES.

\*\*\* DOUGLAS COUNTY FILINGS NOT INCLUDED AFTER 7/1/79. SUPERIOR CT. JUDGE NO LONGER HEARS JUVENILE CASES.

EXHIBIT A-I: TOTAL FY1979 SUPERIOR COURT CASELOAD BY FILING TYPE

CIRCUIT	TOTAL FILINGS	CRIMINAL FILINGS				CIVIL FILINGS				JUVENILE FILINGS
		FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE*
LOOKOUT MTN	4886	776	940	210	1926	877	1539	480	2896	64
MACON	4891	1148	165	60	1373	920	2060	498	3478	40
MIDDLE	2697	422	2	0	424	539	1005	291	1835	438
MOUNTAIN	2168	181	174	80	435	527	703	339	1569	164
NORTHEASTERN	3782	474	344	622	1440	755	964	528	2247	95
NORTHERN	2754	269	654	106	1029	585	606	347	1538	187
OCMULGEE	4698	750	1037	242	2029	844	787	498	2129	540
OCONEE	3060	312	665	343	1320	683	562	237	1482	258
OGEECHEE	2142	336	28	17	381	714	676	204	1594	167
PATAULA	1864	361	459	35	855	420	401	138	959	50
PIEDMONT	2014	157	255	364	776	512	481	245	1238	0
ROME	4973	350	1790	128	2268	1106	871	728	2705	0
SOUTH GEORGIA	2316	658	152	28	838	508	637	203	1348	130
SOUTHERN	4294	698	311	5	1014	865	1924	482	3271	9
SOUTHWESTERN	1525	160	57	2	219	544	450	200	1194	112
STONE MTN.	11432	1852	83	31	1966	2463	5573	1430	9466	0
TALLAPOOSA ***	5846	513	940	407	1860	2078	1340	481	3899	87
TIFTON	2372	308	172	39	519	559	743	348	1650	203
TOOMBS	3605	302	786	913	2001	304	405	222	931	673
WAYCROSS	3185	432	377	286	1095	512	1159	262	1933	157
WESTERN	2428	438	187	50	675	600	806	331	1737	16
TOTAL	181,707	28,511	16,969	15,008	60,488	35,306	61,016	19,116	115,438	5781

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

\*\* JEFF DAVIS COUNTY FILINGS NOT INCLUDED AFTER 9/1/79. SUPERIOR CT. JUDGE NO LONGER HEARS JUVENILE CASES.

\*\*\* DOUGLAS COUNTY FILINGS NOT INCLUDED AFTER 7/1/79. SUPERIOR CT. JUDGE NO LONGER HEARS JUVENILE CASES.

EXHIBIT A-II: SUPERIOR COURT OPEN CASES BY FILING TYPE: FY1979

CIRCUIT	TOTAL OPEN	CRIMINAL OPEN				CIVIL OPEN				JUVENILE OPEN
		FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE *
ALAPAHA	2210	407	424	164	995	608	315	292	1215	0
ALCOVY	2550	394	360	24	778	843	562	367	1772	0
ATLANTA	9827	1160	80	0	1240	5225	2749	613	8587	0
ATLANTIC	1104	219	52	4	275	363	320	127	810	19
AUGUSTA	6956	304	47	9	360	2100	3584	685	6369	227
BLUE RIDGE	2219	399	456	195	1050	462	572	135	1169	0
BRUNSWICK	3580	672	194	3	869	1092	1121	498	2711	0
CHATTAHOOCHEE	5677	670	855	147	1172	1422	2405	662	4489	16
CHEROKEE	5021	429	535	755	1719	1527	996	779	3302	0
CLAYTON	2663	414	7	5	426	840	1175	222	2237	0
COBB	7519	471	0	2	473	2736	3636	674	7046	0
CONASAUGA	2411	263	171	61	495	964	613	320	1897	19
CORDELE	1357	106	382	15	503	307	257	281	845	9
COWETA	4105	47	10	1	58	1462	1422	1162	4046	1
DOUGHERTY	1372	258	0	0	258	375	433	306	1114	0
DUBLIN	2031	267	16	0	283	728	502	498	1728	20
EASTERN	6139	1278	14	0	1292	1276	1944	1627	4847	0
FLINT	1979	130	230	22	382	868	380	289	1537	60
GRIFFIN	2691	180	126	81	387	893	924	487	2304	0
GWINNETT	1378	227	1	0	228	548	454	148	1150	0
HOUSTON	2086	213	10	0	223	323	1097	443	1863	0

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

EXHIBIT A-II: SUPERIOR COURT OPEN CASES BY FILING TYPE, FY1979

CIRCUIT	TOTAL OPEN	CRIMINAL OPEN				CIVIL OPEN			JUVENILE OPEN	
		FELONY	MISDEMEANOR	TRAFFIC	TOTAL CRIMINAL	GENERAL CIVIL	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	INDEPENDENT MOTIONS	TOTAL CIVIL	TOTAL JUVENILE *
LOOKOUT MTN.	3354	491	507	218	1216	704	1013	373	2090	48
MACON	4075	588	54	27	669	980	1860	523	3363	43
MIDDLE	2577	258	3	0	261	811	941	522	2274	42
MOUNTAIN	1040	118	110	42	270	351	244	159	754	16
NORTHEASTERN	1268	156	75	156	387	432	266	175	873	8
NORTHERN	1880	172	326	55	553	523	460	295	1278	49
OCMULGEE	3737	595	639	120	1354	823	639	871	2333	50
OCONEE	1888	138	217	79	434	656	350	413	1419	35
OGEECHEE	2013	182	34	7	223	832	575	362	1769	21
PATAULA	1063	231	300	17	548	212	153	134	499	16
PIEDMONT	1573	104	76	62	242	551	330	450	1331	0
ROME	4441	323	591	114	1028	1349	839	1225	3413	0
SOUTH GEORGIA	890	280	94	6	380	107	213	108	428	82
SOUTHERN	3306	315	86	0	401	887	1388	630	2905	0
SOUTHWESTERN	1025	68	9	0	77	410	286	206	902	46
STONE MTN.	12,147	1131	50	10	1191	4175	5407	1374	10,956	0
TALLAPOOSA	8895	698	863	437	1998	3832	1896	1101	6829	68
TIFTON	1954	456	147	31	634	410	384	472	1266	54
TOOMBS	2221	231	522	346	1099	324	499	291	1114	8
WAYCROSS	1671	273	96	1	370	460	649	185	1294	7
WESTERN	1342	336	85	19	440	383	369	145	897	5
TOTAL	137,235	15,652	8,354	3,235	27,241	44,174	44,222	20,629	109,025	969

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

EXHIBIT A-III: STATE COURT CASELOAD BY CASE TYPE: FY1979

CIRCUIT	# STATE COURTS IN CIRCUIT	MISDEMEANOR		TRAFFIC		GENERAL CIVIL		INDEPENDENT MOTIONS		TOTAL CASES	
		FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED
ALAPAHA	1	173	173	1008	1008	3	3	0	0	1184	1184
ATLANTA	1	7859	8016	16,704	16,552	43,441	48,671	35,839	38,726	103,843	111,965
ATLANTIC	5	1386	1324	19,504	19,601	186	109	95	56	21,171	21,090
AUGUSTA	2	6970	4874	15,824	13,845	218	137	66	58	23,078	18,914
BLUE RIDGE	1	2100	1942	5921	5702	799	657	164	103	8984	8404
BRUNSWICK	3	2466	2551	10,102	9181	1297	1065	1358	1107	15,223	13,904
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1	4490	4893	4798	5240	721	351	34	10	10,043	10,494
CLAYTON	1	3171	2920	11,389	10,697	4077	2841	1134	584	19,771	17,042
COBB	1	5973	4645	21,697	20,996	6795	5198	3522	2819	37,987	33,658
COWETA	3	3633	3482	10,614	9471	1170	974	384	101	15,801	14,028
DOUGHERTY	1	3888	3313	4644	3875	1374	1223	2522	1939	12,428	10,350
DUBLIN	3	473	348	9930	9288	276	210	96	14	10,775	9860
EASTERN	1	2212	2133	1537	1481	3002	1861	1442	790	8193	6265
GRIFFIN	1	856	715	2827	2549	65	37	12	6	3760	3307
GWINNETT	1	2567	2245	725	809	2554	1904	1001	788	6847	5746
HOUSTON	1	1874	1542	7043	5838	789	578	295	230	10,001	8188
LOOKOUT MTN.	1	678	600	1778	1816	37	28	31	16	2524	2460
MACON	1	3489	3307	2373	2238	551	554	107	86	6520	6185
MIDDLE	5	2642	2248	8617	7772	157	116	75	39	11,491	10,175
MOUNTAIN	2	1138	913	1766	1718	131	131	63	47	3098	2809
NORTHEASTERN	1	2472	2072	6080	5725	743	674	241	213	9536	8684
NORTHERN	1	362	393	810	811	26	20	26	23	1224	1247
OCMULGEE *	2	2005	2003	4254	4253	1	1	0	0	6260	6257
OGEECHEE	4	1250	1287	8100	7837	368	253	144	106	9862	9483
PATAULA	2	433	511	1262	1469	29	30	13	6	1737	2016
PIEDMONT	1	363	369	3890	3520	133	90	65	41	4451	4020
SOUTH GEORGIA	3	1566	1638	4686	4913	37	28	24	13	6313	6592
SOUTHERN *	4	3219	2909	16,326	16,153	231	132	53	29	19,829	19,223
SOUTHWESTERN	2	1027	788	2401	2472	173	162	194	85	3795	3507
STONE MTN. **	1										
TALLAPOOSA	1	204	120	1711	1580	260	197	69	22	2244	1919
TIFTON	2	1590	1093	9922	10,415	155	146	18	8	11,685	11,662
WAYCROSS	3	2325	1875	5142	4683	306	288	61	39	7834	6885
WESTERN	1	360	263	190	133	169	155	97	122	816	673

\* NUMBER OF STATE COURTS INCLUDES COUNTY COURTS

\*\* DATA FROM DEKALB COUNTY STATE COURT WAS UNAVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF THIS STUDY.

EXHIBIT A-IV: PROBATE COURT CRIMINAL CASELOAD BY CASE TYPE: FY1979

CIRCUIT	MISDEMEANOR		TRAFFIC		TOTAL FILINGS	
	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED	FILINGS	DISPOSED
ALAPAHA	0	0	4064	4019	4064	4019
ALCOVY	236	235	5677	5609	5913	5844
ATLANTIC	0	0	3011	3011	3011	3011
AUGUSTA	69	69	4783	4783	4852	4852
BLUE RIDGE	71	73	2379	2324	2450	2397
BRUNSWICK	150	150	5406	5478	5556	5628
CHATTAHOOCHEE	137	137	7474	7265	7611	7402
CHEROKEE	37	38	5499	5274	5536	5312
CONASAUGA	313	303	8404	7958	8717	8261
CORDELE	105	99	13,380	12,868	13,485	12,967
COWETA	134	134	3835	4160	3969	4294
DUBLIN	76	78	1153	1152	1229	1230
FLINT	300	301	34,075	33,612	34,375	33,913
GRIFFIN	120	123	6410	6279	6530	6402
LOOKOUT MTN.	35	41	9541	9750	9576	9791
MACON	38	38	4737	4965	4775	5003
MOUNTAIN	172	172	1248	1248	1420	1420
NORTHEASTERN	142	130	1516	1509	1658	1639
NORTHERN	331	251	7994	8090	8325	8341
OCMULGEE	199	197	11,947	11,918	12,146	12,115
OCONEE	273	310	5245	5402	5518	5712
PATAULA	191	190	4518	4521	4709	4711
PIEDMONT	8	8	1708	1800	1716	1808
ROME	209	177	5159	4924	5368	5101
SOUTH GEORGIA	19	19	761	746	780	765
SOUTHERN	31	31	1879	1879	1910	1910
SOUTHWESTERN	157	140	2183	2040	2340	2180
STONE MTN.	0	0	5974	5978	5974	5978
TALLAPOOSA	61	58	7718	6876	7779	6934
TIFTON	44	25	5071	5146	5115	5171
TOOMBS	363	374	7807	7822	8170	8196
WAYCROSS	41	42	1911	2000	1952	2042
WESTERN	0	0	776	741	776	741
TOTAL	4062	3943	193,243	191,147	197,305	195,090

EXHIBIT A-V: JUVENILE COURT CASELOAD BY CASE TYPE: FY1979

CIRCUIT	DELINQUENT		UNRULY		TRAFFIC		DEPRIVED		SPECIAL PROCEEDING		TOTAL	
	CHILDREN FILED	CHILDREN DISPOSED	CHILDREN FILED	CHILDREN DISPOSED	CHILDREN FILED	CHILDREN DISPOSED						
ALAPAHA	219	220	16	16	2	2	8	8	0	0	245	246
ALCOVY	440	418	145	139	126	99	200	173	11	9	922	838
ATLANTA	3863	3657	848	838	225	223	683	621	21	23	5640	5362
ATLANTIC	157	152	10	12	0	0	30	26	6	6	203	196
AUGUSTA	816	683	387	334	47	28	148	147	3	3	1401	1195
BLUE RIDGE	379	312	224	199	109	97	153	140	0	0	865	748
BRUNSWICK	679	657	220	224	176	167	102	96	35	36	1212	1180
CHATTAHOOCHEE	1296	971	518	391	200	197	184	138	139	78	2337	1775
CHEROKEE	477	412	228	213	95	97	79	66	20	22	899	810
CLAYTON	988	861	644	545	119	102	278	258	159	138	2188	1904
COBB	1255	1284	641	644	94	104	303	312	17	25	2310	2369
CONASAUGA	317	313	203	189	3	3	171	171	6	8	700	684
CORDELE	362	332	78	78	6	6	13	17	3	3	462	436
COWETA	561	569	43	33	46	43	211	197	2	2	863	844
DOUGHERTY	493	517	0	0	108	112	63	73	3	3	667	705
DUBLIN	167	158	77	77	21	21	39	36	4	4	308	296
EASTERN	1358	1208	280	218	136	127	80	64	56	53	1910	1670
FLINT	143	131	25	19	7	5	47	21	3	1	225	177
GRIFFIN	293	271	74	70	13	9	94	105	0	0	474	455
GWINNETT	770	463	274	134	63	36	115	89	63	49	1285	771
HOUSTON	154	160	3	3	1	1	8	8	1	0	167	172

\* FY1979 JUVENILE COURT CASELOAD DISPOSITION DATA WAS UNAVAILABLE FROM WARE COUNTY.

EXHIBIT A-V: JUVENILE COURT CASELOAD BY CASE TYPE: FY1979

CIRCUIT	DELINQUENT		UNRULY		TRAFFIC		DEPRIVED		SPECIAL PROCEEDING		TOTAL	
	CHILDREN FILED	CHILDREN DISPOSED	CHILDREN FILED	CHILDREN DISPOSED	CHILDREN FILED	CHILDREN DISPOSED						
LOOKOUT MTN.	276	260	93	75	33	32	31	27	14	16	447	410
MACON	723	724	65	74	8	12	87	70	87	70	970	950
MIDDLE	295	287	79	78	1	1	62	56	1	1	438	423
MOUNTAIN	123	117	6	4	11	12	24	22	0	0	164	155
NORTHEASTERN	357	349	255	256	49	47	77	71	1	1	739	724
NORTHERN	116	106	10	10	15	13	46	56	0	0	187	185
OCMULGEE	279	261	196	190	2	2	44	45	19	17	540	515
OCONEE	156	153	67	62	7	7	23	17	5	4	258	243
OGEECHEE	123	115	12	14	11	11	8	9	13	10	167	159
PATAULA	97	96	5	5	5	5	25	24	0	0	132	130
PIEDMONT	108	93	47	45	4	4	38	50	0	0	197	192
ROME	380	380	170	171	23	26	192	193	13	14	778	784
SOUTH GEORGIA	103	87	3	2	1	0	22	16	1	0	130	105
SOUTHERN	341	301	24	22	11	11	122	96	0	0	498	430
SOUTHWESTERN	234	180	113	104	0	0	22	2	0	0	369	286
STONE MTN.	2450	2386	1237	1237	432	411	474	437	66	78	4659	4549
TALLAPOOSA	195	150	56	37	10	12	43	29	13	14	317	242
TIFTON	160	155	23	23	0	0	20	19	0	0	203	197
TOOMBS	74	68	576	575	0	0	23	23	0	0	673	666
WAYCROSS *	364	134	105	3	16	1	74	7	33	13	592	158
WESTERN	203	201	5	5	311	311	20	21	9	9	548	547
TOTAL	22,344	20,352	8085	7368	2547	2397	4486	4056	827	710	38,289	34,883

\* FY1979 JUVENILE COURT CASELOAD DISPOSITION DATA WAS UNAVAILABLE FROM WARE COUNTY.

EXHIBIT A-VI: POPULATION AND POPULATION CHANGE BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1978 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1978	1985 POP. PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1978-1985
ALAPAHA	ATKINSON	5897	5700	-3.34	6300	10.53
	BERRIEN	11,556	12,900	11.63	13,100	1.55
	CLINCH	6405	6500	1.48	7200	10.77
	COCK	12,129	11,400	-6.01	14,600	28.07
	LANIER	5031	5500	9.32	5800	5.45
	TOTAL	41,018	42,000	2.39	47,000	11.90
ALCOVY	NEWTON	26,282	31,700	20.61	37,900	19.56
	WALTON	23,404	28,600	22.20	33,400	16.78
	TOTAL	49,686	60,300	21.36	71,300	18.24
ATLANTA	FULTON	605,210	581,000	-4.00	589,600	1.48
	TOTAL	605,210	581,000	-4.00	589,600	1.48
ATLANTIC	BRYAN	6539	7900	20.81	9100	15.19
	EVANS	7290	8500	16.60	9400	10.59
	LIBERTY	17,569	33,200	88.97	29,500	-11.14
	LONG	3746	3800	1.44	3900	2.63
	MCINTOSH	7371	7600	3.11	9700	27.63
	TATTNALL	16,557	18,500	11.74	18,800	1.62
	TOTAL	59,072	79,500	34.58	80,400	1.13
AUGUSTA	SURKE	18,255	18,400	0.79	19,200	4.35
	COLUMBIA	22,327	32,200	44.22	35,800	11.18
	RICHMOND	162,437	167,000	2.81	189,900	13.71
	TOTAL	203,019	217,600	7.18	244,900	12.55
BLUE RIDGE	CHEROKEE	31,059	43,200	39.09	50,600	17.13
	FANNIN	13,357	15,000	12.30	16,200	8.00
	FORSYTH	16,928	23,100	36.46	27,900	20.78
	GILMER	8956	11,300	26.17	11,200	-0.88
	PICKENS	9620	10,800	12.27	12,700	17.59
	TOTAL	79,920	103,400	29.38	118,600	14.70
BRUNSWICK	APPLING	12,726	13,900	9.23	15,300	10.07
	CAMDEN	11,334	10,700	-5.59	14,100	31.78
	GLYNN	50,528	52,700	4.30	62,800	19.17
	JEFF DAVIS	9425	11,400	20.95	12,500	9.65
	WAYNE	17,858	19,200	7.51	21,700	13.02
	TOTAL	101,871	107,900	5.92	126,400	17.15
CHATTAHOOCHEE	CHATTAHOOCHEE	25,813	12,400	-51.96	15,500	25.00
	HARRIS	11,520	13,300	15.45	13,600	2.26
	MARION	5099	5000	-1.94	5400	8.00
	MUSCOGEE	167,377	177,300	5.93	177,900	0.34
	TALBOT	6625	6600	-0.38	6600	0
	TAYLOR	7865	7100	-9.73	7900	11.27
	TOTAL	224,299	221,700	-1.16	226,900	2.35
CHEROKEE	BARTOW	32,911	37,400	13.64	49,200	31.55
	GORDON	23,570	27,900	18.37	31,200	11.83
	TOTAL	56,481	65,300	15.61	80,400	23.12
CLAYTON	CLAYTON	98,126	132,100	34.62	168,300	27.40
	TOTAL	98,126	132,100	34.62	168,300	27.40
COBB	COBB	196,793	271,400	37.91	312,100	15.00
	TOTAL	196,793	271,400	37.91	312,100	15.00
CONASAUGA	MURRAY	12,986	17,800	37.07	19,300	8.43
	WHITFIELD	55,108	65,800	19.40	77,200	17.33
	TOTAL	68,094	83,600	22.77	96,500	15.43

EXHIBIT A-VI: POPULATION AND POPULATION CHANGE BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1978 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1978	1985 PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1978-1985
CORDELE	BEN HILL	13,171	14,900	13.13	15,200	2.01
	CRISP	18,087	19,400	7.26	22,400	15.46
	DOOLY	10,404	11,200	7.65	11,300	0.89
	WILCOX	6998	7700	10.03	7100	-7.79
	TOTAL	48,660	53,200	9.33	56,000	5.26
COWETA	CARROLL	45,404	56,800	25.10	65,400	15.14
	COWETA	32,310	37,600	16.37	41,800	11.17
	HEARD	5354	6000	12.07	6200	3.33
	MERIWETHER	19,461	20,800	6.88	25,200	21.15
	TROUP	44,466	45,600	2.55	47,200	3.51
TOTAL	146,995	166,800	13.47	185,800	11.39	
DOUGHERTY	DOUGHERTY	89,639	100,100	11.67	118,900	18.78
TOTAL	89,639	100,100	11.67	118,900	18.78	
DUBLIN	JOHNSON	7727	7700	-0.35	8100	5.19
	LAURENS	32,738	34,100	4.16	36,900	8.21
	TREUTLEN	5647	6000	6.25	6200	3.33
	TWIGGS	8222	8500	3.38	9000	5.88
	TOTAL	54,334	56,300	3.62	60,200	6.93
EASTERN	CHATHAM	187,816	192,100	2.28	207,100	7.81
	TOTAL	187,816	192,100	2.28	207,100	7.81
FLINT	BUTTS	10,560	12,600	19.32	15,600	23.81
	HENRY	23,724	29,300	23.50	35,500	21.16
	LAMAR	10,688	11,300	5.73	11,200	-0.88
	MONROE	10,991	12,200	11.00	14,200	16.39
	TOTAL	55,963	65,400	16.86	76,500	16.97
GRIFFIN	FAYETTE	11,364	20,300	78.63	23,500	15.76
	PIKE	7316	8200	12.08	8400	2.44
	SPALDING	39,514	43,900	11.10	47,200	7.52
	UPSON	23,505	24,300	3.38	28,200	16.05
	TOTAL	81,699	96,700	18.36	107,300	10.96
GWINNETT	GWINNETT	72,349	145,500	101.11	190,600	31.00
	TOTAL	72,349	145,500	101.11	190,600	31.00
HOUSTON	HOUSTON	62,924	81,800	30.00	95,000	16.14
	TOTAL	62,924	81,800	30.00	95,000	16.14
LOOKOUT MTN.	CATOOSA	28,271	34,900	23.45	40,500	16.05
	CHATTOOGA	20,541	21,300	3.70	24,200	13.62
	DADE	9910	11,500	16.04	13,000	13.04
	WALKER	50,691	51,800	2.19	61,800	19.31
	TOTAL	109,413	119,500	9.22	139,500	16.74
MACON	BIBB	143,366	145,000	1.14	162,600	12.14
	CRAWFORD	5748	6800	18.30	7000	2.94
	PEACH	15,990	18,900	18.20	24,200	28.04
	TOTAL	165,104	170,700	3.39	193,800	13.53
MIDDLE	CANDLER	6412	6400	-0.19	7000	9.38
	EMANUEL	18,357	19,500	6.23	21,600	10.77
	JEFFERSON	17,174	16,400	-4.51	19,000	15.85
	TOCOMBS	19,151	21,100	10.18	24,000	13.74
	WASHINGTON	17,480	17,100	-2.17	17,700	3.51
	TOTAL	78,574	80,500	2.45	89,300	10.93

EXHIBIT A-VI: POPULATION AND POPULATION CHANGE BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1978 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1978	1985 POP. PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1978-1985
MOUNTAIN	HABERSHAM	20,691	23,100	11.64	25,200	9.09
	RABUN	8327	8700	4.48	11,300	29.89
	STEPHENS	20,331	22,700	11.65	24,600	8.37
	TOWNS	4565	5200	13.91	5500	5.77
	UNION	6811	8200	20.39	8800	7.32
	TOTAL	60,725	67,900	11.82	75,400	11.05
NORTHEASTERN	DAWSON	3639	5100	40.15	4800	-5.88
	HALL	59,405	68,800	15.82	80,800	17.44
	LUMPKIN	8728	9600	9.99	11,500	19.79
	WHITE	7742	9500	22.71	10,100	6.32
	TOTAL	79,514	93,000	16.96	107,200	15.27
NORTHERN	ELBERT	17,262	17,100	-0.94	19,400	13.45
	FRANKLIN	12,784	13,500	5.60	14,700	8.89
	HART	15,814	16,100	1.81	18,700	16.15
	MADISON	13,517	16,000	18.37	19,100	19.38
	OGLETHORPE	7598	8700	14.50	8900	2.30
	TOTAL	66,975	71,400	6.61	80,800	13.17
OCMULGEE	BALDWIN	34,240	36,400	6.31	37,700	3.57
	GREENE	10,212	10,600	3.80	11,500	8.49
	HANCOCK	9019	9300	3.12	9300	0
	JASPER	5760	7000	21.53	7500	7.14
	JONES	12,270	16,200	32.03	19,200	18.52
	MORGAN	9904	9900	-0.04	11,400	15.15
	PUTNAM	8394	10,100	20.32	10,600	4.95
	WILKINSON	9393	10,100	7.53	10,400	2.97
	TOTAL	99,192	109,600	10.49	117,600	7.30
OCONEE	BLECKLEY	10,291	10,700	3.97	11,500	7.48
	DODGE	15,658	15,800	0.91	18,000	13.92
	MONTGOMERY	6099	6700	9.85	7000	4.48
	PULASKI	8066	7500	-7.02	8900	18.67
	TELFAIR	11,394	11,900	4.44	13,400	12.61
	WHEELER	4596	5300	15.32	5400	1.89
	TOTAL	56,104	57,900	3.20	64,200	10.88
OGEECHEE	BULLOCH	31,585	34,200	8.28	42,200	23.39
	EFFINGHAM	13,632	17,200	26.17	20,200	17.44
	JENKINS	8332	8400	0.82	8400	0
	SCREVEN	12,591	13,700	8.81	11,900	-13.14
	TOTAL	66,140	73,500	11.13	82,700	12.52
PATAULA	CLAY	3636	3700	1.76	3000	-18.92
	EARLY	12,682	12,700	0.14	13,500	6.30
	MILLER	6424	6600	2.74	6600	0
	QUITMAN	2180	1900	-12.84	2000	5.26
	RANDOLPH	8734	9300	6.48	9000	-3.23
	SEMINOLE	7059	7700	9.08	9500	23.38
	TERRELL	11,416	10,500	-8.02	11,500	9.52
TOTAL	52,131	52,400	0.52	55,100	5.15	
PIEDMONT	BANKS	6833	8100	18.54	7500	-7.41
	BARROW	16,859	19,000	12.70	22,800	20.00
	JACKSON	21,093	23,000	9.04	27,500	19.57
	TOTAL	44,785	50,100	11.87	57,800	15.37
ROME	FLOYD	73,742	79,100	7.27	88,900	12.39
	TOTAL	73,742	79,100	7.27	88,900	12.39

EXHIBIT A-VI: POPULATION AND POPULATION CHANGE BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	1970 POPULATION	1978 POPULATION	% CHANGE 1970-1978	1985 POP. PROJECTION	% CHANGE 1978-1985
SOUTH GEORGIA	BAKER	3875	4200	8.39	3500	-16.67
	CALHOUN	6606	6400	-3.12	7100	10.94
	DECATUR	22,310	23,100	3.54	24,000	3.90
	GRADY	17,826	19,100	7.15	20,000	4.71
	MITCHELL	18,956	18,900	-0.30	21,400	13.23
	TOTAL	69,573	71,700	3.06	76,000	6.00
SOUTHERN	BROOKS	13,743	13,900	1.14	14,200	2.16
	COLQUITT	32,298	33,400	3.41	35,500	6.29
	ECHOLS	1924	1900	-1.25	2300	21.05
	LOWNDES	55,112	70,000	27.01	79,300	13.29
	THOMAS	34,562	37,300	7.92	42,000	12.60
	TOTAL	137,639	156,500	13.70	173,300	10.73
SOUTHWESTERN	LEE	7044	9100	29.19	10,900	19.78
	MACON	12,933	12,500	-3.35	14,300	14.40
	SCHLEY	3097	2800	-9.59	3300	17.86
	STEWART	6511	5600	-13.99	5900	5.36
	SUMTER	26,931	27,300	1.37	33,400	22.34
	WEBSTER	2362	2200	-6.86	2800	27.27
	TOTAL	58,878	59,500	1.06	70,600	18.66
STONE MTN.	DEKALB	415,387	479,000	15.31	556,200	16.12
	ROCKDALE	18,152	28,900	59.21	35,300	22.15
	TOTAL	433,539	507,900	17.15	591,500	16.46
TALLAPOOSA	DOUGLAS	28,659	45,900	60.16	72,100	57.08
	HARALSON	15,927	17,900	12.39	18,900	5.59
	PAULDING	17,520	22,700	29.57	28,100	23.79
	POLK	29,656	30,700	3.52	36,000	17.26
	TOTAL	91,762	117,200	27.72	155,100	32.34
TIFTON	IRWIN	8036	8500	5.77	9100	7.06
	TIFT	27,288	31,100	13.97	37,100	19.29
	TURNER	8790	8800	0.11	10,000	13.64
	WORTH	14,770	16,400	11.04	18,400	12.20
	TOTAL	58,884	64,800	10.05	74,600	15.12
TOOMBS	GLASCOCK	2280	2500	9.65	2200	-12.00
	LINCOLN	5895	6400	8.57	7000	9.38
	MCDUFFIE	15,276	17,500	14.56	19,100	9.14
	TALIAFERRO	2423	2500	3.18	1800	-28.00
	WARREN	6669	6300	-5.53	6600	4.76
	WILKES	10,184	10,400	2.12	10,800	3.85
	TOTAL	42,727	45,600	6.72	47,500	4.17
WAYCROSS	BACON	8233	9700	17.82	9500	-2.06
	BRANTLEY	5940	8400	41.41	8300	-1.19
	CHARLTON	5680	6500	14.44	7100	9.23
	COFFEE	22,828	23,800	4.26	28,600	20.17
	PIERCE	9281	11,100	19.60	11,000	-0.90
	WARE	33,525	34,500	2.91	37,100	7.54
	TOTAL	85,487	94,000	9.96	101,600	8.09
WESTERN	CLARKE	65,177	76,900	17.99	96,800	25.88
	OCONEE	7915	9600	21.29	10,900	13.54
	TOTAL	73,092	86,500	18.34	107,700	24.51
STATEWIDE TOTAL		4,587,948	5,153,000	12.32	5,810,000	12.75

SOURCE: ANNUAL ESTIMATE OF POPULATION FOR THE STATE OF GEORGIA 1978 (OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET, SEPT. 1979) AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR GEORGIA COUNTIES 1980-2010 (OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET, SEPT. 1978).

EXHIBIT A-VII: ASSISTANCE FROM SENIOR JUDGES  
BY CIRCUIT: FY1979

CIRCUIT	# OF DAYS	RANK
ALAPAHA	10	22
ALCOVY	0	36.1
ATLANTA	40	14
ATLANTIC	50	12
AUGUSTA	30	16
BLUE RIDGE	98	5
BRUNSWICK	236	1
CHATTAHOOCHEE	0	36.1
CHEROKEE	32	15
CLAYTON	4	28.3
COBB	139	3
CONASAUGA	4	28.3
CORDELE	8	24.3
CDWETA	0	36.1
DOUGHERTY	53	11
DUBLIN	24	19
EASTERN	62	9
FLINT	26	18
GRIFFIN	0	36.1
GWINNETT	4	28.3
HOUSTON	28	17
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	1	32.3
MACON	180	2
MIDDLE	7	27
MOUNTAIN	14	21
NORTHEASTERN	73	8
NORTHERN	1	32.3
OCMULGEE	0	36.1
OCONEE	1	32.3
OGEECHEE	8	24.3
PATAULA	8	24.3
PIEDMONT	9	23
ROME	90	6
SOUTH GEORGIA	1	32.3
SOUTHERN	20	20
SOUTHWESTERN	0	36.1
STONE MOUNTAIN	79	7
TALLAPOOSA	59	10
TIFTON	130	4
TODDMS	2	31
WAYCROSS	44	13
WESTERN	0	36.1
TOTAL	1575	
AVERAGE OF ALL CIRCUITS	37.5	
AVERAGE OF CIRCUITS WHICH USED SENIOR JUDGES	45.0	

SOURCE: GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

EXHIBIT A-VIII: RESIDENT ACTIVE ATTORNEYS: 1978-1979

CIRCUIT	1976	RANK	1979	RANK	1976-1979		RANK
					CHANGE	%	
ALAPAHA	23	41.5	28	41	5	21.7	10
ALCOVY	40	34.5	55	31	15	37.5	3
ATLANTA	3,535	1	4,353	1	818	23.1	9
ATLANTIC	42	32.5	47	33	5	11.9	29
AUGUSTA	245	6	268	6	23	9.4	35
BLUE RIDGE	66	20.5	72	22	6	9.1	36
BRUNSWICK	123	8	142	9	19	15.4	20
CHATTAHOOCHEE	228	7	244	7	16	7.0	40
CHEROKEE	51	28	58	28.5	7	13.7	23
CLAYTON	91	14	133	11	42	46.5	2
COBB	307	4	401	4	94	30.6	5
CONASAUGA	62	23	73	20.5	11	17.7	15
CORDELE	31	38	34	37.5	3	9.7	33
COWETA	118	10	127	14	9	7.6	39
DOUGHERTY	108	11.5	129	13	21	19.4	13
DUBLIN	32	37	34	37.5	2	6.3	42
EASTERN	349	3	407	3	58	16.6	17
FLINT	53	26.5	59	27	6	11.3	32
GRIFFIN	71	18	90	18	19	26.8	7
GWINNETT	83	15.5	132	12	49	59.0	1
HOUSTON	53	26.5	60	26	7	13.2	26
LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN	60	24	68	24	8	13.3	25
MACON	287	5	337	5	50	17.4	16
MIDDLE	65	22	70	23	5	7.7	38
MOUNTAIN	54	25	67	25	13	24.1	8
NORTHEASTERN	105	13	125	15	20	19.0	14
NORTHERN	44	30.5	58	28.5	14	31.8	4
OCMULGEE	66	20.5	74	20.5	8	12.1	28
OCONEE	34	36	38	36	4	11.8	30
OGEECHEE	42	32.5	46	34	4	9.5	34
PATAULA	29	39.5	33	39.5	4	13.8	22.5
PIEDMONT	29	39.5	33	39.5	4	13.8	22.5
ROME	82	17	99	16	17	20.7	11
SOUTH GEORGIA	44	30.5	49	32	5	11.4	31
SOUTHERN	108	11.5	137	10	29	26.9	6
SOUTHWESTERN	40	34.5	39	35	1	2.5	43
STONE MOUNTAIN	628	2	729	2	101	16.1	19
TALLAPOOSA	83	15.5	95	17	12	14.5	21
TIFTON	49	29	57	30	8	16.3	18
TOOMBS	23	41.5	26	42	3	13.0	27
WAYCROSS	70	19	76	19	6	8.6	37
WESTERN	122	9	147	8	2.5	20.5	12
TOTAL	7,775		9,349				

SOURCE: GEORGIA BAR ASSOCIATION DIRECTORY LISTING OF ACTIVE ATTORNEYS

EXHIBIT A-IX: JUDICIAL PERSONNEL: SUPERIOR STATE AND JUVENILE COURT  
BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1979

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	SUPERIOR	STATE		JUVENILE		
			FULL TIME	PART TIME	FULL TIME	PART TIME	REFEREE
ALAPAHA	ATKINSON						
	BERRIEN						
	CLINCH			1			
	COCK						
	LANIER						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2		1			
ALCOVY	NEWTON					1	
	WALTON					1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2				2	
ATLANTA	FULTON	11	8		2		2
ATLANTIC	BRYAN			1			
	EVANS			1			
	LIBERTY			1			
	LONG			1			
	MCINTOSH						
	TATTNALL				1		
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2		5			
AUGUSTA	BURKE			1			1
	COLUMBIA						
	RICHMOND		1				1
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	4	1	1			2
BLUE RIDGE	CHEROKEE		1/2*			1/5*	
	FANNIN					1/5*	
	FORSYTH		1/2*			1/5*	
	GILMER					1/5*	
	PICKENS					1/5*	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2	1			1	
BRUNSWICK	APPLING			1		**	
	CAMDEN					1	
	GLYNN		1			1	
	JEFF DAVIS					1	1
	WAYNE			1		1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2	1	2		4	1
CHATTAHOOCHEE	CHATTAHOOCHEE						
	HARRIS						
	MARION						
	MUSCOGEE		1			1	
	TALSOB						
	TAYLOR						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	4	1			1	
CHEROKEE	BARTOW					1	
	GORDON					1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2				2	
CLAYTON	CLAYTON	3	2		1		
COBB	COBB	4	4		1		1
CONASAUGA	MURRAY						
	WHITFIELD					1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2				1	
CORDELE	BEN HILL						
	CRISP					1	
	DOOLY						
	WILCOX						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	1				1	
COWETA	CARROLL			1		**	
	COWETA			1		**	
	HEARD						
	MERIWETHER					1	
	TROUP		1			1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2	1	2		2	

□ LAW CLERKS SERVE AS REFEREES  
+ 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 COURT  
BY CIRCUIT AND COUNTY - DECEMBER 31, 1979

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	SUPERIOR	STATE		JUVENILE		
			FULL TIME	PART TIME	FULL TIME	PART TIME	REFEREE
DOUGHERTY	DOUGHERTY	2	1	2***		1	1
DUBLIN	JOHNSON			1			
	LAURENS			1		1	
	TREUTLEN			1			
	TWIGGS						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	1	1	3		1	
EASTERN	CHATHAM	4	2		1		1
FLINT	BUTTS						
	HENRY					1	
	LAMAR						
	MONROE						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2				1	
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	1			**	
LOOKOUT MTN.	CATCOOSA					1	
	CHATTOOGA						1
	DADE					1	
	WALKER			1		1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	3		1		3	1
MACON	BISB		1			1	
	CRAWFORD						
	PEACH						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	3	1			1	
MIDDLE	CANDLER			1			1/5 □
	EMANUEL		1				1/5 □
	JEFFERSON			1			1/5 □
	TOOMBS			1			1/5 □
	WASHINGTON			1			1/5 □
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2	1	4			1
MOUNTAIN	HABERSHAM			1			
	RAEUN						
	STEPHENS			1			
	TOWNS						
	UNION						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	1		2			
NORTHEASTERN	DAWSON						
	HALL		1			1	
	LUMPKIN						
	WHITE						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2	1			1	
NORTHERN	ELBERT			1			1
	FRANKLIN						
	HART						
	MADISON						
	OGLETHORPE						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2		1			1

□ LAW CLERKS SERVE AS REFEREES  
 + 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, 1979

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	SUPERIOR	STATE		JUVENILE		
			FULL TIME	PART TIME	FULL TIME	PART TIME	REFEREE
OCMULGEE	BALDWIN			1+			
	GREENE						
	HANCOCK						
	JASPER						
	JONES						
	MORGAN						
	PUTNAM			1+			
	WILKINSON						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	3		2			
OCONEE	BLECKLEY						
	DODGE						
	MONTGOMERY						
	PULASKI						
	TELFAIR						
	WHEELER						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2					
OGEECHEE	BULLOCH			1			
	EFFINGHAM			1			
	JENKINS			1			
	SCREVEN			1			
		CIRCUIT TOTAL	2		4		
OATAULA	CLAY					1/4*	
	EARLY			1		1/4*	
	MILLER			1			
	QUITMAN					1/4*	
	RANDOLPH					1/4*	
	SEMINOLE						
	TERRELL					1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	1		2		2	
PIEDMONT	BANKS					1/2	
	BARROW					1/2	
	JACKSON			1		**	
		CIRCUIT TOTAL	1		1		1
ROME	FLOYD	2				1	1
SOUTH GEORGIA	BAKER						
	CALHOUN						
	DECATUR			1			
	GRADY			1			
	MITCHELL			1			
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2		3			
SOUTHERN	BROCKS						
	CCLQUITT			1		1	
	ECHOLS			1+			
	LOWNDES			1		1	
	THOMAS			1		1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	3		4		3	
SOUTHWESTERN	LEE						
	MACON			1			
	SCHLEY						
	STEWART						
	SUMTER			1		1	
	WEBSTER						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	1		2		1	
STONE MTN.	DEKALB			3		2	
	ROCKDALE					1	
		CIRCUIT TOTAL	7		3		2

- = LAW CLERKS SERVE AS REFEREES
- + 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, 1979

CIRCUIT	COUNTY	SUPERIOR	STATE		JUVENILE		
			FULL TIME	PART TIME	FULL TIME	PART TIME	REFEREE
TALLAPOOSA	DOUGLAS					1	1
	HARALSON						
	PAULDING						
	POLK		1			**	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	3	1			1	1
TIFTON	IRWIN						
	TIFT			1			1
	TURNER						
	WORTH			1			1
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	1		2			2
TOOMBS	GLASCOCK						
	LINCCLN						
	MCDUFFIE						
	TALIAFERRO						
	WARREN						
	WILKES						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	1					
WAYCROSS	BACON						
	BRANTLEY						
	CHARLTON						
	COFFEE			1			1
	PIERCE			1			
	WARE			1		1	
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2		3		1	1
WESTERN	CLARKE			1	1		
	OCCONEE						
	CIRCUIT TOTAL	2		1	1		
TOTAL		104	32	49	8	35	17

- LAW CLERKS SERVE AS REFEREES
- + COUNTY COURT
- \* FRACTIONS INDICATE THAT A SINGLE JUDGE SERVES MORE THAN ONE COUNTY
- \*\* STATE COURT JUDGE HEARING JUVENILE CASES
- \*\*\* JUDGES PRO HAC VICE

**END**