



The Dauphin County Courthouse at Front and Market Streets in Harrisburg combines classic proportions with contemporary details. Dedicated in 1943, it contains six floors for courts and offices and a penthouse for mechanical purposes.

At the Front Street entrance is a fountain which sends forth six streams into an elevated basin. Carved in the wall behind the pool is a quotation from Proverbs: "The law of the wise is a fountain of life." Another on the outward edge of the basin reads: "God gave the fountain of justice. Men must preserve its purity."

Surmounting the three doors on the Market Street side are three marble figures representing Wisdom, Justice and Mercy. Illustrations engraved in the 11 windows of the Law Library symbolize Hebrew Law, Maritime Law, Roman Law, Trial by Jury, the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, Common Law, Equity, Civil Law, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania Administrative Office of **Pennsylvania Courts** Alexander F. Barbieri, Court Administrator

Fiscal Office

(1980) ANNUAL REPORT 6-7-82 **ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE of PENNSYLVANIA COURTS**

NCJRS

CR Sent

NOV 1 3 1981

ACQUISITIONS

U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

81872

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material in mi-crofiche only has been granted by

<u>Charlottee S. Carson</u>

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Room 1414 Three Penn Center Plaza Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102 215-496-4500

407 City Towers 301 Chestnut Street Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101 717-787-8810

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. A

*

0

2

- 3 Table of Contents
- 4 Foreword: Chief Justice Henry X. O'Brien
- 5 Report from Alexander F. Barbieri, Court Administrator
- 6 Map of Pennsylvania's Judicial Districts
- 7 Bringing Order to the Courts
- 9 Map of Unified Judicial System
- 10 The Year in Review
- 14 Advisory Committees and Boards
- 18 How the Numbers Add Up
- 48 District Justices: Where Most Court Action Starts
- 60 Philadelphia Municipal Court
- 61 Court Finances
- 63 Pennsylvania's Judiciary
- 64 Appellate Courts
- 64 Judges of Courts of Common Pleas, Senior Judges & Philadelphia Municipal Court Judges
- 70 Philadelphia Traffic Court & Pittsburgh Magistrate Court Judges
- 71 Glossary of Terms

Figu No.		e Subject	10	21	Court of Common Pleas Case Volume: New Cases
1	20	Highest Six Common Pleas Filings	11	21	Court of Common Pleas Case Volume: Dispositions
2	20	Lowest Six Common Pleas Filings	12	21	Court of Common Pleas Case Volume: Inventory
3	26	Dispositions and Judge Days	13	22	Criminal Dispositions by Type
4	26	Filings, Dispositions,	14	22	Civil Dispositions by Type
5	26	Inventory Disposition Ratio	15	23	Inventory of Criminal Defendant Records
6	27	Days to Disposition: Civil & Criminal	16	25	by County Judges Days: Total
7	27	Days to Disposition: Juve- nile, Domestic Relations,	17	25	Dispositions Criminal Dispositions
8	28	Orphans' Court, Adoptions Common Pleas Cases: Per- cent Disposed by Trial	18	25	per Judge Day Civil Dispositions
9	49	District Justice Cases Filed	19	25	per Judge Day Disposition Time in Days
10	49	District Justice Cases Disposed	20	29 29	Caseload of Judge Filings, Dispositions & Inventories
11	58	Traffic Case Filings	21	30	Criminal & Civil Case
12	58	Traffic Case Dispositions		00	Volume by County
13	62	FY 80-81 General, Special, Federal and Other Funds	22	50	District Justice Dispositions by Category & Type of Action
			23	51	Philadelphia Traffic Court
			24	51	Pittsburgh Magistrates Court
Tabl No.		e Subject	25	51	District Justice Summary of Statewide Filings
1	15	Complaints Against Lawyers Accepted for Investigation	26	52	County Filings: Traffic Citations, Non-Traffic Citations, Summary Com-
2	15	Disciplinary Cases Against Lawyers			Plaints, Misdemeanor & Perony Complaints, Civil Complaints and Warrants
3	15	Supreme Court Disciplin- ary Orders Issued Against Lawyers	27	59	District Justice Courts: 10 Most Active Counties by
4	16	Complaints Against Judges Accepted for Investigation	28	60	Category and Case Volume Philadelphia Municipal
5	16	Disposition of Complaints Against Judges Since 1969	29	60	Court: Civil Cases Philadelphia Municipal
6	16	Inventory of Disciplinary Cases Against Judges			Court: Preliminary Hearings
7	18	Supreme Court Caseload 1976 - 80	30	60	Philadelphia Municipal Court: Trial Cases
8	18	Superior Court Caseload	31	62	Where the Money Goes
0	10	1976 - 80	32	62	Judiciary Funding
9	19	Commonwealth Court Caseload 1980	33	63	Pennsylvania Judiciary Employees

REPORT FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR

FOREWORD

I am pleased to present the report of the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts for the year 1980. Prepared by the Court Administrator of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Alexander F. Barbieri, and his able staff, the following pages provide at once a comprehensive and detailed account of the operations of the Pennsylvania judicial system.

The year 1980 saw the start of many new activities, while others were brought to a successful conclusion. This is particularly evident in the field of appellate court reform.

With the support of the Legislature and the approval of the electorate of Pennsylvania, the Superior Court was increased from seven to 15 judges. A second measure to improve the quality and efficiency of appellate court dispositions was the expansion of the jurisdiction of the Superior Court with a corresponding decrease in the areas of mandated jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. As a result, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, like the United States Supreme Court, could by its discretion accept or reject appeals in major jurisdictional areas, thereby rendering virtually final the decisions of the two intermediate appellate courts. Though they will take some time to fully implement, these changes are designed to free the Supreme Court to review, as needed, judgments in which there was uncertainty at the intermediate appellate level or a division in the court itself as to what the law in the particular instance should be. These changes will also provide the Court with the much needed time to meet its vast administrative responsibilities as head of the unified judicial system of Pennsylvania.

For these reforms, we owe a considerable debt to former Chief Justice Michael J. Eagen. His foresight and dedication helped to bring about a new era of judicial service in Pennsylvania.

The courts of this Commonwealth are steadfastly committed to advancing the interests of justice. But we must remember, it is only with the continued support of the citizens of Pennsylvania that our courts can bring existence and meaning to this fundamental ideal.

Henry X.[/]O'Brien Chief Justice of Pennsylvania

To: The Chief Justice of Pennsylvania and the Justices of the Supreme Court of PennsylvaniaRe: 1980 Annual Report

I am pleased to submit herewith, pursuant to R.J.A. 505(14), the Annual Report of the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts for the year 1980.

More than any prior year during my tenure as Court Administrator of Pennsylvania, 1980 was a year of major changes, improvements and reforms at all levels of Pennsylvania's judicial system. In the "Foreword" preceding this statement, the Chief Justice has noted the major reforms achieved with the support of the Legislature in the appellate court system. Other accomplishments in which the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC) played a significant role are detailed at length in the report that follows.

I particularly want to take this opportunity to express to the Justices of the Supreme Court my appreciation for their total support, cooperation and confidence. On my behalf and on behalf of my dedicated staff. I extend to the Judiciary and to the administrative and support personnel of all other courts. including district justice and other "grass roots" courts, our sincere thanks for their vital assistance. Without the unstinting efforts of all personnel in the many systems involved, the responsibilities of this Office could not have been met.

4

The decade of the 80's will surely be one of further changes and challenges. The litigation explosion shows some signs of abating in terms of the rapid increase in the number of cases filed. At the same time, the cases continuing to pour into the courts are more complex and time consuming than before. It is also clear that the courts will be required to increase their efficiency wherever possible, as they face the twin pressures of more work and existing or reduced financial support.

These challenges can be met, as have those in the past, by the cooperation and ingenuity of the entire judicial branch. I look forward to being part of this rewarding task. Respectfully submitted,

Alexander F. Barbieri Court Administrator of Pennsylvania



 \geq =

ELPHIA Spha

6

The Pennsylvania Constitution in 1968 created a unified court system to bring order to the law and ease the workings of justice. To direct this system and serve as a resource for those within it, the Supreme Court established the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts.

The law is with us and about us, from birth certificate to death certificate and in between: driver's license, marriage license, owning property, observing the corner traffic light, settling contractual disputes and righting wrongs,

Yet, of our government's separate executive, legislative and judicial branches, least is known about the last. This is not because of any conscious attempt to cover up. Rather, it is because of our own perceptions

that the law is complex and technical, that the pathways to justice are intricate and obscure, that the language is arcane and opaque. We see the law through a glass darkly.

But the law gives our lives structure. Within this structure, there is freedom; without it, chaos. The law preserves our individual rights and protects our communities and country. The law is dignity and majesty: it is also humanity and decency.

How well does the law work for us? To answer that question, the Pennsylvania Constitution in 1968 created a unified court system to bring order to the law and ease the workings of justice. To direct this system and serve as a resource for those within it, the Supreme Court established the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, AOPC. The AOPC has wide-ranging responsibility for a unified court system from the district justices in a small upstate community with one trial judge serving two geographically vast counties, to the 81-judge Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia, to the state's 28,000 lawyers, to the intermediate appeal courts, Commonwealth and Superior, and to the Supreme Court itself.

This report is an accounting of how that Office has served the citizens of Pennsylvania,

How the Courts Work -From Special Courts to the Courts of Common Pleas, to the Appellate Courts

Special Courts

You've been ticketed for running a red light. You say it isn't so, and you go to court to protest and get out of paying the fine.

This is the introduction most of us have to the court system. At this first level are the special courts, generally known in Pennsylvania as the District Justice Courts. In counties other than Philadelphia, district justices, formerly known as justices of the peace, preside over the special courts in Magisterial Districts. They have jurisdiction over summary criminal case like traffic offenses, over landlord-tenant matters and other civil actions with claims no higher than \$2,000. They can issue warrants as well as hold arraignments and preliminary hearings in all criminal cases.

Although district justices do not have to be lawyers, they must take a course and pass a qualifying examination before taking office. They must also take one week of continuing education each year that they stay in office. This continuing education is one of the services which the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts provides.

Separate Traffic Courts are part of the special courts in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh has six police magistrates in addition to its district justices. The Philadelphia Municipal Court is a court of record, the third largest court of record in Pennsylvania. Its 22 judges must be lawyers. They have jurisdiction over all criminal offenses punishable by a maximum five-year prison term and over civil actions where the amount claimed is no more than \$1,000.

Court of Common Pleas

You feel that you have been wronged. Your neighbor's dog, a large and largely untrained mastiff, has knocked over your trash cans, trampled your vegetable plot, imprinted his paws in your newly poured concrete sidewalk and bitten your child. You sue for damages in the amount of \$5,000.

Your case goes to the Common Pleas Court. These are the courts of general trial jurisdiction, with original jurisdiction over all cases not exclusively assigned to another court. Each of Pennsylvania's 59 judicial districts has at least one Common Pleas Court Judgc. Philadelphia, the 1st Judicial District has 81 judges. These districts coincide geographically with most of Pennsylvania's 67 counties, except in eight districts made up of two less populated counties each.

ана на наладиот на селото на наладиот на полотика, се на станците на условението станците на состорија у насед У на поседението на селото на селото на на на на на на селото на селото селото на на селото на селото на на село

Appellate Courts

You've lost your case in Common Pleas and you decide to appeal.

Pennsylvania has two levels of appellate courts. On the first or intermediate appellate level, are Commonwealth Court and the Superior Court. Above these two is the Supreme Court, the court of last resort in this State.

Commonwealth Court basically has jurisdiction over appeals involving government agencies and officials, as well as many matters involving notfor-profit corporations. It also has jurisdiction over many cases in which state officials are parties.

The Superior Court has jurisdiction over all appeals not specifically entrusted by law to another appellate court.

The Supreme Court has exclusive jurisdiction of appeals from Common Pleas courts in certain types of cases and may, in its discretion, hear any appeal from a decision of one of the intermediate appellate courts. It also may take jurisdiction over any case pending in state courts when the case is precedent-setting or involves an issue of immediate public importance. The Supreme Court decides on almost every issue of consequence to Pennsylvania's voters, aside from contests between parties, be it taxation, political apportionment, administration of public business and maintenance of ethical standards.

Let's say you lose in Commonwealth Court. You're angry enough and have money and patience enough to appeal to the Supreme Court. The Court denies cert or certiorari, its willingness to hear a case. In effect, then, the decision of the lower court stands.

Helping this system run smoothly is tl. Administrative Office of Pennsylv. ...d Courts. It recommends improvements, compiles financial and statistical data on the business of the courts, prepares educational and training materials, receives comments and complaints from the public about the system and advocates a judicial system that is just and fair and furthers the dynamics of democracy.





THE YEAR IN REVIEW

"The law must be stable, but it must not stand still." Roscoe Pound, Introduction to the *Philosophy of Law*, 1922

Two signal events in 1980 will have far-reaching effects on the administration of justice in Pennsylvania for years to come.

The first was legislation expanding the Superior Court from seven to 15 judges.

The second was the decision by the State Legislature to convert the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to certiorari.* The Court can now decide, for the most part, which cases it hears.

These management reforms should redistribute the load of the appellate courts and ease the workings of justice. Expansion of Superior Court by eight judges, from seven to 15, was preceded by a decision to allow the Court to sit in panels of three, in routine cases, rather than *en banc*, or all together. The results of these two measures are an almost five-fold increase in the capacity of the Superior Court to hear cases.

The "cert" decision allows Pennsylvania's highest court of appeals, like the United States Supreme Court, to focus its efforts on important cases that break new legal or constitutional ground.

Both changes directly affect the key question of the speed of disposition. Reduced to basics, disposition is brought about by court action or by the prospect of imminent and certain court action. It is the antithesis of "justice delayed is justice denied."

Another influence on disposition was the 240 day rule requiring that civil cases be certified as ready for trial within that period. This rule, which was actually a temporary order

*In Pennsylvania, referred to as "allowance of appeal" or "allocatur."

of the Court, was rescinded in 1981. It served an important purpose: to expedite the movement of cases.

Expansion of Superior Court by eight judges... was preceded by a decision to allow the Court to sit in panels of three... rather than en banc... The results of these two measures are an almost five-fold increase in the capacity of the Superior Court to hear cases.

Also affecting disposition was a decision declaring a portion of the Medical Malpractice Law unconstitutional. Accordingly, malpractice cases, which formerly were sent to arbitration panels, may now go to the Court of Common Pleas, unless the parties choose to use the Malpractice Act panels.

Legislation Affecting "The Law"

Acts by the Pennsylvania Legislature similarly influence the way the law affects each of us. In that respect, 1980 was a significant year for legislation, not the least of which were the aforementioned Superior Court expansion and Supreme Court "cert" ruling.

The "no-fault" Divorce Law went into effect last July. It should remove the prior perception of collusion and over-emphasis on family conflicts. Mutual assent divorce is permitted after 90 days of separation and determination that the marriage is irretrievably broken.

Counseling is mandatory in mutual assent divorces as well as those where indignities are charged. The courts may also require counseling when the couple involved has at least one child under 16. The Law provides for alimony, child support and equitable distribution of property. Alimony is limited to that time until the recipient becomes self-sufficient.

For the first time in Pennsylvania, the Legislature established court proceedings for the involuntary termination of parental rights and mandated that a child up to age 18 must have legal counsel. By making the child a legal party to the adoption proceedings, the Law pays attention to his or her needs and welfare. At the same time, any parent wishing to relinquish rights to their child must appear in court to establish the voluntary nature of this action.

Parental rights are legally terminated if the child has been abandoned for three months, or if he or she has been in a foster home for six months with no sign that the natural parent can provide adequate care in the future. The Law's intention is to end the limbo of lengthy foster care which causes uncertainty and anxiety to the child and to his natural, foster or adoptive parents.

Improving Jury Management

Another statute passed in 1980 governs jury selection, service and compensation. It aims to reduce the aimless idling affecting many jurors and disaffecting their enthusiasm for the jury system while they wait to be called to hear a case. The act applies to all counties except Philadelphia and home rule counties, which have already adopted or adapted it.

Under the statute, a master list of prospective jurors must be compiled at least annually from the voter registration lists. Disqualified persons are those illiterate in English and those with a mental or physical infirmity or a criminal conviction. Qualified persons are exempt if they are serving in the military or have served on a jury within the last year. Jury fees are nine dollars a day for the first three days and \$25 a day thereafter, with mileage reimbursement at 17 cents a mile. By providing reimbursement at 80% after the third day if the juror is participating in a trial, the Law offers monetary incentive to put the juror's time to use immediately.

To save money and cut juror inconvenience, many counties began on their own a one-day, one-trial system. Under it, a juror not called to a panel the first day is dismissed instead of sitting around the courthouse for up to two weeks. To cite just two examples in 1980, Montgomery County saved \$64,140 and Allegheny county saved \$252,195 in juror fees and mileage.

The "Foreign Juries" Law, also known as the "Change of Venire" Law, allows juries in criminal cases to be selected in a "foreign county" to hear the case in the county in which the offense charged took place. The costs involved are less than those with "change of venue" when a new location for a trial had to be found; not only juries, but witnesses, counsel and judges had to move also.

Act 1980-106 created a total of 14 additional judgeships for the Courts of Common Pleas in Bucks, Butler, Chester, Erie, Lebanon, Lehigh, Lycoming, Mercer, Monroe-Pike, Montgomery, Westmoreland, York and two for Delaware County. Like the expansion in Superior Court, expansion in the trial courts is based on the expectation that more judges can hear more cases; and thus cases will move more quickly to disposition.

More Hearings, Fewer Trials

As Administrator for the Pennsylvania Courts, Judge Alexander F. Barbieri invited District Court Administrators to let him know what they thought were significant improvements in their trial court administration during 1980. Here is some of what they reported:

Cambria County has found that 90% of custody complaints are settled by the officer at a hearing set by the local court administrator. These settlements are approved by a judge. Adams County has similar preliminary custody conferences and Clinton County has tightened its pre-

10

trial conference procedures. In addition to settling many cases outside the courtroom, this extra step enables the court to schedule custody hearings more quickly and economically.

The sharing of ideas means counties learn from each other. Bedford County has adopted a central magistrate's court plan similar to one in Centre County. Preliminary hearings are held at a central location one day a week, and a different district justice presides each week. The hearings are scheduled routinely at the time of preliminary arraignment. As a result, many cases are disposed of at the magisterial level and do not have to go to the Common Pleas Court. The new system also keeps minor complaints out of the county court and allows more time for serious cases.

Tioga County requires all criminal defendants to appear for court arraignment. The benefits have been a shorter time lapse from the filing of complaint to arraignment, increased control of cases, fewer bench warrants for failure to appear, and more cases achieving early adjudication.

Lackawanna County started scheduling one week a month for arbitration in 1980. Two panels of arbitrators hear about six cases each and receive \$150 daily. The results have been a 73% disposition rate and a savings of about \$20 on each case, despite the increase of \$100 a day for the arbitrators.

Allegheny County has created a new Children's Room where mothers awaiting disposition of their support, custody or divorce cases can get trained supervision for their children. The service costs nothing to either the parents or taxpayers and is staffed by adult volunteers. A number of counties reported a variety of improved jury management systems. Clarion, for example, abolished its Grand Jury and now calls one panel of jurors every other month for both criminal and civil juries. It often starts court at 7:30 A.M. when doing so can try a case in one day.

Delaware County implemented an Individual Calendaring system which immediately assigns a case to a judge; the case remains with that judge until trial or settlement. The system involves mandatory pre-trial conferences, close judicial supervision and accurate, timely and continuous monitoring. Philadelphia increased the judges assigned to its Individual Calendaring program from six to 10 and the cases heard from 60 to 100.

Other instances of improved jury management like automated questionnaires and summons forms, jury orientation and jurors' evaluation of one day-one trial jury service were reported by Bucks, Indiana, Lebanon, Mercer, Monroe, Schuylkill and Washington Counties.

Word processing equipment has made a significant impact on court operations. Through it, the Harrisburg and Philadelphia offices of Commonwealth Court can achieve instant communication and transmission of documents; decisions can be filed more quickly as typing time is reduced. This equipment, selected for all the appellate courts, has quickened the preparation and circulation of opinions.

Allegheny County established a computerized Collecting and Disbursing Office in the Family Division to handle more than \$25 million a year in support checks. One of the County's more creative programs was a new Children's Room where mothers awaiting disposition of their support, custody or divorce cases can get trained supervision for their children. The service costs nothing to either the parents or the taxpayers and is staffed by adult volunteers weekdays from 9 A.M. to noon. The objective is to extend the hours to meet the full schedule of the court.

Year in Review (cont'd)

Additional space has increased the courtrooms available for trials from six to nine in Westmoreland County. More space has made possible better access to records in Snyder and Fayette counties.

In Philadelphia a new Housing Court gave residents a better forum for handling housing problems, and a new Tax Court collected more than \$5 million in delinquent taxes. The County's Common Pleas Court established a dismissal program that cleared several hundred inactive cases from its docket. This program will remove one thousand cases a week until the docket is completely cleared. This, combined with automation, should end manual docketing within the next 18 months.

In Lycoming County, a weekend retreat involved the court, county commissioners, other elected officials, and key appointed officials. Its purpose: to broaden the understanding each has of the others' responsibilities and problems.

Luzerne County scheduled regular meetings between county judges and lawyers to exchange views and ideas and to improve the trial system.

Throughout the Commonwealth, efforts continued - some new, some modified, all intensified - to improve the administration of justice.

Technological Advances

No account of management improvements can fail to include advances in technology - word processing, data processing, automation - which facilitate the flow of work. Courts are finding increasing use and applicability of space-age systems, now considered essential in court management rather than mysterious and esoteric.

The AOPC gathers and disseminates much of the systematic and comprehensive centralized information basic to an efficient trial court system.

For instance, the Offender Based Tracking System, OBTS, will, when fully operational, identify and follow a defendant through the judicial system from first entry to final disposition. The Docket Transcript Unit of Planning and Development provides timely information necessary for making informed decisions. Some examples: it can submit figures to the Statistical Analysis Center in Harrisburg, let the Pennsylvania State Police know the outcome of criminal cases or analyze computer data for court management, case flow and budget purposes.

A Law Enforcement Assistance Act (LEAA) grant from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency afforded an increase in the coding and processing staff. For the first time, the AOPC was able to keep current with the inflow of forms.

The docket transcript form itself was redesigned and reduced in size. Other changes incorporated suggestions from various agencies. This Office offered an extensive series of training programs on use of the new technology to district justices, staffs and clerks of court.

Developing Cooperation, Programs, Procedures

To improve the quality and timeliness of docket transcript data, AOPC established a close working relationship with representatives of other statewide criminal justice agencies. Liaison is maintained to a number of court or justice-related groups, such as the Committee to Study Pennsylvania's Unified Court System known as the "Pomeroy Task Force," the Joint Family Law Council, the Governor's Council on Drug and Alcohol Abuse, and the National Center for State Courts' Metropolitan Court Delay Study.

Local courts were supplied with specifications for placing data on computer tape. The Planning and Development Department also proposed changes in court rules and procedures to speed completion of the reports or to improve the criminal justice information system throughout the Commonwealth.

In addition to processing statistics for various reports, the Planning and Development Department prepared a number of special studies during 1980.

These included: Analysis of judges' responses to the March 20, 1980 Order of the Supreme Court requiring a report of pending cases;

Study of local court filing fee revenues; Estimate of time-to trial in various counties based on reported intake and disposition.

Outside funding helps planning efforts which are directed toward program innovation and experimentation. During 1980, several major LEAA grants were developed, along with comprehensive rules for court reporters and new procedures for the statewide civil case tracking system.

This Department also reviewed more than a dozen local court programs and helped them find solutions to the persistent problems of case flow, records management, follow-up of records on appeal and destruction of old records to create new space.

Suits Against Judges

The "litigation explosion" all around us includes suits for monetary damages and prospective relief against judges as a result of actions they took in the performance of their official duties. In such situations, the Administrative Office provides them with legal counsel.

In 1980, the AOPC's Legal Department represented judges and other employees of the judicial system in 154 legal proceedings. This was an increase of 34% over 1979. There was a slight drop in the number of *pro se* filings by plaintiffs without benefit of counsel. These were primarily civil rights actions seeking various forms of relief. *Pro se* lawsuits were generally directed against judges challenging alleged errors occurring during legal proceedings or due to dissatisfaction with the result of the proceedings.

The complaints by counsel typically involved complex constitutional issues and sought some form of equitable remedy such as injunctive or declaratory relief. The majority of trial litigation was in the federal system.

On the appellate court level, fully half of the activity involved actions for mandamus and prohibition. The remaining portion of cases involved appeals from the trial level and they were split evenly between the State Appellate Courts and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, with some litigation in the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judicial Education

The high priority this Office places on judicial educational services results from our recognition that continuing education improves both the quality and efficiency of justice. Funding for these programs came, in part, from a grant by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

AOPC conducted 11 educational programs in 1980, including: Orientation Seminar for freshmen judges; Semi-Annual and Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trials Judges: Domestic Relations Training Program; Superior Court Seminar; Two seminars on court administration; Juvenile Court Training Program; President Judges/District Court Administrators Conference; Superior Court Orientation for the new judges of that recently enlarged court.

AOPC's monthly newsletter, the *Pennsylvania Judiciary News*, also provides pertinent information about case law, rules changes, administrative directives, legislation and other new relevant to the judicial system. About 1,850 people and agencies receive each issue.

Internal Management: Saving Time and Money

Money spent in 1980 for data processing is an investment in more efficient management of trial cases and hearings with improved accountability and accuracy.

Automation of the Superior Court docket system was a major breakthrough. It will reduce the heavy case backlog of this appellate court. With computerization of the Docket Transcript Program, more than 200,000 district justice records will be available in a compact, quickly retrievable form.

ي يوني بالموجود

Internal Management is also concerned with providing an environment in which people can work more effectively. The five-year lease of 51,307 square feet in the old U.S. Courthouse in Philadelphia relieves the overcrowding and uncertainty of location for the many panel hearings before judges of the Superior and Commonwealth Courts. Philadelphia has thus provided these courts, for the first time in history, with their own space, judicial chambers and a law library equipped with computer terminals for nationwide legal research.

Such practical improvements as renovations and refurbishings have meant tremendous differences in how people work, where records are stored and what information is easily available. The bricks and mortar of the judicial system cannot be separated from the people who run it.

Other 1980 achievements of this Department:

Supervision of a federally funded contract with Pennsylvania State University to survey each county courthouse in the State, develop guidelines and criteria for court facilities and establish blueprints for each.

Newly developed guidelines for appellate court judges for space, furniture, equipment and staff.

An inventory of statewide judicial property out of which new judges can be supplied with furniture and equipment whenever a vacancy on the courts occurs.

Reimbursement totaling \$24 million to the 67 counties for their county court costs and for some of their appellate court expenditures. This program, begun in 1971, has been funded by the State.

Such practical improvements as renovations and refurbishings have meant tremendous differences in how people work, where records are stored and what information is easily available. The bricks and mortar of the judicial system cannot be separated from the people who run it.

Department of Administrative Services: Improving Fiscal Management

Improved fiscal management to save taxpayers' money is one of the primary missions of the Department of Administrative Services.

Modern word processing equipment was selected for the appellate courts to facilitate the preparation and circulation of opinions.

In 1980, this Department of the AOPC developed uniform procedures to implement the Jury Reform Act. It also gave administrative support to the newly expanded Superior Court in its use of three-judge panels to equalize the workload and give each judge an opportunity to work with every other judge on the Superior Court.

A judiciary personnel classification and compensation system set up job classifications and pay grades, including documented salary increments for all appellate court and AOPC employees to insure equitable and adequate compensation for performance. In addition, the Supreme Court approved the Judiciary Personnel Policies for appellate court employees in regard to appointments, classification, salary administration, leave administration, conduct and performance evaluations. A Judiciary Travel Policy was approved and implemented for all employees other than judges.

Major progress came in setting up computerized, uniform accounting standards in accordance with general accounting principles to document all expenditures made by state-paid personnel. A comprehensive review of accounting practices was begun to improve the purchasing, payment and accounting process.

These accounting standards were also extended to the management of grants so that a clearly defined audit trail could be marked for all federal monies recieved from LEAA.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

The expertise of judges and practicing lawyers is brought to the Court each year through various advisory committees. They bring recommendations from sources in the bench and bar that suggest improvements in procedures. Thus, they are a major assistance to the Supreme Court in meeting its constitutional responsibilities in the procedural areas of Pennsylvania's judiciary system.

Changes originating in the Supreme Court are, for the most part, passed through appropriate committees before promulgation by the Court. Proposals for new rules and changes in existing rules are generally published in preliminary form to afford the widest opportunities for comment and criticism.

Among the advisory entities is the Judicial Council whose members look at the judicial system as a whole. The Council can act on matters referred to it by the Supreme Court, or it can originate recommendations to the Court.

In 1980, its 22 members were Chief Justice Henry X. O'Brien, Chairman, who succeeded former Chief Justice Michael J. Eagen; Justices Samuel J. Roberts and Robert N. C. Nix, Jr., of the Supreme Court, and the Honorable Alexander F. Barbieri, Court Administrator.

Other members were President Judges: William F. Cercone, Superior Court: James C. Crumlish, Commonwealth Court; Edward J. Bradley, Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; Michael J. O'Malley, Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas; Charles P. Mirarchi, President, Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges; State Senator Edward P. Zemprelli; State Representative William D. Hutchinson; Common Pleas Judges Joseph F. O'Kicki, Edwin M. Kosik and Edwin L. Snyder: District Justice Richard Reeser, Practicing Attorneys James A. Strazzella, Philip W. Amram, Frederica Massiah-Jackson, Lewis H.

14

Van Dusen; non-lawyer electors: Glen Y. Forney, President Security Bank and Trust Co., Stroudsburg; Arthur W. Thomas, President, Philadelphia Board of Education; Sister M. Lawreace Antoun, S.S.J., President, Villa Maria College, Erie.

The Lawyers' Disciplinary Board

For the first time since its creation in 1972, two non-lawyers were appointed to the Disciplinary Board, which hears complaints against lawyers. Expanding the Board from 11 to 13 members are Nancy Neuman, former president, Pennsylvania League of Women Voters and chairman of the Federal Judiciary Nominations Committee, and Dr. Winfield Keck, chairman of the Physics Department, Lafayette College. Both were appointed by former Chief Justice Michael J. Eagen.

Other members, all lawyers, are Charles V. Henry, III, Chairman; John C. Anderson, Vice Chairman; Robert C. Daniels, John M. Elliott, May Bell Hammerman, Dennis C. Harrington, Herbert J. Johnson, Jr., Sidney L. Krawitz, Frank J. McDonnell, Raymond Pearlstine, Pasco L. Shiavo.

The number of complaints received during 1980 increased over the previous year, to continue a trend during the past decade. The 2,079 resolved .omplaints were 72 more than the previous year. An average of 173 complaints is filed monthly. The increasing activity is in part because of the larger number of attorneys now registered to practice — 28,816 on December 31, 1980, compared to 27,910 the previous year — and to increasing public awareness of the Disciplinary Board.

During the past year 2,021 complaints, 52 more than the previous year, were disposed of; however, there was a net increase of 58 complaints received over matters terminated. This

left 802 active complaints at the start of 1981.

The increasing activity is in part because of the larger number of attorneys now registered to practice - 28,816 on December 31, 1980 - and to increasing public awareness of the Disciplinary Board.

In 1980, discipline was imposed in 124 cases. This figure does not include 10 interim suspensions of various types. In addition, 11 petitions for reinstatement were acted upon. Three matters were dismissed after hearing and review by the Board.

Since 1973, the workload has increased because of the number of attorneys who have applied for reinstatement after being inactive more than three years (the application of this rule had been waived by the Supreme Court until November 1, 1979), and because periods of suspension for attorneys disciplined in previous years have run their course.

Table 1

Complaints Against Lawyers Accepted for Investigation in 1980

1. Conduct which brings office into disrepute and prejudices administration of justice

2. Failure to comply with procedures and rule

3. Failure to perform professional duties

4. Political activity

5. Conflict of interest

6. Procedural conduct during trial

7. Willful misconduct

8. Mental or physical disability

9. Pending criminal proceedings

Table 2 **Disciplinary Cases**

Disciplinary Cases: 1. Informal Admonition

2. Suspensions

3. Disbarments

4. Private Reprimand

5. Public Censure

6. Probation

Total of Disciplinary Actions

Reinstatement Cases: 1. Petitions for Reinstatement Granted

2. Petitions for Reinstatement Denied

*This figure does not include interim suspensions of various types

	Judge	District Justice
	24	23
es	9	20
	12	8
	5	4
	4	1
	2	2
	0	4
	0	1
	1	0

Table 3 Supreme Court Disciplinary Orders **Issued Against Lawyers in 1980***

1.	Orders on Misc. Petitions-Rules	29
2.	Suspensions	22
3.	Disbarments with Consent	10
4.	Disbarments	3
5.	Public Censure	3
6.	Placed on Inactive Status	2
7.	Reinstatements	2
		71
Th	ree of above argued and	
Op	pinions filed	3

*Complaints not handled by the Disciplinary Board went to the Surteme Court.

Calendar	Years				Cumulative
1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	Total
81	96	102	121	98	448
8	10	13	17	8*	56
5	13	6	12	12	48
9	7	14	5	5	40
8	10	7	6	1	32
0	2	1	0	0	3
111	138	143	161	124	647
3	3	4	2	6	18
0	0	3	1	5	9

Judicial Inquiry and Review Board

Hon. William F. Cercone, Chairman; Hon. Robert Van der Voort, Vice Chairman; Lois W. Barnum, Hon. William E. Breene, Hon. James R. Cavanaugh, Hon. Henry R. Smith, Jr.; and these attorneys: G. Thomas Miller, Robert B. Surrick; Richard E. McDevitt, Executive Director.

The Judicial Inquiry and Review Board, which was created in 1968, hears complaints against judges. During its initial years, the volume of complaints increased steadily to a total of 379 received in 1979. That volume has leveled off. In 1980, 328 complaints were received.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has a total of 969 judges and justices. Since 1969 the overall dispositions are as follows:

Table 4 Complaints Against Judges Accepted for Investigation in 1980

1. Litigants	28
2. Public Official	21
3. Referrals from Court	
Administrator	18
4. Judges	16
5. Attorneys	15
6. Anonymous	7
7. News Media	7
8. Board Initiated	6
9. Citizens Groups	2

Table 5Disposition of Complaints Against Judges Since 1969*

	Judge	District Justice
1. Board admonition or warning	48	126
2. Resignations while proceedings pending	7	45
3. Interim suspensions	1	39
4. Term expired while proceedings pending	2	26
5. Suspensions	1	15
6. Censured by Supreme Court order	4	11
7. Removals	2	12
8. Retired while proceedings pending	2	4

*The Judicial Inquiry and Review Board issued 14 orders against judges in 1980.

Table 6

Inventory of Disciplinary Cases Against Judges 1/1/80 – 12/31/80

	Non Judicial	Judge	District Justice	Tota
Cases Pending 1/1/80	4	13	36	53
Complaints Received in 1980	25	190	113	328
Total Case Lead in 1980	29	203	149	381
Dispositions in 1980				
Rejected as Frivolous or Unfounded	6	71	32	109
Rejected as Cause for Appeal		47	14	61
Rejected as Not Within Board's Jurisdiction Investigated and Dismissed	23	7	3	33
(No Evidence of Misconduct) Closed during investigation with Reprimand,		31	41	72
Admonition or by Compliance		8	24	32
Closed as Moot (office declared vacant)		-	2	2
Resigned during investigation			1	
Died during investigation			1	1
Disposition by Supreme Court of Board's Reports and Recommendations Office declared vacant (Term expired during appeal process upon conviction of crime) Suspended for 90 days and ordered to make restitution to the Commonwealth of \$500. Office declared vacant (Candidate for non- judicial office) Removed from office upon conviction of crime		1	1 1 1 3]] 2
Miscellaneous Reinstated after criminal charges were dismissed			1]
Total Dispositions Pending 12/31/80	29	165 38	125 24	319 62

Juvenile Court Judges' Commission

Hon. Fred P. Anthony, Chairman; Hon. Isaac S. Garb, Vice Chairman; Hon. Albert E. Acker, Hon. Maxwell E. Davison, Hon. W. Richard Eshelman, Hon. Doris M. Harris, Hon. Edmund V. Ludwig, Hon. Stanton Wettick, Jr., Hon. Robert L. Wolfe; Dr. Ronald Sharp, Executive Director.

This agency operates independently of the Unified Judicial System; its members are nominated by the Chief Justice and appointed by the Governor. The Commission's interests are in juvenile affairs. It seeks to provide training for juvenile probation officers and consultation with juvenile court judges. In 1980, it published a handbook, a directory of juvenile agencies and a newsletter.

Civil Procedural Rules Committee

Philip W. Amram, Esq., Chairman; John A. Metz, Jr., Vice Chairman; Hon. Albert E. Acker, Hon. Ruggero J. Aldisert, Consultant to the Committee; Hon. Madaline Palladino, Hon. Dale F. Shugart, and these attorneys: Edward J. Balzarini, William H. Eckert, John G. Gent, Richard L. Grossman, Richard Henry Klein, Morton Myers, Rod J. Pera, David S. Shrager, C. H. Welles, and Sidney Schulman, Executive Director; Harold K. Don, Jr., Staff Attorney.

The Committee held 10 two-day meetings during 1980, three in Pittsburgh and all others in Philadelphia. In addition, there were numerous subcommittee meetings on divorce, support, custody and partition of personal property.

Two new attorneys were added to the Committee for three-year terms beginning July 1, 1980: James J. Flaherty, of Pittsburgh, and David Pittinsky, of Philadelphia. Their appointments increased Committee membership to 21.

Several significant amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure were promulgated or became effective during 1980. Rule 2180, governing service upon corporations and similar entities, was amended by the addition of new subdivision (d), effective January 5, 1980. The amendment added a catchall provision where service cannot be made under the other provisions of the rule.

Rule 4003.4 was amended to clarify the right of discovery of a statement of another party. Rule 4024 was promulgated to make the 1978 amendments to the discovery rules applicable to pending actions.

New rule 237.1 became effective February 1, 1980, providing for notification of intention to enter a default judgment. This rule was suggested by the Superior Court to stem the tide of appeals on judgment.

New Rules 1601 to 1604, governing declaratory judgments, became effective February 1, 1980. These rules filled the void created by the repeal of the Judiciary Act Repealer Act, JARA.

Criminal Procedural Rules Committee

Professor James Strazzella, Chairman; Hon. Robert I. Shadle, Vice Chairman, Hon. G. Thomas Gates, Hon. Thomas D. Gladden, and these attorneys: Robert L. Eberhardt, A. Richard Gerber, Benjamin Lerner, Edward G. Rendell, Nicholas Sellers.

The Criminal Procedural Rules Committee continued in 1980 to advise the Supreme Court on its mandate to prescribe rules governing criminal practice and procedure throughout the Commonwealth. The Committee made a variety of recommendations to the Court about criminal procedural rule revisions and undertook general studies of areas of criminal procedure that may need future revision. It also communicated with individuals and groups connected with the criminal justice system.

As is typical each year, the Committee considered and rejected, as unnecessary, impractical or unwise, a large array of suggested rule changes.

The Committee met approximately every six weeks in 1980 for two to three days. At each meeting, its members considered a detailed agenda, extensively researched by staff and circulated in advance. Many of the 1980 agenda matters were necessitated by JARA, which became effective in 1978 to further unification and repeal unnecessary or contradictory statutes. Several agenda matters came to the Committee's attention through insights of members, referrals by other Court agencies, and communications from members of the bench and bar. As always, the Committee invited and received a steady flow of communication articulating difficulties with the rules and suggesting revisions.

New Rules of Criminal Procedure and Amendments to Existing Rules

Upon the Committee's recommendations, the Supreme Court in 1980 adopted several new Rules of Criminal Procedure and amended numerous others. The new rules and rule amendments were published in the *Pennsylvania Bulletin* before final recommendation to the Court.

HOW THE NUMBERS ADD UP

Statistics are a fundamental and necessary part of our everyday lives. We just call them by more familiar names like temperature, grocery bills, salary or baseball scores.

In fact, anything that can be measured or counted is a statistic. Viewed in these terms, statistics are not as confusing or awe-inspiring as some people might have you imagine. Used wisely, they improve

administration, cut costs, increase profits, compare past performances and identify trouble areas.

Such is the case with this Annual Report. Its purpose is to organize, tabulate, analyze, and present statistics in a meaningful fashion. This is no mean feat considering that the data collected by the AOPC are of a general nature.

Here is information received from the counties in aggregate form; yet, with the proper analytical or "massaging" technique, it is returned to them as descriptive, essential and accurate. The figures viewed as a whole provide a comprehensive picture of the judicial district's workload. The picture is not exhaustive, but comparisons between county lines and within county limits are made possible.

Table 7

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania Caseload 1976 - 1980

Year	No. Appeals Filed	No. Days Court Heard Cases	No. Cases Argued	No. Cases Submitted	No. Cases Opinions Filed	Misc. Petitions	Petitions For Allocatur	Allocatur Petitions Granted
1976	830	39	307	117	583	1,195	906	178
1977	823	34	283	96	740	1,090	844	118
1978	818	39	292	110	958	1,262	1,126	155
1979	798	45	334	117	659	1,375	1,052	215
1980	758	40	357	153	667	1,311	1,016	147

Table 8

Superior Court of Pennsylvania Caseload 1976 - 1980

Year	No. Appeals Filed	No. Days Court Heard Cases	No. Petitions Filed (Incl. Misc. Docket)	No. Cases Oral Argument	No. Cases Submitted on Briefs	No. Cases Opinions Filed
1976	3,631	41	6,223	922	1,130	1,596
1977	3,700	42	5,682	941	874	1,550
1978	4,495	36	4,074	1,037	970	2,416
1979	4,047	40	3,548	1,178	1,060	2,604
1980	4,523	37	3,718	1,226	968	1,750

Table 9 Commonwealth Court Caseload - 1980 I. Appeals Filed A. By Notice of Appeal B. By Petition for Review C. By Transfer from other Courts¹ Subtotal Filed II. Appeals Disposed1 A. By Opinion of Court or Panel B. By Remand or Transfer C. Withdrawn or Dismissed D. Consolidation with other Appeals E. By Stipulation Subtotal Disposed III. Appeals Argued/Submitted1 A. Argued before Court en banc B. Argued before Panel C. Submitted on Briefs Subtotal: Appeals Argued IV. Other Business A. Original Jurisdiction Cases B. Combined Original and Appellate C. Miscellaneous Docket D. Petitions, Motions and Applicatio E. Trials and Evidentiary Hearings2 V. Number of Judge Days in Formal Sess A. Hearing Argument of Appeals¹ B. Hearing Original Cases³ C. Conference on Appeals4 1. This figure includes both original and appellate matters, 2. In many instances, these trials and evidentiary hearings involve several days of testimony. 3. This also includes ancillary matters in appellate cases. 4. It is the Court's practice to have conferences after arguments are completed. Thus, this figure represents partial days.

	1,004 1,884 78 2,966
İs	1,029 248 1,052 138 234 2,701
d or Submitted	121 821 50 992
e Cases ons	354 14 192 2,565 269
ssions	284 169 284

COURTS OF COMMON PLEAS

If it is true that art imitates life, Common Pleas Court has to be a rich vein for source material. Here is where the difficult decisions are made: how an inheritance will be divided, who gets custody of the child, and will the 12-year-old accused of arson be reprimanded, referred to a child welfare agency or detained in a maximum security facility. Here such human emotions as rage, frustration and vindictiveness vie with such human frailities as vanity, greed and covetousness. It would sound melodramatic if it were not real life. One necessary purpose of the judiciary is that cooler heads and calmer hearts will prevail, that an uninvolved third party can create some semblance of fairness and justice.

To go from feelings to facts requires a shifting of mental gears, but the facts allow for the dispassionate decisions essential to justice. The facts outlined in the next several pages show how each county has handled the large volume of criminal and civil cases through its Common Pleas Court. For example, Table 10, Figures 1 and 2 show us that in the five years from 1976 though 1980, civil cases increased by 18,000; arbitration by 9,000; juvenile by 6,000, and domestic relations by 31,000. Custody cases were up by 4,000, mental health hearings up 3,000, and miscellaneous up 8,000. All other case volumes were down or steady. (Table 10, Figures 1 and 2)

Figure 1 Highest Six Common Pleas Filings as a Percentage of Total



Figure 2 Lowest Six Common Pleas Filings as a Percentage of Total



Judicial Case Volume, 1976 - 1980

COURTS OF COMMON PLEAS Table 10 New Cases

	Civil	Arbitration	Divorce	Juvenile	Domestic Relations	Orphans' Court	Post Conviction	Custody	Mental Health	Adoptions	Misc.	Totals
68,227	21,127	29,544	ه 2,339	37,084	51,496	20,075	970	3,831	6,628	6,760	7,105	292,186
63,045	21,307	27,988	39,953	35,614	50,885	19,375	846	4,915	8,741	7,072	9,167	288,878
60,331	20,279	26,316	41,784	37,365	56,151	19,616	844	6,386	9,025	6,549	11,387	296,033
60,335	22,472	28,342	41,132	39,685	63,416	19,787	864	7,510	7,914	6,346	12,566	310,369
65,782	39,272	38,531	35,250	43,350	82,794	19,574	916	7,927	9,384	6,255	15,271	364,306
	63,045 60,331 60,335	63,045 21,307 60,331 20,279 60,335 22,472	63,045 21,307 27,988 60,331 20,279 26,316 60,335 22,472 28,342	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 50,885 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 56,151 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685 63,416	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 50,885 19,375 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 56,151 19,616 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685 63,416 19,787	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 50,885 19,375 846 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 56,151 19,616 844 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685 63,416 19,787 864	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 50,885 19,375 846 4,915 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 56,151 19,616 844 6,386 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685 63,416 19,787 864 7,510	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 50,885 19,375 846 4,915 8,741 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 56,151 19,616 844 6,386 9,025 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685 63,416 19,787 864 7,510 7,914	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 50,885 19,375 846 4,915 8,741 7,072 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 56,151 19,616 844 6,386 9,025 6,549 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685 63,416 19,787 864 7,510 7,914 6,346	63,045 21,307 27,988 39,953 35,614 50,885 19,375 846 4,915 8,741 7,072 9,167 60,331 20,279 26,316 41,784 37,365 56,151 19,616 844 6,386 9,025 6,549 11,387 60,335 22,472 28,342 41,132 39,685 63,416 19,787 864 7,510 7,914 6,346 12,566

Table 11 Dispositions

	Criminal	Civil	Arbitration	Divorce	Juvenile	Domestic Relations		Post Conviction	Custody	Mental Health	Adoptions	Misc.	Totals
1976	66,408	20,652	28,634	38,878	38,145	51,551	20,118	838	3,751	6,706	6,770	7,097	289,548
1977	58,606	20,987	28,177	40,183	34,201	50,124	19,650	743	4,619	8,639	7,054	8,528	281,511
1978	54,343	19,921	28,395	39,797	37,750	54,909	19,551	623	6,137	8,792	6,283	10,706	287,207
1979	53,751	21,447	26,793	41,321	38,943	58,075	19,723	647	7,223	8,024	6,296	12,474	294,717
1980	54,982	24,595	29,246	34,426	43,079	75,838	19,702	884	7,399	9,896	6,139	14,740	320,926

Table 12 Inventory

	Criminal	Civil	Arbitration	Divorce	Juvenile	Domestic Relations		Post Conviction	Custody	Mental Health	Adoptions	Misc.	Totals
1976	23,038	17,178	16,182	16,091	4,859	6,854	1,676	539	662	228	846	1,487	89,640
1977	23,511	21,074	15,993	15,861	6,272	7,585	1,401	642	958	330	864	2,126	96,617
1978	25,339	21,432	13,914	17,848	5,887	8,827	1,466	863	1,207	597	1,128	2,807	101,315
1979	27,885	21,736	15,463	17,329	6,552	13,716	1,469	1,080	1,346	300	1,241	2,873	110,990
1980	31,953	39,631	25,377	19,221	6,888	21,145	1,449	1,137	1,969	107	1,546	3,758	155,461

For the first time in the five ye_{ir} 's shown in Table 10, criminal case dispositions increased by about 1,200 cases from 1979 to 1980. This was not enough, however, to offset the 5,400 case increase in filings. As a result, inventory rose.

Dispositions Reach Record High

This was the year that saw the largest volume of new cases filed in the Courts of Common Pleas: approximately 364,000, or a 17% increase over 1979. The reasons were a 75% jump in civil cases - 17,000 more than last year - and a 30% rise in domestic relations cases. Only divorce filings decreased to any significant degree. (Table 10)

Dispositions also reached their highest level: nearly 321,000. Here domestic relations cases showed a 30% growth, but divorce dispositions were down to their lowest levels in six years.(Table 11)

Inventory is what remains after dispositions have reduced the total of both pending and newly filed cases:

Table 13 Criminal Dispositions By Type

Pendings beginning '80 + Filings -Dispositions = Pendings End '80

Inventory grew 40% by 155,000 cases, mainly because of an 85% spurt in civil caseload inventory over 1979. Other notable inventory increases were: domestic relations, 54%; arbitration 40%, and criminal, 19%. Inventory also reached an all-time high in 10 of the 12 Common Pleas catagories. (Table 12)

Significant increases in about half of the State's 59 judicial districts in 1980 caused the highest recorded criminal inventory since reporting began, with 31,953 criminal cases pending throughout the state. This is a 14.5% increase (4,068 cases) over 1979, and the fourth consecutive year that inventory has risen.

Criminal Dispositions by Type 1976 - 1980

Table 13 shows a significant rise in guilty pleas. Cases dismissed through the 180-day rule dropped to .4% of total dispositions, the first significant reduction in three years.

Inventory is what remains after dispositions have reduced the total of both pending and newly filed cases: Pendings Beginning '80 + Filings - Dispositions = Pendings End '80

	Guilty Plea	Trial by Jury	Jury Waived	Nol Pros	A.R.D. (Accelerated Rehabilatative Disposition)	Grand Jury*	Rule 1100**	Disposition in Lieu of Trial	Other	Totals
1976	29,811	3,272	7,071	10,090	10,834	1,249	784	232	3,065	66,408
1977	26,783	3,127	6,143	8,873	10,553	379	441	161	2,146	58,606
1978	23,477	3,055	4,850	8,594	10,062	355	410	105	3,435	54,343
1979	24,006	2,726	4,647	7,373	10,406	359	424	112	3,698	53,751
1980	26,130	2,781	4,936	7,249	10,935	202	304	194	2,251	54,982
Change 1979-80	8.84%	2.01%	6.21%	-1.68%	5.08%	-43.73%	-28.3%	73.21%	-39.12%	2.29%

*Only Bedford, Lackawanna and Wayne Counties use indicting grand juries.

**Rule 1100, or the 180-day Rule, states that from filing of complaint to start of criminal trial, no more than 180 days shall elapse. It flows from the 5th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees a defendant in criminal proceedings the right to a speedy trial.

Civil Dispositions by Type 1976 - 1980

dispositions, it could not offset the rise in filings, a probable result of the 240-day rule requiring all civil cases to be certified for trial within that time. The result was an 85% rise in inventory. The only major change in types of civil dispositions was a 39% increase in settlements after hearings over 1979. They continue to account for the largest portion of civil dispositions, 43%. (Table 14)

Although this was the second straight year of an increase in civil

Table 14Civil Dispositions By Type

	Non-Jury	Jury Verdict	Hearing Settled	Settlement	Stricken	Trans. to Arbitration	Other	Totals
1976	3,807	1,952	1,515	9,156	1,482	1,482	1,733	20,652
1977	3,336	1,839	2,735	7,984	703	1,369	3,021	20,987
1978	3,717	1,898	1,818	9,669	794	1,105	920	19,921
1979	4,183	1,695	2,879	9,284	1,322	923	1,161	21,447
1980	4,412	1,775	4,007	10,637	1,512	1,173	1,079	24,595
% Change 1979-80	5.47%	4.71%	39.18%	14.57%	14.37%	27.08%	-7.06%	14.67%
22								

Inventory of Criminal Defendant Records by County

Pennsylvania had 31,953 undisposed criminal cases at the end of 1980. Twenty percent, about 6,390 cases, awaited indictment or information; 62%, about 19,810 cases, awaited trial, and 18%, about 5,750 cases, awaited final sentencing.

Table 15 shows how individual county inventories compared with the statewide average. For example, 62% of the criminal cases are awaiting trial. If the majority of pending criminal cases in one county still awaits information to be filed, that indicates the need to move cases from this area into the trial stream.

Table 15

Inventory of Criminal Defendant Records by County

County	Total Pending Caseload	Percent Awaiting Information/ Indictment	Percent Awaiting Trial	Percent Awaiting Sentence
Adams	138	15%	58%	27%
Allegheny	3,106	25%	60%	15%
Armstrong	128	56%	36%	8%
Beaver	329	27%	60%	13%
Bedford	139	52%	43%	5%
Berks	910	27%	54%	19%
Blair	939	7%	82%	11%
Bradford	116	27%	58%	15%
Bucks	1,088	24%	39%	37%
Butler	309	0%	83%	17%
Cambria	570	1%	91%	8%
Cameron	29	38%	62%	0%
Carbon	83	8%	79%	13%
Centre	201	0%	69%	31%
Chester	918	39%	45%	16%
Clarion	106	59% 68%	43% 19%	13%
Clearfield	350	15%	85%	
Clinton	72			0%
Columbia	189	19%	43%	38%
Crawford	256	16%	73%	11%
Cumberland		20%	66%	14%
••••••	554	1%	27%	72%
Dauphin	1,519	37%	55%	8%
Delaware	1,259	24%	62%	24%
Elk	40	98%	0%	2%
Erie	1,087	19%	64%	17%
Fayette	330	15%	54%	31%
Forest	12	0%	100%	0%
Franklin	113	59%	30%	11%
Fulton	16	12%	75%	12%
Greene	74	89%	8%	3%
Huntingdon	102	58%	10%	32%
Indiana	206	19%	77%	4%
Jefferson	131	63%	37%	0%
Juniata	32	9%	75%	16%
Lackawanna	669	22%	54%	24%
Lancaster	1,698	31%	67%	2%
Lawrence	284	57%	14%	29%
Lebanon	466	44%	32%	24%
Lehigh	689	24%	49%	27%
Luzerne	874	16%	79%	5%
Lycoming	320	0%	78%	22%
McKean	28	11%	78%	11%
Mercer	378	30%	57%	13%
Mifflin	140	30%	44%	26%
Monroe	67	37%	29%	34%
Montgomery	1,191	50%	39%	11%
Montour	30	0%	70%	30%
Northampton	553	0%	73%	27%
Northumberland	371	14%	54%	32%
Perry	57	19%	63%	32% 18%
Philadelphia	5,584	0%	76%	24%
		0%		
Pike	33		100%	0% 40%
Potter	34	8%	88%	4%

continued next page

 Table 15

 Inventory of Criminal Defendant Records by County (cont'd.)

County	Total Pending Caseload	Percent Awaiting Information/ Indictment	Percent Awaiting Trial	Percent Awaiting Sentence
Schuylkill	0	0%	0%	0%
Snyder	89	34%	32%	34%
Somerset	253	12%	60%	28%
Sullivan	9	0%	55%	45%
Susquehanna	69	39%	43%	18%
Tioga	198	9%	87%	4%
Union	47	40%	23%	37%
Venango	126	25%	54%	21%
Warren	60	20%	40%	40%
Washington	483	16%	82%	2%
Wayne	151	13%	76%	11%
Westmoreland	813	8%	88%	4%
Wyoming	98	20%	58%	22%
York	640	21%	71%	8%
State Totals	31,953	20%	62%	18%

240-Day Rule Reveals Dormant Civil Case

The 240-day rule mandating that civil cases be certified ready for trial no more than 240 days after filing significantly affected caseload during the last four months of 1980. Large numbers of cases which had lain dormant were added to the court calendar as a result of the rule.

There were 54,000 more Common Pleas Court cases than in 1979, 31% of which were civil cases (Table 10). Civil dispositions increased by only 3,000 cases. This smaller number of dispositions plus new filings increased civil inventory by almost 18,000 cases, an increase of about 85% over 1979.

The 240-day rule meant the transfer of many cases to arbitration. Since dispositions did not keep pace, arbitration inventory rose 67%.

Major increases in civil and/or arbitration cases were reported in many districts, including Allegheny, Bedford, Blair, Clearfield, Delaware, Lawrence, Luzerne, Philadelphia, Schuylkill and Washington. Other counties such as Lackawanna, Lancaster and Westmoreland reported significant drops in civil cases with little or no increase in arbitration. There were few major changes in disposition patterns in the judicial districts. The Accelerated Rehabilitative Disposition, A.R.D., program has had about the same number of defendants for the past five years. Nol pros have been steadily declining along with Grand Jury dismissals and Rule 1100 dismissals.

Dispositions Per Judge Increasing

As visiting judge days increased, so did dispositions (Table 16). Total increase in dispositions was more than 26,000 cases; total judge days increased by about 2,700.

These figures are only approximations because the total dispositions include dispositions by masters, hearing officers and boards of arbitration. If divorce and arbitration dispositions are excluded, the ratios of total dispositions per judge day are, as seen above, increasing.

These ratios imply that output is increasing on a more than one-to-one basis. In other words, each additional judge day in 1980 resulted in more than 4.45 dispositions. To be specific, there were 2,713 more judge days in 1980 than in 1979, and 30,657 more dispositions than in 1979. This is an average of 11.3 additional dispositions for each_additional judge day. The ratios become more meaningful when criminal and civil activity are examined separately. The following table shows the three-year pattern of criminal activity.

In 1980 there was a significant drop of 451 days in the use of visiting judges, most of whom were senior judges (Table 17). At the same time, regular judge days increased by 647, resulting in an overall increase of almost 200 days. This increase effected a 1,200 case growth in disposition mentioned earlier.

Total increase in dispositions from 1978 through 1980 was more than 26,000 cases; total judge days increased by about 2,700.

Although the 2.79 dispositions per day ratio might seem low, it must be remembered that criminal dispositions comprise 17% of the total Common Pleas dispositions. Even more important, the judge days are just for time spent on the bench. The figures do not show pre-trial activity, a timeconsuming process. Also, the increase in criminal dispositions should be considered in light of the general increase of other forms of dispositions which reached their highest levels in 1980.

Civil activity parallels criminal activity (Table 18).

In general, reported activity has been expanding. These figures suggest that unreported activity is also increasing and will continue to do so in response to the growing number of filings.

Year	Regular Days	Visiting Days	Total Days	Total Dispositi	ons	Total Dispositions Per Judge Da
1978 1979 1980	47,068 46,112 48,376	4,049 4,789 5,238	51,117 50,901 53,614	287,207 294,717 329,926		4.28 4.45 4.79
Table 1 Crimina	7 ll Disposition Pe	er Judge Day				
Year	Regular Days	Visiting Days	Total Days	Criminal Dispositi	ons	Criminal Dispositions Per Judge Da
1978 1979 1980	18,212 18,003 18,650	1,211 1,505 1,054	19,423 19,508 19,704	54,343 53,751 54,982	**	2.797 2.755 2.790
Table 1 Civil Dis	spositions Per Ju					Civil
Regular Year Days		Visiting Days	Total Days	Civil Dispositio	ons	Dispositions Per Judge Da
1978 1979 1980	11,661 11,371 11,724	606 772 715	12,267 12,143 12,439	19,921 21,447 24,595		1.623 1.766 1.977
Table 1 Disposi	9 tion Time in Da	ys 1977	·	1978	1979	198
Crimina		137		158	176	200
Civil		441		390	357	677
	tion	207		179	310	323
Arbitra		144		163	152	610
Arbitra Divorce	:	± • •				······································
		67		57	61	58
Divorce Juvenile		·,	<u></u>	57 58	61 85	58
Divorce Juvenile Domest	9	67				
Divorce Juvenild Domest Orphan Post Co	e ic Relations	67 55		58	85	102
Divorce Juvenild Domest Orphan Post Co	e tic Relations s' Court onviction g Act Petitions	67 55 26		58 27	85 27	102
Divorce Juvenild Domest Orphan Post Cc Hearing	e tic Relations s' Court onviction g Act Petitions y	67 55 26 315	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	58 27 503	85 27 606	102 27 483
Divorce Juvenild Domest Orphan Post Cc Hearing Custod	e ic Relations s' Court onviction g Act Petitions y Health	67 55 26 315 75	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	58 27 503 71	85 27 606 66	102 27 483 98
Divorce Juvenild Domest Orphan Post Cc Hearing Custod: Mental	e ic Relations s' Court onviction g Act Petitions y Health ons	67 55 26 315 75 14		58 27 503 71 25	85 27 606 66 13	102 27 483 98

Disposition Time: Median is 120 Days

Added to this report is a useful, if somewhat crude equation, developed by two attorney/researchers* measures the disposition time of pending cases. The equation relates filings with beginning and ending inventories to determine how long it will take to dispose of a newly filed case.

To make this estimate, we divide the number of available cases for disposition by the actual dispositions: for example, if a court has 800 cases to dispose and disposes 400 during a given year, 800 ÷ 400, the disposition time for pending cases is two years. The method uses only one year of past data to project the next year. Because of this, severe fluctations in the statistic are likely. It does not take into account the many factors that influence the processing of cases such as number of judges, number of attorneys, rule changes or support personnel.

It would require about 200 days to dispose of a newly filed criminal case in 1981. The trend is an increasing time estimate for .he total caseload as well as for most of the individual cases.

Nevertheless, the equation can indicate where problems exist when there is a significant rise in inventory. A four-year comparison of how the processing times have changed is listed in Table 19.

For example, with the beginning inventory and filing combination of criminal cases in 1980, it would require about 200 days to dispose of a newly filed criminal case in 1981. The obvious trend is more time for total caseload disposition as well as for most of the individual cases.

Civil processing time remains the slowest of common pleas activities, followed closely by Post Conviction Act matters. Ironically, the 240-day rule, designed to move civil cases, caused the projected processing time to more than double in 1980. A civil litigant who files a case in 1981 could expect to wait a year and nine months for final adjudication.

* Michigan Law Review, November 1976, Vol. 75, No. 1, Clark & Merryman, "Measuring the Duration of Judicial and Administrative Proceedings"

Disposition Time (cont'd)

This result is not a true measure of the rule's effect: the 240-day order caused a relatively large influx of cases in the last calendar quarter of 1980, which in turn produced unusually high year-end inventories. Dispositions of these cases could not be achieved until early 1981.

Seven of the common pleas categories of cases have processing times of less than six months. The overall caseload indicates that the average case filed in 1981 would have required 177 days for adjudication.

Estimated times for each of the categories of cases are, for the most part, consistent from year to year. Only civil and post conviction cases show a wide range of processing time over the four-year period. The median time in 1980 is 128 days, with 49 of 67 counties having total processing time of less than six months. Three counties had total processing times of over one year, with a maximum 544 days.

Figure 3

Disposition/Judge Day



Figure 3 pictures the changing disposition figures and changing patterns of both regular and visiting judge days. Note the decrease in 1977 dispositions despite the sharp increase in judge days. In Figure 4, the disposition line is below the filing line throughout the six years, and the gap between the two lines consistently grows. As a result, the inventory line also keeps ascending; and the ratio line showing judge days to dispositions keeps falling.

Figure 4 Filings, Disposition and Inventory

Volume in Thousands







Disposition Time Charts

Two separate charts are presented, one comparing criminal vs. civil dispositions and one showing several miscellaneous types of cases in the total common pleas caseload. Figure 6 shows a trend in criminal processing times from an average of 136 days in 1977 to 200 days in 1980.

The civil line reacted sharply to the 240-day rule, rising from an average of 357 days to adjudication to 676 days. However, before the sudden jump in 1980, civil cases still required the longest for disposition with the exception of Post Conviction Hearing Act cases in 1978 and 1979. But these are few in number.

The line charting processing times for total Common Pleas cases is fairly level through 1979 and increases suddenly in 1980, most likely due to the civil case processing time. The final figure indicates that it will require about 177 days to dispose of a single Common Pleas case, based on filings and inventory figures.

Figure 6 Days to Disposition

Figure 7 Days to Disposition





	Jury Trials			Non-Jury T	Total Trials		
	Total Dispositions	Number	Percent of Dispositions	Number	Percent of Dispositions	Number	Percent of Dispositions
Civil	24,595	1,775	7.21	4,412	17.93	6,187	25.15
Criminal	54,982	2,781	5.05	4,936	8.97	7,717	14.03
TOTAL	79,577	4,556	5.72	9,348	11.74	13,904	17.47

Most Cases Settled **Out of Court**

Figure 8 Percent of cases disposed by trial

100

90

80

70

60

50

40

30

20

10

Jury Trials

Television and Perry Mason notwithstanding, only a small percentage of cases go to trial, as this chart graphically illustrates. Time, expense and other alternatives are the reasons. Altogether, jury trials accounted for only 5.7% of criminal and civil dispositions, non-jury trials for 11.4%.

Trial settlements are a quarter, 25%, of all civil dispositions and 14% of criminal dispositions. Of these, the ratio of civil non-jury to jury trials is more than 10 to 1. In criminal cases, the ratio is almost 2 to 1 in favor of non-jury trials. (Figure 8)



Common Pleas Caseload Comparison for Pennsylvania's 59 Judicial Districts

Table 20 presents a comparison of district caseloads showing per judge filings for common pleas filings, dispositions and inventory;

Row 1: Number of judges in each district; e.g.: 1,2,3.

Row 2: Number of districts by number of judges; e.g.: 24 districts have 1 judge, 13 districts have 2 judges.

Table 20

Caseload by Judge: Filings, Dispositions

Number of Judges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	12	14	39	81
Judicial Districts	24	13	1	2	7	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
Population	1,182,800	1,376,700	171,900	344,200	1,597,400	1,815,200	338,700	468,400	583,700	628,200	1,493,600	1,784,500
Population/Judges	49,283	52,950	57,300	43,025	45,640	50,422	48,385	52,044	48,641	44,871	38,297	22,030
Cases Filed: Criminal/Judge	246	291	329	200	242	321	189	456	252	228	229	111
Civil/Judge	107	134	84	101	108	84	154	97	116	150	325	151
Family/Judge	411	386	292	142	337	248	109	214	488	408	207	622
Orphans'/Judge	37	54	0	65	58	62	47	22	31	64	64	99
Other/Judge	171	156	290	222	168	125	83	227	260	221	154	47
Cases Disposed: Criminal/Judge	235	255	247	182	204	228	153	348	232	215	187	92
Civil/Judge	78	65	82	82	71	68	75	81	78	69	163	60
Family/Judge	413	357	191	153	337	240	110	174	473	310	395	612
Orphans'/Judge	38	56	0	66	63	60	44	22	33	64	64	99
Other/Judge	168	150	190	216	161	124	85	150	263	209	176	46
Cases Pending: En Criminal/Judge	d of Year 109	161	184	112	107	181	124	120	104	85	79	68
Civil/Judge	77	132	25	51	95	46	117	60	86	146	207	163
Family/Judge	101	102	0	12	22	27	9	210	60	169	23	100
Orphans'/Judge	4	4	0	8	4	10	8	2	11	0	6	1
Other/Judge	36	38	23	22	54	14	4	96	13	45	19	9
Total: Filed/Judge	975	1,023	795	732	914	843	582	1,016	1,147	1,071	979	1,030
Disposed/Judge	933	884	711	702	837	722	467	775	1,079	867	985	909
Pending Judge	347	440	233	207	284	281	262	488	274	445	334	341

Row 3: Population by category of district; e.g.: all one-judge districts totalled 1,182,800 people.

Row 4: Average population by district size; e.g.: the one-judge districts averaged 49,283 people.

Rows 5-9: Filings per judge in 1980 for criminal, civil, Family Court, Orphans' Court and miscellaneous cases. For example, in the 13 districts with two judges, each judge averaged 291 criminal filings and 134 civil filings.

Rows 10-14: Dispositions per judge.

Rows 15-19: Pending caseload per judge.

Row 20: Total filings per judge. For example, judges in the six-judge districts averaged 843 total common pleas filings in 1980; Philadelphia judges averaged 1030 filings.

Row 21: Total dispositions per judge.

Row 22: Total pending caseload per judge.

5 8	and	Inventory	12/31	l/80
-----	-----	-----------	-------	------

On the following pages, Table 21 shows the number of criminal and major civil cases filed and disposed in each county Court of Common Pleas

and a second
during 1980. The method of disposition and the increase or decrease in pending cases are also shown. A breakdown of "other dispositions," where

one or more types account for a significant percentage, appears at the end of the table.

BEAVER Beginning 1980 + Filed **Criminal Cases** 316 831 830 **Civil Cases** 90 (Trespass, Assumpsit, Equity & Miscellaneous) BEDFORD **Criminal Cases** 201 220 **Civil Cases** 45 90 (Trespass, Assumpsit, Equity & Miscellaneous) BERKS 803 2,059 **Criminal Cases** 87 513 **Civil Cases** (Trespass, Assumpsit, Equity & Miscellaneous) BLAIR 761 666 **Criminal Cases**

Table 21:

a martin a la constante de la c

Criminal and Civil Case Volume by County

ADAMS	Beginning 1980	+ Filed -	– Dispositions	=	End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Days	
Criminal Cases	123	267	252 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	169 28 0 17 26 12	138	15	15 110 7		
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	35	70	71 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	3 30 19 19 0 0	34	-1	50	28	
ARMSTRONG									
Criminal Cases	128	351	351 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	82 6 66 80 111	128	0	63	0	
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	100	179	195 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 76 8 18 0 93		-16	74	3	
ALLEGHENY			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Criminal Cases	2,791	8,933	8,618 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	2,599 412 1,001 2,513 1,798 295	3,106	315	2,534	132	
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity & Miscellaneous)	6,831	8,079	6,832 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	810 2,877 300 1,702 104 1,039	8,078	1,247	1,648	219	

30

	- Dispositions	:	End = 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Days
31	818 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	352 58 25 188 151 44	329	13	185	23
0	664 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	8 174 19 391 4 68	256	166	273	0
0	264 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	144 13 14 52 35 6	157	-44	60	0
0	53 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	2 22 3 0 2 24	82	37	25	0
59	1,954 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	764 111 24 232 349 474	908	105	406	98
3	355 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	19 104 53 125 2 52	245	158	149	60
6	488 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	237 9 6 81 55 100	939	178	198	96

continued next page

BLAIR (cont'd.)	Beginning 1980 + Filed	- Dispositions		End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting S Judge Tri	enior Il Days	CAMBRIA	Beginning 1980 + Filed	- Dispositions		End = 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Days
Civil Cases Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	238 51	1 37 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	1 31 4 0 0 1	712	474	111	19		Criminal Cases	455 86	l 696 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	260 20 41 190 170 15	620	165	347	7
BRADFORD Criminal Cases	163 35	Guilty Pleas Jury Trials	231 3	116	-47	39	0		Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	82 53	Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials	91 49 42 307	114	32	367	39
		Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	2 73 89								Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 18				
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	83 24	Other Dispositions 9 144 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 72 9 16 0 47	188	105	52	1		CAMERON — EL	<u>к</u> 50 25	1 232 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	82 5 2 41 98 4	69	19	57	0
BUCKS			<u></u>						Civil Cases	24 11			41	17	67	2
riminal Cases	682 4,10		1,569 57 48 333 1,217	1,088	406	557	9		(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)		Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 89 4 2 0 0			sý*•	
		Other Dispositions	479						CARBON							
ivil Cases Frespass, Assump- t, Equity, & fiscellaneous)	531 87	 866 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions 	1 368 103 168 0 226	540	9	230	42		Criminal Cases	86 18) 183 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	46 12 4 31 83 7	83	-3	64	10 .
BUTLER									Civil Cases	23 11			67	44	35	4
Criminal Cases	304 81	1 806 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	285 21 2 65 288	309	5	72	3		(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)		Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 36 6 22 0 7				
		Other Dispositions	145						CENTRE	• •				······································		
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	280 30	 181 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions 	6 68 15 34 34 24	407	127	45	18		Criminal Cases	187 46	 455 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions 	257 17 10 64 105 2	201	14	76	29
······································		<u></u>								······································	·					continued next pag

. Bellen i 1997 het en 1997 het en 1997 het en 1997 het en 1998 het en de sen en 1997 het et in de sen er sen s

CENTRE (cont'd.)	Beginning 198	0 + Filed -	- Dispositions	=	End • 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Days	. كەركەر يېچىلىغىنىكى	CLINTON	Beginning 198	0 + Filed
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	64	147	144 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	5 88 9 18 1 23	67	3	23	17		Criminal Cases	108	22
CHESTER										Civil Cases	37	8
Criminal Cases	645	2,036	1,763 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	725 107 18 294 244	918	273	436	21		(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)		
			Other Dispositions	375)	COLUMBIA/MC	ONTOUR	
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	146	917	594 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	33 222 55 244 0 40	469	323	. 225	0		Criminal Cases	196	32
CLARION										Civil Cases	84	18
Criminal Cases	62	292	248 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	204 5 0 16 23	106	44	11	0		(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)		
			Other Dispositions	0	100					CRAWFORD		1
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	35	155	61 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 19 4 0 30 8	129	94	8	6		Criminal Cases	181	58
CLEARFIELD										Civil Cases	18	7
Criminal Cases	300	480	430 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	385 9 1 11 20 4	350	50	30	0		(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)		
Civil Cases	44	266	Other Dispositions	4	126	82	17		P	CUMBERLAND		
(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	44	200	184 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 79 15 13 0 77	126	82	1/	0		Criminal Cases	521	98

led -	– Dispositions	=	End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Days
221	257 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	124 10 1 22 72 28	72	-36	76	1
82	80 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 45 6 4 7 18	39		11	0
326	303 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	146 11 2 63 20 61	219	23	61	13
180	136 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	8 95 12 8 5 8	128	44	44	7
586	511 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	269 30 6 71 63 72	256	75	67	1
74	80 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	6 25 10 28 4 7	12	-6	49	0
987	954 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	569 29 9 115 0 232	554	33	161	11 continued next pag

CUMBERLAND (cont'd.)	Beginning 1980 + H	Filed -	– Dispositions	=	End = 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Days		FAYETTE	Beginning 1980 + File	ed –	- Dispositions		End = 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Day
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	89	254	267 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	1 134 28 30 2 72	76	-13	61	1	_	Criminal Cases	343	754	767 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	250 49 16 220 232 0		-13	180	0
DAUPHIN										Civil Cases		273	189		295	84	140	0
Criminal Cases	1,363	2,111	Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed	856 52 147 140 418	1,519	156	321	0	1	(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 96 20 30 6 37				
				342					_ ∜	FOREST/WARR	REN							
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	26	512	Jury Trials	5 101 45 305 0 26	56	30	178	0	· ·	Criminal Cases	59	214	201 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	125 9 1 22 31 13	72	13	26	0
DELAWARE										Civil Cases	45	84	61		68	23	23	0
Criminal Cases	1,233	3,031	Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed	1,160 218 125 381 904	1,259	26	606	37	-	(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 46 6 2 0 7				
				217					-	FRANKLIN/FU	LTON							
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)		1,393		425 360 86 59 1 100	1,039	362	345	0	-	Criminal Cases	138	665	674 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	268 12 28 110 241 15		-9	161	0
ERIE										Civil Cases	47	134	17		164	117	95	0
Criminal Cases	854	1,687	Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	687 93 12 187 466	1,087	233	154	12		(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	1 9 4 2 0 1				
			Other Dispositions	9						GREENE								
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	207	294	187 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	8 108 22 27 4 18	314	107	67	0	N	Criminal Cases	109		312 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	153 10 1 21 127 0		-35	50	0
<u></u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				,			continued next pa

fer diales, 🛩 en Nacional de la francés de la Recipie este de la composition de la companya envantación de la

.

GREENE cont'd.)	Beginning 198	0 + Filed	- Dispositions		End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visi Jud	iting Senior Ige Trial Days	JUNIATA/PERRY	Beginning 1	1980 + Filed -	- Dispositions		End = 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visitin Judge	ng Senior Trial Day
Civil Cases Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	17	27	32 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 16 8 7 0 1	12	-5	97	' (0	Criminal Cases	119	166	223 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	132 21 6 23 27 14	52	-67	61	2	
HUNTINGDON										Civil Cases	214	148	131 Settled Without Hearing	2	231	17	44	6	
riminal Cases	73	165	136 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	68 2 3 39 7	102	29	22	2 14	4	(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	2 48 3 27 0 51					
			Other Dispositions	17						LACKAWANNA									
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	31	41	36 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 12 7 3 0 14	36	5 5	19)	7	Criminal Cases	616		727 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	261 23 0 139 173 131	669	53	134	10	
INDIANA									:	Civil Cases	490	377	366 Settled Without Hearing	17	501	11	249	4	
Priminal Cases	216	444	454 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	200 17 13 82 118	206	5 -10	125	5	5	(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	203 40 80 0 18		. •			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Other Dispositions	24						LANCASTER									
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	98	273	81 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	2 50 2 25 0 2	290	0 192	36	5	0	Criminal Cases	1,500	2,194	1,996 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	1,278 102 34 177 43 362	1,698	198	276	4	
JEFFERSON										Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump-	144	87	175 Settled Without Hearing	2	56	88	-88	0	
Criminal Cases	128	317	318 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	268 4 0 29 9	127	7 -1	26	5	0	sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	107 17 21 0 28					
			Other Dispositions	8		76 <i>i</i> .				LAWRENCE			· · ·						
C ivil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	50	70	74 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 24 6 10 10 24	40	5 -4	36	6	0	Criminal Cases	115	967	763 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	129 26 2 37 14 555	319	204	. 97	23	

LAWRENCE (cont'd.)	Beginning 19	980 + Filed -	- Dispositions	En = 19		Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visitin Judge	g Senior Trial Days	LYCOMING	Beginning 1	980 + Filed	– Dispositions	End = 198			Trial Days	Visiting Se Judge Tria
ivil Cases Trespass, Assump- it, Equity, & Iiscellaneous)	131	332	108 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	2 74 15 9 1 7	355	224	44	4 4		Criminal Cases	273	631	584 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	278 94 13 45 113 41	320	47	85	51
EBANON.										Civil Cases	160	755	331 Settled Without Hearing	1	584	424	64	17
ninal Cases	468	535	537 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed	362 35 0 24	466	-2	96	5 1		(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	1 276 22 15 2 15				
			ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	108 8						MCKEAN								
vil Cases Trespass, Assump- t, Equity, & iscellaneous)	54	108	113 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	3 31 7 12 3 57	49	-5	4	0 0	de la compañía de la	Criminal Cases	32	214	218 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	95 3 0 22 36 62	28	-4	37	0
EHIGH										Civil Cases	152	59	73 Settled Without Hearing	0	138	-14	69	3
ninal Cases	795	1,679	1,785 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed	523 56 16 148	689	-106	268	8 86	con internet in the second	(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	62 8 1 0 2				
			ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	135 907					and the second second	MERCER			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
il Cases espass, Assump- Equity, & scellaneous)	81	809	423 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	20 164 18 67 4 150	467	386	68	3 15	a de series de la constante de	Criminal Cases	387	510	519 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	291 79 12 120 2 15	378	-9	136	0
LUZERNE						**			and the second se	Civil Cases	327	219	149 Settled Without Hearing	4	397	70	34	0
Criminal Cases	754	1,325	1,205 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	691 34 13 141 188	874	120	16	1 20	مان معالى مان	(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	92 10 1 5 37				
			Other Dispositions	138						MIFFLIN							7.4ii.	
vil Cases Frespass, Assump- t, Equity, & iscellaneous)	294	1,080	549 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	6 206 65 67 71 134	825	531	244	4 31		Criminal Cases	131	202	193 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	129 11 25 11 17 0	140	9	76	0

• • • •

MIFFLIN (cont'd.)	Beginning 1980) + Filed –	Dispositions	=	End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Day
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	13	67	44 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 22 5 5 3 9	36	23	43	0
MONROE/PIKE								
Criminal Cases	52	406	417 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	143 27 123 85 32 7	41	-11	177	99
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	61	369	284 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	12 141 19 13 4 95	146	85	200	63
MONTGOMERY			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Criminal Cases	1,279	3,204	3,282 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	1,855 85 90 237 681 334	1,191	-88	898	209
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	944	2,100	992 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	16 684 143 50 0 99	2,052	1,108	649	30
NORTHAMPTO	N							
Criminal Cases	479	1,177	1,103 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	481 70 26 186 88 252	553	74	287	0
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	85	623	500 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	4 286 36 100 0 74	208	123	249	0

المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المستخدم المراجع
NORTHUMBER- LAND	Beginning 1980) + Filed	– Dispositions	=	End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Day
Criminal Cases	347	422	398 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	296 23 0 61 14 4	371	24	45	0
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	81	82	109 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 84 13 10 0 2	54	-27	37	0
PHILADELPHIA								
Criminal Cases	4,367	8,992	7,775 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	2,630 337 2,851 1,327 346 284	5,584	1,217	7,278	0
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	5,809	12,304	4,896 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	2,452 1,647 318 242 0 237	13,217	7,408	3,801	8
POTTER								
Criminal Cases	26	115	109 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	58 11 0 22 18 0	32	6	27	0
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	22	43	53 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 18 1 23 4 7	12	-10	23	2
SCHUYLKILL								
Criminal Cases	55	856	911 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	469 57 18 82 248 28	0	-55	399	0

CHUYLKILL cont'd.)	Beginning 1980	+ Filed —	Dispositions		End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days J	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Day	SUSQUEHANNA	Beginning 1980	0 + Filed -	– Dispositions		End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Days
Civil Cases Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	59	481	178 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	24 51 40 8 0 55	362	303	209	0	Criminal Cases	74	89	94 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	69 3 0 12 9 1	69	-5	3	0
SNYDER/UNION	1	<u></u>							Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump-	116	128	87 Settled Without Hearing	1	157	41	84	0
Criminal Cases	133	222	206 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	116 12 0 28 26	136	3	22	0	sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	36 8 4 0 38				
			Other Dispositions	37					TIOGA		······································				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
C ivil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	50	67	58 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	1 37 4 15 0 1	59	9	17	0	Criminal Cases	162	387	351 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	205 10 3 49 77 7	198	36	64	0
SOMERSET									Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump-	9	73	69 Settled Without Hearing	0	13	4	82	0
Criminal Cases	351	465	563 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	197 11 3 84 113	253	-98	45	0	sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	56 1 9 0 3				
			Other Dispositions	155					VENANGO								
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	200	185	156 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 82 14 4 3 53	229	29	86	6	Criminal Cases	147	198	219 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	88 31 0 38 59 3	126	-21	42	9
SULLIVAN/WY	OMING								Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump-	38	97	49 Settled Without Hearing	0	86	48	18	0
Criminal Cases	90	215	198 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	108 7 3 65 11	107	17	30	1	(Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)			Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	38 8 1 0 2				
			Other Dispositions	4					WASHINGTON								
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	13	59	57 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 17 6 3 0 31	15	2	19	1	Criminal Cases	297	1,494	1,281 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	643 10 97 199 318 41	483	186	28	0

- •

.

•

WASHINGTON (cont'd.)	Beginning 1980	+ Filed -	– Dispositions	=	End 1980	Change 79-80	Trial Days	Visiting Senior Judge Trial Day
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	. 44	639	497 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials	0 368 5 109	186	142	39	0
			Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	0 15				
WAYNE								
Criminal Cases	146	205	200 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial	65 4 2 47 32	151	5	14	10
			Other Dispositions	50				
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	12	117	102 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	3 58 9 3 1 28	27	15	9	5
WESTMORELAN	ND							
Criminal Cases	747	1,529	1,463 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	365 52 26 256 489 275	813	66	269	0
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	746	189	517 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	3 308 21 133 2 50	418	-328	134	0
YORK								
Criminal Cases	361	1,662	1,383 Guilty Pleas Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed ARD/Disp. in Lieu of Trial Other Dispositions	639 111 6 188 273 166	640	279	304	0
Civil Cases (Trespass, Assump- sit, Equity, & Miscellaneous)	1,180	541	196 Settled Without Hearing Settled After Hearing Jury Trials Non-Jury Trials Withdrawn/Dismissed Other Dispositions	4 17 34 58 0 83	1,525	345	488	47

Explanation of "Other Dispositions," Where Significant

Other Civil Dispositions	
Sent to Arbitration	Number
Allegheny	441
Armstrong	7
Beaver Bedford	10
Berks	15 9
Bradford	8
Bucks	134
Butler	9
Cambria Centre	13 16
Chester	14
Clearfield	34
Clinton	3
Columbia/Montour Cumberland	5 20
Dauphin	20
Delaware	95
Erie	8
Fayette Huntingdon	25
Jefferson	9 22
Juniata/Perry	17
Lackawanna	16
Lancaster Lawrence	4 7
Lebanon	5
Lehigh	24
Luzerne	22
Lycoming	6
Mercer Monroe/Pike	37 8
Montgomery	26
Northampton	18
Schuylkill	10
Somerset	8
Washington	0
Washington Wavne	8 7
Wayne Westmoreland	8 7 42
Wayne Westmoreland York	7
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List	7 42 4 Number
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny	7 42 4 Number 431
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List	7 42 4 Number 431 86
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford	7 42 4 Number 431
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 3 33 33
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 3 33 33 39 90
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 3 33 33
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 6 49 4
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 4 12
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Eric Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata / Perry Lancaster	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 23 24
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 24 22
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 23 24
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 5
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe/Pike	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 5 25
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Eric Fayette Huntingdon Juniata / Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe / Pike Montgomery	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 5 25 73
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe/Pike Montgomery Northampton Philadelphia	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 5 25
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe/Pike Montgomery Northampton Philadelphia Schuylkill	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 25 73 56 204 17
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe/Pike Montgomery Northampton Philadelphia Schuylkill Sullivan/Wyoming	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 25 73 56 204 17 30
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe/Pike Montgomery Northampton Philadelphia Schuylkill Sullivan/Wyoming Susquehanna	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 5 5 5 5 5 73 56 204 17 30 3 3
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe/Pike Montgomery Northampton Philadelphia Schuylkill Sullivan/Wyoming Susquehanna Washington	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 25 73 56 204 17 30
Wayne Westmoreland York Stricken From Trial List Allegheny Armstrong Beaver Bedford Berks Bradford Bucks Cambria Carbon Centre Chester Clearfield Clinton Cumberland Dauphin Erie Fayette Huntingdon Juniata/Perry Lancaster Lebanon Lehigh Luzerne Mifflin Monroe/Pike Montgomery Northampton Philadelphia Schuylkill Sullivan/Wyoming Susquehanna	7 42 4 Number 431 86 57 3 33 39 90 5 4 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 20 43 6 49 4 4 12 3 23 24 22 121 65 5 25 73 56 204 17 30 3 2

46

Sec. At

Adjusted for Arithmetic Error	Number	Remanded to District Justice	Number
Butler	5	Berks	10
Mifflin	2	Blair	2
Transformed to Other Course	.	Cambria	15
Transferred to Other Courts Susquehanna	Number 4	Columbia/ Montour	23
Susquenanna	4	Huntingdon Lawrence	4
Summary Judgments	Number	McKean	445 19
Susquehanna	4	Mercer	4
-		Monroe/Pike	3
Other Criminal Dispositions		Northampton	12
		Snyder/Union	5
Transferred to Inactive Status	Number	Westmoreland	10
Allegheny	295		
Beaver Berks	43 397	Extradited	Number
Chester	104	Chester Lawrence	6
Cumberland	87	Lawrence	5
Dauphin	342	Probation W/O Verdict	Number
Delaware	217	Franklin/Fulton	2
Lawrence	26	Lycoming	7
Lehigh	187		
Montgomery	271*	Pleas to Summary Offenses	Number
Northampton	189	Cumberland	61
Philadelphia Wayne	269		
Westmoreland	3 92	Adjusted for Arithmetic Error Jefferson	Number
westhoreland	92	Lehigh	2 389
Civil Compromises (Rule 145)	Number	Mercer	309
Armstrong	18	Schuylkill	23
Carbon	7	Wayne	-3
Columbia/ Montour	15		
Cumberland	31	Not Indicted by Grand Jury	Number
Forest/Warren	4	Lackawanna	130
Franklin/ Fulton Indiana	10		
Jefferson	5 3	<i>Expunged</i> McKean	Number
Lebanon	5	Werkean	39
Lehigh	12	Disposed Under Drug Act	Number
Luzerne	13	Montgomery	47
Lycoming	13	- /	
Monroe/Pike	1	Sent to Family Court	Number
Northampton	48	Philadelphia	15
Snyder/Union Somerset	7		
Tioga	4 4	<i>Farview Hospital Cases</i> Wayne	Number
York	2	wayne	30
		*or Adjusted for Arithmetic Error	
Multiple Dispositions	Number		
Armstrong	95		
Blair	35		
Butler	143		
Chester Clinton	263		
Crawford	27 71		
Cumberland	49		
Huntingdon	12		
Lancaster	361		
Lawrence	48		
Lehigh	275		
Luzerne	124		
Snyder/Union Somerset	11		
Washington	147 14		
Westmoreland	14		
York	135		
•		•	

Transferred to Juvenile Court Berks

Number 32

DISTRICT JUSTICES: WHERE MOST COURT ACTION STARTS

District Judges must take and pass a four-week, 120-hour qualifying course given by the Minor Judiciary Education Board and administered by the AOPC... They must complete a minimum of 32 hours of continuing education each year.

Most people come into contact with the judiciary through District Justices. Their contact can be as simple as exceeding the speed limit or as serious as rape or murder. Activity abounds at the magistrate court level: nearly two million cases were filed in 1980.

Pennsylvania's 550 District Justices are elected for terms of six years. The Supreme Court establishes the number of statewide magisterial districts every ten years after reviewing recommendations of the counties, the census population, the area served and the number of cases filed.

District Justices who are not lawyers must take and pass a fourweek. 120-hour qualifying course given by the Minor Judiciary Education Board and administered by the Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Courts. Civil law and procedure, criminal law and procedure, judicial ethics, rules of evidence, human behavior, judicial administration, motor vehicle law, the Drug, Device and Cosmetic Act are covered. Of 107 people who took the course last year, 88 passed.

All District Justices must complete a minimum of 32 hours of continuing education each year. In 1980, 542 district justices completed the course, which is administered by AOPC under the Minor Judiciary Education Board, Subjects included judicial ethics, office procedures, actions in assumpsit, landlord/tenant matters, rules of civil and criminal procedures, rules of evidence, crimes code update, motor vehicle code and regulations update. Because of greater public awareness and growing evidence of abuse within the family, a special course studying some of the remedies provided by the Protection from Abuse Act was offered.

AOPC, putting to work funds from the Governor's Commission on Crime and Delinquency, taught 403 district justices and related personnel about

retail theft processing procedures in 23 seminars.

The Administrative Office revised the District Justice Office Procedures Manual to improve efficiency in processing cases. The manual established standards of record keeping, financial accountability and office practices in general. Nearly 250 secretaries of District Justices participated in regular seminars given throughout the state and at the AOPC's Wilson College facility.

The year saw increased efforts to improve the constable system. Through funding from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, two statewide training programs were designed and implemented.

In the first, classroom instruction combined with field training to teach a small group of constables at 17 different locations how to serve warrants and perform their other dayto-day constable duties.

In the second, a 40-hour classroom program in selected locations throughout the Commonwealth taught constables how to serve warrants, trespass and assumpsit complaints, conduct of sales, landlord and tenant proceedings and how to serve an order of possession.

Each participant received a 50-page manual containing applicable rules and regulations. Each was tested before and after the course to measure the program's effectiveness.

Detailed information and statistics on each of the magisterial districts is available upon request by contacting the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts at: 1414 Three Penn Center Plaza Philadelphia, PA 19102 215-496-4500

District Justice Courts Judicial Case Volume 1980

I. Filings

1. Nearly two million cases -1,934,933 to be exact - were filed in District Justice Courts in 1980, an increase of 7%* over 1979. Traffic citations were 64% of all filings, non-traffic citations represented 14% and summary complaints made up 7% of the whole. Misdemeanor/felony complaints are the most serious offenses before a district justice; these cases make up the smallest part of the total caseload, 5%. Civil complaints represented 10% of the volume, double the number of serious criminal cases filed at this level. (Figure 9)

2. Eighty-five percent of case volume pertains to summary level violations. The remaining 15%, which are the more serious cases, require more time per district justice.

II. Disposition

A. District Justices District justice courts disposed of 1,728,984 cases last year. Of these, traffic citations accounted for 64%, non-traffic citations, 13%; summary complaints, 6%; misdemeanor/felony cases, 5%, and civil complaints, 11%. Overall dispositions were up 5% from 1979. As in the past, traffic citations represented the major part of dispositions statewide. (Figure 10)

B. Filing-to-Disposition Ratio The number of dispositions divided by the number of cases filed yields a filing-to-disposition ratio. This ratio indicates what part of the total case volume for a given year is processed in that year and what part must be carried to the next year.

The filing-to-disposition ratios for 1980 were 89% for traffic citations, 87% for non-traffic citations, 82% for summary complaints and 97% for civil complaints. The overall filing-todisposition ratio decreased by 2% between 1979 and 1980. These ratios ranged from a decrease of 7% for summary complaints to an increase of 2% for non-traffic citations.*

*Figures rounded 10 nearest number.

48



KEY



TRAFFIC NON-TRAFFIC SUMMARY COMPLAINTS MISDEMEANOR/FELONY

Table 22 District Justice Courts Disposition by Category and Nature of Action 1980

	Traffic Citations	Non- Traffic Citations	Summary Complaints	Misdemeanor/ Felony Complaints	Civil Complaints	Disposition Total	Percent of Total
Guilty Plea	875,013	164,086	59,742			1,098,841	63.54%
Non Guilty Plea	48,049	14,628	6,183		_	68,860	3.98%
Guilty by Trial	45,679	17,540	12,271	_	_	75,490	4.37%
Withdrawal of Prosecution	53,715	15,953	13,917	14,219	_	97,804	5.65%
Substantive Defect	7,945	1,030	258	-	_	9,233	0.53%
Unable to Locate	39,633	9,356	8,166			57,155	3.31%
Guilty Plea – Misdemeanor 3		_		6,657	 	6,657	0.39%
Bound to Court at Preliminary Hearing	•			32,625		32,625	1.89%
Dismissed at Preliminary Hearing		••••		12,610		12,610	0.73%
Waiver of Preliminary Hearing		_	_	16,933		16,933	0.98%
Declared Fugitive		<u> </u>		2,517	_	2,517	0.15%
Dismissed Without Prejudice	_	_			4,794	4,794	0.28%
Trial	_				42,793	42,793	2.48%
Settled At or Before Trial		2,377	7,220	4,837	37,473	51,907	3.00%
Judgment by Default			<u> </u>		93,312	93,312	5.40%
Closed – No Service					7,229	7,229	0.42%
Withdrawal of Complaint	<u> </u>		_		2,969	2,969	0.17%
Other	35,808	4,570	2,101	2,734	2,042	47,255	2.73%
Total by Category	1,105,842	229,540	109,858	93,132	190,612	1,728,984	100.00%
Percentage Distribution by Category	63.96%	13.28%	6.35%	5.39%	11.02%	—	100.00%
Dispositions Per District Justice	2,052	426	204	173	354	3,208	

District Justice Courts (cont'd) Judicial Case Volume 1980

C. Statewide Tables 24 and 25 show filings for Philadelphia Traffic Court and Pittsburgh Magistrates Court, in addition to the district justice data. In 1980, more than 3.3 million cases were filed in these courts. Traffic citations were 79% of these filings. The data indicate that there were almost as many traffic citations filed in the Philadelphia Traffic Court as were filed in the 550 district justice offices statewide.

Л щ_от

Table 23 Philadelphia Traffic Court Case Volume – 1980

	Number Issued	Number Disposed	\$ Revenue
Traffic Citations: Issued Traffic Citations Paid	1,049,813	232,380	\$ 4,452,130
Summons: Printed Paid Paid Court Discharged Summons	801,786	103,258 16,364 51,197	\$ 3,000,620 \$ 690,613
Warrants: Printed Paid Warrants Discharged Warrants	680,582	134,680 23,330	\$ 5,321,294
TOTALS	2,532,181	561,199	\$13,464,657

Table 24 Pittsburgh Magistrates Court

City Court Misdemeanor/Felony cases filed Summary cases filed Miscellaneous citations filed (ordinance violations)	8,702 12,442 652
Housing Court Summary cases filed	2,174
Traffic Court Misdemeanor/Felony cases filed Traffic citations filed (moving violations) Parking citations filed	2,466 36,061 340,781

Table 25 1980 Summary of Statewide Filings

Statewide Filings	District Justices	Philadelphia Traffic Court	Pittsburgh Magistrates Court	Total
Traffic Citations	1,235,603	1,049,813	376,842	2,662,258
Non-Traffic Citations	265,034	-)	12.004	265,034*
Summary Complaints	134,333	-)	13,094	134,333*
Misdemeanor/Felony Complaints	103,792		11,168	114,960
Civil Complaints	196,171		2,174	198,345

*These figures do not include Pittsburgh Magistrates Courts.

Table 26	
m cei ottatt	

All services and a service of the se

Fraffic Citations	
--------------------------	--

County	No. Filed	Adjusted	No. Disposed	Guilty by Trial	Guilty Plea	Not Guilty	Wthdrwl. of Pros.	Subs. Defect.	Un- locatbl.	Other
Adams	8,493	7	7,990	181	7,332	100	370	2	5	0
Allegheny	119,237	161	101,028	6,926	68,615	10,376	5,583	2,766	5,485	1,277
Armstrong	4,453	26	4,451	198	3,845	178	166	<u>18</u> 254	12	34
Beaver	22,521	44	22,672	796	17,117	1,627	1,965		886	27
Bedford	12,207	9	12,154	228	10,129	66	436	1	1,294	0
Berks	24,112	10	22,455	910	19,955	507	867	<u>40</u> 37	<u>144</u> 261	32 46
Blair	9,565	10	9,320	301	8,330	200			10	46 65
Bradford	4,154	27	4,105	173	3,610	64	179	4 95	996	
Bucks	74,359	2,355	59,929	3,433	47,888	3,041	2,281 313	57	128	2,195
Butler	29,552	102	11,533	553	10,054	417			204	754
Cambria	12,304	202	11,610	331	9,681	363	246	31		
Cameron	763	0	780	25	696	21	38	0	0	0
Carbon	7,626	46	7,981	313	6,877	137	190	6	17	441
Centre	19,474	10	20,156	434	16,493	447	2,391	6	384	10,100
Chester	59,169	47	53,481	1,489	38,293	1,857	964	72	698	10,108
Clarion	4,423	21	4,746	113	4,029	53	547	1	2	1
Clearfield	8,045	0	8,542	297	7,321	102	374	0	0	448
Clinton	7,787	0	8,441	178	6,944	67	249	2	0	1,001
Columbia	9,032	22	8,972	224	8,275	133	317	13	0	10
Crawford	10,710	229	10,785	379	9,356	133	888	8	7	14
Cumberland	28,165	181	28,003	777	23,821	452	915	190	1,168	680
Dauphin	33,800	16	29,887	1,071	26,130	533	451	156	619	927
Delaware	122,812	1,976	92,486	5,209	62,059	8,978	3,753	1,818	8,397	2,272
Elk	4,225	11	4,157	144	3,717	57	124	59	51	5
Erie	23,809	19	25,119	793	21,138	915	1,805	8	316	144
Fayette	8,318	12	7,507	398	6,310	350	263	61	102	23
Forest	1,001	1	1,031	23	940	5	37	. 1	17	
Franklin	9,968	12	9,176	277	8,261	51	176	14	304	93
Fulton	5,971	405	6,150	128	5,469	12	193	7	8	333
Greene	4,245	0	3,735	72	3,451	75	116	0	0	21
Huntingdon	3,501	1	3,403	119	3,040	43	150	9	42	0
Indiana	6,054	41	5,618	292	5,065	135	103	4	11	8
Jefferson	6,297	251	6,397	174	5,651	55	269	13	12	223
Juniata	1,531	0	1,536	58	1,439	15	23	1	0	0
Lackawanna	19,505	33	17,355	406	12,896	528	1,101	305	683	1,436
Lancaster	42,424	333	36,366	978	30,676	448	1,094	56	1,088	2,026
Lawrence	7,648	0	6,489	320	5,641	178	210	14	14	112
Lebanon	17,388	12	15,842	495	14,627	84	554	39	13	30
Lehigh	31,426	59	25,109	1,163	21,725	749	797	84	357	234
Luzerne	27,030	3	22,580	870	18,614	1,160	1,637	41	190	68
Lycoming	14,132	209	18,406	368	12,325	236	797	0	317	4,363
McKean	3,119	0	3,113	91	2,857	31	88	11	33	2
Mercer	13,177	29	12,916	402	11,068	211	1,177	2	41	15
Mifflin	2,999	1	3,434	48	3,090	38	152	43	32	31
Monroe	12,864	0	12,442	274	10,550	63	973	6	38	538
Montgomery	133,321	227	115,573	6,093	81,842	7,743	6,702	638	10,377	2,178
Montour	2,754	18	2,946	65	2,042	18	182	0	620	´ 19
Northampton	23,129	163	21,837	818	18,228	710	900	141	677	363
Northumberland	8,726	5	8,465	375	7,590	149	238	0	55	58
Perry	2,476	2	2,428	69	2,238	21	98	1	0	1
Pike	3,735	ō	3,477	83	3,214	52	19	4	105	Ō
Potter	1,442	1	1,504	80	1,319	15	76	2	2	10
Schuylkill	9,982	191	9,627	406	8,168	228	599	31	50	145
Snyder	3,330	30	3,227	49	3,037	38	49	0	4	50
Somerset	14,545	249	14,590	385	11,821	308	1,970	61	25	20
Sullivan	704	0	708	33	643	1,0	20	0	23	20
Susquehanna	4,901	0	4,833	77	4,229	49	41	49	387	1
Tioga	4,200	89	4,476	135	4,011	60	99	26	57	88
Union	4,200	0	4,470	77	3,734	20	99 40		193	44
	8,067	307						2		44
Venango	0,007	307	8,423	184	6,942	79	1,211	0	0	/

Table 26 Traffic Citations (cont'd.)

County	No. Filed	Adjusted	No. Guil Disposed By 7		v Not Guilty	Settled	Wthdrwl. of Pros.	Subs. Defect.	Un- locatbl.	Other
Warren	3,27	0 13	3,224	99	2,975	20	73	1	35	21
Washington	27,13	5 202	26,102	947	18,251	1,171	3,040	421	1,646	626
Wayne	2,21	9 65	2,086	71	1,830	56	36	4	11	78
Westmoreland	35,889	732	37,967	1,612	31,908	1,228	2,188	109	450	472
Wyoming	2,210) 5	2,195	106	1,946	55	18	5	5	60
York	40,049		38,656	1,483	33,645	728	649	95	546	1,510
State Totals	1,235,603	3 9,335	1,105,842	45,679	875,013	48,049	53,715	7.945	39,633	35,808

Table 26 Non-Traffic Citations

County	No. Filed	Adjust	No. Disposed	Guilty By Trial	Guilty Plea	Not Guilty	Settled	Wthdrwl. of Pros.	Subs Defect	Un- locatbl.	Other
Adams	1,325	1	1,305	.77	1,046	24	20	131	0	5	2
Allegheny	29,888	66	22,792	3,003	12,808	3,662	632	1,178	220	1,017	272
Armstrong	1,767	149	1,850	150	1,463	119	16	77	• 7	6	12
Beaver	4,946	8	5,133	313	3,309	325	14	592	87	459	34
Bedford	705	2	623	43	497	23	2	51	0	6	1
Berks	6,824	1	5,822	433	4,726	226	96	257	11	46	27
Blair	3,537	1	3,166	213	2,515	97	20	88	6	219	8
Bradford	851	5	766	49	600	14	1	30	1	0	71
Bucks	16,338	578	11,721	1,178	7,802	966	108	526	31	551	559
Butler	6,775	11	6,483	303	4,914	146	21	670	36	385	8
Cambria	3,599	22	3,204	104	2,627	155	7	135	6	68	102
Cameron	310	0	272	9	231	8	0	24	0	0	0
Carbon	1,243	35	1,157	240	605	73	0	200	2	34	3
Centre	8,262	2	7,729	130	4,371	210	28	1,929	1	1,060	0
Chester	11,582	171	9,960	787	6,734	811	25	769	20	152	662
Clarion	1,217	1	1,203	66	860	27	118	131	1	0	0
Clearfield	1,837	0	1,795	101	1,538	45	7	72	1	5	26
Clinton	1,033	0	968	104	702	49	6	100	1	0	6
Columbia	2,226	5	1,861	242	1,401	68	57	82	1	9	1
Crawford	2,028	32	1,847	157	1,419	67	59	108	1	12	24
Cumberland	4,234	1	4,301	221	3,618	76	7	227	38	48	66
Dauphin	9,140	2	6,939	563	5,086	380	33	253	19	232	373
Delaware	18,918	18	15,730	2,226	8,961	1,960	169	1,474	162	397	381
Elk	542	12	557	70	405	17	2	41	13	6	3
Erie	7,211	43	7,374	543	5,505	471	85	378	9	363	20
Fayette	2,759	6	1,881	135	1,358	171	17	121	10	52	17
Forest	260	0	185	14	110	4	4	52		0	0
Franklin	1,788	14	2,035	71	1,259	17	10	112	5	344	217
Fulton	220	1	203	7	180	6	0	10	0	0	0,
Greene	319	0	228	20	174	15	1	6	0	4	8
Huntingdon	950	0	978	40	733	19	0	84	5	97	0
Indiana	2,067	9	1,608	162	1,141	81	15	136	7	46	• 20
Jefferson	927	0	<u>822</u> 152	<u>41</u> 29	730	<u>16</u> 8	6	22	3	0	4
Juniata	128	0			113					-	
Lackawanna	3,033	5	2,471	372	1,499	184	62	235	51	68	0
Lancaster	10,557	91	8,279	316	6,972	<u>162</u> 66	<u> </u>	388 72	30	105 19	<u> </u>
Lawrence	1,978	0	1,335	118	1,000			178	0		
Lebanon	5,098	5	3,862	258	3,252	90	6		43	11	24 85
Lehigh	6,121	25	3,972	208	2,937	189	36	389	7	121	
Luzerne	6,446	15	4,788	406	3,590	314	70	291	4	110	3 67
Lycoming	3,097	120	2,919	124	2,301	127	3	197	0	100	
McKean	937	0	704	42	561	28	4	61	1	3 continued r	4

continued next page

.

52

Table 26
Non-Traffic Citations (cont'd.)

-120

- 11

County	No. Filed	Adju	No. Isted Disp		Guilty Gu y Trial Pla	uilty ea	Not Guilty	Wthdrwl. of Pros.	Subs. Defect.	Un- locatbl.	Other
Mercer	3,744	18	3,375	177	2,898	42	33	167	0	30	28
Mifflin	1,072	0	1,294	43	1,082	42	1	101	4	16	5
Monroe	2,030	3	1,788	125	1,202	20	72	207	0	136	26
Montgomery	19,297	9	19,341	1,202	14,492	1,262	57	1,123	36	974	195
Montour	375	Ó	423	15	331	18		31	1	27	0
Northampton	11,153	23	10,790	379	7,998	365	37	476	47	1,304	184
Northumberland	2,235	0	2,279	102	1,851	57	7	139	1	61	61
Perry	403	Ō	430	10	345	4	4	65	1	0	1
Pike	324	0	282	21	197	14	0	20	1	17	12
Potter	366	1	345	18	301	6	0	20	0	0	0
Schuylkill	2,758	70	2,436	148	1,853	133	12	232	19	9	30
Snyder	396	10	424	10	289	14	66	38	0	7	0
Somerset	1,824	71	1,568	156	1,235	91	5	48	9	7	17
Sullivan	137	0	123	13	87	6	0	13	0	4	0
Susquehanna	291	0	283	22	234	11	2	3	1	10	0
Tioga	625	20	576	72	425	33	2	35	0	2	7
Union	480	0	555	32	325	12	57	96	0	4	29
Venango	2,004	164	1,877	89	1,531	31	37	160	0	0	29
Warren	681	7	593	41	472	18	2	31	3	22	4
Washington	5,671	212	4,471	306	2,860	292	17	391	37	364	204
Wayne	936	16	572	17	476	14	2	25	3	17	18
Westmoreland	6,012	174	6,862	349	5,307	360	53	420	16	160	197
Wyoming	425	0	360	31	282	22		4	0	1	20
York	8,772	32	7,513	474	6,360	245		229	10	24	103
State Totals	265,034	2,362	229,540	17,540	164,086	14,628	2,377	15,953	1,030	9,356	4,570

Table 26 Summary Complaints

County	No. Filed	Adjust	No. Disposed	Guilty By Trial	Guilty Plea	Not Guilty	Settled	Wthdrwl. of Pros.	Subs Defect	Un- locatbl.	Other
Adams	1,045	0	740	69	525	42	12	80	0	12	0
Allegheny	17,952	11	15,133	4,272	4,296	1,597	2,233	1,455	57	1,163	60
Armstrong	675	23	662	76	409	71	39	64	0	1	2
Beaver	2,742	2	2,633	193	1,207	207	129	425	21	447	4
Bedford	867	0	707	36	552	18	5	70	0	26	0
Berks	2,445	8	1,901	215	1,053	116	192	198	4	116	7
Blair	2,238	9	2,377	182	1,562	93	63	176	2	266	33
Bradford	523	1	400	36	274	20	9	46	1	6	8
Bucks	3,444	17	2,543	266	760	298	257	573	14	290	85
Butler	844	1	1,334	84	908	31	59	75	24	124	29
Cambria	2,068	39	1,793	123	1,341	103	54	119	0	41	12
Cameron	10	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0
Carbon	315	0	240	44	91	33	23	40	1	7	1
Centre	3,983	1	3,917	73	2,533	201	39	853	0	218	0
Chester	3,086	62	2,763	265	1,312	211	50	381	2	287	255
Clarion	851	24	886	13	613	19	158	45	4	0	34
Clearfield	1,431	15	1,250	122	952	39	12	69	0	8	48
Clinton	379	0	393	24	320	17	0	31	0	0	1
Columbia	874	0	608	73	433	28	17	32	0	25	0
Crawford	1,793	88	1,543	91	1,022	45	86	175	0	69	55
Cumberland	1,582	4	1,185	39	939	15	36	59	1	70	26
Dauphin	20,992	36	13,808	329	8,570	148	121	2,747	28	1,595	270
Delaware	5,261	82	5,356	1,655	1,008	550	329	1,618	5	130	61
Elk	291	1	294	10	262	2	4	10	0	4	2
Erie	3,412	15	2,831	360	1,618	166	172	243	23	235	14
Fayette	1,858	7	1,139	110	747	71	72	108	2	14	15
Forest	43	0	32	4	19	0	3	5	1	0	0

Table 26 Summary Complaints (cont'd.)

County	No. Filed	Adjust	No. ed Disposed			Guilty Plea	Not Guilty	Wthdrwl. of Pros.	Subs. Defect.	Un- locatbl.	Other
Franklin	1,488	2	1,334	72	991	19	20	86	0	74	72
Fulton	72	0	55	3	34		10	5	0	0	C
Greene	701	0	433	21	320		9	25	0	0	45
Huntingdon	328	0	291	11	235		11	20	1	5	5
Indiana	1,801	9	1,300	97	887	104	12	126	0	72	2
Jefferson	807	153	704	56	521	28	50	39	7	1	2
Juniata	248	0	193	20	148		4	11	0	0	1
Lackawanna	2,800	38	2,525	340	1,143	200	339	350	4	96	53
Lancaster	3,707	8	2,615	107	1,935	53	28	220	3	166	103
Lawrence	807	3	631	58	379	26	82	70	0	3	13
Lebanon	334	0	253	8	209	1	4	29	0	1	1
Lehigh	3,011	8	2,530	196	1,372	70	111	298	7	389	87
Luzerne	3,601	9	2,374	376	1,037	204	467	216	3	67	4
Lycoming	1,439	114	1,931	42	1,346	59	49	225	0	209	1
McKean	639	0	533	23	433		17	29	0	14	C
Mercer	2,467	2	1,940	85	1,448	29	19	257	0	99	3
Mifflin	593	0	597	2	507		4	43	7	25	. 2
Monroe	1,024	0	902	54	479		75	88	2	62	129
Montgomery	4,818	25	3,413	355	1,277	225	713	382	4	372	85
Montour	101	0	75	1	64		0	10	0	0	C
Northampton	2,771	6	2,474	352	1,283		95	225	1	359	9 0
Northumberland	325	9	205	8	171	3	3	19	1	0	C
Perry	891	0	746	27	413		90	168	0	40	0
Pike	137	0	112	9	78		0	7	0	4	0
Potter	140	6	169	21	130	0	6	11	0	1	0
Schuylkill	536	12	498	59	342	15	33	38	2	6	3
Snyder	640	8	735	78	378		107	94	0	55	5
Somerset	754	35	539	30	369		19	48	5	17	13
Sullivan	64	0	62	7	35		0	15	0	3	0
Susquehanna	139	0	118	15	72		13	12	0	1	C
Tioga	657	45	508	78	266		36	61	0	44	6
Union	632	0	680	19	560		35	22	0	18	10
Venango	275	2	239	13	148		37	35	0	0	2
Warren	225	5	198	15	132		10	13	2	23	1
Washington	2,493	140	1,799	227	803		131	154	7	252	54
Wayne	359	25	205	17	157		11	13	1	. 0]
Westmoreland	6,162	143	5,205	350	3,195		218	461	9	429	. 259
Wyoming	531	1	473	53	289		4	26	i	39	37
York	4,812	7	3,791	202	2,830	182	174	265	1	66	71
State Totals	134,333	1,127	109,858 12	2,271	59,742	6,183	7,220	13,917	258	8,166	2,101

Table 26 Misdemeanor and Felony Complaints

County	No. Filed	Adjust	No. Disposed	Guilty Plea	Bound	Dismiss	Waiver	Settled	Wthdrwl. of Pros.	Fugitive	Other
Adams	602	20	464	74	212	21	65	14	. 68	2	8
Allegheny	12,066	41	11,867	358	4,362	3,361	940	652	1,627	185	382
Armstrong	567	13	404	11	101	61	89	38	89	1	14
Beaver	1,824	4	1,905	93	476	320	302	31	606	75	2
Bedford	582	0	575	152	128	40	85	35	130	1	4
Berks	2,459	2	2,500	14	908	428	531	54	420	122	23
Blair	1,421	0	1,305	75	486	113	324	112	181	6	8
Bradford	511	0	461	1	156	31	177	3	62	29	2
Bucks	7,949	935	5,814	21	1,948	420	1,707	88	734	552	344
Butler	1,636	5	1,546	245	226	83	576	247	121	16	32
Cambria	1,960	43	1,866	20	421	163	432	163	268	90	309
Cameron	130	0	119	0	49	20	37	8	5	0	0

continued next page

1

continued next page 55

Table 26

			,	
Misdemeanor as	nd	Felony	Complaints	(cont'd.)

County	No. Filed	Adjusted	No. Disposed	Guilty By Trial	Guilty Plea	Not Guilty	Settled	W thdrwl of Pros	Subs. Defect.	Un- locatbl.	Other
Carbon	376	0	355	30	138	54	51	10	62	5	5
Centre	856	0	877	49	362	47	252	39	122	6	0
Chester	3,334	203	2,891	44	1,335	243	457	53	591	42	126
Clarion	512	3	534	76	126	27	182	51	57	1	14
Clearfield	930	30	900	190	147	93	336	14	109	2	9
Clinton	417	4	439	35	170	40	117	16	60	0	1
Columbia	960	14	897	273	157	101	99	34	209	0	24
Crawford	946	28	903	68	320	49	259	22	146	3	36
Cumberland	1,445	83	1,358	9	608	90	282	91	203	61	14
Dauphin	5,471	5	5,509	2,257	1,484	365	704	212	293	28	166
Delaware	7,810	200	7,307	17	2,669	1,275	246	655	1,930	382	133
Elk	224	3	240	2	66	14	107	3	21	1	26
Brie	2,907	32	2,675	104	904	439	674	167	277	30	80
			1,065	8	472	182	164	47	133	44	15
Fayette	1,261 82	1	1,005 86	19	472 9	0	23	3	23	7	2
Forest		01	644		9	47	239	48	92	17	4
Franklin	733				58	47	239	3	13	0	1
Fulton	98	1	90 226	2		4 29	9 75	11	36	1	15
Greene	414	2	336	5	164		<u> </u>	10	38	3	
Huntingdon	301	3	255	34	105	12			38 51	5 11	7
Indiana	665	1	624	14	274	87	150	30			
Jefferson	462	0	434	65	101	19	121	18	106	4	(
funiata	93	0	85	0	57	4	11	3	9	0]
Lackawanna	2,441	93	1,970	183	476	335	268	188	384	14	122
Lancaster	2,888	19	2,699	149	1,391	229	565	24	312	12	17
Lawrence	932	16	830	63	284	162	43	59	126	11	82
Lebanon	874	3	834	3	484	32	193	31	74	11	6
Lehigh	3,178	58	2,377	266	905	298	594	66	184	2	62
Luzerne	2,649	28	2,085	164	620	288	622	159	210	4	18
Lycoming	1,323	28	1,109	163	359	113	264	20	163	5	22
McKean	301	0	314	30	111	28	64	4	77	0 _	(
Mercer	1,257	15	1,036	139	322	54	86	24	368	37	
Mifflin	277	0	253	7	41	18	104	20	57	0	e
Monroe	990	1	947	155	291	111	32	163	179	2	14
Montgomery	6,179	5	5,116	53	2,231	494	1,187	188	718	82	163
Montour	124	0	101	14	29	2	32	0	24	0	(
Northampton	1,898	8	1,722	139	783	172	199	60	230	108	31
Northumberland	657	4	628	35	199	64	199	56	81	8	
Perry	236	4 0	214	2	73	9	61	29	39	1	(
Pike	119	1	110	2	40 40	4	16	3	36	1	
	119	10	169	1	65	10	37	9	43	0	
Potter		23	1,103	20	499	119	327	26	45 96	9	,
Schuylkill	1,146		227		499 86	13	85	20	8	0	(
Snyder	223	2		18		94	269	31	202	71	
Sonterset	1,049	7	990 75	139	178						
Sullivan	82	2	75	1	13	0	33	4	17	0	
Susquehanna	245	0	229	24	58	34	47	37	24	1	
Tioga	694	22	618	50	123	57	194	51	106	15	2
Union	146	0	165	6	59	14	37	6	37	2	
Venango	426	15	369	82	121	14	53	17	69	0	1
Warren	351	6	308	60	86	11	91	11	28	0	2
Washington	2,988	326	2,319	40	817	481	308	194	262	132	8
Wayne	275	10	243	0	97	36	52	б	47	0	
Westmoreland	4,734	202	3,936	174	1,257	807	246	281	915	110	14
Wyoming	213	0	211	16	99	19	36	13	23	3	
York	2,694	18	2,495	89	1,032	206	734	64	188	149	3
State Totals	103,792	2,593	93,132	6,657	32,625	12,610	16,933	4,837	14,219	2,517	2,73

Table 26 Civil Complaints

County	No. Filed	Adjust	No. Disposed	Trial	Settled	Judge By Default	Dismiss Prejud.	Complnt. Wthdrwn.	Closed	Other
Adams	1,198	0	1,065	125	338	509	27	3	63	C
Allegheny	22,514	8	20,804	6,242	2,846	10,177	490	267	727	55
Armstrong	843	1	839	204	121	475	26	6	5	2
Beaver	3,018	3	2,906	654	433	1,510	158	46	103	2
Bedford	886	1	960	64	227	512	8	9	140	C
Berks	3,921		3,497	658	674	1,970	75	49	63	
Blair	2,169	0	2,039	564	307	1,066	76	7	19	(
Bradford	1,349	0	1,229	107	305	755	18	10	33]
Bucks	14,433	127	15,610	3,581	3,015	6,852	348	177	1,494	143
Butler	3,156	7	3,703	635	1,367	1,303	62	42	257	37
Cambria	3,003	1	2,939	486	670	1,505	74	61	86	57
Cameron	98	01	83	9	27	45	<u>l</u>	1	0	(
Carbon	1,189	1	1,075	211	268	496	36	7	19	38
Centre	1,896	0	1,971	429	693	523	38	· 176	112	(
Chester Clarion	8,932	<u>37</u> 3	<u>8,328</u> 771	2,087	1,191	3,952	281	96	521	200
	623			75	186	459	21	11	19	(
Clearfield Clinton	2,065	0	1,987	220	385	1,301	62	17	1	-
Clinton Columbia	699	0	848	254	127	415	<u>17</u>	9	26	(
Columbia Crawford	1,195	0 243	1,077	223	180	638	9	11	16	(
	3,638		3,550	366	788.	2,095	85	42	171	3
Cumberland	2,873		2,605	424	428	1,556	82	33	68	<u>14</u> 20
Dauphin	6,368		6,094	1,191	1,103	3,219	134	156	271	
Delaware Elk	10,850 642	4	12,609 594	5,730	2,024	3,754	195	164	221	52
				66	192	305	14	5	12	(
Erie	4,751	1	4,776	1,290	774	2,249	76	36	293	58
Fayette	1,329	8	1,101	163	211	673	43	6	4	-
Forest	91	0	98	11	34	48	1	0	4	(
Franklin	1,195	0	959	87	206	597	10	30	20	9
Fulton	249	0	239	21	78	126	6	4	4	(
Greene Huntingdon	<u> </u>	$-\frac{1}{1}$	<u> </u>	<u>28</u> 71	211	<u>133</u> 412	<u>14</u> 34	37	14	(
Indiana	1,555	1 17		357		729			14	21
Jefferson	1,098		1,402		267	813	39	9	18	8
Juniata	497	0	<u>1,166</u> 536	<u>178</u> 39	<u>126</u> 98	379		48	<u> </u>	(
Lackawanna	497 4,312	4	3,922		733	1,930	1	8 65	156	4
	4,312 6,977			931 888		3,716	102 130	131	328	
Lancaster Lawrence	1,690	$-\frac{4}{1}$	<u>6,409</u> 1,539	209	<u>1,097</u> 347	887	34	20	328	119
Lebanon	2,231	0	2,147	209	465	. 1,168	53	20 93	39 90	18
Lehigh	7,135		6,239	260 808	465 1,045	3,894		93 74		
Luzerne	5,288	<u> </u>	4,951				<u>159</u> 77	105	<u>183</u> 82	70
Lycoming	2,285	2	2,306	1,487 354	1,038 460	2,160 1,305	23	103 72	82 82	10
McKean	1,186	0	2,300	334 164	231	624	23 70	4	82)
Mercer	3,377	2	2,908	524	607	1,638	38	29	70	
Mifflin	1,002	0	2,908 977	131	277	487	38 71	29 9	1	4
Monroe	3,266	0	3,382	602	1,218	1,264	40		91	
Montgomery	15,633	15		4,035	2,847	6,663	287	<u>161</u> 228	459	359
Montour	270	0	14,878 247							
Northampton	3,455	6	3,143	47	56 593	138 1,320	2 92	3 35	1 25 -	(42
Northumberland	1,172	0	1,089	<u>1,031</u> 328	258	435	52	15		
Perry						654	32		1	
Pike	1,152 1,000	0 0	1,052 1,324	95 51	266 285	634 798	139	6 37	1 14	(
Potter	270	0	251	25	65	151	<u>139</u> 5	3	2	(
Schuylkill	1,589	19	1,533	301	351	759	42	17	29	34
Snyder	1,589	19	1,533 949	301 66	506	739 348	42 5	17	29 10	ىن (
Somerset	1,737	4	1,660	167	306	1,069	35	<u>14</u> 6	38	
Sullivan	1,737	4	1,000	167	26	75	33 1	2	38 2	
Susquehanna	615	1	540	77 -	136	279	17	6	25	
Tioga	1,307	0	1,287	92	348	756	17	23	<u>23</u> 49	(
Union	720	0	650	92 161	229	201	38	12	49	1
Venango	1,087	0	1,081	133	229 260	585	38 40	12	52	
• unango	1,007	U	1,001	100	200	202	40	11	continued i	

Table 26		
Civil Coa	nplaints	(cont'd.)

County	No. Filed	Adjusted	No. Disposed	Trial	Settled	Judge By Default	Dismiss Prejud.	Compint. Wthdrwn.	Closed	Other
Warren	1,038	7	911	105	241	525	17	3	20	0
Washington	2,620	6	2,438	548	438	1,280	89	26	51	6
Wayne	1,327	68	1,312	94	303	711	68	8	125	3
Westmoreland	5,074	31	4,810	1,262	779	2,163	189	97	182	138
Wyoming	772	0	771	75	162	453	64	8	6	3
York	6,055	5	6,208	884	1,488	3,325	191	134	182	4
State Totals	196,171	588	190,612	42,793	37,473	93,312	4,794	2,969	7,229	2,042

Table 26 District Courts Warrants

	Issued	Disposed
Adams	1,944	1,795
Allegheny	20,308	19,418
Armstrong	1,626	1,596
Beaver	7,007	6,506
Bedford	1,380	1,374
Berks	6,536	6,553
Blair	2,656	2,589
Bradford	1,086	1,222
Bucks	17,915	13,530
Butler	2,980	2,700
Cambria	3,162	2,650
Cameron	72	76
Carbon	963	963
Centre	13,230	8,653
Chester	24,419	20,551
Clarion	1,025	1,033
Clearfield	2,252	2,375
Clinton	2,411	2,318
Columbia	1,965	1,871
Crawford	2,605	2,754
Cumberland	5,358	4,641
Dauphin	16,995	11,304
Delaware	41,897	31,584
Elk	477	420
Erie	6,666	6,560
Fayette	2,273	2,036
Forest	189	197
Franklin	1,809	1,687
Fulton	393	266
Greene	1,180	774
Huntingdon	1,021	1,040
Indiana	2,021	1,923
Jefferson	1,434	1,267

Table 26 District Courts Warrants (cont'd.)

	Issued	Disposed
Juniata	295	222
Lackawanna	2,954	2,612
Lancaster	10,417	7,659
Lawrence	2,242	1,581
Lebanon	3,317	2,511
Lehigh	6,115	5,871
Luzerne	3,551	3,446
Lycoming	3,842	9,819
McKean	617	627
Mercer	2,605	2,352
Mifflin	1,325	1,391
Monroe	2,904	2,202
Montgomery	29,680	22,854
Montour	325	263
Northampton	11,321	10,831
Northumberland	2,014	2,196
Perry	833	805
Pike	205	209
Potter	356	371
Schuylkill	2,131	1,882
Snyder	315	297
Somerset	2,244	2,235
Sullivan	285	275
Susquehanna	946	1,039
Tioga	1,149	1,102
Union	. 619	543
Venango	1,583	1,320
Warren	717	734
Washington	6,822	6,102
Wayne	631	458
Westmoreland	9,087	7,497
Wyoming	664	617
York	12,490	13,845
State Totals	321,856	279,994



Figure 12 Traffic Case Dispositions 1980*



Trat	trict Justice Courts Table 27 Ten M ffic Citations inty
2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Montgomery Delaware Allegheny Bucks Chester Lancaster York Westmoreland Dauphin Lehigh
	n-Traffic Citation
2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Allegheny Montgomery Delaware Bucks Chester Northampton Lancaster Dauphin York Centre
	nmary Complaints Inty
2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Dauphin Allegheny Westmoreland Delaware Montgomery York Centre Lancaster Luzerne Bucks
	demeanor/Felony Complaints anty
2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Allegheny Delaware Bucks Dauphin Montgomery Westmoreland Chester Lancaster Erie Berks
	l Complaints Inty
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Allegheny Montgomery Bucks Delaware Chester Lancaster Dauphin York Luzerne Westmoreland

10. Westmoreland

Filings	County	Dispositions
133,321	1. Allegheny	119,237
122,812	2. Montgomery	115,573
119,237	3. Delaware	92,486
74,359	4. Bucks	59,929
59,169	5. Chester	53,481
42,424	6. York	38,656
40,049	7. Westmoreland	37,967
35,889	8. Lancaster	36,366
33,800	9. Dauphin	29,887
31,426	10. Cumberland	28,003
Filings	County	Dispositions
29,888	1. Allegheny	22,792
19,297	2. Montgomery	19,341
18,918	3. Delaware	15,730
16,338	4. Bucks	11,721
11,582	5. Northampton	10,790
11,153	6. Chester	9,960
10,557	7. Lancaster	8,279
9,140	8. Centre	7,729
8,772	9. York	7,513
8,262	10. Erie	7,374
Filings	County	Dispositions
20,992	1. Allegheny	15,133
17,952	2. Dauphin	13,808
6,162	3. Delaware	5,356
5,261	4. Westmoreland	5,205
4,818	5. Centre	3,917
4,812	6. York	3,791
3,983	7. Montgomery	3,413
3,707	8. Erie	2,831
3,601	9. Chester	2,763
3,444	10. Beaver	2,633
Filings	County	Dispositions
12,066	1. Allegheny	11,867
7,949	2. Delaware	7,307
7,810	3. Bucks	5,814
6,179	4. Dauphin	5,509
5,471	5. Montgomery	5,116
4,734	6. Westmoreland	3,936
3,334	7. Chester	2,891
3,178	8. Lancaster	2,699
2,988 2,694	9. Erie 10. Berks	2,675 2,500
	10. Dorks	
Filings	County	Disposition
22,514	1. Allegheny	20,804
15,633	2. Bucks	15,610
14,433	3. Montgomery	14,878
10,850	4. Delaware	12,609
8,932	5. Chester	8,328
6,977	6. Lancaster	6,409
6,368	7. Lehigh	6,239
6,055	8. York	6,208
5,288 5,074	9. Dauphin	6,094
	10. Luzerne	4,951

Philadelphia Municipal Court Judicial Case Volume

In civil cases an 81% hike came in small claims filings, accompanied by an equally impressive 74% rise in dispositions. Compared to the caseload increase, the inventory has increased by a relatively modest 2,400 cases (Table 28).

Landlord and Tenant inventory remained low, relative to other civil cases. In 1980, it dropped by 17%. (Table 28).

Preliminary hearings increased significantly: 14% for filings and 21% for dispositions. Inventory rose a relatively slight 4%. Nearly 9,000 cases were held for Common Pleas Court. while the judges were able to dismiss 5.463 cases at the preliminary hearing stage. Municipal Court judges sat for 1,268 days on preliminary hearings (Table 29).

Criminal trial cases dropped to 4.822 cases in 1980, the second straight decrease following a large rise in inventory in 1978. Nol pros and probation under the pre- or postindictment program continue to dominate Municipal Court dispositions, and account for 73%* of total dispositions (Table 30).

* Figures rounded to nearest number.

Table 28 Philadelphia Municipal Court Civil Cases 1976-1980

	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	% Change 1979-80
Code Enforcement						
Records Received	22,642	25,141	25,597	24,852	27,085	8.98
Records Disposed	22,824	23,908	25,730	25,188	26,745	6.18
Records Pending	3,357	4,590	4,457	4,121	4,461	8.25
Landlord and Tenant						
Records Received	14,243	15,989	18,073	18,782	18,683	- 0.52
Records Disposed	14,218	15,839	18,458	18,350	18,886	2.92
Records Pending	1,015	1,165	780	1,212	1,009	-16.74
Small Claims						
Records Received	32,334	31,744	26,043	28,179	50,955	80.82
Records Disposed	32,936	31,923	27,504	28,001	48,608	73.59
Records Pending	5,439	5,260	3,799	3,977	6,324	59.01

Table 29

Philadelphia Municipal Court Preliminary Hearings 1976-1980

	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	% Change 1979-80
Preliminary Hearings						
Records Received	11,934	11,447	10,954	12,895	14,719	14.14
Records Disposed	12,127	11,128	10,983	11,790	14,303	21.31
Records Pending	757	1,076	1,047	1,655	1,718	3.80

In 1980, there were 5,463 dismissals at the preliminary hearing and 8,840 cases held for court.

Private Criminal						
Records Received		9,047	10,277	5,619	5,743	2.20
Records Disposed	_	9,047	10,277	5,556	5,848	5.25
Records Pending		0	0	361	256	-29.08

Table 30

Philadelphia Municipal Court^(a) Trial Cases 1976-1980

(a)	All 22 authorized judges for Philadelphia		1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	% Chang 1979-80
	Municipal Court are members of the bar of the Supreme Court.	Criminal Cases						
(b)	These criminal cases are all trial cases and	Records Received(b)	31,970	31,246	30,960	28,705	28,182	- 1.82
	do not include preliminary hearings or summary proceedings.	Records Disposed	32,237	30,707	29,005	28,568	28,182	- 1.35
(c)		By Guilty Plea	1,965	2,008	2,525	3,005	4,272	42.16
(•)	Act, there is no right of trial by jury, but the	Jury Waived(c)	6,342	4,090	3,793	2,838	2,930	3.24
	defendant has the right of appeal of trial de	Nolle Pros	12,755	13,688	13,139	13,962	11,638	-16.64
	novo, (new trial) including the right of trial by jury to the Trial Division of the Court of	A.R.D.	11,086	10,812	9,430	8,467	8,864	4.68
	Common Pleas.	Other Dispositions	89	0	0	162(d)	478(d)	195.06
(d)	includes 162 transfers to Family Court and	Adjustments	-298	-374	-290	-591	-230(e)	-61.08
	317 cases transferred to other jurisdictions.	Inventory of Cases	3,693	3,858	5,506	5,052	4,822	- 4.55
(e)	Includes 570 records placed in deferred status and 340 records reinstated.	Trial Days Visiting Judges	1,357	1,140	1,272	1,107	1,219	10.11
(f)	Common Pleas judges assigned to Municipal Court.	Trial Days(f)	474	0	475	342	290	-15.20

COURT FINANCES

The Courts of Pennsylvania are comparatively inexpensive to run. In Fiscal Year 1980-81, costs totalled \$53 million. or one half of one percent of the expenditures for state government... Fees collected from filing costs by appellate courts are also included in the .5%.

The Courts of Pennsylvania are comparatively inexpensive to run. In Fiscal Year 1980-81, costs totalled \$53 million, or one half of one percent (.5%) of the expenditures for State government. This figure does not include the county court reimbursement program.

A breakdown of the distribution of funds across the three branches of government is found in Figure 13. Table 31 shows where the money goes within the judiciary system.

Fees collected from filing costs by Appellate Courts are also included in the .5% of the State Budget which goes to the Judiciary Department. (See Table 31, Part b.) The total of all fees was \$516,983 in FY 79-80 and \$450,382 in FY 80-81. County Fees are not included.

The largest portion of State general funds is earmarked for the county reimbursement program (Table 31). Direct expenditures for the Courts of Common Pleas and District Justices make up the next largest expense; however, 99% of the costs of the lower courts are spent on salary and fringe benefit expenses. At the appellate level, these personal expenses account for 73% of the cost.

Where does the money come from? In Pennsvivania, the Courts are financed through a combination of federal, state, and county revenues. Furthermore, the federal contribution itself has two components. The first is federal revenue sharing as appropriated by the Pennsylvania Legislature. In Fiscal Year 79-80 the last year of the program, it amounted to \$24 million. Federal grants, mostly from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, comprise the second component of federal funding (See Table 32).

Two other items in Table 32 deserve attention. The \$2 million increase in the Superior Court is a result of its expansion from seven to 15 judges. A further increase in the FY 80-81 appropriations for all of the various courts comes from an increase in judicial salaries, the first since 1976. Inflation accounts for much of the remainder.

The state contribution to the Courts also has two components. First, State general funds, which totalled \$50.5 million in Fiscal Year 80-81, directly underwrite court operations for the Appellate Courts, the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, and the salaries for Common Pleas Judges and District Justices. Second, the State indirectly finances the courts through the county court reimbursement program by disbursing federal revenue sharing dollars in FY 79-80, and by using general fund monies in FY 80-81 to give a fixed sum of money to the counties in proportion to their courtrelated expenses. The largest portion of these reimbursements is based on expenditures for the Courts of Common Pleas.

The counties are responsible for appropriating money for all county court operating expenses, including the District Justices' offices. Judicial salaries, however, are paid by the State.

Table 31 Where the Money Goes: General Funds Fiscal Resources* In Millions of Dollars

	1979-80 Expenditu	ires	1980-81 Appropria	tion
Supreme Court	3,229	5.0%	3,630	4.9%
Superior Court	2,771	4.4%	4,770	6.4%
Commonwealth Court	2,435	3.8%	2,754	3.7%
Administrative Office	1,563	2.5%	1,700	2.3%
Common Pleas	16,190	25.4%	19,807	26.7%
Minor Judiciary Education Board	223	0.4%	272	0.4%
Philadelphia Municipal Court	970	1.5%	1,469	2.0%
County Court Reimbursement For Courts of Common Pleas	23,246	37.7%	23,087	32.4%
For Appellate Judges	754		913	
District Justices and Philadelphia Traffic Court	12,246	19.3%	15,718	21.2%
TOTAL	63,628	100,0%	74,120	100.0%
*Included Funds Collected As Fees Supreme Court Board of Law Examiners Superior Court Commonwealth Court Minor Judiciary Education Board	57,212 297,964 84,763 62,044		60,000 260,000 70,000 46,382 14,000	



TOTAL = \$11,336,000,000

Table 32

Judiciary Funding Where the Money Comes From

In Thousands of Dollars

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1979-1980	. .		
	State Judiciary*	County Courts of Common Pleas	County District Justice Offices	
State General Fund State Federal Revenue Sharing	39,109 754		0 0	
Federal Grants Local Funding	473	1,460 58,145**	0 24,971	
TOTAL	40,336	82,851	24,971	
	1980-81	- <u> </u>		
State General Fund State Federal Revenue Sharing	50,583	23,087	0	
Federal Grants Local Funding	(: 	 1,064 64,000***est.	0 0 27,500 est.	
TOTAL	51,408	88,141	27,500	

Figure 13 Pennsylvania Government FY 80-81 General, Special, Federal and Other Funds



PENNSYLVANIA'S JUDICIARY (AS OF 12/31/80)

Compared to the millions of people who come into contact with the Judicial System of Pennsylvania only 1,300 are directly employed by it. (See Table 33.) Of these 969 or 72% are elected judicial officers.

Sixty-one persons or 4.5% of the Commonwealth's judiciary employees staff the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts; and an additional 311 or 21% serve as Appellate Court personnel, including staff on advisory committees of the Supreme Court. (Table 33)

Each justice on the Supreme Court and each judge on the Superior Court, Commonwealth Court and Common Pleas Court serves a 10-year term... The Pennsylvania Consitiution provides that the person with the longest service on the Supreme Court automatically becomes chief justice.

NOTES

- Includes all expenditures for the appellate courts and the Administrative Office and salary costs for Common Pleas judges and district justices. The former includes Philadelphia Municipal Court and the latter includes the Philadelphia Traffic Court.
- ** For calendar year 1979 expenditures, but not including capital costs for any court, district justice office costs, or row office costs.
- *** For calendar year 1980 expenditures, but not including capital costs for any court, district justice office costs, or row office costs.

Each justice on the Supreme Court and each judge on the Superior Court, Commonwealth Court and Common Pleas Court serves a 10-year term. The mandatory retirement age is 70, but some who have reached that age or older continue to hear cases as senior judges.

Prior to the 1968 Constitutional reform, Supreme Court justices could serve for one term of 21 years each. After 1968, those with an unexpired 21-year term were allowed to serve the remaining time. The Pennsylvania Constitution provides that the person with the longest service on the Court automatically becomes Chief Justice.

Lawyers become judges in one of two ways:

- 1. by filling a vacancy, in which case they are appointed by the Governor and must be confirmed by the Senate. They must then run in the next general election if they wish to remain a judge.
- 2. by winning a general election.

After their 10-year term is up, they may run for retention on a simple yes or no ballot question.

District justices serve for a term of six years and may run for reelection every six years afterward.

Kind of Positions	Total Number of Authorized Personnel Positions Statewide		
1. Judicial Personnel			
Appellate Courts – Supreme, Superior and Common- wealth Courts	31		
Judges – Courts of Common Pleas and Philadelphia Municipal Court	331		
District Justices – Includes Philadelphia Traffic Court Judges but not Pittsburgh Magistrate Court Judges who are paid locally	561		
Senior Judges for Superior, Common Pleas, Philadelphia Municipal and District Justice Courts	46		
Judicial Personnel Sub-Total	969		
2. Appellate Courts	281		
3. Administrative Office	61		
4. Committees of Supreme Court	30		
Total	1,341		

Pennsylvania's Judiciary As of December 31, 1980.

Appellate Courts

Supreme Court Justices In Order of Length of Service

Henry X. O'Brien Chief Justice

Samuel J. Roberts Robert N.C. Nix, Jr. Rolf Larsen John P. Flaherty, Jr. Bruce W. Kauffman

Superior Court Judges

William F. Cercone President Judge

John G. Brosky James R. Cavanaugh Richard DiSalle John P. Hester Justin M. Johnson Frank J. Montemuro, Jr. Zoran Popovich Gwilym A. Price, Jr. Perry J. Shertz Edmund B. Spaeth Richard B. Wickersham Donald E. Wieand

Commonwealth Court Judges

James C. Crumlish President Judge

Genevieve Blatt David W. Craig John A. MacPhail Glenn E. Mencer Madaline Palladino Theodore O. Rogers Roy Wilkinson, Jr. Robert W. Williams, Jr.

Judges of the Courts of Common Pleas, Senior Judges, and Philadelphia Municipal Court Judges (listed alphabetically according to county, as of December 31, 1980)

Adams County Judicial District 51 Oscar F. Spicer, President Judge Mary L. Mummert, District Court Administrator

*Superior Court

Allegheny County

Judicial District 5 Michael J. O'Malley, President Judge Robert E. Dauer, Administrative Judge - Criminal Division Nicholas P. Papadakos, Administrative Judge - Civil Division R. Stanton Wettick, Administrative Judge - Family Division Paul R. Zavarella, Administrative Judge - Orphans' Court Division Francis A. Barry Gerard M. Bigley Ralph J. Cappy James F. Clarke Joseph A. Del Sole Robert A. Doyle S. Louis Farino Marion K. Finkelhor Thomas A. Harper Livingstone M. Johnson Lawrence W. Kaplan Bernard J. McGowan James R. McGregor Emil E. Narick Raymond A. Novak John W. O'Brien Zoran Popovich Joseph H. Ridge Eunice Ross George H. Ross Raymond L. Scheib Nathan Schwartz Silvestri Silvestri Henry R. Smith, Jr. Ralph H. Smith, Jr. Leonard C. Staisey William L. Standish Eugene B. Strassburger, III Samuel Strauss Patrick R. Tamilia J. Warren Watson I. Martin Wekselman Stephen A. Zappala Richard G. Zeleznik Charles H. Starrett, Jr., District Court Administrator Senior Judges

Henry Ellenbogen Loran L. Lewis Maurice Louik Harry M. Montgomery* William S. Rahauser Frederic G. Weir Robert Van der Voort*

Armstrong County Judicial District 33 Roy A. House, President Judge J. Frank Graff Beatrice M. Livengood, District Court Administrator

Beaver County Judicial District 36 John N. Sawyer, President Judge

Thomas C. Mannix Robert C. Reed James E. Rowley Joseph S. Walko John A. Clarke, Jr., District Court Administrator

Senior Judges Frank E. Reed J. Ouint Salmon

Bedford County Judicial District 53 Ellis W. Van Horn, Jr., President Judge

Richard C. Snyder William K. E. Kauffman, District Court Administrator

Berks County Judicial District 23 W. Richard Eshelman, President Judge

Frederick Edenharter Thomas J. Eshelman John N. Sawyer Arthur Ed Saylor Forrest G. Schaeffer Grant E. Wesner Margaret S. Freeman, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges James W. Bertolet Warren K. Hess

Blair County Judicial District 24 Thomas G. Peoples, Jr., President Judge

Richard A. Behrens R. Bruce Brumbaugh Michael D. Reighard, District Court Administrator

Bradford County Judicial District 42 Evan S. Williams, Jr., President Judge

Bucks County Judicial District 7 Paul R. Beckert, President Judge

Kenneth G. Biehn Edward G. Biester, Jr. Oscar S. Bortner Isaac S. Garb George T. Kelton Edmund V. Ludwig Harriet M. Mims William Hart Rufe, III H. Paul Kester, Esq., District Court Administrator

Senior Judges John Justus Bodley Lawrence A. Monroe Edwin H. Satterthwaite

Butler County Judicial District 50 George P. Kiester, President Judge

John C. Dillon Bette M. McAnany, District Court Administrator

Cambria County Judicial District 47 H. Clifton McWilliams, Jr., President Judge

Caram J. Abood Eugene A. Creany Joseph F. O'Kicki Robert Allison, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges George W. Griffith

Cameron/Elk County Judicial District 59 Paul B. Greiner, President Judge

Joseph Brunner, District Court Administrator

Carbon County Judicial District 56 John P. Lavelle, President Judge

Senior Judges Albert H. Heimbach

Centre County Judicial District 49 Charles C. Brown, Jr., President Judge

Lawrence C. Bickford, District Court Administrator

Chester County Judicial District 15 Dominic T. Marrone, President Judge

Robert S. Gawthrop, III Thomas A. Pitt, Jr. John E. Stively, Jr. Leonard Sugerman Lawrence E. Wood Charles R. Hostutler, District Court Administrator

Clarion County Judicial District 18 Merle E. Wiser, President Judge

Emma Lou Carrier, District Court Administrator

Clearfield County Judicial District 46 John K. Reilly, Jr., President Judge

Senior Judges John A. Cherry

Clinton County

Judicial District 25 Carson V. Brown, President Judge

Richard K. Sweeley, District Court **Administrator**

Senior Judges Abraham H. Lipez*

Columbia/Montour County

Judicial District 26 Jay Walter Myers, President Judge

Donna J. Coombe, District Court Administrator

Crawford County

Judicial District 30 P. Richard Thomas, President Judge

Robert L. Walker

Cumberland County

Judicial District 9 Dale F. Shughart, President Judge

George E. Hoffer Harold E. Sheely Bernice I. Duke, District Court Administrator

Dauphin County

Judicial District 12 Lee F. Swope, President Judge

William W. Caldwell John C. Dowling William W. Lipsitt Warren G. Morgan Clarence C. Morrison Lucy J. Cremonesi, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges Homer L. Kreider

Delaware County

Judicial District 32 Francis J. Catania, President Judge Joseph W. deFuria, Administrative 'Judge - Trial Division

Domenic D. Jerome Robert F. Kelly Joseph T. Labrum, Jr. Melvin G. Levy Clement J. McGovern, Jr. Rita E. Prescott Howard F. Reed R. Barclay Surrick William R. Toal, Jr. Robert A. Wright Dennis Metrick, Ph.D., District Court Administrator

Senior Judges Louis A. Bloom John V. Diggins

Erie County Judicial District 6 Edward H. Carney, President Judge

Fred P. Anthony James B. Dwver Lindley R. McClelland-William E. Pfadt Theodore G. Miller, District Court Administrator—Civil Division O. Gregory Orlando, District Court Administrator—Criminal Division

Fayette County

Judicial District 14 Richard D. Cicchetti, President Judge

Fred C. Adams Conrad B. Capuzzi William J. Franks Eleanor V. Sementa, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges James A. Reilly

Forest/Warren County Judicial District 37

Robert L. Wolfe, President Judge

Franklin/Fulton County Judicial District 39

George C. Eppinger, President Judge

John W. Keller William A. Sheaffer, District Court Administrator

Greene County

Judicial District 13 Glenn Toothman, President Judge

Wanda B. Smith, District Court **Administrator**

Huntingdon County

Judicial District 20 Newton C. Taylor, President Judge

A. Keith Black, District Court Administrator

*Superior Court

Indiana County Judicial District 40 Earl R. Handler, President Judge

Robert C. Earley Mildred R. Simpson, District Court Administrator

Jefferson County Judicial District 54 Edwin L. Snyder, President Judge

Eleanor Haky, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges Robert M. Morris

Juniata/Perry County Judicial District 41 Keith B. Quigley, President Judge

Donna M. Jones, District Court Administrator

Lackawanna County Judicial District 45 Edwin M. Kosik, *President Judge*

S. John Cottone James M. Munley Daniel L. Penetar James J. Walsh William J. Murray, *District Court Administrator*

Lancaster County Judicial District 2 Anthony R. Appel, *President Judge*

W. Hensel Brown
Wilson Bucher
Ronald L. Buckwalter
D. Richard Eckman
Wayne G. Hummer
Paul A. Mueller, Jr.
R. Ronald Reedy, District Court Administrator

Lawrence County Judicial District 53 Glenn McCracken, Jr., President Judge

William R. Balph Carol E. Young, *District Court Administrator*

Lebanon County Judicial District 52 G. Thomas Gates, *President Judge*

John A. Walter Linda C. Kerkeslager, *District Court Administrator* Lehigh County Judicial District 31 Martin J. Coyne, *President Judge*

John E. Backenstoe Maxwell E. Davison James N. Diefenderfer David E. Mellenberg Daniel P. Sabetti, Esq., *District Court Administrator Senior Judges* Kenneth H. Koch Henry V. Sheirer

Luzerne County Judicial District 11 Bernard C. Brominski, *President Judge*

Arthur D. Dalessandro Robert J. Hourigan Charles D. Lemmond, Jr. Peter Paul Olszewski Bernard J. Podcasy Patrick J. Toole, Jr. Andrew J. Mihalko, Jr., *District Court Administrator* Senior Judges

Richard L. Bigelow

Donald E. Wieand

Lycoming County Judicial District 29 Charles F. Greevy, *President Judge*

Thomas C. Raup Raymond A. Holland, District Court Administrator

McKean County Judicial District 48 William F. Potter, *President Judge*

Mercer County Judicial District 35 John Q. Stranahan, President Judge Albert E. Acker Michael M. Webster, District Court Administrator

Mifflin County Judicial District 58 R. Lee Ziegler, *President Judge* Senior Judges Paul S. Lehman

Monroe/Pike County Judicial District 43 James R. Marsh, President Judge

Harold A. Thomson, Jr. Frank J. Forrie, Jr., District Court Administrator Senior Judges Fred W. Davis Arlington W. Williams

Montgomery County Judicial District 38 Richard S. Lowe. President Judge

Mason Avrigian Lawrence A. Brown Vincent A. Cirillo Horace A. Davenport William T. Nicholas Samuel W. Salus, II Anthony J. Scirica Joseph H. Stanziani Louis D. Stefan Alfred L. Taxis, Jr. Robert W. Tredinnick William W. Vogel Cornelius G. Sullivan, Esq., District Court Administrator

Senior Judges Edwin H. Satterthwaite Frederick B. Smillie

Northampton County Judicial District 3 Alfred T. Williams, Jr., President Judge

Michael V. Franciosa Robert A. Freedberg Richard D. Grifo Franklin S. Van Antwerpen A. V. Marhefka, *District Court Administrator*

Senior Judges Carleton T. Woodring

Northumberland County Judicial District 8 Peter Krehel, *President Judge*

Samuel C. Ranck David A. Packer, *District Court Administrator*

Philadelphia County Judicial District 1 Edward J. Bradley, President Judge Joseph R. Glancey, President Judge of the Municipal Court** Charles P. Mirarchi, Jr., Administrative Judge - Trial Division Nicholas A. Cipriani, Acting Administrative Judge - Family Court Edward S. Pawelec, Administrative Judge - Orphans' Court

Lynne M. Abraham Michael J. Bednarek** Francis A. Biunno Edward J. Blake Lynwood F. Blount** Alex Bonavitacola **Philadelphia Municipal Court

Joseph P. Braig Joseph C. Bruno Matthew W. Bullock, Jr. Francis P. Cadran** Berel Caesar Herbert R. Cain, Jr. Vito F. Canuso Curtis C. Carson, Jr. Paul M. Chalfin John J. Chiovero Nicholas A. Cipriani Eugene H. Clarke, Jr. James Gardner Colins** Michael J. Conroy** Francis P. Cosgrove** Nicholas M. D'Alessandro Paul A. Dandridge Armand Della Porta Alfred J. DiBona, Jr. Charles L. Durham William A. Dwver, Jr. Lois G. Forer Abraham J. Gafni John A. Geisz Eugene Gelfand Murray C. Goldman Bernard J. Goodheart Levan Gordon Stanley M. Greenberg Angelo A. Guarino Theodore S. Gutowicz Marvin R. Halbert Doris M. Harris Kenneth S. Harris** Louis G. Hill Leonard A. Ivanoski George J. Ivins Ricardo C. Jackson** Judith J. Jamison Norman A. Jenkins Arthur S. Kafrissen** Jacob Kalish Leon Katz Julian F. King Richard B. Klein I. Raymond Kremer Stanley L. Kubacki Gregory G. Lagakos Robert A. Latrone William J. Lederer Samuel M. Lehrer** Mitchell S. Lipschutz** Charles A. Lord Alexander J. Macones** Edwin S. Malmed Charles J. Margiotti, Jr. William M. Marutani Joseph Patrick McCabe, Ju** Thomas J. McCormack** James D. McCrudden James T. McDermott Edward G. Mekel** Joseph T. Murphy William Porter Lawrence Prattis Paul Ribner Lisa A. Richette

William J. Brady, Jr.**

Meyer Charles Rose** Edward B. Rosenberg Albert F. Sabo David N. Savitt Harvey N. Schmidt John J. Scott, Jr.** Thomas N. Shiomos Alan K. Silberstein** Paul Silverstein J. Earl Simmons, Jr. ** Theodore B. Smith. Jr. Bernard Snyder Juanita Kidd Stout Harry A. Takiff Paul A. Tranchitella Evelyn M. Trommer Michael E. Wallace Thomas A. White Calvin T. Wilson Charles Wright Jerome A. Zaleski

Hon. David N. Savitt, District Court Administrator Bernard A. Scally, III, Court Administrator, Municipal Court

Senior Judges Levy Anderson Alexander F. Barbieri Victor J. DiNubile Ethan Allen Doty Ned L. Hirsh J. Sydney Hoffman* Charles Klein John J. McDevitt, III John R. Meade Maxwell L. Ominsky Jerome A. O'Neill Samuel H. Rosenberg Edward Rosenwald Benjamin W. Schwartz Kendall H. Shover Maurice W. Sporkin James L. Stern

Potter County Judicial District 55 Harold B. Fink, President Judge

Bertha M. Downs, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges Walter Pierre Wells

Schuylkill County Judicial District 21 Guy A. Bowe, Jr., President Judge

Donald D. Dolbin George W. Heffner John E. Lavelle Joseph F. McCloskey David R. Workman, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges G. Harold Watkins* Snyder/Union County Judicial District 17 A. Thomas Wilson, President Judge

Richard G. Shuck, District Court Administrator - Snyder County Bertha Boyer, District Court Administrator - Union County

Somerset County Judicial Existrict 16 Charles H. Coffroth, President Judge

Norman A. Shaulis Howard H. Trexel, *District Court* Administrator

Sullivan/Wyoming County Judicial District 44 Roy A. Gardner, *President Judge*

Senior Judges Robert W. Trembath

Susquehanna County Judicial District 34 Donald O'Malley, President Judge

Barbara W. Rydzweski

Tioga County Judicial District 4 Robert M. Kemp, *President Judge*

Carl L. Matteson, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges Charles G. Webb

Venango County Judicial District 28 William E. Breene, *President Judge*

Carol E. Hutchinson, District Court Administrator

Washington County Judicial District 27 Charles G. Sweet, *President Judge*

John F. Bell Thomas D. Gladden Samuel L. Rodgers Thomas J. Terputac Walter W. Gregory, Jr., Esq., District Court Administrator

Wayne County Judicial District 22 Robert J. Conway, *President Judge*

James Rutherford Vincent A. Scamell, *District Court Administrator*

*Superior Court **Philadelphia Municipal Court

Westmoreland County Judicial District 10 Richard E. McCormick, President Judge

Daniel J. Ackerman Joseph A. Hudock Charles H. Loughran Charles E. Marker Gilfert M. Mihalich Dennis Joyner, District Court Administrator

Senior Judges James Rutherford L. Alexander Sculco

York County Judicial District 19 Robert I. Shadle. President Judge

James E. Buckingham Emanuel A. Cassimatis Joseph E. Erb Richard E. Kohler John T. Miller Russell A. Myers, District Court Administrator

District Justices (As of December 31, 1980)

Adams County Harold J. Deardorff Eugene S. Long Donald G. Weaver John C. Zepp

Allegheny County Eileen H. Ambrose Daniel Anderson Albert V. Belan George Bobich Leonard W. Boehm James H. Bowen Matthew Butteri, Jr. Raymond L. Casper Anthony F. Clark Arthur P. Conn Elverda J. Daw Mark B. Devlin Nicholas A. Diulus Sarge Fiore Dominic Frasca William E. Garove Robert R. Graff James J. Hanley William J. Ivill, III Paul Komaromy And tew V Howard D. ldberg Lee J Mazur Rebert E. McCarthy Elaine M. McGraw Martin McTiernan Jules C. Melograne 68

Regis C. Nairn Thomas J. O'Neill Lee G. Peglow Harry J. Pokora Donald H. Presutti Eugene L. Raible Douglas W. Reed Bernard J. Regan James E. Russo Arthur Sabulsky John H. Salton Adam L. Shillinger Andrew S. Skundrich Donald E. Sparrow Olive S. Stocker John E. Swearingen Richard J. Terrick

John L. Musmanno

Raymond C. Thomas Angelo Toscolani Robert E. Tucker Peter J. Wagner Regis C. Welsh, Jr. Jacob H. Williams Gary M. Zyra

Armstrong County Robert J. Easley Lisle E. James Louis E. Milks, Jr. Eugene W. Shaeffer

Beaver County John J. Avoob Hugo R. Iorfido Ross M. Keefer, Jr. Lewis E. Kirchner Joseph J. Liberati Stephan D. Mihalic Milton H. Richeal Arthur L. Schlemmer George L. Shaffer

Bedford County Charles O. Guyer Kenneth G. Jewell Marion L. Morgret J. Robert Shaffer

Berks County

John A. Bender Mabel E. Blank Ralph A. Breneiser Barbara A. Clark Doris M. Dorminy Albert J. Gaspari Paul W. Geiger Arthur W. Herb Douglas N. Heydt Laura A. Keener B. Brevard Lord Charlotte F. Reber Henry E. Shultz Frank D. Shurr Patsy F. Spadafora Wallace W. Wagonseller Stephen G. Wanner George L. Wenger

Blair County Denver K. Ake William T. Camberg Domenic A. Caminiti Patrick T. Jones Thomas P. Kilcoyne Frederick L. Klepser William B. Lower James W. Morrisey

Bradford County Bernard F. Bride James M. Cox Albert J. Frank Jack Huffman, Jr.

Bucks County Joseph F. Basile Oliver A. Groman Anna V. Huhn J. Robert Hunsicker James M. Kelly Thomas E. League Clyde C. Leaver, Jr. John B. Leedom Elizabeth M. Leonard Michael J. Manto Catherine Marks* Anne E. Orazi Jennie I. Pekarski Dorothy A. Pollock Chris G. Ritter Dominick C. Spadaccino Kathryn L. Stump

Butler County John E. Banyay James H. Galbreath Alberta M. Hindman William R. O'Donnell George A. Stevenson, Jr.

Cambria County Francis P. Brosius Anthony A. Carnicella Mike Kreskosky Alice M. Krug James E. Mayer Joseph P. McCabe Max F. Pavlovich Joseph P. Piurkowsky Kenneth Robine Julia A. Rozum William J. Shay 1 vacancy

Cameron County Alvin E. Brown

Carbon County Harry E. Heydt Andrew Moisev Willard A. Steigerwalt Joseph M. Sverchek

Centre County Palmer K. Bierly Louise O. Green

Robert A. Shoff Clifford H. Yorks

Chester County John R. Blackburn, Jr. Donald C. Brown John F. Catanese C. Burtis Coxe Eugene J. DiFilippo, Jr. Earl M. Heald Carl W. Henry John T. Jeffers Robert G. Mull Armand A. Pomante

Clarion County Virginia C. Dibble Alta L. Hamilton Norman E. Heasley Paul Matson

Clearfield County William M. Daisher Alice L. Gregg Stephen Prunella Wesley J. Read

Clinton County Kevin R. Dwyer C. David Gilmore Carl R. Hamberger

Columbia County William L. Breech R. Donald Holter Delbert L. Pennypacker Nickolas B. Piazza

Crawford County Ronald A. Cole, Sr. Maurice L. Dickson Carol Good Robert J. Leonhart Harry E. Randall Estelle S. Reisner

Cumberland County

Chester H. Brymesser Edward J. Carl Violet Cassner Esther M. Cohick Glenn R. Farner Ronald E. Klair Meade G. Lyons Joseph Zedlar

Dauphin County

Lawrence E. Alvord Mary E. Cross William J. Gardner Paul H. Hardy Samuel J. Magaro Truman B. Peters Joseph S. Pinamonti, Jr. William P. Rathfon Francis Reichenbach Robert G. Shue Marlin E. Strohm William E. Woods

Garland W. Anderson Albert J. Berardocco Charles S. Bottino William L. Brown Robert W. Burton Vincent J. Cirilli Michael G. Cullen Robert H. Dewey William J. Dittert, Jr. Joseph M. Dougherty, II Paul Ewaka Joseph V. Gessler Martin J. Kerns Thomas J. Lacey Dewey LaRosa John L. Laskey, Jr. Gerald C. Liberace Leon J. Mascaro C. Walter McCray, Jr. Leonard M. McDevitt Carl J. Melone Harry P. Merlino Kenneth N. Miller Francis J. Murnaghan John J. Neilson Clarence B. Nesbitt, Jr. George W. Paige Joseph E. Palma Nicholas Sellers Henry J. Silva Robert M. Shaffer Anthony M. Truscello David T. Videon

Delaware County

Elk County Daniel T. Brahaney Elizabeth J. Friedl

Erie County Frank Abate, Jr. Joyce K. Dunn Larry R. Fabrizi Mary J. Fuller Sophie C. Hogan Harry L. Joslin L. Elliott Lefaiver, Sr. Anna O. McCall Peter P. Nakoski, Jr. Patsy S. Nichols Kathrvn L. Pohl Samuel U. Rossiter Robert C. Saxton, Jr. Ronald E. Stuck John A. Vendetti Charles R. Wise

Favette County Lawrence Blair James E. Hare Charles F. Hartz Grant Nicholson Michael Rubish Dona S. Saunders Paul Shenal Anthony A. Shuli Eugene J. Simon Andrew E. Turick

Leila Van Sickle Lloyd A. Williams 1 vacancy

Forest County Regis A. Fleming Arthur D. Sager

Franklin County James L. Campbell Robert E. Eberly Charles C. Harrison Bruce C. Ingels Mabel Shoemaker William J. Stover

Fulton County Dorothy S. Brantner Carol J. Johnson Don C. Knepper

Greene County Emil Bertugli Anne R. Hughes John C. Watson

Huntingdon County Daniel S. Davis Gretchen A. Krouse James H. Kyper N. Dale Wakefield

Indiana County Angelo C. Cravotta Louis J. Nocco Richard G. Orendorff Geraldine M. Wilkins

Jefferson County Guy M. Lester George B. Miller Bill G. Wescoat

Marian S. Mertz Lackawanna County Donna Andrews Eugene T. Cadden George E. Clark, Jr., Esq. Joseph B. Eiden Ferdinand A. Grunik Thomas M. Hart Daniel J. Kelleher James P. Kennedy Mary A. McAndrew John E. V. Pieski Michael S. Polizzi Frank F. Talerico Donald A. Yurgosky

Lancaster County John S. Alexander Justus F. Bard Joseph W. Bledsoe Gilbert R. Book James R. Burie

Juniata County Betty G. Gingrich Stella V. Caldwell Robert P. Drvden Harold E. Griener Nancy G. Hamill Edward A. Hermesky Murray R. Horton William A. Hull, Jr. Raymond B. Knorr John W. Miller Richard L. Reeser Richard A. Sheetz Sharron A. Simpkins Marilyn E. Stoner Mary F. Wilkinson Louise B. Williams

Lawrence County Ruth E. French Howard B. Hanna Betty Lou Kradel Wayne E. Shaffer Robert L. Zedaker

Lebanon County John F. Arnold Catherine M. Coyle Lucy A. Dinunzio Jacob D. Ensminger Lee R. Lehman JoAnn Shultz Mary M. Spannuth

Lehigh County Ralph H. Beck William H. Burdette Charles A. Deutsch Edward R. Ernst Wilbur K. Gilbert Willis E. Hankee Joseph J. Maura Edward F. Pressman Theodore L. Russiano George H. Schadler Marybeth Shankweiler James E. Stahl Charles J. Trinkle Donald Walter*

Luzerne County Joseph M. Augello Burton E. Balliet Andrew Barilla, Jr. John A. Bednarz Michael J. Collins Michael T. Conahan Patrick L. Cooney Francis P. Flynn Earl S. Gregory Leonard D. Harvey Carmen J. Maffei Robert Marshall S. Keene Mitchell, Jr. Viola S. Mrochko Electra M. O'Donnell Leonard C. Olzinski Ronald W. Swank Edward Verbonitz Joseph Verespy

Bernard J. Wujcik

Lycoming County Ronald E. Blackburn John W. Callahan Dean E. Dawes Richard T. Eisenbeis John M. McDermott

McKean County David D. Feheley John D. Geibel Patricia J. Morey Edward M. Rosenswie Robert V. Zimmerman

Mercer County Francis W. Brown William M. Coleman Joseph V. Gabany George E. McCandless Frank J. Tamber

Mifflin County E. Frank Burlew Barbara A. Clare

Monroe County Earl R. Ammerman Glenn A. Borger Gerald D. Canfield Dale A. Keenhold Clara Pope Eleanor K. Randolph Emanuel Scavone Marjorie J. Shumaker

Montgomery County Elaine J. Adams Everett P. Arnold John C. Bready, Jr. Charles A. Dasch George R. Eastburn, Jr. Richard E. Evans Leonard P. Flack Ronald Furlin Seymour L. Green Robert P. Johnson George H. Knoell, Jr. Francis J. Lawrence Bernard J. Maher A. T. Maynard, Jr. Donald B. McIntyre Nancy W. Moore Grant Musselman James L. O'Brien Leroy S. Oelschlager M. William Peterson Frank V. Plummer William W. Reed Donald O. Riehl Carroll A. Rosenberger John T. Sachaczenski Robert A. Saranceni James W. Speers Dorine F. Sutch Sherwood F. Zepp

Montour County Robert B. Geiger

Northampton County

Walter F. Auch, Jr. Elmo L. Frey, Sr. John Gombosi William B. Griffith Sherwood R. Grigg Michael J. Koury Samuel L. Kulp Pat J. Maragulia Stephen J. Marcincin Dennis J. Monaghan David T. Reibman Frederick A. Reinhart Elizabeth A. Romig James F. Stocklas Harold R. Weaver, Jr.

Northumberland County Wade J. Brown Kenneth R. Fairchild Michael F. Mychak Wilbur Reddinger

Perry County Jane R. Dyar Donald F. Howell Howard R. Maguire

Pike County Dore N. James Carolyn H. Purdue

Potter County Jeanne M. Cole Edward L. Easton Katherine G. Flynn Laura Hemphill Mary A. Walters

Schuylkill County Robert T. Brennan Bernard Brutto Elizabeth M. Lurwick Earl H. Matz, Jr. Charles V. Moran William J. Purcell Lester M. Reber Norman H. Richards Dwight M. Stine Suzanne M. Subalusky Catherine E. Thompson Joseph B. Weyman

Snyder County, Clark H. Arbogast William C. Saylor

Somerset County Jon A. Barkman Frances L. Cornish Constant N. Ferre Anthony F. Muscatello Robert M. Philson Sullivan County Milo D. Clinton Francis M. McCarty

Susquehanna County Barbara A. Obelenus Kenneth W. Seamans Marjory A. Wheaton

Tioga County William A. Buckingham William G. Farrell Eleanor Trask

Union County Leo S. Armbruster William D. Yohn

Venango County Robert E. Billingsly, Sr. Mary E. Nosco Donald E. Sloan, Jr. Charles R. Thurau

Warren County Allen D. Carlett

Suzanne M. Hodges Dalton E. Hunter J. C. Lobdell Ruth J. Mills Francis I. Rhodes

Washington County Roland M. Checca Matthew L. Cowell, Sr. June B. Lilley Walter A. Mark Richard L. Martin Henry Mavrich Thomas McGraw Steve Morgo Louis I. Quail Joseph P. Reichel J. Albert Spence Marjorie L. Teagarden Clyde G. Tempest Daryl A. Zeaman

Wayne County Edward H. Dix Margaret C. Farley Marjorie B. Kinsman Dorothy C. Laabs

Westmoreland County Jeane C. Anderson Anthony Angelo John F. Billy Lance Brown Buddy P. Cipolla Lois L. Diehl Joseph P. Gearing William S. Guido Donald C. Japalucci Ernest M. Johnson Michael R. Mahady James H. Mann, Jr. Terry R. Marolt Martha Medich Shirley A. Miller Michael G. Moschetti Robert E. Scott R. Daniel Smith C. McKee Speer Margaret I. Tlumac Raymond E. Tubbs

Wyoming County Leo P. Conway, Jr. Herbert W. Downs Patricia A. Robinson

York County Jack H. Barton Mildred G. Becker Paul M. Diehl, Jr. Harold C. Dixon Roger Estep Samuel A. Hill Margaret L. Klinedinst Virginia I. Klinefelter Lois Jean Mundoroff James W. Reedy Donald G. Rode Curtins C. Sponseller Quentin R. Stambaugh Chester D. Thomas, Jr. James G. Wallace Arthur D. Weeks

Philadelphia Traffic Court Judges*

Dominick Iannerelli, *President Judge* Samuel Clark, Jr. Salvatore DeMeo Raymond A. Malone George Twardy

Pittsburgh Magistrate Court Judges*

Alan Penkower, Esq., *Chief Judge* Louis Dadowski, Jr., Esq. Gretchen G. Donaldson, Esq. Joseph James, Esq. Douglas King Walter Little, Esq. Angela Marasco Donald G. Turner, Esq.

*As of December 31, 1980

GLOSSARY

Allocatur: It is allowed. A word denoting the allowance of a writ or order.

A.R.D. or Accellerated Rehabilitation Disposition: A program for nonviolent offenders set up by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 1972, involving the concept of probation supervision without conviction. Its purpose is to take offenders who have not yet made crime a way of life and encourage them to make a new start under the supervision of this program. Removing these first offenders from the criminal courts will, in turn, make those facilities available for the trial and rehabilitation of habitual or violent criminals.

Assumpsit: A promise of engagement by which one person assumes or undertakes to do some act or pay something to another.

Change of Venire: Bringing in a jury from one community to another.

Change of Venue: Change of place; moving the trial from one community to another.

Court of Record: A court that is required to keep a record of its proceedings and that may fine or imprison. Example: Court of Common Pleas, Appellate Courts. District Justice Courts are not courts of records. They have no court stenographers, no record of proceedings.

Declaratory Judgment: Where the plaintiff is in doubt as to his legal rights, the court issues a declaration of the rights and status of the litigants, which is conclusive and binding.

70

En Banc: Literally, full bench. Refers to a session where the entire membership of the court, as opposed to a single justice or panel of justices, will participate in the decision.

Equity: Justice administered according to fairness as contrasted with the strictly formulated rules of common law. The term "equity" denotes the spirit and habit of fairness, justness and right dealing which would regulate the relationships between people.

Felony: Crimes punishable by death or imprisonment in the state prison or penitentiary. The fundamental distinction between felonies and misdemeanors rests with the penalty and the power of imprisonment. In Pennsylvania, felonies are of the 1st, 2nd, or 3rd degree, depending upon their statutory designation and the length of their term of imprisonment.

Injunction: A prohibitive, equitable remedy used by a court requiring a party defendant to do or refrain from doing some act.

In Forma Pauperis: Permission given by a court to a poor person, an indigent, to proceed without liability for court fees and costs.

Judiciary Act Repealer Act (JARA): An act intended to eliminate numerous obsolete, unnecessary or suspended Pennsylvania statutory provisions.

Mandamus: Command issuing from a court of law of competent jurisdiction requiring the performance of a particular duty. The action is not available when the duty to be enforced is purely discretionary.

Misdemeanor: All crimes or indictable offenses not amounting to felonies, for which a punishment other than death or imprisonment in the state prison is prescribed by law, such as fines or imprisonment in the county jail. In Pennsylvania, they are divided into three grades, in reverse order of their severity. For example: a misdemeanor 3, giving cigarettes to a minor, is less serious than a misdemeanor 1 for the sale of firearms, or a misdemeanor 2 for carrying explosives.

Nol Pros: "Nolle Prosequi." Formal entry on the record by the prosecuting officer, or the plaintiff in a civil suit, declaring that he or she will not prosecute the case further.

Pro Se: In his or her own behalf. One who does not retain a lawyer and appears for himself in court.

Prothonotary: The title given to an officer who officiates as principal clerk of some courts.

Rule 145 of Criminal Procedure: Provides for the settlement of certain cases at the earliest possible stage before the District Justice.

Summary Offense: A minor offense that is adjudicated by a court not of record but is appealable to a court of record. It is punishable by a term of imprisonment not exceeding 90 days.

Tort: A private or civil wrong or injury, other than a breach of contract, for which the court will provide a remedy in the form of an action for damages.



END