LOAN COPY

National Criminal Justice Reference Service

ncjrs

This microfiche was produced from documents received for inclusion in the NCJRS data base. Since NCJRS cannot exercise control over the physical condition of the documents submitted, the individual frame quality will vary. The resolution chart on this frame may be used to evaluate the document quality.



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Microfilming procedures used to create this fiche comply with the standards set forth in 41CFR 101-11.504.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice United States Department of Justice Washington, D.C. 20531

11/3/83

in the o



### CASE TIME SEQUENCE STUDY:

#### A Study Of The Average Times Taken To Process Cases In Georgia's Superior Courts In Fisdal Year 1980

#### U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been

granted by Public Domain/Administrative Office of the US Courts

to the National Criminai Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

#### Prepared for the Judicial Council of Georgia By The Administrative Office Of the Courts

Judge Richard Bell Judge Berry E. Brock Judge Robert L. Culpepper, Jr. Clerk Woodson Daniel Judge Joel J. Fryer Judge P. Harris Hines Judge Ben A. Hodges Judge Willis B. Hunt, Jr. Judge Harry Johnson, Jr. Judge R. Don Lewis

The Case Time Sequence Study was approved by the Judicial Council of Georgia on June 9, 1982, and is provided as a first step in assessing the significance of trial court delay in Georgia.

This document was prepared under the auspices of the Administrative Office of the Courts. J. Chris Perrin, Assistant Director for Research and Court Services, directed research efforts involved in this study. Holly K. O. Sparrow, Senior Research Associate, supervised the efforts of the Research Section and coordinated data collection efforts.

Other A.O.C. personnel responsible for this report are:

Research Associates: Tracy Lightcap Julianne Goecke Shirley Johnson

Publication Number J-0682-B-04

June 4, 1982

#### JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF GEORGIA

#### ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

84 Peachtree Street Suite 500 Atlanta, Georgia 30303

404-656-5171

#### COUNCIL MEMBERS

Judge Joseph J. Gaines, Chairman Judge Andrew J. Whalen, Jr., Vice Chairman Judge James W. Head, Secretary - Treasurer

> Judge Juanita D. Marsh Justice Thomas O. Marshall Kirk M. McAlpin, Esq. Judge Walter C. McMillan, Jr. Judge Reid Merritt Judge Grady C. Pittard Judge J. Kelley Quillian Bob Reinhardt, Esq. Judge Edward D. Wheeler Judge Jere F. White

#### DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

Robert L. Doss, Jr.

Systems Analyst: Doug Bales

Data Preparation and Computer Operations: Martha Wilder

Data Collection and Verfication: Gloria Byrd

Benjamin Parks William Sarandis Dave Stahl

Word Proccessing: Teri Popham

Typing: Sandra Rainey Jennifer Spears

This report would have been impossible without the assistance of the District Administrator from the second Judicial Administrative District, Mr. Roger Douglas, and his secretary Claudia Cooper in data collection and verification, and without the cooperation of numerous superior court judges and clerks who provided insight and assistance in locating data needed for this effort.

In May of 1981, representatives of the Georgia Judiciary attended a Southeastern Regional Workshop on Irial Delay Reduction sponsored by the National Center for State Courts and the Institute of Court Management. The workshop emphasized judicial participation in trial delay reduction plans and techniques for assessing and eliminating trial delay. This workshop provided the Georgia Judiciary an opportunity for sharing the viewpoints and experiences of other jurisdictions in the southeastern region concerning trial delay.

serious problem in Georgia courts. Superior Courts.

The interest of the workshop delegation and the Judicial Council led to this study of civil and criminal cases in the Superior Courts. It is hoped that the information in this report will help the state's judges assess the seriousness of trial delay.

#### FOREWORD

An important result of this meeting was a realization by Georgia judges that, despite public concern with trial court delay, there was no concrete information as to whether trial delay is a

The Judicial Council of Georgia had been concerned for some time with the lack of information on case processing times, and had earlier directed the Administrative Office of the Courts to study the feasibility of a project to assess case processing times in the

> Robert L. Doss, Jr. Director

iii

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	NCJRS Page
FOREWORD	iii
INTRODUCTION	APR 5 1983
Purpose of the Study	ACQUISITIONS 2
Comparative Case Processing S	tandards4
Georgia Law Time Guidelines	6
Report Design	7
EXECUTIVE SYNOPSIS OF FINDINGS	9
SUMMARY OF METHODS USED	
STATEWIDE ANALYSIS	
Criminal Cases	
Civil Cases	
CIRCUIT ANALYSIS	
Circuit A	45
Circuit B	
Circuit C	
Circuit D	
Circuit E	
Circuit F	
Appendix I - Detailed Methodology.	
Appendix II - Georgia Law - Case P	rocessing Time Limitations121
Appendix III - Definitions and Dat	a Collection Forms131

Beginning in the late 1960's and throughout the 1970's numerous national and state commissions were established and surveys conducted to study judicial administration, especially judicial administration of criminal cases. A primary focus of these study groups, partially in response to public opinion, was trial court delay.

In a 1977 national survey, 59.8% of the general public and 27.7% of the judiciary perceived lack of court efficiency as a serious or very serious problem, and 64.5% of the general public felt that it would be very helpful or extremely helpful to have their tax dollars spent on trying to make the courts handle their cases faster.<sup>1</sup> The tables following are illustrative.

Respondents answered this question: "Here is a list of social problems that people are talking about today ... Please tell me how serious is the problem of the efficiency of courts?"

Lawyers (N=486) Judges (N=332) Community Leaders (N=377) General Public (N=1,886)

<sup>1</sup>The survey was conducted by Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc. and results were published by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in The Public Image of Courts: General Public Data and Special Public's Data (Washington, D.C.: 1977).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

1

181

#### INTRODUCTION

.

#### Table 1 Views about the Efficiency of Courts<sup>2</sup>

"No problem at all"	"Small problem"	"Moderate problem"	"Serious problem"	"Very serious problem"
1.4%	15.5%	46.9%	26.1%	10.0%
4.2	19.3	48.8	22.3	5.4
0.3	7.4	33.7	34.7	23.9
3.0	8.4	28.8	30.3	29.5

Table 2 Views about Faster Case Processing<sup>3</sup>

Respondents answered this question: "Please tell me how useful it would be to have your tax dollars spent on... trying to make the courts handle their cases faster."

	"Not at all	"Slightly	"Somewhat	"Very	"Extremely
	helpful"	helpful"	helpful"	helpful"	helpful"
Lawyers (N=484)	12.6%	14.0%	23.1%	30.5%	19.7%
Judges (N=332)		12.0	22.9	32.5	21.4
Community Leaders (N=377) General Public (N=1,900)		10.6	13.3 19.2	34.7 31.3	37.9 33.2

These commissions and the studies and surveys they generated provided the foundation for continuing efforts by states and trial courts to define trial court delay, to investigate its causes and to determine plans of action to reduce delay where it exists.

#### Purpose of the Study

3Ibid.

The potential causes of delay identified in the rapidly growing literature on court delay are many, ranging from factors such as high judicial workloads and inadequate court resources to poor court management. The proposed solutions are just as varied, including establishing omnibus hearings to handle proliferating pre-trial motions, pre-trial conferences to discourage defendant procrastination in entering guilty pleas, strict continuance policies to eliminate excessive continuances, and the further addition of judicial manpower.

While there have been some excellent recent studies done in other states and trial courts on court delay reduction, both in identifying problems and solutions, this study attempts to identify neither specific problems nor to propose broad-reaching solutions. Such goals would have been premature in Georgia since no comprehensive information previously existed measuring the amount of time taken to process cases in Georgia's superior courts.

2

Therefore, the purpose of this study is simply measurement--to measure the average pace of litigation in the superior courts. From the outset, the focus of the study has been on determining through a sampling methodology the average length of time taken in the state and in selected sample circuits to dispose of cases in the superior courts -- not to diagnose the reasons for delay, if any, nor to identify methods to improve case processing.

Ð

A

.

.

This study also compares case processing standards in national literature and Georgia statutory standards with Georgia data as one method of assessing the existence of case delay. It should be noted, however, that the case processing standards against which the Georgia data is measured are designed to prescribe the maximum number of days which should be required to bring a case to trial, not the average amount of time taken to process all cases as measured in this study. Thus, the resulting comparison may be more favorable to Georgia than justified. For example, even if the average number of days taken in Georgia to dispose of criminal cases were below the suggested standards, the actual number of days required to dispose of some individual cases included in the average might well exceed the standard. Unfortunately, it is impractical to measure case processing times for each case disposed in the state without an individual case reporting system. Sampling techniques and funding limitations precluded providing greater details about the range or distribution of the days required to process the state's caseload in an exploratory study such as this. However, the average number of days required to dispose of cases is a good indicator of the overall pace of litigation in Georgia's superior courts.

The outcomes sought by this study are to enable Georgia Superior Court Judges, Court Administrators, the Judicial Council and other interested parties to evaluate the significance of the statewide superior court delay problem, to provide six individual circuits with information on their own paces of litigation, and to provide a methodology by which other circuits may accomplish the same ends.

#### COMPARATIVE CASE PROCESSING STANDARDS

Time limitation standards for case processing were first promulgated by several of the commissions and associations established to study the judicial and law enforcement systems of the nation in the 1960's. In the 1967 report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, a standard of four months for processing felonies from arrest to trial was proposed.<sup>4</sup> The following year, the American Bar Association Commission on Standards of Criminal Justice issued draft standards for speedy trials.<sup>5</sup> These standards emphasized the priority of criminal cases over civil cases, and urged that statutes be passed to set specific time limits for processing criminal cases. A supporting study in 1973 for the ABA standards suggested a maximum time limit for disposing of a felony case of 90 days from case initiation.<sup>6</sup> In the same year, the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice outlined its own speedy trial maximum standards.<sup>7</sup>

> Arrest or Indictment to Trial - 60 days for felony cases Arrest or Indictment to Trial - 30 days for misdemeanor cases

In 1974, Congress passed the Speedy Trial Act<sup>8</sup> which set standards for criminal cases filed in the federal courts. This act allows 30 days between arrest and indictment and 70 days from indictment to trial. If this time limit not be adhered to, the judge may dismiss the case.

<sup>4</sup>Katzenbach, chmn., <u>The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society</u> (Washington D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 155.

<sup>5</sup>The final report of the committee was published as Standards Relating to the Administration of Criminal Justice, Compilation: Speedy Trial (Chicago: American Bar Association, 1974), pp. 275-279.

<sup>6</sup>Solomon, Caseflow Management in the Trial Court: Supporting Studies - 2 (ABA Commission on Standards of Judicial Administration: American Bar Association. 1973), p. 37.

Comparative Analysis of Standards and Goals of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals with Standards for Criminal Justice of the American Bar Association (Washington, D.C.: American Bar Association, 1974), p. 249.

<sup>8</sup>18 U.S.C. §§3152 et. seq. (1976).

Ð

ð

Many of the states have followed suit in passing legislation to set their own standards. These standards range from a limit of 60 days from criminal case initiation to disposition in Nevada to 270 days for Mississippi.<sup>9</sup> The concern for case processing times has not been limited to criminal cases. The ABA trial court standards suggest a specific time limit on civil cases of 6 months from filing to disposition and 30 days for summary proceedings.<sup>10</sup> Numerous trial court studies have been conducted not only for the purposes of determining civil trial delay but also for the development of reasonable case processing standards and policies.<sup>11</sup> All these studies encourage courts to set reasonable time limits for case processing for their particular jurisdictions and to continually monitor their efforts in achieving their goals. In many courts, these trial delay reduction programs have been successful in lowering the average case processing times.<sup>12</sup> Listed below are the standards most frequently mentioned in recent trial delay literature for civil and criminal cases for the processing intervals that will be presented in this study of Georgia courts.

> Arrest to Indictment Felony Cases - 30 days (22 judicial days) Case Initiation to - 70 days (52 judicial days) Disposition Civil Cases - 6 months (127 judicial days) Case Initiation to Disposition

9Fort, et al., Speedy Trial: A Selected Bibliography (Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1978), p. 155.

1976), p. 93.

<sup>11</sup>See, e.g., Sipes, <u>Managing to Reduce Delay</u> (Williamsburg: National Center for State Courts, 1980). The profiles on Maricopa County, Arizona, and Multnomah County (Ore.) Circuit Court are particulary instructive.

12Ryan, et al., "Analysing Court Delay-reduction Program: Why Do Some Succeed?" Judicature 65 (1981), p. 58.

10Standards Relating to Trial Courts (New York: American Bar Association,

#### GEORGIA LAW TIME GUIDELINES

Unlike some other states which have set definite time limitation guidelines or mandatory rules for processing cases, as mentioned earlier, Georgia judges have a great deal of discretion in determining the reasonability of the amount of time taken to dispose of cases. The superior court judge is given great statutory latitude in deciding the appropriate pace of litigation.<sup>13</sup> This discretion allows flexibility in handling cases of differing complexities, types, and numbers. The use of this discretion in criminal cases is tempered by the requirement that justice be done and the constitutional guarantee to the defendant of a speedy trial.

Although, in contrast to criminal procedures, the Georgia Civil Practice Act sets specific time limitations for many events in the course of a civil action,<sup>14</sup> the time needed to dispose of a civil case is largely dependent on the length of discovery, the pre-trial motions filed, and the desire or resistance of the parties to bring the case to trial. The Civil Practice Act provides for judicial discretion in case scheduling and the promulgation of local practice rules unless in conflict with the Act.<sup>15</sup>

As those in other jurisdictions do, Georgia statutes affect the timing of case events. For example, the number of court terms set by the legislature determines the number of opportunities for indictment and trial in a county. The criminal and civil procedures statutes outline case flow priorities and the outline of how a case should progress through the system. Appendix II is a brief description of the Georgia statutory and case law requiring case processing time limits.

<sup>13</sup>See, e.g., Ga. Code Ann, §81a-106(b) (Suppl. 1981).

 $^{14}E.g.$ , service within the state must be made within 5 days of filing (later service is not invalid). An answer must likewise be filed within 30 days. Ga. Code Ann. §§81A-104(c),-112(a) (Suppl. 1981).

<sup>15</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-104 (Suppl. 1981).

D

D

The remainder of this report is organized into four major sections. First, there is an executive synopsis which succinctly presents primary findings of this report. Secondly, a summary of the methods used in preparing and analyzing the data is presented to assist the reader in understanding the study design and interpreting the statistics used. The third section of this report is a detailed analysis of the statewide averages for case processing in the superior courts. This analysis is divided into two subsections: criminal and civil cases. Graphs and tables are used to illustrate the study findings. The last of the four sections is an analysis of the average times taken to process criminal and civil cases for each of the six circuits from which data was collected. At the conclusion of the report, appendices are included which provide an in-depth explanation of the study methodology, a description of Géorgia statutory case processing time limitations and a collection of the forms and definitions used in the data gathering stage of the study.

7

#### **REPORT DESIGN**

2

æ

騺

**\$**.

#### EXECUTIVE SYNOPSIS OF FINDINGS

The statewide average length of time taken by Georgia superior courts to dispose of cases in fiscal year 1980 generally met nationally established standards for case processing. Civil case disposition times were the primary exception. However, the average times taken to dispose of cases by some individual circuits also fell short of suggested national standards for felony and domestic relations cases.

Ð

The statewide average time taken in fiscal year 1980 to process felony cases in Georgia superior courts from indictment to disposition was approximately 55 judicial days -- almost equalling the 52 judicial days (70 calendar days) standard suggested in the court delay literature. Even felony jury trials, cases usually thought of as more prolonged, were processed from indictment to disposition in a statewide average of approximately 52 judicial days. In only one of the six individual circuits examined by the Administrative Office of the Courts did the average time taken for processing felony cases clearly exceed the national standard.

However, the average time taken from arrest to indictment or accusation in the state, approximately 50 days, exceeded the recommended standard of 22 judicial days. Although there may be numerous reasons for this difference, the most obvious one is that grand juries generally indict only at the beginning of each term of court and regular terms of court are legislatively established. Many counties have only two terms of court per year so that the indictment process in some counties occurs only once every six months.

American Bar Association guidelines suggested that civil cases generaily should be heard within 6 months of the filing of a complaint (127 judicial days). In fiscal year 1980, domestic relations cases were, on the average,

disposed by superior courts in less than that amount of time -- approximately 109 days. The 223 judicial days taken, on the average, to dispose of general civil cases in the state, however, substantially exceeded the suggested 127 judicial days standard. Furthermore, the average number of days taken to dispose of both civil and domestic relations jury trials appears to substantially exceed the suggested national standards, although limitations in sample size preclude stronger conclusions. Differences between the suggested national standard for civil case dispositions and the actual court case processing times are significantly greater for some individual circuits than for the state as a whole, indicating a greater need for self-examination by some circuits. For example, the average time to case disposition in general civil cases in the circuits examined ranged from approximately 65 days to a high of at least 319 judicial days. Statewide average processing times for complaint to service and complaint to answer in both civil and domestic relations cases appear to conform fairly well to the times required in the Civil Practice Act. The average days taken from complaint to service in general civil and domestic relations cases in Georgia were approximately 8.4 and 3.4 days, respectively -- both close to the five days prescribed in the Civil Practice Act. The 30 day limit for complaint to answer required by the CPA, unless waived by the parties, seems consistent with the statewide averages for complaint to answer of approximately 27.2 and 22.9 days for general civil and domestic

relations cases.

Care should be used when drawing conclusions from this data for two primary reasons. First, this data reflects the average number of days taken to process cases in the superior courts. Some individual cases may have taken longer than the national standards to process and national standards are intended as tools for measurement against each case processed.

9

1

Secondly, industrious case processing of an inherited backlog of cases by a responsible judge may be reflected in longer processing times for the court. Such was the case in one circuit examined in this study. Therefore, this data should not be used to ascribe individual responsibility for problematic case processing times, but rather to set court case processing goals and to identify, for individual courts and for the state, areas in which improvement of case processing times should be considered.

8

þ

This report presents the findings from a sample survey conducted by the Administrative Office of the Courts in 1981 of cases heard in Georgia's superior courts. The survey was undertaken at the direction of the Judicial Council to assess the length of time it takes criminal and civil cases disposed in various ways to proceed from initiation to disposition. Data was collected to provide estimates of the average time elapsed between several different processing events in these cases. The following sections contain tables and graphs presenting these averages for the state as a whole and for each of the six circuits actually sampled.

cases are analyzed:

In addition to figures for these case types as a whole, the data is subdivided into four kinds of criminal dispositions and three kinds of civil dispositions for further analysis:

Criminal

Nol Pros/Dismissed Non-trial Non-jury Trial Jury Trial

times:

)

.

.

•

)

•

.

.

2

\$

#### Criminal

Arrest - Indictment Indictment - Arraignment Indictment - Disposition Disposition - Sentence Arrest - Disposition

#### SUMMARY OF METHODS USED

Data presented in the following sections has been classified using Administrative Office of the Courts statistical definitions. Three types of

> Felony General Civil Domestic Relations

#### Civil

Settled/Dismissed Before Trial/Non-jury Trial Jury Trial

The following time intervals were utilized to arrive at average processing

#### Civil

Complaint	-	Service
Complaint	-	Answer
Complaint	-	Last Pleading
Complaint	-	Disposition

The final sample consisted of 5,481 cases, consisting of 1,600 felony cases, 1,786 general civil cases, and 1,895 domestic relations cases. (Further information concerning the design of this study may be found in Appendix 1.)

- ) -

*(*)

()

Ð,

10

Ť.

¢

The tables in the following sections present three main statistics. First, the mean amount of time in whole days needed to complete the various processing intervals is presented. This is simply an estimated average processing time. Next, the standard error of the mean is given. This gives the reader an idea of how variable the mean estimates are; it is exactly analogous to the standard deviation of a group of numbers.

Finally, the 90% percent confidence limits for the means are laid out. These figures give the low and high points of a range in which one can be 90% certain that the actual mean lies. For example, if the sample mean for an interval is 200 days and the standard error of the mean is 2 days, then it is 90% certain that the actual mean for the interval will be less than 203 days and more than 197 days. Thus, the width of the confidence intervals reported in the tables gives a ready benchmark to gauge how accurate the sample mean is as a predictor of the true mean. The wider the confidence interval, the less certain the results. In this study, if a confidence interval is greater than the size of the estimated mean or greater than 90 days, the mean associated with the confidence interval is identified as unreliable and any assertions based on the mean are qualified.

The overall means of various intervals are also presented comparatively in bar graphs accompanying the data analysis.

14

#### STATEWIDE ANALYSIS

CRIMINAL CASES CIVIL CASES

#### STATEWIDE ANALYSIS

This section considers data from both criminal and civil cases representative of the cases filed in Georgia's superior courts in fiscal year 1980. Analysis of processing times for felony cases is presented first, then analysis for general civil and domestic relations cases. In each category, statewide results are given and discussed. Then the data is re-analyzed after being separated by disposition type.

#### Criminal Cases

Superior courts in Georgia disposed of almost 40,000 (39,567) felony counts using all disposition methods in fiscal year 1980. These disposed counts involved 34,964 felony defendants. When completed, the survey used in this study had collected data on the cases of 1,600 of these defendants.

#### Overall Averages

Estimated state means for the case processing intervals for the total sample of all felony cases can be found in Table S1. As the table indicates, felony cases, on the whole are being processed with dispatch in Georgia; the mean time from arrest to disposition is 100.7 days. The proposed national standards previously mentioned are only met in part, however. The average time lapsed between arrest to indictment for felony cases is 50.7 days, greater than the 22 day recommended standard. This appears to be a reliable estimate (confidence interval: +10.87 days). The range of the confidence limits for this period also indicates that the actual mean time from arrest to indictment is probably between 39.77 and 61.57 days, both numbers exceeding the guidelines.

Much the same can be said for the 52 day recommended time limit for processing felony cases from indictment to disposition. The statewide mean for this interval slightly exceeds the standard (55.5 days). As before, the confidence limits around the estimate indicate that it is a fairly stable one. There is Averages by Disposition Type

The time lapse for a felony case from arrest to indictment appears to vary greatly among disposition methods. (See Table S2 to Table S5.) It seems that the nolle prosequi or dismissal mean is much higher than national standards recommended (79.9 days), but the confidence limits for this estimate (19.93

<sup>16</sup>Shortages in data were particulary pronounced for non-jury trials. The main difficulty in this category was that no non-jury felony trials could be found in one of the circuits for FY1980. This deficiency led to great discrepancies in the initial statewide estimates calculated due to the effect that excluding the circuit had on the state mean and variance formulae. (See Appendix 1 for a description of the formulae involved.) Records inconsistencies had an especially bad effect on the indictment to first appearance processing interval once the data was categorized. The problem which arose involved either very small or, in some cases, negative means for this interval. This occurred mainly because cases would not have dates of arraignment clearly recorded. In most instances where confusion arose, cases would be stamped by clerks of the court with either the date the case was filed or with the term of court in which the case was filed without any clear entry detailing when a true bill issued. This left data coders in a dilemma. The date given was the only logical choice to use as an indictment date in this situation, even if it occurred before the date given for arraignment in the case. By the same token, it had to be assumed that an unidentified first appearance was for arraignment, even if a bond hearing or other proceeding was a possibility. The resulting inconsistencies make inferences involving this interval (and, indeed, all intervals beginning with indictment) less certain than would be preferred.

17

also a chance that the guidelines are being met. The actual mean is probably between 46.74 and 64.16 days; if it is at the lower end of this interval, then the proposed standard is not violated.

Other intervals observed indicate that little time is taken processing a felony case from indictment to first appearance (16.4 days) or from disposition to sentence (5.6 days). Both means appear reliable.

When felony cases for the state are categorized according to disposition type, findings become much more variable in relation to the proposed national guidelines. Further, some processing intervals have been eliminated due either to shortages in data or to problems in data coding stemming from inconsistencies in court records.<sup>16</sup> In general, however, comparisons of the three main intervals can be made between disposition types.

days to 139.91 days) are so great that no firm conclusion can be drawn. Much the same can be said for the smallest estimate, the mean for non-jury trials (23.6 days). While the confidence interval for this estimate is acceptable  $(\pm 3.9 \text{ days})$ , the mean is based on estimates for one of the sample circuits and cannot be considered comparable. Both jury trials (44.7 days) and non-trial dispositions (45.6 days) show means for this interval which exceed the recommended standards. The estimates appear stable. The actual mean probably falls between 28.04 and 61.42 days for jury trials, and between 39.73 and 51.37 days for non-trial pleas. Thus, in both instances, the actual mean is probably greater than recommended by the Federal Speedy Trial Act.

As the tables show, estimates for the indictment to disposition interval reveal similar differences, replicating state findings again. Nolle prosequi or dismissed cases appear to take much longer to proceed from indictment to disposition (99.7 days) than national guidelines suggest. Further, this estimate appears fairly stable (confidence interval:  $\pm 35.7$  days). All other disposition types show fairly stable estimates which are equal to or less than the 52 day national guideline. The average time for jury trials is equal to the proposed standard (52.4 days) and appears stable (confidence interval:  $\pm 13.1$  days). It is possible that the actual mean could exceed 52 days, however; the high limit of confidence interval:  $\pm 5.7$  days) to go from indictment to disposition. Also, as can be seen, there is only a 10% risk that the actual mean is greater than 52 days. Again, non-jury trials appear to take the least time (37.2 days) but this statistic must be treated gingerly, given the tentative nature of the data in this category.<sup>17</sup>

.

<sup>17</sup>Estimates presented in Table S4 are based on using figures from Circuit B to estimate means and variances for Circuit F. No non-jury criminal trials disposed in FY1980 could be found in Circuit F. The resulting statewide estimates are extremely suspect, though more believable than initial calculations. Data on non-jury trials is further limited by record discrepancies described in footnote 2. The means and confidence intervals in Table S4 are given solely for informational purposes; inferences should remain extremely limited.

19

Georgia's superior courts disposed of 30,995 general civil cases and 54,608 domestic relations cases in fiscal year 1980. When completed, the survey used in this study had collected data on 3,681 of these cases: 1,786 general civil cases and 1,895 domestic relations cases. <u>Overall Average</u> As can be seen in Table S6, the overall estimated means for both kinds of civil cases appear to meet the Georgia Civil Practices Act requirements of 30

civil cases appear to meet the Georgia Civil Practices Act requirements of 30 days from complaint to answer. This interval is 27.2 days for general civil cases and 22.9 days for domestic relations cases. The confidence limits for both estimates indicate that the actual mean in each case is not far off this standard. As can be seen, however, the actual mean for general civil cases might violate the 30 day requirement (high limit of confidence interval: 39.5 days). The same cannot be said for the requirement that service be made on complaints within five days. As can be seen in Table S6, domestic relations cases take slightly less than the required period (3.4 days) and this estimate appears highly stable. General civil cases, however, take 8.4 days on the average between these processing points. Further, the confidence limits show that there is a 90% chance that the average general civil case take more than five days to effect service. Similar differences emerge when the length of time from complaint to disposition is compared to the national standards. Domestic relations cases appear to reach disposition on the average well before the 127 days' limit is reached (109.9 days) and the sample mean appears to be fairly close to the actual mean in this category (confidence interval: +3.3 days). General civil

#### Civil Cases

書

2

cases, however, usually take over 200 days (222.9 days) to reach disposition. Also, the actual mean time to disposition is probably between 215.74 and 229.12 days, both figures in excess of national standards. Similar disparities between general civil and domestic relations cases can be observed for the remaining processing intervals. 8

2

Z

爱

#### Averages by Disposition Type

Ð

C

C

C

Æ

These patterns apparently repeat themselves when the statewide data is categorized by disposition type. While the means for jury trials are unstable for both case types, some comparisons can be made. In general, the 30-day complaint to answer standard (as Tables S7 thru S9 show) is met, with estimated means ranging from 18.6 days for settled/dismissed domestic relations cases to 34.8 days for general civil jury trials (a questionable estimate; confidence interval:  $\pm 21.68$  days). In two instances -- settled/dismissed general civil and domestic relations jury trials -- reliable sample means have confidence intervals which suggest that actual means may exceed the standard (high limits 36.65 days and 38.76 days respectively). All other processing intervals with stable means have confidence intervals indicating actual means near the 30 days requirement. In general, however, settled/dismissed cases take the least amount of time.

As in the overall analysis, when cases are compared across disposition types, the five-day requirement for service on a complaint is consistently met for domestic relations cases and consistently overshot for general civil cases. Tables S7 to S9 illustrate that for domestic relations cases, the estimated means for this processing interval range from 3.6 days for settled/dismissed cases to 4.7 days for jury trials. These are reliable estimates for this interval and the range of the confidence limits remains consistently below the standard. Quite the opposite applies for general civil cases. Here the mean times range from 6.9 days for settled/dismissed cases to 19.9 days for jury trials. While this last estimate must be considered unreliable (confidence interval: +19.7 days), only the lowest mean has confidence limits -- 4.11 days to 9.75 days -- which even allow the possibility of meeting requirements. Again, as might be expected, settled/dismissed cases take less time for service for both types of cases and, according to the estimates, jury trials have a longer complaint to service interval. The final processing interval considered shows the most variable results.

Tables S7 thru S9 illustrate that, except for before trial/non-jury trial dispositions, the 127 days disposition guideline is consistently exceeded by both types of civil cases. For before trial/non-jury trial cases both of the means (85.1 days for general civil, 51.8 days for domestic relations) are within the recommended limits. Further, the confidence limits of each indicate that the proposed standard is probably not violated by the actual mean and that the estimated means are fairly reliable. Similar reliability is apparent for the means found for settled/dismissed cases -- 205.9 days for general civil cases and 181.4 days for domestic relations cases. However, these means and their confidence intervals reveal that cases of this type probably consistently exceed the recommended limits. While the means for jury trials are highly unreliable (both confidence intervals are greater than 90 days), it must be noted that general civil jury trials have a mean of almost a year and a half of available judicial days (348.6 days).

21







\$

Ŷ

X

## \$

ŧ







			FIGURE	56:	AVERAGE For CI	NUMBER VIL CASE	OF DAYS OF S DISPOSED STATEWIDE	PROCESSII By All M	NG TIME ETHODS	
	STAGES:	COMPLAINT COMPLAINT	TO SERVICE TO ANSWER TO LAST PLE TO DISPOSIT	AD I NGS I ON	FILED	•				
AVERAGE FOR CIRCUIT										
GENERAL CIV Complaint to Service		8.4								
Complaint to Answer		3.4 ] 27.2			•					
Complaint to La Pleadings File Complaint to	ist	42.7								
Disposition							222.4			
DOMESTIC RELATIN Complaint to Service	<u>UNS</u> 3.	.4								
Complaint to Answer		22.9							•	
Complaint to Las Pleadings Filed Complaint to		11.2								
Disposition		50		9.9	-			·		
		50	100	150		200 N	250 IUMBER OF D	300 Ays	350	 400

Ň

.

and the factor of the state of









### TABLE S1: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY ALL METHODS STATEWIDE IN DAYS

.

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) HIGH
Arrest to Indict-		Name and a specific sec		<u>11101</u>
ment/Accusation	50.7	6.6	39.77	61.57
Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	16.4	2.2	12.81	19.93
Indictment to Disposition	55.5	5.3	46.74	64.16
Disposition to Sentencing	5.6	1.3	3.55	7.69
Arrest to Disposition	100.7	2.7	96.29	105.03



 TABLE S2:
 FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NOLLE PROSEQUI OR DISMISSAL

 STATEWIDE IN DAYS

άĩ

J.

1

TIME		STANDARD	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)		
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH	
*Arrest to Indict-					
ment/Accusation	79.9	36.4	19.93	139.91	
Indictment to Arraignment or First					
Appearance	34.4	18.3	4.24	64.62	
Indictment to	•				
Disposition	99.7	21.7	64.05	135.49	
*Arrest to					
Disposition	170.5	40.2	104.23	236.85	

\*Confidence interval greater than 90 days.

ယ္သ



## TABLE S3: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-TRIAL CONVICTION (PLEAS) STATEWIDE IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)	
Arrest to Indict-	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH
ment/Accusation	45.6	3.5	39.73	
Indictment to			39.13	51.37
Arraignment or First Appearance	16.8	3.3	11.38	: :
Indictment to			11.30	22.16
Disposition	40.2	3.5	34.49	<b>AE 07</b>
Disposition to				45.87
Sentencing	5.7	.9	4.22	7.14
Arrest to				/•14
Disposition	81.1	5.4	72.25	89.89



### TABLE S4: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-JURY TRIAL STATEWIDE IN DAYS

	T I ME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	INT	IDENCE ERVAL 0%) HIGH
. 1	Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	23.6	2.4	19,66	
	Indictment to Disposition	37.2	1.2	35.16	27.44
	Arrest to Disposition	59.8	3.2	54.56	39.24 65.18
					03+10

ω 5



## TABLE S5: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL STATEWIDE IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)		
	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH	
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	44.7	10.1	28.04		
Indictment to Disposition	52.3	7.9		61.42	
Disposition to		, , ,	39.32	65.44	
Sentencing	6.0	2.0	2.72	9.34	
Arrest to Disposition				3404	
0.00011101	91.9	17.2	63.46	120.30	

Зб



TABLE S6: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY ALL METHODS STATEWIDE IN DAYS

ें

3

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD Error		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)
GENERAL CIVIL			LOW	HIGH
Complaint to Service	8.4	2.00	5.02	11.70
Complaint to Answer	27.2	7.50	14.92	39.50
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	42.7	7.10	31.04	54.36
Complaint to Disposition	222.4	4.10	215.74	229.12
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				
Complaint to Service	: 3.4	0.01	3.43	3.45
Complaint to Answer	22.9	3.50	17.28	28.68
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	11.2	1.70	8.34	13.98
Complaint to Dispositon	109.9	2.00	106.55	113.15
				110010

37

-----

(I)



TIME INTERVAL GENERAL CIVIL	MEAN	STANDARD <u>Error</u>	INT	IDENCE ERVAL 0%) <u>HIGH</u>
			•	
Complaint to Service	6.9	1.70	4.11	9.75
Complaint to				
Answer	25.0	7.10	13.39	36.65
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	50.3	11.30	31.70	68.94
Complaint to Disposition	205.3	12.00	185.51	225.17
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				220.17
Complaint to Service	3.6	0.50	<sup>:</sup> 2.82	4.32
Complaint to Answer	18.6	4.10		
Complaint to Last	•		11.78	25.40
Pleadings Filed	8.8	2.90	3.96	13.68
Complaint to Dispositon	181.4	17.90	151.88	210.88

### TABLE S7: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY SETTLEMENT OR DISMISSAL STATEWIDE IN DAYS



# TABLE S8: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY BEFORE TRIAL JUDGMENT OR NON-JURY TRIALSTATEWIDE IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>
GENERAL CIVIL				
Complaint to Service	8.3	1.60	5.64	10.94
Complaint to Answer	22.7	3.40	17.09	28.27
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	14.9	2.20	11.41	18.57
Complaint to Disposition	85.1	14.70	60.93	109.27
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	• •			
Complaint to Service	3.2	0.01	3.18	3.20
Complaint to Answer	22.5	3.70	16.38	28.58
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	7.8	1.60	5.25	10.35
Complaint to Dispositon	51.8	2.50	47.64	55.92

39

•

**\$** 



### TABLE S9: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL STATEWIDE IN DAYS

TIME		STANDARD	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)	
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH
GENERAL CIVIL		•		
**Complaint to Service	19.9	11.90	.16	39,58
Complaint to Answer	34.8	13.10	13.09	56.45
*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	177.5	61.60	75.99	279.09
*Complaint to Disposition •	348.6	91.80	197.07	500.09
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				
Complaint to Service	4.7	2.10	1.15	8.21
Complaint to Answer	26.9	7.20	14.94	38.76
*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	116.9	40.20	50.60	183.22
*Complaint to Dispositon	207.2	64.40	100.89	313.53

\*Mean less than confidence interval.



#### CIRCUIT ANALYSIS

Ъ.

Circuit	А
Circuit	В
Circuit	С
Circuit	D
Circuit	Ε
Circuit	F

### CIRCUIT ANALYSIS

This section of this study presents the data analysis for each circuit sampled. This analysis begins for each circuit with a general description of the circuit characteristics and the number of cases disposed in that circuit in fiscal year 1980.

The following analysis will be divided into a criminal and civil section. In each case category section (criminal and civil) a graph will display the sample circuit mean of total cases for each time interval followed by an explanatory table. (For example, see pages 48 and 50). Thereafter will be tables of the cases separated by disposition method. (See pages 51 through 55).

The tables will contain footnotes to identify when the circuit sample mean for a time interval is less than the number of days between the ninety percent confidence interval. A footnote is also used to designate when the number of days between the confidence interval is greater than ninety days. Both these measures indicate that there was a considerable variance in the time between specified case events in the sample cases. Further, it means that the true circuit mean may be significantly different from the sample mean.

Various problems arose in the data collection phase of this study which affected the reliability and completeness of the data recorded. Please refer to pages 18 and 19 for a discussion of these difficulties. Despite these problems, the data does present the first data on time for case processing in the superior court circuits ever compiled in Georgia, and has provided the state with valuable knowledge on the best method of completing future studies in our state on trial delay.

#### CIRCUIT A

Circuit A is a one-county, multi-judge urban court. It holds six terms of court a year. This circuit handles a significant number of complex commerical cases and administrative board reviews. It does not hear misdemeanor cases. Instead, these cases are handled by limited-jurisdiction trial courts in the circuit.

#### Criminal Cases

There were 5.929 felony counts disposed of by this circuit in fiscal year 1980. These counts were charges relating to approximately 5,665 defendants. Data for 608 defendants was collected for this study.

In this circuit, the felony sample circuit means for arrest to indictment (36.6 days) and indictment to disposition (77.2 days) time intervals are similar to the trial delay standards of 22 and 52 judicial days mentioned on page 5. The confidence intervals for these time intervals are fairly small (+5.02 and +8.40). Therefore, the true circuit mean probably lies between 31.58 and 41.62 for the arrest to indictment interval and between 68.75 and 85.65 days for the indictment to disposition interval. Thus, in this circuit it appears that felony case processing time for the average case is not substantially greater than national guidelines.

The arrest to indictment time interval means and confidence intervals remain fairly stable when these felony cases are segregated by disposition type. (See Tables A3 through A7.) The sample circuit mean is lowest for felonies disposed by jury trial (25.0 days) and highest for felonies disposed by nontrial convictions (41.0 days).

The sample circuit means and confidence intervals for the indictment to disposition time interval for pleas and trial dispositions are also very similar to the total felony figures. In contrast, the dead docket and nol pros/

Civil Cases

There were 4,419 general civil cases and 6,998 domestic relations cases disposed by this court in fiscal year 1980. 445 general civil cases and 341 domestic relations cases were sampled in this study. The Civil Practice Act in Georgia sets general guidelines for the time between filing of the complaint and service (5 days) and for the time between filing of the complaint and filing of the answer (30 days). (See Appendix II, Georgia Law - Case Processing Time Limitations.) Of course, the first time interval may be affected by the defendant's attempts to evade service of a complaint upon him, and the second time interval may be delayed by the granting of an extension of time to file an answer. The sample circuit means and the confidence intervals for both general civil and domestic relations cases in Circuit A for the complaint to service interval are actually slightly longer than five days (See Table A2.) This demonstrates that despite the fact many cases are served by acknowledgment of service before the complaint is filed with the clerk, there are numerous cases in this circuit in which service is not completed until after five days from complaint filing have expired. In contrast, the sample circuit means and confidence intervals for the complaint to answer time interval show that the true mean for Circuit A probably falls within 25.41 to 30.19 days for general civil cases and 17.00 to 25.60 days for domestic relations cases. This demonstrates that most answers are filed within the thirty-day period in this circuit.

dismissal disposition types have both higher sample means (over 100 days) and a greater variability as demonstrated by the fact that the confidence interval was greater than ninety days. (See Tables A3 and A4.)

The disposition to sentencing interval sample means and confidence interval for felony cases shows, as expected, that only a small amount of time generally separates these two case events. (See Table Al.

There is a significant difference in the amount of time between the complaint to disposition interval for general civil and domestic relations cases in Circuit A. The sample circuit mean is 84.4 days for domestic relations cases and the confidence interval ranges from 72.68 days to 96.12 days. This is considerably less than the national guidelines of six months (127 days). On the other hand, the general civil sample circuit mean was 294.7 days and the confidence interval was from 274.12 days to 315.28 days. (See Table A2\_.)

The sample circuit mean for complaint to disposition of both general civil and domestic relation cases for cases disposed by jury trial (450 days and 243 days, respectively) is substantially greater than the sample circuit mean for civil cases disposed by other methods. The confidence intervals for cases disposed by jury trial are over ninety days in length. Unfortunately, this indicates a great variability in the length of time consumed by civil cases which are concluded by jury trial and reduces the significance of the data gathered.






TABLE A1: TOTAL FELONY CASES FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS

CONFIDENCE

TIME		STANDARD	INTERVAL (90%)	
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	36.6	3.04	31.58	41.62
Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	54.1	14.83	29.63	78.57
Indictment to Disposition	77.2	5.12	68.75	85.65
Disposition to Sentencing	5.7	1.10	3.89	7.51
Arrest to Disposition	106.9	5.95	97.09	116.71

TABLE A2: TOTAL CIVIL CASES FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS

TIME	STANDADD		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)	
TIME	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	HIGH
GENERAL CIVIL				
Complaint to Service	10.1	1.43	7.73	12.47
Complaint to Answer	27.8	1.45	25.41	30.19
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	125.2	9.10	110.19	140.21
Complaint to Disposition	294.7	12.47	274.12	315.28
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				
*Complaint to Service	7.3	3.84	0.96	13.64
Complaint to Answer	21.3	2.61	17.00	25.60
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	14.4	2.54	10.21	18.59
Complaint to Disposition	84.4	7.10	72.68	96.12
*Mean is less than con	fidence interva	1		

TIME INTERVAL Arrest to Indictment/Accusation \*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance \*\*Indictment to Disposition \*\*Arrest to Disposition \*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days. 

 TABLE A4 :
 FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY DEAD DOCKET

 FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS

 TIME INTERVAL Arrest to Indictment/Accusation \*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance

\*\*Indictment to Disposition

1

٢

0

\*\*Arrest to Disposition

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

.

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

50

		IN	FIDENCE TERVAL
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	90%) <u>HIGH</u>
37.6	5.36	28.75	46.45
54.1	21.45	18.70	89.50
148.6	30.49	98.30	198.90
174.1	31.53	122.07	226.13

-D

### TABLE A3: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NOLLE PROSEQUI OR DISMISSAL FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS

		INT	IDENCE ERVAL
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	(9) LOW	0%) <u>HIGH</u>
32.6	4.11	25.82	39.38
51.8	17.76	22.50	81.10
111.6	29.68	62.63	160.57
139.8	32.79	85.69	193.91

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD <u>ERROR</u>		IDENCE ERVAL D%) HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	41.0	4.83	33.02	48.98
Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	44.8	5.32	36.02	53.58
Indictment to Disposition	66.0	5.77	56.47	75.53
Disposition to Sentencing	5.8	1.30	3.66	7.94
Arrest to Disposition	101.0	7.48	88.65	113.35

## TABLE A5: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-TRIAL CONVICTION (PLEAS) FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS

Ē

Ŧ

đ

ſ

## TABLE AG: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS

TIME			CONFIL	RVAL
INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	(90%) Low	HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	27.7	3.11	22.56	32.84
Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	32.0	5.04	23.69	40.31
Indictment to Disposition	63.9	6.77	52.73	75.07
Disposition to Sentencing	2.1	0.54	1.21	2.99
Arrest to Disposition	87.2	6.61	76.29	98.11
	5	2		

### TIME INTERVAL

.

3

3

÷.,

Arrest to Indict-ment/Accusation

Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance

Indictment to Disposition

\*Disposition to Sentencing

Arrest to Disposition

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

### TABLE A7:FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIALFORCIRCUIT A IN DAYS

		INTE	DENCE RVAL
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	(90 <u>LOW</u>	%) <u>HIGH</u>
25.0	2.11	21.52	28.48
32.8	5.49	23.74	41.86
68.9	5.82	59.29	.78.51
6.9	2.88	2.15	11.65
87.5	5.85	77.84	97.16

TIME	FOR CI		IN	IDENCE TERVAL
INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	0%) <u>HIGH</u>
GENERAL CIVIL				
Complaint to				
Service Complaint to	9.3	1.74	6.43	12.17
Answer Complaint to Last	26.5	1.89	23.38	29.62
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	112.2	11.28	93.58	130.82
Disposition	279.3	16.00	252.90	305.70
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				
Complaint to			*7	
Service Complaint to	5.8	1.65	3.07	8.53
Answer Complaint to Last	17.5	2.33	13.65	21.35
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	18.1	8.38	4.27	31.93
Dispositon	101.4	14.88	76.84	125.96

### TABLE A8: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY SETTLEMENT OR DISMISSAL

Mean is less than confidence interval.

8

### TABLE A9: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY BEFORE-TRIAL JUDGMENT OR NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS CONSTRENCE

TIME	STANDARD		INTI	IFIDENCE ITERVAL 90%)	
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH	
GENERAL CIVIL				-	
Complaint to Service Complaint to	9.0	2.34	5.13	12.87	
Answer	30.7	3.85	24.35	37.05	
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to	79.0	12.88	57.74	100.26	
Disposition	201.6	19.84	168.85	234.35	
DOMESTIC RELATIONS					
*Complaint to Service Complaint to	7.7	4.72	0.09	12.51	
Answer	23.7	3.85	17.35	30.05	
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	9.9	1.73	7.05	12.75	
Complaint to Dispositon	76.5	7.93	63.41	89.59	
		• •			

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

54

#### TIME INTERVAL

3

3

\$

(\* ) •

1

**\$** 

្រោ

٢

#### GENERAL CIVIL

\*Complaint to Service

Complaint to Answer

Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed

\*\*Complaint to Disposition

#### DOMESTIC RELATIONS

Complaint to Service

Complaint to Answer

\*\*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed

\*\*Complaint to Dispositon

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

### TABLE A10: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT A IN DAYS •

MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>
13.7	4.33	6.55	20.85
28.0	2.19	24.39	31.61
216.1	26.61	172.19	260.01
450.0	30.59	399.53	500.47
		•	
2.1	0.51	1.26	2.94
15.3	3.70	9.19	21.44
160.7	51.70	75.39	246.01
243.0	60.44	143,27	342.73

#### CIRCUIT B

Circuit B is a multi-county, multi-judge rural circuit. The circuit is located in the northern half of the state. There are four terms of court per year in each county. The circuit ranks in the lower quarter statewide in circuit population per judge. Since no county has a state court, the superior court must handle both felony and misdemeanor cases.

### Criminal Cases

In fiscal year 1980, there were 1,176 felony counts disposed for 898 defendants in this circuit. For the purposes of this study on case time sequences, data was collected from cases in which 194 defendants were listed. The results of this sample are discussed below.

The national guideline (mentioned in the earlier sections of this study) for arrest to indictment is 30 days (22 judicial days). The mean for this time span in Circuit B is 54.1 days, over twice the national guideline. With a confidence interval of  $\pm$ 5.43 days, the true circuit mean probably falls between 48.67 and 59.53 days. (See Table B1.) It may be expected that the sample mean for this circuit would be greater than 30 days since the grand jury usually meets only quarterly.

The indictment to disposition circuit sample mean of felony cases is only 40.2 days compared to the national guidelines of 70 days (52 judicial days). The confidence interval for this period is  $\pm 6.71$ ; thus, the actual mean for the circuit should fall between 33.49 and 46.91 days. A breakdown of the felony cases by disposition types, however, shows a wide range of times between indictments and conclusions of the cases. For example, there is a 32.2 day sample mean for non-trial convictions (pleas) and a 37.6 day sample mean for jury trials, but there is a 90 day sample mean for cases disposed by an entry in

in the dead docket. (See Tables B3 through B7.) Clearly, the nature of the disposition method in part influences these time differences. The Circuit B indictment to arraignment (or first appearance) mean is 4.7 days. However, since the confidence interval is greater than the mean at  $\pm 5.48$  that there can be little certainty where the circuit mean actually falls. The disposition to sentencing mean is 1.7 days for the sample and the confidence interval is  $\pm 0.36$  days. These low figures indicate that the judges routinely sentence within two days of disposition of the case. **Civil Cases** 

Circuit B disposed of 898 general civil and 896 domestic relations cases in fiscal year 1980. The case time sequence sample consisted of 347 general civil cases and 339 domestic relations cases.

The sample mean for the general civil complaint to answer time interval was 30.7 days. With a confidence interval of  $\pm 8.42$ , the actual circuit mean has a 90% probability of falling within 22.28 and 39.12 days. This range comports fairly well with the requirement in the Georgia Civil Practice Act that an answer be filed within 30 days (22 judicial days) of the filing of the complaint.

The data collected for the domestic relations time span from complaint to answer is not nearly so satisfactory. Although the sample mean is 35.2 days, the confidence interval is  $\pm 18.27$  days, so that the actual circuit mean may fall anywhere from 16.93 to 53.47 days. (See Table B2.) However, only 46 answers were filed in the 339 domestic relations cases sampled which may account for the relatively unreliable results.

The Civil Practice Act states that service should be accomplished within five days of filing the complaint. The domestic relations cases sampled have a mean of 1.4 days which falls well within this limit. The confidence interval of  $\pm 1.75$  days indicates that the true circuit mean is less than 3.15 days.

56

On the other hand, the general civil sample mean for complaint to service is greater (nine days). A confidence interval of  $\pm 3.9$  indicates that the actual mean should lie between 5.1 days and 12.9 days.

The sample civil cases for Circuit B show a significant divergence from national trial delay reduction guidelines for the complaint to disposition time interval. The mean for the general civil cases is 361.1 days, and for domestic relations, 308.2 days, while the national goal is 127 days (6 months). The confidence intervals are  $\pm 42.03$  and  $\pm 38.54$ , respectively, so that the true circuit means would fall roughly between 319 and 403 days, and 270 and 347 days all of which exceed the national guideline.

The Circuit B civil and domestic relations dispositions for fiscal year 1980 include a number of cases which were disposed by the five year administrative termination method; 66 of these cases were included in the sample. The sample mean for these cases is 1,372 days. Since dispositions of this type require that the cases have been inactive for five years, these numbers will certainly affect the totals.

Yet other disposition types, with the exception of before-trial judgments/ non-jury trials, also have large sample means for the complaint to disposition interval. (See Tables B8 and B11.) The before-trial judgment/non-jury trial sample mean is only 56.5 days, with a confidence interval of  $\pm 10.41$  for domestic relations cases, and for general civil cases is 79.2 days with a confidence interval of  $\pm 17.58$ . However, the sample means for both civil case-types in the settlement/dismissal and jury trial categories are over 300 days. The conclusion is that the confidence intervals for these disposition categories (from  $\pm 49.2$  to  $\pm 262.68$ ) are so broad that no satisfactory projection can be made for the actual mean for the complaint to disposition time interval in Circuit B.

<sup>18</sup>This large number of cases disposed by five-year administrative termination resulted because a newly appointed judge faced with a backlog of old civil cases set them on a calendar to clear this backlog from the court.









### TABLE B1: TOTAL FELONY CASES FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

TTME				CONFIDENCE	
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	(90%) <u>HI</u>	GH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	54.1	3 <b>.</b> 29	48.67	59.	53
*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	4.7	3.79	-1.56	10.	96
Indictment to Disposition	40.2	4.07	33.49	46.	91
Disposition to Sentencing	1.7	0.22	1.34	2.	06
Arrest to Disposition	88.7	5.02	80.42	96.	98

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

### TABLE B2:TOTAL CIVIL CASESFORCIRCUIT BINDAYS

	CONFIDENCE				
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR		ERVAL 0%) <u>HIGH</u>	
GENERAL CIVIL				•	
Complaint to Service	9.0	2.36	5.10	12.90	
Complaint to Answer	30.7	5.10	22.28	39.12	
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	31.2	5.29	22.47	39.93	
Complaint to Disposition	361.1	25.47	319.07	403.13	
DOMESTIC RELATIONS					
*Complaint to Service	1.4	1.06	0.35	3.15	
*Complaint to Answer	35.2	11.07	16.93	53.47	
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	10.9	3.13	5.74	16.06	
Complaint to Dispositon	308.2	23.36	269.66	346.74	
*Mean is less than conf	idence interv	al			

61

# TIME INTERVAL

and the second

愙

\$

3

8

S.

-

Arrest to Ind ment/Accusat

\*Indictment to Arraignment Appearance

Indictment to Disposition

Arrest to Disposition

### TIME INTERVAL

Arrest to Indi ment/Accusati

\*Indictment to Arraignment or Appearance

Indictment to Disposition

Arrest to Disposition

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

		STANDARD	INTI	IDENCE ERVAL
dict-	MEAN	ERROR	<u>LOW</u> (90	J%) <u>HIGH</u>
tion o or First	56.2	5.34	47.39	65.01
I.	23.7	15.33	- 1.60	. 49.00
•	38.0	. 7.10	26.29	49.71
	88.8	8.67	74.48	103.12

# TABLE B3: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NOLLE PROSEQUI OR DISMISSAL FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

# TABLE B4: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY DEAD DOCKET FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

	MEAN	MEAN		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)		
ict_		ERROR	LOW	HIGH		
ion	93.4	16.65	65.92	120.88		
or First						
	3.1	5.55	- 6.06	12.26		
	90.0	12.16	69.93	110.07		
	169.3	18.04	139.53	199.07		

### TABLE B5: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-TRIAL CONVICTION (PLEAS) FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS CONFIDENCE

AND NO.

TIME		STANDARD		ITERVAL 90%)
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	44.5	4.82	36.54	52.46
*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	0.5	2.37	- 3.41	4.41
Indictment to Disposition	32.2	6.16	22.03	42.37
Disposition to Sentencing	1.2	0.10	1.03	1.37
Arrest to Disposition	68.1	6.37	57.58	78.62

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

## TABLE B6: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL	STANDARD MEAN ERROR		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)	
		ERKUK	LOW	HIGH
**Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	38.5	34.50	0	95.43
*Indictment to Disposition	42.0	20.99	7.36	76.64
Arrest to Disposition	79.5	13.50	57.23	101.77

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

### TIME INTERVAL

### Arrest to Indict-ment/Accusation

\*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance

Indictment to Disposition

Disposition to Sentencing

Arrest to Disposition

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

## TABLE B7: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

		STANDARD	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		
	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	(90%) <u>HIGH</u>	
	52.3	6.03	42.35	62.25	
t	1.7	4.84	- 6.29	9.69	
	37.6	8.78	23.10	52.10	
	4.4	1.09	2.60	6.20	
	89.7	9,98	73.22	106.18	

 TABLE B8: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY SETTLEMENT OR DISMISSAL

 FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

17

3

 $\sim$ 

TIME		STANDARD		NFIDENCE NTERVAL (90%)
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	- LOW	HIGH
GENERAL CIVIL				
Complaint to				
Service	6.2	1.16	4.29	8.11
Complaint to			7045	0.11
Answer	30.5	8.08	17.16	43.84
Complaint to Last		•		
Pleadings Filed	38.5	8.45	24.56	52.44
**Complaint to Disposition	220 5	<b>a</b> a <b>a</b> a		
Disposition	330.5	29.82	281.30	379.70
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	•			
*Complaint to				
Service	0.4	1.78	- 2.54	2.24
Complaint to		1.70	- 2.54	3.34
Answer	21.2	4.81	13.26	29.14
*Complaint to Last			100120	27.14
Pleadings Filed	5.0	1.47	2.57	7.43
**Complaint to				
Dispositon	538.5	34.70	481.24	595.76

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

۲

## TABLE B9: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY 5 YEAR ADMINISTRATIVE TERMINATION FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

TINE				FIDENCE TERVAL
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	90%) <u>HIGH</u>
GENERAL CIVIL	•			
*Complaint to				
Service *Complaint to	7.4	3.96	. 0.86	13.94
Answer *Complaint to Last	49.8	18.30	19.61	79.99
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	15.7	6.26	5.37	26.03
Disposition	1367.3	11.98	1347.53	1387.07
DOMESTIC RELATIONS		. •		
*Complaint to				
Service *Complaint to Last	6.9	6.34	- 3.56	17.36
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	11.9	9.73	0	27.95
Dispositon	1372.0	16.16	1345.34	1398.66
*Mean is less than co	nfidence interv	val.		

TABLE BIO: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY BEFORE-TRIAL JUDGMENT OR NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS TIME INTERVAL GENERAL CIVIL \*Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to Disposition DOMESTIC RELATION \*Complaint to Service \*Complaint to Answer \*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to Dispositon \*Mean is less than confidence interval. TIME INTERVAL GENERAL CIVIL \*Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer \*\*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed \*\*Complaint to Disposition DOMESTIC RELATIONS \*Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer \*\*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed \*\*Complaint to Dispositon \*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

65

	eri b in DAIS		
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>
9.4	4.16	2.54	16.26
23.7	2.98	18.77	28.63
8.1	1.74	5.23	10.97
79.2	10.66	61.62	96.78
1.6	1.32	0.57	3.77
40.0	16.86	12.18	67.82
10.4	3.90	3.96	16.84
56.5	6.31	46.09	66.91
idence interval			

## TABLE B11:CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT B IN DAYS

-			
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>
28.6	23.74	-10.58	67.78
26.0	7.41	13.77	38.23
173.3	60.03	74.26	272.34
346.8	63.06	242.75	450.85
12.7	6.17	2.51	22.89
45.0	2.00	41.70	48.30
245.7	199.67	0	575.16
345.7	159.20	83.02	608.38
dence interval.	•	•	

#### Circuit C

Circuit C is a rapidly growing one-county suburban circuit. It is a multi-judge court and has six terms of court a year. The superior court judges do not hear misdemeanor cases since these are handled by other limited-jurisdiction courts in the county. Domestic relations cases comprise a large proportion of this court's workload.

#### Criminal Cases

There were 759 felony counts disposed by this court in fiscal year 1980. Approximately 555 defendants were involved in these cases. Data on the cases of 166 defendants was collected.

In this circuit the arrest to indictment interval for felony cases appears on the average to consume more time than the national trial delay guideline of 30 days (22 judicial days). The sample circuit mean was 65.6 days and the confidence interval shows the true mean probably lies between 56.06 days and 75.14 days. (See Table C1.)

The first appearance in court after the indictment probably occurs on an average between 28 days and 39 days after the indictment. (See Table C1.)

The sample circuit mean (69.6) for the indictment to disposition time interval which has a 90% confidence interval of  $\pm$  11.69 days shows that the true circuit mean probably falls within 57.91 days and 81.29 days. Thus, the true mean for this Circuit C interval is probably very close to the national felony trial time guidelines. The sample mean for felony cases disposed by jury trial and non-jury trial for the indictment to disposition interval was 81 days. (See Tables C5 and C6.) This is greater than the non-trial disposition sample mean of 44 days. (See Table C4.) Unfortunately, the small number of cases sampled which were disposed in this circuit by non-jury or jury trial, and the wide range in times of these cases resulted in confidence intervals of greater than

Civil Cases

This study indicates that on the average domestic relations cases in Circuit C move more rapidly to conclusion than do general civil cases in this circuit, and that there is less variability (as concerns processing times) among domestic relations cases. For instance, the sample circuit mean for general civil cases for the complaint to dispositon time interval is 172 days and the 90% confidence interval is  $\pm$  11.96 days while the domestic relations sample mean is 66.7 days with a confidence interval of  $\pm$  4.88 days. The complaint to disposition time for domestic relations cases in Circuit C compares favorably with the national guideline of 127 days.

The sample mean for the complaint to disposition time interval for domestic relations cases disposed by before-trial judgments as compared to those cases disposed by jury trial is considerably smaller. The sample mean for jury trials

67

 $\pm 25$  days. This reduces the usefulness of the data since the true mean for these cases could fall anywhere between a value of 46.59 days to 115.41 days.

There were 414 general civil cases and 1,859 domestic relations cases disposed in fiscal year 1980 in Circuit C. The sample included data from 204 general civil cases and 428 domestic relations cases.

The complaint to service time interval for general civil cases in this circuit is more variable and has a higher sample mean than the domestic relations case results. (See Table C2.) But for neither civil case-type is the higher end of the confidence interval around the mean greater than 15 days. The complaint to answer time interval results for both general civil cases and domestic relations cases disposed in Circuit C closely adhere to the 30 day requirement of the Civil Practice Act. The sample circuit means for both civil case-types for this time interval are less than 35 days.

is 157.6 days; the confidence interval ranges from 137.99 days to 177.21 days. (See Table C9.) Somewhat unexpected is that the sample circuit mean for domestic relations cases concluded by dismissal is 81 days, since a smaller mean was anticipated.









N.



### TABLE C1: TOTAL FELONY CASES FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS

TIME		STANDARD	CONFID INTER	VAL
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	<u>LOW</u> (90%	HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	65.6	5.78	56.06	75.14
Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	34.0	3.38	28.42	39.58
Indictment to Disposition	69.6	7.08	57.91	81.29
Disposition to Sentencing	11.3	1.49	8.84	13.77
Arrest to Disposition	129.3	8.80	114.80	143.81

TABLE C2: TOTAL CIVIL CASES FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD Error	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) HIGH
GENERAL CIVIL				
Complaint to Service	10.7	2.60	6.41	14.99
Complaint to Answer	34.0	7.25	22.04	45.96
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	59.4	7.95	46.28	72.52
Complaint to Disposition	172.0	11.61	152.84	191.16
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				
Complaint to Service	4.0	0.51	3.17	4.83
Complaint to Answer	19.3	1.06	17.55	21.05
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	16.8	1.82	13.79	19.81
Complaint to Dispositon	66.7	2.96	61.82	71.58
				. •

72

### TABLE C3: FELONY TIME INTERVAL \*Arrest to Indictment/Accusation \*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance \*Indictment to Disposition \*\*Arrest to Disposition \*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days. TABLE C4: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-TRIAL CONVICTION (PLEAS) FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS TIME INTERVAL Arrest to Indict-ment/Accusation Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance Indictment to Disposition Disposition to Sentencing Arrest to Disposition

X

CASES	DISPOSED BY	NOLLE PROSEQUI	OR DISMISSAL
	FOR CIRCUIT		

٦	CT100100		ONFIDENCE INTERVAL
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	(90%) <u>HIGH</u>
88.9	29.75	39.81	137.99
27.8	8 <b>.</b> 47	13.82	41.78
162.8	28.29	116.12	209.48
231.6	36.18	171.90	. 291.30

			CONFIDENCE INTERVAL
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	(90%) <u>HIGH</u>
60.1	4.03	53.45	66.75
35.2	3.86	28.82	41.58
44.5	3.99	37.91	51.09
11.3	1.56	8.73	. 13.87
102.1	5.54	92.95	111.25

#### CONFIDENCE INTERVAL TIME STANDARD (90%) INTERVAL MEAN ERROR LOW HIGH \*\*Arrest to Indictment/Accusation 108.0 30.61 57.49 158.51 \*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance 31.0 9.39 15.51 46.49 Indictment to Disposition 81.0 15.67 55.14 106.86 \*Disposition to Sentencing 15.8 14.09 0 39.04 \*\*Arrest to Disposition 187.8 30.58 137.34 238.26

TABLE C5 : FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-JURY TRIAL

FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

¥

### TABLE C6 : FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	IN (!	FIDENCE TERVAL 90%)
Appact to the t		LANON	LOW	HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	53.9	14.52	29.94	77.86
*Indictment to				
Arraignment or First Appearance	33.0	16.08	6.47	59.53
Indictment to				
Disposition	81.0	20.85	46.59	115.41
*Disposition to				
Sentencing	7.8	3.73	1.64	13.96
Arrest to				
Disposition	122.0	16.57	94.65	149.35

74

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

TIME INTERVAL

#### GENERAL CIVIL

\*Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to Disposition

#### DOMESTIC RELATIONS

Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to Dispositon

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

#### TIME INTERVAL

1

.

GENERAL CIVIL

Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to Disposition

#### DOMESTIC RELATIONS

Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to Dispositon

FUR	CIRCUIT C IN DAYS	CON	FIDENCE
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR		ITERVAL 90%) <u>HIGH</u>
11.5	3.87	5.11	17.89
27.2	2.96	22.31	. 32.09
47.1	6.88	35.74,	58.46
158.2	12.25	137.98	178.42
4.4	0.88	2.95	5.85
21.5	2.14	17.96	25.04
14.1	3.63	8.11	20.09
81.5	6.99	69.96	93.04

### TABLE CZ: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY SETTLEMENT OR DISMISSAL FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS

#### TABLE C8: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY BEFORE-TRIAL JUDGMENT OR NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS CONETDENCE

	STANDARD	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)			
MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH		
5.4	0.79	4.10	6.70		
20.8	2.24	17.11	24.49		
23.8	4.81	15.86	31.74		
95.6	13.91	72.65	118.55		
3.8	0.66	2.70	4.90		
17.0	1.47	14.57	19.43		
10.3	1.39	8.00	12.60		
50.5	2.41	46.52	54.48		
	75				

#### TABLE C9: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT C IN DAYS

TÍME <u>INTERVAL</u> GENERAL CIVIL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	INTI	IDENCE ERVAL D%) <u>HIGH</u>
*Complaint to Service	20.2	10.94	2.14	38.26
**Complaint to Answer	65.8	30.95	14.72	116.88
**Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	181.9	39.24	117.15	246.65
**Complaint to Disposition	396.5	33.63	341.00	452.00
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				•
Complaint to Service	4.2	1.05	2.46	5.94
Complaint to Answer	20.2	1.99	16.91	23.49
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	85.8	11.36	67.05	104.55
Complaint to Dispositon	157.6	11,88	137.99	177.21

76

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

\*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

Circuit D is a multi-county, multi-judge rural circuit, located in southern Georgia. In population per judge it ranks in the upper one third of circuits statewide. The majority of its counties have state or county courts which try small civil cases and misdemeanor cases. The counties in Circuit D have only two terms of court per year. Criminal Cases

felony defendants.

\*\*\*\*\*

The national trial delay guideline suggested for felonies for the time span between arrest and indictment is 30 days (22 judicial days). The sample mean for that time period in Circuit D is 53.0 judicial days for all felony cases. The confidence interval of +7.75 indicates that the actual mean for the circuit should fall between 45.25 and 60.75 days. The semiannual schedule for court terms may in part explain the fairly large interval between these case events in Circuit D.

No statistically sound conclusion can be drawn from the circuit's sample indictment to arraignment/first appearance interval of 10.8 days because the confidence interval (+11.88 days) calculated from the sample data is relatively large. The inability to secure for this study reliable dates for the arraignment (or first appearance) from accessible court sources, and the small number of these appearances recorded for the sample data probably contributed to these poor results.

The indictment to disposition time interval for Circuit D, however, compares favorably with the proposed national guideline of 52 judicial days. The sample mean is 58.5 days with a confidence interval of +7.34 so that the true circuit mean has a 90% probability of falling between 51.15 and 65.85 days which is close to the standard. (See Table D1.)

#### CIRCUIT D

In fiscal year 1980, there were 1,197 felony counts for 858 defendants disposed in Circuit D. The felony sample for this study was composed of 258

When the felony cases are separated by disposition type, the trial categories have means similar to the mean for all felonies. The non-jury trial and jury trial sample means, 58.5 and 59.7 days, respectively, are almost identical to the felony case total. However, the confidence interval for jury trial is larger than for felony cases taken as a whole so that the true circuit mean may lie between 43.98 and 75.42 days.

#### Civil Cases

There were 695 general civil and 1,299 domestic relations cases disposed in Circuit D in fiscal year 1980. The sample for this study includes 237 general civil and 227 domestic relations cases.

The Georgia Civil Practice Act suggests that service be made on the defendant in a case within five days of filing of the complaint. The Circuit D sample mean for this time bracket for general civil cases is 4.7 days with a 90% confidence interval of +1.27 days. Thus, the actual circuit mean probably falls between 3.44 and 5.96 days. For domestic relations cases, the sample mean for this same time interval is 6.1 days with a confidence interval of +1.98. The actual mean, then, should fall somewhere between 4.13 and 8.07 days. (See Table D2.) Analysis of data by disposition method reveals that the sample mean and confidence interval are such that the true circuit means should fall very close to five days with the exception of those for civil cases disposed by jury trial and domestic relations cases disposed by settlement or dismissal. (See Tables D7 through D9.) The sample mean and confidence intervals are such that for jury trials the complaint to service time period is shorter than for other civil cases.

The Civil Practice Act also sets a 30 day (22 judicial days) limit for filing of the defendant's response to the complaint if the parties do not agree to an extension of time. The results of this study for Circuit D indicate that this rule is generally being followed. The sample means for both general civil and domestic relations cases are remarkably close to the 22 judicial day limit

cases. caution.

at 22.7 and 20.7 days, respectively. The confidence interval is small so that the true circuit mean for this time interval should not exceed 25.84 days for

either civil case-type. (See Table D2.) None of the case groups when segregated by disposition type shows a significant variance from this mean. In Circuit D, the sample mean for complaint to disposition of all cases is 64.7 days for general civil and 60.9 days for domestic relations. Both figures are basically reliable with confidence intervals  $\pm 5.84$  and  $\pm 5.82$ , respectively. Therefore, the true circuit mean should fall between 55.07 and 66.73 days f or domestic relations cases, and between 58.86 and 70.54 days for general civil Thus, it appears that civil cases are being dealt with in an expeditious manner in this circuit, and that they fall well within the national guideline of 127 judicial days for the time interval.

The sample data for jury trials reveals significantly greater means for the complaint to disposition interval. The general civil sample mean is 156.1 days and the domestic relations sample mean for jury trials is 113.5 days. (See Table D9.) Since there were only nine jury trials in the general civil sam ple and only two in the domestic relations sample, these results must be viewed with





### TABLE D1: TOTAL FELONY CASES FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

	FOR CIRCOIT D IN DATS			CONFIDENCE
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	53.0	4.70	45.25	60.75
*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	10.8	7.20	- 1.08	22.68
Indictment to • Disposition	58.5	4.45	51.15	65.85
Disposition to Sentencing	14.1	1.51	11.61	16.59
Arrest to Disposition	106.4	6.24	96.10	116.70

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

.

#### TABLE D2: TOTAL CIVIL CASES FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

			I D IN DATO	CONFIDENCE	
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	INTERVAL (90%)	IIGH
GENERAL CIVIL					
Complaint to Service	4.7	0.77	3.44		5.96
Complaint to Answer	22.7	1.90	19.56	1	25.84
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	9.9	1.68	7.13		12.67
Complaint to Disposition	64.7	3.54	58.86		70.54
DOMESTIC RELATIONS					
Complaint to Service	6.1	1.20	4.13		8.07
Complaint to Answer	20.7	2.85	15.99	•	25.41
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	6.0	0.90	4.51		7.48
Complaint to Dispositon	60.9	3.53	55.07		66.73

82

TIME INTERVAL

Arrest to Indictment/Accusation

\*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance

Indictment to Disposition

Arrest to Disposition

#### TIME INTERVAL

Arrest to Indictment/Accusation

Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance

Indictment to Disposition

Disposition to Sentencing

Arrest to Disposition

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

.

TABLE D3:	FELONY	CASES	DISPOSED BY NOLLE FOR CIRCUIT D IN			
ME RVAL		MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>	
st to Indict- t/Accusation	•	51.2	9.17	36.06	. 66.34	
ctment to aignment or F earance	irst	28.8	14.21	5 <b>.</b> 35	. 52.25	
ctment to position		94.3	10.96	76.22	112.38	
st to sposition		139.4	14.00	116.30	162.50	

### TABLE D4: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-TRIAL CONVICTION (PLEAS) FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

		•	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	(90%) <u>HIGH</u>
56.6	6.87	45.25	67.95
7.1	13.41	-15.02	29.22
36.5	3.61	30.55	42.45
14.9	1.77	11.97	17.83
90.5	7.70	77.79	103.21

#### TABLE D5: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

, 

TIME			CONFIDENCE INTERVAL			
INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	<u>LOW</u> (90	%) <u>HIGH</u>		
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	38.5	6.50	27.78	49.22		
Indictment to · Disposition	58.5	4.50	51.08 -	65.92		
Disposition to Sentencing	12.0	1.99	8.71	15.29		
Arrest to Disposition	96.0	11.00	77.85	114.15		

### TABLE D6: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

TIME	•	CTAND ADD		CONFIDENCE
INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	(90%) <u>HIGH</u>
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	46.2	7.81	33.31	59.09
*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	11.9	9.58	- 3.90	27.70
Indictment to Disposition	59.7	9.52	43.98	75.42
Disposition to Sentencing	10.8	2.67	6.39	15.21
Arrest to Disposition	94.8	10.52	77.44	112.16

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

TIME INTERVAL	
GENERAL CIVIL	
Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer Complaint to Last	ž
Complaint to	]
Disposition	5
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	
Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer	1
Complaint to Last	19
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	5
Dispositon .	63
TABLE D8: CIVIL CASES	DIS
TIME INTERVAL	ME/
GENERAL CIVIL	
*Complaint to Service	
Complaint to	5.
Answer Complaint to Last	15.
Pleadings Filed	3.9

TIME INTERVAL GENERAL CIVIL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE .INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>
*Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to Disposition	5.7 15.6 3.9	1.22 2.31 1.30	3.68 11.79 1.76	7.72 19.41 6.04
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	63.2	4.32	56.07	70.33
Complaint to Service Complaint to Answer	5.1	1.88	1.99	8.21
Complaint to last	22.7	4.56	15.18	30.22
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	5.9	1.34	3.68	8.12
Dispositon *Mean is less than con	55.1 fidence interval.	4.24	48.10	62.10

84

	DINGOTI D IN DAIS		
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>
3.7	0.85	2.29	5.11
25.3	2.50	21.18	29.42
12.3	2.24	8.60	16.00
58.5	5.22	49.88	67.12
6.8	1.57	4.20	9.40
9.4	4.02	12.76	26.04
5.7	1.20	3.72	7.68
3.9	5.14	55.41	72.39

# TABLE D7: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY SETTLEMENT OR DISMISSAL FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

SPOSED BY BEFORE-TRIAL JUDGMENT OR NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD		FIDENCE TERVAL 90%)	
GENERAL CIVIL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH	
Complaint to Service	1.8	0.24	1.39	2.21	
Complaint to Answer	17.7	2.52	13.54	21.86	
*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	69.0	24.85	28.00	110.00	
Complaint to Disposition	156.1	25.56	113.92	198.28	
DOMESTIC RELATIONS					
Complaint to Service	1.0	. 0	1.00	1.00	
Complaint to Answer	22.5	0.50	21.67	23.33	and the second
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	28.5	5.49	19.43	37.57	
Complaint to Dispositon	113.5	4.50	106.08	120.92	

TABLE D9: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT D IN DAYS

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

Circuit E is an urban, multi-county, multi-judge circuit. Terms are six times a year and four times a year in the individual counties. The largest county is served by a state court as well as a superior court. Criminal Cases

There were 3,040 felony counts disposed in this circuit in fiscal year 1980. These counts were charged against approximately 2,121 defendants. A sample of 265 defendants was taken for this study. The arrest to indictment time interval sample mean for this circuit is 64 days with a confidence interval of  $\pm 5.58$ . The true mean of the circuit probably lies between 58.42 and 69.58 days. Thus, the mean for Circuit E is over twice as long as the suggested national standard of 22 judicial days for this time interval. Although longer than the national guideline, the time consumed between these two events in criminal case processing is similar to that in other circuits sampled in this study.

The first recorded appearance of a defendant in this court after indictment probably occurs within fewer than 35 days. The indictment to arraignment/first appearance interval has a sample mean of 28.6 days and the 90% confidence interval ranges from 23.32 days to 33.88 days. (See Table E1.)

余

\*

Unlike several of the other circuits sampled, the indictment to disposition sample mean time for Circuit E exceeds 100 days. The sample circuit mean is 104.9 days and the 90% confidence interval lies between 90.34 and 119.46 days. Thus, the true circuit mean is probably about 35 to 65 days greater than the trial guideline of 52 judicial days for felony cases mentioned in trial delay reduction literature.

The indictment to disposition mean times for felonies disposed by jurytrial and by non-trial convictions are very different. The jury-trial mean of 124.9 days, with a confidence interval of  $\pm 38.82$  days, is far greater than the

86

#### CIRCUIT E

indictment to disposition sample mean of non-trial cases (73.5 days <u>+</u>9.23 days).

The confidence interval range for the indictment to disposition interval of the other disposition categories is greater than 90 days in Circuit E. (See Tables E3 through E7.) This is probably due to two factors: 1) a small number of cases sampled; and 2) a greater variability in the time consumed for this interval for cases in these groups. Therefore, the range of the confidence interval around the mean is so large that the true mean of the circuit cannot be clearly predicted.

As in the other circuits sampled, the average time expiration from disposition to sentencing is relatively short, and there is little variance among the felony cases. Table E1 shows that in Circuit E the sample mean is 3.3 days with a confidence interval of  $\pm 0.99$ . Thus, the true circuit mean should be between 2.31 and 4.29 days.

#### <u>Civil Cases</u>

Ŧ

Of the civil cases disposed in Circuit E in fiscal year 1980, 1,963 were general civil cases and 4,692 were domestic relations cases. The sample data collected for this circuit included 369 general civil and 373 domestic relations cases.

The sample means of the complaint to service time interval for this circuit for general civil (12.4 days) and domestic relations cases (2.8 days) differ substantially. The confidence intervals indicate that the actual mean for general civil cases lies between 8.38 and 16.42 days, while that for domestic relations cases (1.22 to 4.38 days) may be a result of the small number of cases in which the defendant acknowledges service before filing of the complaint in the clerk's office.

For the complaint to answer time period, the sample means of the two civil case-types are similar, 32.1 and 29.7 days, respectively. As in the other cir-

88

cuits sampled, the sample means are close to the response time of 30 days (22 judicial days) set out by the Civil Practice Act. The time from the filing of the complaint to last pleadings filed date for domestic relations cases is quite small. The mean for Circuit E probably falls within 13.63 and 24.57 days. (See Table E2.) This could be a result of the fact that in many domestic relations cases a formal response is never filed by the defendant. Of the 373 domestic relations cases sampled, in only 71 cases was an answer located.

In contrast to the domestic cases, the sample mean time from complaint to last pleading for general civil cases in Circuit E is 93.9 days and the 90% confidence interval is  $\pm$ 11.24 days. (See Table E2.) This much larger consumption of time may be due to the possibility of more extensive discovery in these types of cases, than in domestic relations cases, requiring a greater amount of time for settlement negotiations and trial preparation. The sample mean for Circuit E for the complaint to disposition time period for domestic relations cases is 79.1 days and the 90% confidence interval is  $\pm$ 10.25. This suggests that the true circuit mean probably lies between 68.85 and 89.35 days. The complaint to disposition time span is much greater for general civil cases. The true mean should lie between 177.58 and 205.02 days. (See Table E2.) This average would exceed the commonly mentioned six-month (127 judicial days) trial goal, whereas the domestic relations mean would fall within

In both civil case-types, the cases disposed by jury trial had sample means which were over 300 days. Unfortunately, this data is not totally reliable since the confidence intervals are very large and since only a small number of jury trial cases was sampled. (See Table E10.)

this limit.







## TABLE E1: TOTAL FELONY CASES FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL		STANDARD		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)
THERMAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation *Indictment to Arraignment or First	64.0	3.38	Ed.42	69.58
Appearance Indictment to	28.6	3.20	23.32	33.88
Disposition Disposition to	104.9	8.83	90.34	119.46
Sentencing Arrest to	3.3	0.60	2.31	4.29
Disposition .	160.2	9.77	144.10	176.32

### TABLE E2: TOTAL CIVIL CASES FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL GENERAL CIVIL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	CONFIDEN INTERVA (90%)	
Complaint to Service Complaint to	12.4	2.44	8.38		16.42
Answer Complaint to Last	32.1	3.23	26.77		37.43
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	93.9	7.11	82.16		105.64
Dispositon	191.3	8.31	177.58	•	205.02
DOMESTIC RELATIONS					•
*Complaint to					
Service Complaint to	2.8	0.96	1.22		4.38
Answer Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed Complaint to	29.7	8.45	15.77		43.63
	19.1	3.31	13.63		24.57
Disposition	79.1	61	68.85		89.35

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

TOR OTROOT L IN DATS		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR		0%) <u>HIGH</u>	
58.9	6.80	47.68	70.12	
44.9	23.53	6.07	83.73	
170.3	27.50	124.93	215.67	
236.6	31.34	184.88	288.32	
	<u>MEAN</u> 58.9 44.9 170.3	MEANSTANDARD ERROR58.96.8044.923.53170.327.50	STANDARD         CONF           MEAN         ERROR         LOW           58.9         6.80         47.68           44.9         23.53         6.07           170.3         27.50         124.93	

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

#### TIME INTERVAL

\*Arrest to Indict-ment/Accusation \*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance \*\*Indictment to Disposition \*\*Arrest to Disposition

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

### TABLE E3: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NOLLE PROSEQUI OR DISMISSAL FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

### TABLE E4: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY DEAD DOCKET FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)		
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	HIGH	
85.5	25.88	42.80	128.20	
27.7	10.81	9.87	45.53	
30.5	91.46	179.59	481.41	
91.5	90.92	241.48	541.52	

## TABLE E5: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-TRIAL CONVICTION (PLEAS) FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

				IDENCE ERVAL
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR		0%) HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	63.7	3.93	57.21	70.19
Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	27.3	2.53	23.13	31.47
Indictment to Disposition	73.5	5.59	54.27	82.73
Disposition to Sentencing	3.2	0.61	2.19	4.21
Arrest to Disposition	128.4	8.05	115.12	141.68

#### TABLE E6: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

TIME		STANDARD	INT	IDENCE ERVAL
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	D%) HIGH
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	72.0	17.89	42.47	101.53
*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	15.0	8.00	1.80	28.20
**Indictment to Dîsposition	147.7	79.43	16.64	278.76
*Disposition to Sentencing	20.5	10.49	3.18	37.82
*Arrest to Disposition	218.7	80.59	85.73	351.67

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

#### TIME INTERVAL

Arrest to Indictment/Accusation

Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance

Indictment to Disposition

Disposition to Sentencing

Arrest to Disposition

#### TIME INTERVAL

#### GENERAL CIVIL

Complaint to Service

Complaint to Answer

Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed

Complaint to Disposition

#### DOMESTIC RELATIONS

Complaint to Service

Complaint to Answer

\*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed

\*\*Complaint to Dispositon

### TABLE E7: FELONY CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

FUR CIRCU		CONFIDENCE INTERVAL	
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	(90%) LOW	
59.8	11.58	40.69	78.91
11.5	3.42	5.85	17.15
124.9	23.53	86.08	163.72
1.0	0	1.00	1.00
183.7	29.28	135.39	232.01

#### TABLE E8: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY SETTLEMENT OR DISMISSAL FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS CONSTRENCE

MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	IN	FIDENCE TERVAL 90%) <u>HIGH</u>
10.1	2.88	5.35	14.85
27.9	1.67	25.14	30.66
91.8	9.03	76.90	106.70
198.9	<b>11.26</b>	180.31	217.49
4.7	1.31	2.53	6.87
27.3	6.96	15.81	38.79
24.6	12.94	3.25	45.95
158.9	33.27	104.00	213.80

\*Mean is less than confidence interval. \*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

# TABLE E9: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY BEFORE-TRIAL JUDGMENT OR NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL GENERAL CIVIL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	CONFIE INTER (90% LOW	RVAL
Complaint to Service Complaint to	14.5	4.24	7.50	21.50
Answer Complaint to Last	32.7	7.08	21.02	44.38
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	62.6	10.43	45.38	79.82
Disposition	139.9	12,24	119.70	160.10
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				
*Complaint to Service Complaint to	2.4	1.07	0.63	4.17
Answer Complaint to Last	22.1	2.78	17.51	26.69
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	9.7	1.36	7.46 .	11.94
Dispositon	53.5	3.41	47.87	59.13

### TABLE E10: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT E IN DAYS

TIME INTERVAL		STANDARD	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)		
GENERAL CIVIL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH	
*Complaint to					
Service *Complaint to	17.2	· 10.63	- 0.35	34.75	
Answer **Complaint to Last	50.1	18.36	19.80	80.40	
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	207.4	27.98	161.23	253.57	
Disposition .	322.4	23.02	284.42	360.38	
DOMESTIC RELATIONS					
Complaint to Service **Complaint to	7.8	2.24	4.11	11.49	
Answer **Complaint to Last	52.8	36.72	0	113.39	
Pleadings Filed **Complaint to	184.8	46.47	108.12	261.48	
Dispositon	340.8	31.95	288.08	393.52	•
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

\*\*Confidence interval is greater than 90 days.

96

Circuit F is a multi-county, two judge circuit located in the southern half of the state. It has three or four terms of court a year in its counties. In two of the counties, a limited jurisdiction court handles the misdemeanor cases and some of the less complex civil cases.

#### Criminal Cases

Ŧ

Approximately 232 defendants were responsible for these charges. For this study, data was collected for 109 felony defendants. The arrest to indictment time period for this circuit has a sample mean of 66 days and a +9.31 confidence interval. Thus, the true mean of the circuit has a 90% probability of being found between 56.69 and 75.31 days. Although the mean is substantially greater than the 30-day guideline (22 judicial days) set in many trial delay reduction projects, it is similar to several of the other circuits sampled in this study. The quality of the data gathered is not sufficient to compare the time consumed from arrest to indictment for the cases by their different disposition methods.

The period of time expended from the indictment to arraignment or first appearance in the court is very small for this circuit. The sample circuit mean is 2.8 days and the confidence interval ranges from 1.91 days to 3.69 days. Even when the cases are separated by disposition type, the small time interval is consistent. (See Tables F3 through F4.)

The figure of 53 days for the mean time between indictment and disposition with a confidence interval of  $\pm 12.33$  indicates that the true circuit mean lies between 40.67 and 65.33 days. This figure is close to the guideline of 52 judicial days. The non-trial conviction (pleas) and jury trial disposition methods for which the study produced fairly reliable estimates show very dissimilar

#### GIRCUIT F

Felony counts disposed in this circuit in fiscal year 1980 numbered 308.

results. The non-trial circuit mean should fall between 22.73 and 40.67 days while the jury trial mean calculated from the sample is between 36.41 and 95.19 days.

The disposition to sentencing time interval, as in several of the other circuits sampled, consumes little time. Here the sample mean for felony cases is 2.8 days with a 90% confidence interval of  $\pm 1.89$  days.

#### Civil Cases

In Circuit F in fiscal year 1980, 380 general civil and 685 domestic relations cases were disposed according to annual Judicial Council caseload statistics. Of that number, 184 general civil and 187 domestic relations cases were sampled for this study.

The sample mean time for domestic relation cases from complaint to service is 1.5 days with a confidence interval of  $\pm 0.90$  days. This is a much smaller sample mean and smaller confidence interval than that shown for general civil cases in this circuit (7.7 days,  $\pm 4.72$  days). Thus, it appears that there is probably a much greater variability in the time expired between these two case events for general civil cases.

The complaint to answer sample means for general civil cases and domestic relations cases are very similar, 22.6 and 23.3 days, respectively. The confidence intervals are such that the true mean for both types of civil cases should fall between 17 and 29 days. Thus, generally, time expired between complaint and answer should not exceed 30 days in Circuit F. (See Table F2.)

As in the other circuits sampled, the complaint to disposition time period is generally less for the average domestic relations case than for the average general civil case. This study indicates that the domestic relations mean for this interval should fall between 45.60 and 57.00 days, while the general civil mean should be between 54.49 and 82.31 days. The higher ends of these ranges both fall well within the six month trial guidelines.

98

When the cases are segregated by disposition method, both the settlement/ dismissal and the before-trial judgment/non-jury trial categories exhibit similar results. The jury trial cases have a much higher sample mean (over 200 days), but both a great variability in the time consumed in processing these cases and the very small number of cases sampled prevent these results from being reliable estimates.





### TABLE F1: TOTAL FELONY CASES FOR CIRCUIT F IN DAYS

FOR CI	FOR CIRCUIT F IN DAYS			
MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	LOW	INTERVAL (90%)	HIGH
66.0	5.64	56.69		75.31
2.8	0.54	1.91		3.69
53.0	7 <b>.</b> 47	40.67		65.33
1.2	0.13	0.99		1.41
115.0	9,37	99.54		130.46
	<u>MEAN</u> 66.0 2.8 53.0 1.2	MEAN         ERROR           66.0         5.64           2.8         0.54           53.0         7.47           1.2         0.13	MEANSTANDARD ERRORLOW66.05.6456.692.80.541.9153.07.4740.671.20.130.99	MEAN         STANDARD ERROR         LOW         CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (90%)           66.0         5.64         56.69           2.8         0.54         1.91           53.0         7.47         40.67           1.2         0.13         0.99

TABLE F2: TOTAL CIVIL CASES FOR CIRCUIT F IN DAYS

	FUK CIK	COLL F IN DALS	CONFID INTER	
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	(90%) LOW	
GENERAL CIVIL				
*Complaint to Service	7.7	2.86	2.98	12.42
Complaint to Answer	22.6	3.21	17.31	27.90
*Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	7.1	2.25	3.38	10.82
Complaint to Disposition	73.4	5.40	64.49	82.31
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				4
*Complaint to Service	1.5	0.54	0.60	2.40
Complaint to Answer	23.3	3.52	17.49	29.11
Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	7.1	1.62	4.43	9.77
Complaint to Dispositon	51.3	3.45 .	45.60	57.00

\*Mean is less than confidence interval.

102

TABLE F3: FELO	NY CASES DIS	POSED BY NON-TR RCUIT F IN DAYS	IAL CONVICTION (	PLEAS)
			INT	IDENCE ERVAL
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR		0%)
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	57.9	5.62	48.62	
Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	2.3	0.57	1.36	
Indictment to Disposition	31.7	5.44	22.73	
Disposition to Sentencing	1.0	0.00	1.00	
Arrest to Disposition	87.2	7.79	74.35	1
TABLE		CASES DISPOSED I RCUIT F IN DAYS	BY JURY TRIAL	
· · · · · ·				IDENCE ERVAL
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR		)%)
Arrest to Indict- ment/Accusation	82.0	20.88	47.54	1
*Indictment to Arraignment or First Appearance	3.4	1.50	0.92	
Indictment to Disposition	65.8	17.81	36.41	
Disposición			0.01	
*Disposition to Sentencing	2.8	1.14	0.91	

SPOSED BY NON-TRIAL IRCUIT F IN DAYS			
STANDARD ERROR	I	NFIDENCE NTERVAL (90%) <u>HIGH</u>	
· 5.62	48.62	67.18	
0.57	1.36	3.24	
5.44	22.73	40.67	
0.00	1.00	1.00	
7.79	74.35	100.05	

	FUR CIR	CUIT F IN DAYS	CONF	IDENCE
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	INT	ERVAL D%) <u>HIGH</u>
GENERAL CIVIL				
Complaint to Service Complaint to	5.0	0.96	3.41	6.59
Answer Complaint to Last	21.4	4.01	14.79	28.01
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	7.8	1.77	4.87	10.73
Disposition	70.1	7.93	57.01	83.19
DOMESTIC RELATIONS				
*Complaint to Service *Complaint to	2.4	1.06	0.65	4.15
Answer *Complaint to Last	29.4	12.34	9.03	49.77
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	4.8	2.06	1.40	8.20
Dispositon	43.4	5.80	33.83	52.97

### TABLE F5: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY SETTLEMENT OR DISMISSAL FOR CIRCUIT F IN DAYS

## TABLE F6: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY BEFORE-TRIAL JUDGMENT OR NON-JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT F IN DAYS

TIME		STANDARD	INT	IDENCE ERVAL D%)
INTERVAL	MEAN	ERROR	LOW	HIGH
GENERAL CIVIL				
*Complaint to				
Service Complaint to	9.2	4.45	1.86	16.54
Answer *Complaint to Last	26.5	5.55	17.34	35.66
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	3.6	1.32	1.43	5.77
Disposition	72.5	6.69	61.46	83.54
DOMESTIC RELATIONS			•	
*Complaint to				
Service Complaint to	1.1	0.65	0.02	2.18
Answer Complaint to Last	19.6	2.90	14.82	24.38
Pleadings Filed Complaint to	4.7	1.05	2.97	6.43
Dispositon	49.7	3.19	44.44	54.96
*Mean is less than con	fidence interv	al.		

		FOR CIRCUIT	F IN DAYS	
TIME INTERVAL	MEAN	STANDARD ERROR	I	NFIDENCE NTERVAL (90%) HIGH
GENERAL CIVIL				
*Complaint to Service	5.0	3.00	0.05	9.95
**Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	186.5	185.50	0	492.57
**Complaint to Disposition	234.51	180.50	0	532.32
DOMESTIC RELATIONS	•			
*Complaint to Service	2.8	1.44	0.43	5.17
Complaint to Answer	28.5	2.62	24.17	32.83
**Complaint to Last Pleadings Filed	111.8	36.75	51.17	172.43
**Complaint to Dispositon	203.8	68.38	90.97	316.63

6

1

104

### TABLE F7: CIVIL CASES DISPOSED BY JURY TRIAL FOR CIRCUIT F IN DAYS

by various methods in Georgia's superior courts. ing categories:

The classification and definition of types of dispositions<sup>2</sup> also were based on those approved by the Judicial Council for the annual case-counting project and were:

Criminal Dispositions

Cash Bond Nol Pros/Dismissed Dead Docketed Non-trial Non-jury Trial Jury Trial

The major processing intervals<sup>3</sup> measured were:

Criminal Cases

Arrest -> Indictment (or Accusation) Indictment -> Arraignment or 1st Appearance Indictment -> Disposition Disposition -> Sentencing

Indictment -> Sentencing

1<sub>Appendix</sub> III, Table 1 contains a detailed listing of the case types.  $2_{Refer}$  to Appendix III, Table 2 for detailed information on disposition types. <sup>3</sup>Appendix III, Table 3 consists of definitions and explanations of the time

intervals used.

쳸

5

**APPENDICES** 

#### APPENDIX 1

#### Detailed Methodology

#### Introduction

This study was designed to determine the average number of days elapsed between major intervals in the processing of criminal and civil cases disposed

The classification of types of cases selected for study were based on the case types and definitions used in the annual case-counting study conducted by The Administrative Office of the Courts.<sup>1</sup> Cases were sampled from the follow-

- Felony
- Other Criminal
- General Civil
- Domestic Relations

#### Civil Dispositions

Settled/Dismissed 5 Year Administrative Termination Before Trial/Non-jury Trial Jury Trial

#### Civil Cases

Complaint -> Service Service -> Answer Pre-Trial Motion -> Hearing Complaint -> Last Pleading Filed or Discovery Filed Complaint -> Disposition Disposition -> Fi Fa Issued
To measure the time elapsed in the disposition of cases, cases <u>disposed</u> in fiscal year 1980 were selected (those cases which were disposed between July 1, 1979, and June 30, 1980). Only entire court workdays were counted as days elapsed. Weekends and traditional county holidays were excluded from consideration. The holidays (7) which were excluded were: New Year's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Veteran's Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas. Thus, in a regular year, there were 254 court days available to be counted as elapsed.

## 365 Days -104 Weekend Days - 7 Holidays

## 254 available judicial days

Data for this study was collected from the courts' original records, primarily from the criminal and civil issue dockets and from the original case files, but sometimes from minute books, calendars and other court records. Data for each case sampled was recorded on data collection sheets coded and keypunched to be computer processed. The data collection sheets and coding sheets are included as Table \_\_\_\_\_ on page \_\_\_\_\_ of Appendix III.

#### Sample Design

Because there were over 170,000 cases disposed by the superior courts of Georgia in fiscal year 1980, constraints of time and funds made examination of all cases impractical. Therefore, some form of sampling was required.

The sample chosen for the case time sequence study is a relatively simple one based on a two-stage stratified random design. This type of sample is very widely used in all kinds of statistical research.

Choosing the sample design for the case time sequence study was predicated on two straightforward considerations. The first of these was the expense of data collection. Obviously, one could simply sample the cases in all Georgia superior courts, picking a few cases at random in each county. The problem with this strategy is that such a survey would take a long time to complete and would greatly increase project costs. Two-stage samples help alleviate this difficulty. The idea is quite simple. Instead of direct selection of the cases themselves, the items to be sampled are divided into larger units according to a set of criteria. In the first stage of the sample, a random selection of the large units is made. The actual cases in the final sample are then randomly chosen from within the first stage units. In this study, the judicial circuits in the state were randomly sampled first, then in the selected circuits the actual cases to be surveyed were chosen, again randomly. Such a design insures a probability sample which can be used to provide inferences about the population examined. As importantly, this design also greatly reduces the amount of travel required to do the survey and insures a concentrated effort to obtain data.

The first stage units in this study, the judicial circuits, were stratfied prior to selection. This was done in hope of producing more accurate estimates of population parameters, the second major consideration in this study. When a population is stratified, it is divided into groups of homogeneous units. Consequently, the amount of variation encountered in each stratum should be less for each factor measured than it is for the population as a whole. With luck, this reduction in variation should be reflected in the sample taken, thus producing more accurate estimates than found by simple random samples.

To draw the final sample used in this study, the 42 judicial circuits in Georgia were divided into three strata. The stratification factor used was

the number of superior court judges in each circuit. The first stratum included all circuits with one or two judges (26 circuits); the second, all circuits with three or four judges (14 circuits); and the third, all circuits with five or more judges (2 circuits). Two circuits were chosen from each stratum as first stage units. The cases within the circuits were categorized by case type (criminal and civil) and by disposition type within each case type. Superior court cases from all counties within each circuit (15 counties in all) were chosen from within these case and disposition categories as the final sample units.

The survey data was collected by direct examinations of the docket books, case files, and other original records of superior courts and court offices in the chosen circuits. Data was generated for a variety of time intervals in the processing of cases and on the type of disposition involved, as described on page 109. The survey was conducted between March and September, 1981.

A total sample of 6,674 cases was planned initially. The final planned sample included 2,410 criminal cases, 2,119 general civil cases, and 2,145 domestic relations cases. The planned sample was allocated among the sampled circuits according to the proportion of the total cases each circuit had in each case type. The sample alloted to each circuit for criminal or civil cases was then allocated among the various disposition types in proportion to the amount each kind of disposition was of the total cases disposed for that circuit. The single exception to this strategy involved jury trials. Since jury trials are relatively rare events but are analytically important in this study, an attempt was made to collect data on at least 50% of all jury trials in all the sampled circuits.

As is usually the case, difficulties encountered in the data collection effort (poor records, incomplete data, etc.) reduced the sample somewhat. The data presented in this final report are based on a sample of 5,281 cases, including 1,600 felony cases, 1,786 general civil cases, and 1,895 domestic relations cases. In general, the proportions between different cases originally planned were maintained in this sample. In some instances, the number of cases found in particular disposition categories or time intervals was not sufficient in all circuits to warrant reporting estimates. The data limitations made the final estimates too unstable to convey much information. The following categories and intervals were eliminated for this report:

#### Categories

#### Other Criminal Cash B Dead D 5 Year Civil Terminations

٢

Ť

In addition, other intervals had to be dropped in particular circuits due to insufficient or unstable data. However, despite these difficulties, a sufficient number of cases was surveyed to allow estimates to be reported for most of the disposition types and time intervals originally foreseen in the research design. Data from these cases were used to estimate the mean time in days between points in the processing of cases for each type of disposition within the criminal and civil case types. The estimated standard error of the mean for each interval was also calculated, allowing confidence intervals to be drawn around the sample means.

The major purpose of this study is to provide estimates for the length of time required in Georgia for certain types of cases disposed in various ways to progress from initiation to final disposition. As is always the case in such

112

#### Intervals

Criminal Cases Bond Cases Docketed Cases	Indictment - Arrest Indictment - Sentence
rs Administrative	Motion Filed - Hearing Disposition - FiFa

#### Estimation Techniques

studies, only an estimation of the average time involved in going from action to action within a case can be made. There are a surprising number of ways to reach such an estimate, all of them varying somewhat in accuracy and ease of computation. This section describes the techniques used to provide estimates of the time intervals and their variability.

The aim of any sample survey is to obtain reliable estimates of certain aspects of a population of units. The means in days for different time intervals are the major estimates produced in this study. These are presented for both the circuits studied and the state as a whole. The reliability of these figures is established by putting boundaries, called confidence intervals, around them giving a range within which one can be reasonably sure that the population figure falls. Since two different sampling schemes are used at the study's two levels (simple random sampling for circuits, two-stage stratified random sampling for the state), the formulae used to estimate means and draw confidence intervals around them are different as well. The following sections describe how the final estimates and confidence intervals were established for both circuits and the state.

## Estimated Means

The basic statistic presented in this study is the mean time in days between different processing points in cases of various kinds. This figure is easily determined for the six circuits chosen as first stage units.

In each circuit a simple random sample of the criminal and civil cases disposed was selected. Simple random samples use uncomplicated estimate formulae. The mean time for each interval was found by taking the arithmetic average for all cases included in the interval in each case category. The formula involved is: Where: y is the estimated mean for the processing interval yi is the time in days for each case having the interval n is the number of these cases in the sample
In addition to being straightforward, this estimate is consistent and unbiased.<sup>4</sup> Statewide means presented a more complicated problem. First, since the sample was stratified, estimates had to be found for each stratum. These strata estimates, in turn, had to be constructed using data from a subset of the total number of circuits found in each stratum. This situation requires that estimates for each stratum must be weighted to reflect the proportion of all first stage units in each. The strata estimates can then be combined to obtain statewide figures.

As before, the statewide means are derived from estimated totals divided by the number of cases of each particular type found in the state as a whole. The estimator used is an unbiased one found by first obtaining strata totals using this formula:

		Ŷj	= <u>n</u>
Ŷj	is tir cas	ne i	unbias n days
Nj	is	the	number
n	is	the	number
Mij			al numb led cir
<b>y</b> ij	is	the	estima

<sup>4</sup>See, Cochran, <u>Sampling Techniques</u>, 3rd ed. (New York: John Wiley, 1977), pp. 20-22 for a discussion of this estimate. <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 303.

114

Σyi

f.

\$

3

.

Where:

 $\frac{Nj}{n} \Sigma Mij \overline{y}ij$ 

sed estimate for the statum of the total for each time interval for each type of

r of circuits in the stratum

r of circuits sampled (always 2)

ber of cases of each type disposed in rcuit

ated mean in days for each time interval.<sup>5</sup>

The mean for the state as a whole is then found by this formula:

Ŷ	=	(	Σ	Ŷj)
•	-		М	

Where:

1

is the estimated mean for the state for each time interval

is the total number of cases of each type disposed for the state as a whole

and other symbols are as previously defined.<sup>6</sup>

## Confidence Intervals

It is important to have an idea of how reliable the estimates obtained from sample data are. The normal device for determining this reliability is the confidence interval. Confidence intervals are built from two major components: the standard normal deviate associated with the level of confidence desired, and the standard error of the estimate concerned. The standard error of the estimate, in turn, is based on its variance. Thus, three steps were involved in formulating the confidence intervals for this study. The first, the choice of the desired level of confidence for the confidence intervals, is a matter of prior decision. Since this study is exploratory in nature, it was decided that a 90 percent confidence level for the confidence intervals was acceptable (i.e. that a ten percent risk that the population mean would actually be outside the confidence interval was accepted). Thus, the standard normal deviate for this level, 1.65, is already set. The variance figures necessary to form the standard errors of the sample means remain to be determined.

As with the means themselves, the standard error of the means in the sampled circuits is rather easily calculated. The formula for the variance of the time intervals in each circuit is the simple random sample estimator: s² s<sup>2</sup> is the estimated variance in days for each time interval Where: yi is the time in days for each interval for each case n is the number of cases of each type sampled<sup>7</sup> The variance of the mean estimate can be determined with this formula after the variance is found:  $V(\overline{y})$  $V(\overline{yi})$  is the estimated variance of the mean in days for each Where: time interval N is the total number of cases of each type in each circuit and all other notation is as before.<sup>8</sup> Once this figure is obtained, 90%confidence limits can be easily expressed as shown below:  $\overline{y}i - 1.65 \sqrt{V(\overline{y}i)}, \overline{y}i + 1.65 \sqrt{V(\overline{y}i)}$ 

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 26. <sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 26-27.

囊

3

3

\$

v.

0

Û

 $\bigcirc$ 

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 294-5.

$$= \frac{\Sigma (yi - \overline{y}i)^2}{n - 1}$$

$$i) = \frac{s^2}{n} \left(\frac{N-n}{N}\right)$$

These numbers are reported as confidence intervals for the estimated circuit means.9

As was the case with the mean estimates, determining statewide confidence intervals was a more complex calculation. As before, figures must be found for each stratum, suitably weighted, and combined in final statewide estimates. To determine the variance of means for the state at a whole, estimates of the variance of the totals in days for each time interval were calculated for each stratum. The formula involved is:

$$V(\hat{Y}j) = \frac{Nj^2}{n} (1 - \frac{n}{Nj}) \Sigma (\hat{Y}ij - \hat{\overline{Y}}.j)^2 + \frac{Nj}{n} \Sigma \frac{Mij (1 - \frac{mij}{Mij}) s^2 ij}{mij}$$

Where:

 $V(\hat{Y}_{ij})$  is the estimated variance in days for each time interval for the stratum

is the total number of circuits in the stratum Ni

is the number of circuits sampled n

 $\hat{Y}_{ij}$  is the total in days for each interval in each circuit

- $\widehat{Y}.\,j$  is the mean of the circuit totals in days for each interval
- Mij is the total number of cases disposed of each type in each circuit
- mij is the number of cases disposed of each type sampled in each circuit

 $s^2ij$  is the variance in days for each circuit.10

<sup>9</sup>See Williams, <u>A Sampler On Sampling</u> (New York: John Wiley, 1978), Chap. 8 for a Tucid explanation of this entire process.

<sup>10</sup>Cochran, p. 303.

This formula may appear complex, but actually it is straightforward enough. The first term in the equation calculates the variance between the circuits chosen (i.e., how different they are from each other), raising the results accordingly. The second term gives an estimate of the variance within the circuits chosen, again weighting the results. To obtain the variance of the mean for the state as à whole, this formula is used: V(Y  $V(\overline{Y})$  is the estimated variance of the mean in days for each time Where: interval for the state M is the total number of cases disposed of each type for the state And all other notations are as before.<sup>11</sup> Once this statewide figure is

calculated, confidence limits can be laid around the mean as before:

Ÿ - 1.65 √

As before, the means obtained are subtracted and added to 1.65 (90% standard deviate) multiplied by the standard error of the mean. This interval is the one reported for statewide estimates in the text itself.12

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 295.

8

3

1

3

٢

 $^{12}$  The research staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts would like to acknowledge the timely and learned assistance of Dr. Charles Alexander of the Cross Sectional Studies Division of the Bureau of the Census in determining the correct formulae to use for statewide estimates in this study. Dr. Alexander's written comments and advice have been indispensable to our research effort.

$$D = \frac{1}{M^2} (\Sigma V(\hat{Y}j))$$

$$(V(\overline{Y}), \overline{Y} + 1.65 \vee V(\overline{Y}))$$

## APPENDIX II GEORGIA LAW - TIME LIMITATIONS OUTLINES

# On the next few pages is a brief description of the statutory and case law of Georgia which affects the speed of case processing.

## A. CRIMINAL CASE PROCESSING TIME LIMITS IN GEORGIA

Although there are no definite time limits on completion of criminal prosecutions in Georgia's superior courts, there are several laws relating to the timing of events within a criminal case.

### I. Arrest/Commitment

The first time restriction imposed by the state law on prosecuting and judicial officials concerns the time of arrest to commitment. A person arrested must be brought before a committing officer within 72 hours after arrest.<sup>1</sup> If the arrest is made without a warrant, a shorter time period (48 hours) is allowed within which the accused must be brought before a magistrate for issuance of a warrant.<sup>2</sup>

These strict requirements are tempered by Ga. Code Ann.  $\S27-419$  which permits waiver of a commitment hearing by the defendant. Posting of an appearance bond is also considered a waiver of the commitment right.<sup>3</sup> Lastly, if an indictment is returned prior to a commitment hearing, the court need not grant the defendant a hearing.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §27-206 (1978). <sup>2</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §27-212 (1978). <sup>3</sup>Hopkins v. State, 5 Ga. App. 700 (1908). <sup>4</sup>Collins v. State, 243 Ga. 291 (1979).

II. Indictment/Statutes of Limitation The statute of limitations sets the time period allowable between commission of the crime and the time prosecution must commence. $^5$  A warrant is not sufficient to stop the statute from running.<sup>6</sup> Instead an indictment, presentment or accusation is necessary. If an indictment is quashed or a nolle prosequi is entered, the statute of limitations is extended for six months from the date of indictment.<sup>7</sup> Not only must an indictment be found or accusation be drawn within the statute of limitations, but if he is refused bail, the defendant is entitled to the grand jury charge within 90 days of his imprisonment or he must be granted bail.<sup>8</sup> III: Arraignment/Plea Although there is a provision that the clerk of court give a defendant three days' notice of the arraignment date, there is no provision that a defend-

<sup>6</sup>Flint v. State, 12 Ga. App, 169 (1912). <sup>7</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §§26-504, 27-601 (1978). <sup>8</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §27-701 (1978). <sup>9</sup>Brand v. Wofford, 230 Ga. 750 (1973). <sup>10</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §§27-1404,-1405 (1978). <sup>11</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §27-704 (Supp. 1981). <sup>1</sup>2Ga. Code Ann. §27-2528 (1978).

ant be arraigned, informed of the charges and requested to enter his plea within a fixed period of time.<sup>9</sup> If the defendant does enter a plea of guilty at the arraignment, the court can dispose of the case immediately.<sup>10</sup> The court can hear a guilty plea except for capital felonies at any time if the judge and defendant consent.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, the judge may accept a guilty plea to an offense punishable by death either at term or vacation.12

 $^{5}$ Ga. Code Ann. §27-601 (1978). The statute of limitations for felonies is 4 years; for misdemeanors, 2 years; for murder, no limit; and for other capital felonies or those which involve perpetual imprisonment, 7 years.

## IV. Preliminary Hearing/Trial

A preliminary hearing is not a required step in criminal prosecutions in this state and, therefore, there are no time limitations. $^{13}$ 

The Georgia law balances the defendant's right to a speedy trial, his right to a reasonable time to prepare his case, and the public's right to a fair, orderly and speedy resolution of criminal cases by providing general guidelines for trial timing. The Code directs cases be set for trial in the order of docketing unless the judge in his discretion believes it is not in the furtherance of justice.<sup>14</sup> Although the Code directs the court to try a case at the term the indictment was found, it also provides the judge discretion to continue the case from term to term for cause.<sup>15</sup> The defendant is specifically granted by Ga. Code Ann. §27-403 a reasonable but unspecified amount of time to prepare the case and secure counsel. Further, the defendant is given the authority after indictment to file a demand for trial, which requires the prosecutor to try the case within a specified number of court terms or have the defendant be automatically acquitted.16

### V. Sentencing

A pre-sentence hearing must be conducted immediately following the return of a conviction.<sup>17</sup> Unless the case is a capital case, in which the

14<sub>Ga</sub>. Code Ann. §27-1301 (1978).

15<sub>Ga</sub>. Code Ann. §27-2002 (1978).

 $16_{
m For}$  non-capital felonies, the defendant must be tried in the term when the demand is made or in the next succeeding term. The capital defendant must enter a demand within the term or that next succeeding, and be tried within two regular terms after demand. Ga. Code Ann. §§27-1901, 1901.1,-1901.2 (1978).

17<sub>Ga</sub>. Code Ann. §27-2503(a) (1978).

.

jury must recommend the sentence,  $^{18}$  the judge may recess the trial to take the sentencing evidence under consideration. There is no specified time limit for the judge to return the sentence.

processed.

B. CIVIL CASE PROCESSING TIME LIMITS IN GEORGIA The Georgia Civil Practice Act sets specific time limitations for many events in the course of a civil action. But ultimately, the time needed to dispose of a civil case is largely dependent on the use of judicial discretion and the conduct of the parties.

I. Complaint/Service

A civil action is commenced by the filing of a complaint in the court.<sup>19</sup> The complaint must be served on the defendant or service must be acknowledged or waived by the defendant. Ga. Code Ann. §81A-104 outlines the methods of securing valid service. Although the Code states that service shall be made within the state within five days of the receipt of the summons and complaint by the person charged with completing service, a later service is not invalid.<sup>20</sup> The return of service to the court must be made within the same amount of time as the defendant is allowed to answer the complaint.

<sup>18</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §27-2503(b) (1978). <sup>19</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-103 (1977). <sup>2</sup>O<sub>Ga</sub>. Code Ann. §81A-104(c) (Supp. 1981).

## VI. Court Terms/Local Rules

The number of court terms within a year which are statutorily created for each circuit may provide differing opportunities for processing cases. In Georgia, the superior courts hold sessions from two to six times a year.

Local court rules as well as state statutes affect the timing of criminal case processing. Many superior courts have local rules which provide a specific manner for setting the arraignment, motion and trial calendars. These case assignment systems may affect the speed at which certain types of cases are

<sup>13&</sup>lt;sub>Ault</sub> v. State, 148 Ga. App. 761 (1979).

## II. Answer/Default

Usually the defendant must answer within 30 days after service.21 But if service is by publication, the defendant must answer within 60 days of the publication order. Counsel for the parties may by agreement filed with the clerk of court extend the time for filing defensive pleadings but by no more than 30 days.<sup>22</sup>

A civil action is not triable until after the last day for the defendant's answer, but the case can be terminated during this period by the plaintiff's voluntary dismissal. Ga. Code Ann. §81A-141 provides that the case may be dismissed at any time before verdict.

If the defendant fails to answer within 30 days, the case is in default. If the defendant then fails to open the case within 15 more days, the plaintiff can request a judgment.<sup>23</sup> If a hearing is not needed to determine unliquidated damages, the case may be closed immediately. Thus, a plaintiff may have a judgment as soon as 45 days after service of the complaint on the defendant if there is no defense of the action. Although these time limits are fairly stringent, the Code provides that the judge may permit the case to be reopened for cause after 45 days have expired if a final judgment has not been rendered.24

## III. Pre-trial Motions

Various motions may be made by one of the parties in a civil case; if granted, some will terminate the case. For example, a motion for summary judgment, for judgment on the pleadings or to dismiss due to lack of jurisdiction may terminate the case. A motion for judgment on the pleadings may

21<sub>Ga</sub>. Code Ann. §81A-112(a) (1977). 22Ga. Code Ann. §81A-115(a) (Supp. 1981). 23Ga. Code Ann. §81A-155(a) (Supp. 1981). 24<sub>Ga</sub>. Code Ann. §81A-155(b) (Supp. 1981).

motion does not delay trial.<sup>25</sup> A motion for summary judgment may be made 30 days after the action has commenced.<sup>26</sup> Some defense motions are generally required to be raised in the defensive pleadings also. The opposing party must be given notice of all motions set for hearing. The Code provides when notice must be given for certain kinds of hearings. These time periods are fairly short; summary judgment, for example, requires 30 days,<sup>27</sup> and written motions, 5 days.<sup>28</sup> In contrast, the Code does not regulate the specifics of motion assignments and hearing schedules. Instead the judge may establish the order and scheduling for motion hearings.<sup>29</sup> Defense motions are usually heard before trial, but Ga. Code Ann. §81A-112(d) permits these motions to be heard at trial. IV. Discovery Not only may the parties file various pre-trial motions, but they may

use discovery methods to preserve and collect evidence for trial. Generally these techniques can be used on the plaintiff as soon as the suit is commenced. Oral depositions cannot be taken of the defendant until 30 days have expired after service of the complaint except in certain specific situations.<sup>30</sup> Interrogatories and requests for admission may be served on the defendant after he has been served with the complaint and summons. $^{31}$ 

<sup>25</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-112 (1977). <sup>26</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-156 (1977). <sup>27</sup>Id. <sup>28</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-106(a) (1977). <sup>29</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-178 (1977). <sup>30</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-130 (1977). <sup>3</sup>1<sub>Ga.</sub> Code Ann. §§81A-133,-136 (1977; Supp. 1981).

be made at any time after pleadings are closed so long as the timing of the

The exact timing and location of the deposition is determined by the requesting party. Testimony is transcribed and must be submitted to the party or witness for signature within 30 days of transcription. Thereafter, the deposition is filed.<sup>32</sup>

Interrogatories and requests for admission addressed to a party must be answered within 30 days of service, or, if the party is the defendant, within either the 30 days or 45 days from service of the original complaint, whichever is the later.<sup>33</sup> The Code limits the number of interrogatories (to 50) which may be served without special leave of court.<sup>34</sup> This perhaps indirectly limits time that may be consumed in discovery by interrogatories.

The conduct of discovery is accomplished by the parties in accordance with the Civil Practice Act.<sup>35</sup> The court is generally not directly involved unless a party seeks a protective order or special allowances, or refuses to comply with a discovery request.

V. Pre-trial Conference

A pre-trial conference is not required by the Civil Practice Act, but a party may request a court order, or the court, on its own initiative, may order a conference.<sup>36</sup> Scheduling is handled by local rules or an order of the court.

IV. Trial/Continuances

Ga. Code Ann. §81A-140 describes the order in which civil cases are triable. Both this section and Ga. Code Ann. §24-3343 (Superior Court Rules)

<sup>32</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-130 (Supp. 1981).

<sup>33</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-133,-136 (1977; Supp. 1981).

<sup>34</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-133 (Supp. 1981).

<sup>35</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §§81A-126 et. seq. (1977; Supp. 1981).

<sup>36</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-116 (1977).

require that cases be placed on the calendar in chronological order by filing dates. These statutes provide that the judge may change this order of trial for good cause shown. A civil case is triable anytime after the last day for the defendant's answer (usually 30 days after the complaint was served) except that the court is charged with insuring that a reasonable time for discovery has been allowed. Lastly, this Code section gives the court discretion to set a case on the trial calendar on its own order with notice to the parties or to allow a party to request the case be set for trial. Thus, the Code encourages prompt trial and case termination, but allows the judge to exercise discretion in scheduling so as to assure that the parties are allotted a reasonable time to prepare their case.

Trial timing is not only affected by trial calendaring, but by continuance statutes and local practice. Ga. Code Ann. §81-1401 states that for any one cause a party is entitled to only one continuance for one term of court. There, are special statutory reasons for when a continuance will be granted.<sup>37</sup> Under the authority of Ga. Code Ann. §81-1419, the judge has discretion in granting continuances. Therefore, statutes and local court rules and custom are extremely important in the determination of trial dates.

The judgment in a civil case is entered when it is signed by the judge and filed by the clerk. There is no time limit for this signing and filing.<sup>38</sup> The entry of the judgment is important in determining when execution may issue. Unless the parties agree otherwise, an execution cannot issue until 10 days have expired after the entry of the judgment.<sup>39</sup> This rule does not apply to default judgments for which execution may issue immediately upon entry of the judgment.

<sup>37</sup>See, e.g., Ga. Code Ann. §§81-1402 through-1423 (Supp. 1981).
 <sup>38</sup>Moore v. Moore, 229 Ga. 600 (1972).
 <sup>39</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-162(a) (1977).

## VII. Judgment/Execution

3

Ţ

## VIII. Post-judgment Motions/Appeal

Post-judgment motions are required to be filed promptly after the conclusion of a case. A motion to amend a judgment, for instance, must be made within 10 days after the entry of the judgment.<sup>40</sup> Two of the most important post-judgment motions--a motion for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict and a motion for a new trial--both must be made within 30 days of the verdict.<sup>41</sup> The party opposed to the party receiving a favorable judgment notwithstanding the verdict.<sup>41</sup> the verdict may file a motion for a new trial 30 days from the JNOV entry.

Not only must post-judgment motions be filed speedily, but if a party wants to challenge the decision at the appellate level, he must act quickly. A notice of appeal is required to be filed within 30 days after the entry of a final judgment.<sup>42</sup>

## IX. Failure to Prosecute

The Georgia Code provides for termination of cases which remain inactive for a long period of time. A civil action is automatically dismissed if no order has been entered on the case within five years.<sup>43</sup>

X. Local Court Rules

1

As mentioned above, parts of the Civil Practice Act provide for judicial discretion in some aspects of case scheduling. Ga. Code Ann. §81A-183 specifically provides that local court rules will apply unless in conflict with the Civil Practice Act. Thus, local courts are permitted some discretion in setting time limits and goals for case processing.

<sup>40</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §§81A-152(b) (1977).
<sup>41</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-150(b) (1977).
<sup>42</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §6-803 (1975).
<sup>43</sup>Ga. Code Ann. §81A-141 (1977).

## C. SUMMARY

The preceding outlines show that the flow of civil and criminal case processing is largely determined by the court and the parties. The state statutes provide only a general outline with few strict time limitations. Therefore, the role the judge plays in setting the pace of litigation and the existence of local pleading customs is very important in understanding the current caseflow process in the superior courts in Georgia.

## APPENDIX 111

## DEFINITIONS AND DATA COLLECTION FORMS

## TABLE 1

### Case Type Definitions

FELONY - a count or charge filed against a defendant by indictment or accusation in the Superior Court, as a state offense for which the defendant, if convicted, could receive a sentence or incarceration of one vear or more.

A listing of common felonies is provided on pages

GENERAL CIVIL - an action initiated in the Superior Court by the filing of a complaint or petition seeking establishment, recovery or redress of an individual right. A complaint listing numerous parties or various claims, counter-claims or cross-claims constitutes only one case for data collection purposes.

A listing of common civil actions is provided on pages

DOMESTIC RELATIONS - a civil proceeding arising from the marital relationship including divorce, alimony, annullment, petitions to change child custody, child support, and URESA actions.

Abandonment of Child or pregnant wife (defendant leaves state) 2. Acceptance by witness Advocating overthrow of government 3. 4. Aggravated assault 5. Aggravated battery Aiding escape 6. 7. Aircraft hijacking 8. Armed robbery 9. Arson \*10. Bad check (drawn on out-of-state bank or \$500 or more) 11. Bail jumping on felony 12. Barratry 13. Bestiality 14. Bigamy 15. Bribery 16. Bribery of contestant 17. Burglary \*18. Carrying a concealed weapon (second offense) Carrying a pistol without a license (second offense) \*19. Carrying firearms while on parole or probation of felony 20. 21. Child molestation \*22. Commercial gambling Communication gambling information 23. \*24. Compounding a crime (which is a felony) 25. Conspiracy in restraint of free and open competition Conspiracy to commit a crime (which is a felony) \*26. Conspiracy to defraud state or political subdivision 27. 28. Conversion of leased personal property 29. Criminal abortion 30. Criminal damage to property in the first degree 31. Criminal damage to property in the second degree \*32. Criminal interference with government property (destroy, damage, de 33. Criminal possession of explosives 34. Criminal possession of an incendiary 35. Cruelty to children Damaging, destroying or secreting property to defraud another 36. Distributing material depicting nudity or sexual conduct 37. \*38. Distributing obscene materials (to minors) 39. Embracery 40. Enticing a child for indecent purposes \*41. Escape (after conviction or while armed with a dangerous weapon) 42. False imprisonment 43. False imprisonment under color of legal process 44. False official certificates or writings \*45. False public alarm (concering explosives) 46. False swearing

## CRIMINAL CASE-TYPES

FELONIES

\*

FELON	IES (cont'd)
47.	Fraud in obtaining public assistance (over \$500)
48.	
	Furnishing alcohol to a minor
	Habitual violator, driving without license
51.	
52.	Illegal use of credit cards; false statements as to financial
	condition or identity; credit card theft; forgery of credit card;
	credit card fraud; criminal possession of credit card forgery;
	criminal receipt of goods and services fraudently obtained; un-
	authorized use; publication of information regarding schemes,
	devices, means or methods for credit card fraud or theft of
	telecommunication services
53.	Impersonating an officer
54.	Impersonating in a legal proceeding
55.	Improperly influencing legislative action
56.	Incest
57.	Inciting to insurrection
58.	Influencing witness
59.	Instigating mutiny in penal institutions
60.	Insurrection
61.	Interference with custody
62. 63.	Intermarriage - when prohibited Involuntary manslaughter
63. 64.	Kidnapping
65.	Machine guns; illegal sale, etc.
66.	Malicious confinement of same person
67.	Marrying a bigamist
68.	Motor vehicle theft
69.	Murder
70.	Mutiny in penal institutions
71.	Officer or employee improperly influencing another officer or employee
72.	Officer or employee selling to government or political subdivision
*73.	Pandering (by compulsion)
74.	"Peeping Tom"
75.	Perjury (three different penalties)
76.	Possession, sale and distribution of eavesdropping devices
77.	Possession of dangerous weapons
*78.	Possession of illegal drugs
79.	Possession of tools for the commission of a crime
80.	Rape
81. 82.	Robbery Seduction
83.	Shoplifting (over \$100)
84.	Shoplifting (fourth offense)
85.	Sodomy; aggravated sodoly (two different penalties)
86.	Soliciting or accepting a bribe
	Statutory rape
88.	Subornation of perjury or false swearing
89.	Terroristic threats
90.	Theft by extortion
*91.	Theft of property or services <sup>1</sup>
	Theft of trade secret <sup>1</sup>
93.	Treason

遼

傷

2

## FELONIES (cont'd)

蹇

霮

宠

94. Unlawful eavesdropping and surveillance
95. Vandalism to a place of worship
\*96. Violation of Georgia Controlled Substance Act (VGCSA) (possession of more than one ounce of marijuana; possession of any other controlled substance; sale of any drug)
97. Violation of oath by public officer
98. Voluntary manslaughter
99. Violation of Uniform Narcotic and Drug Act

## GENERAL CIVIL CASE-TYPES

## General Civil Cases

Account, Suit on Open

All Appeals from Lower Courts

Bail Trover

η

D

£

P

E

3

E)

T

S.

Birth Certificate, Petition for

Check, Suit on

Condemnation of Land

Condemnation on Right of Way

Construction Petition for

Contract, Suit. on

Coversion, Suit on

Custody, Petition to Pelease from (S)

Damages, Suit for

Death, Suit on Wrongful

Debt, Suit on

Deed, Petition to Amend Warranty

Deed, Petition to Cancel Warranty

Disability, Petition to Remove

Ejectment

Election, Civil Action on Primary

Equity, Complaint in Equitable Complaint in Rem

Equitable Direction, Petition for

Funds, Suit to Recover

Habeas Corpus

Illegality, Affidavit of

### General Civil Cases

Injunction

Insurance Policy, Suit on

Interpleaders, Petition for

Judgment, Petition for Declaratory

Judgment, Petition to Enforce Foreign Land Lien Proceeding

Land, Petition for

Lease Agreement, Suit on

Mandamus, Petition for

Negligence, Complaint fo.

Note, Suit on

Nuisance, Injunction for Abatement of Common

Padlock, Suit to Remove

Partition, Equitable

Performance, Petition for Specific

Prohibition, Petition for Writ of

Promise, Breach of

Promissory Note, Complaint on

Recovery, Claim for Unde Georgia Real Estate Recovery Act

Rent, Suit for

## General Civil Cases

Sale, Petition to Halt

Sale, Quick

Tax Refund, Suit for

Title, Petition to Establish

Title, Petition to Remove Cloud from

Trespass, Petiton Restraining

Trespassing, Injunction for

Trust, Modification of

Trustee, Petition for Appointment of

Wife, Petition to Declare Lawful

Injunctive Relief, Complaint for

action is separate proceeding (S) (C) counted only if original action is closed

## TABLE 2

### Definition of Types of Dispositions

#### Criminal

R.

韵

- A. Cash Bond cash bond is a disposition for misdemeanor (game and fish violations) or traffic counts when the court accepts forfeiture of a cash bond as a final disposition of a count.
- B. Nolle Pros/Dismissed dispositions of criminal counts in which the district attorney makes a determination not to prosecute or in which the judge dismisses a criminal count without a trial.
- C. Dead Docketed disposition of a criminal count in which action by a court is to place a case on the "dead docket." While cases that are placed on the dead docket may be reactivated for prosecution later, for purposes of this study, it is counted as a disposition.
- D. Non-Trial counts disposed by primarily guilty pleas and pleas of nolo contendere, but also including dispositions when the defendant is deceased, extradicted, or found by a judge to be incompetent to stand trial or insane.
- E. Non-Jury Trial counts which are disposed by a judicial determination of quilt or innocence after completion of trial.
- F. Jury Trial counts which are disposed by a jury verdict of guilt or acquittal.

#### Civil Dispositions

- A. Settled/Dismissed settled is a case disposition when the case was concluded without adjudication; but, instead was voluntarily dismissed by the plaintiff. Dismissed is a case disposition when the case is terminated upon an order of dismissal, of the judge on his own initiative, or upon a motion of the defendant.
- B. 5-Year Administrative Termination disposition of a case provided for under Georgia Code Ann. §81A-141(a) for civil cases in which no order has been entered within five years.
- C. Before Trial/Non-Jury Trial a case which is closed through an order of the judge either after a trial on the issues or before trial if the judge makes a ruling based on the record of the case such as default judgment, consent judgment, summary judgment, confession of judgment or judgment on the pleadings.
- D. Jury Trial if the case was closed by a jury verdict.

2. Indictment - A grand jury's written formal charge of criminal offenses enumerated against an individual stating that there is probable cause for the State to pursue the case.

3. Accusation - A formal charge presented by the prosecutor alleging that a certain individual is guilty of a criminal offense.

4. Arraignment - A proceeding in which a prisoner is informed of his rights, criminal charges against him, and is required to answer these charges.

5. Disposition - Termination of the prosecution of a criminal charge by entry of one of the following orders: Conviction, dead docket, nol pros, forfeiture of cash bond, dismissal, or acquittal.

R

137

## TABLE 3

## Definition of Major Case Intervals Criminal

1. Arrest - The taking, with authority, of an individual into custody for the purpose of detaining this individual to answer criminal charges.

6. Sentencing - Upon conviction of a defendant of charges against him, formal pronouncement of punishment or treatment by the judge.

## TABLE 3

## Definition of Major Case Intervals <u>Civil</u>

- Complaint The petition of a plaintiff which initiates a civil action by setting out the plaintiff's claim.
- Service Delivery of the complaint to the individuals named (herein referring to each defendant named) notifying such individuals of a pending civil action. Service includes delivery as recognized by <u>Ga. Code Ann.</u> §81A-104.
- Answer The response of a defendant to the plaintiff's complaint setting out his defenses.
- 4. Last Pleadings Filed Filing in the clerk of court's office of any pleading in a civil action including answer, amended pleadings, cross-claim or counter-claim. For purpose of the case time sequence study, "the last pleadings filed" also includes filing of any discovery motion or paper excluding depositions.
- 5. Motion Formal written application for a rule or order of the court.
- 6. Hearing Formal proceeding in which the court in chambers or on the bench issues a ruling upon a motion in a civil action.
- 7. Disposition Termination of a civil action as to all parties.
- Fi.Fa. (Fieri Facias) A writ of execution which is issued by the court commanding the sheriff to levy upon the property of a party against which a money judgment of the court has been issued.

## TABLE 4

象

L

(F

# DATA COLLECTION SHEETS AND CODING SHEETS

CASE TIME SEQUENCE CRIMIN	IAL CODING SHEET			
· · · · ·				
County ID = #	Trial Type =			
Case number = Docket number	1 = Non-jury			County ID = #
	2 = 12 person jury 3 = Other (jury)			Case number = Dock
Manner of initiation =		i i		
<pre>1 = Grand Jury Indictment 2 = Information/Accusation</pre>	Court Disposition =			Case Type =
3 = Appeal from Court of limited special	Acqu = Acquitted Aq In = Acquitted by Reason of		•	1 = General Civ
jurisdiction	. Insanity	•		2 = Domestic Rel 3 = Independent
4 = Transfer from other court	Dism = Dismissed			o macpendent
5 = Other 6 = UTC	DsMI = Dismissed due to Mental			Type of Service =
	Incompetence Conv = Convicted			1 = Personal
Defendant's Status =	Dece = Deceased			2 = Substitute 3 = Publication
J = Jail	Exte = Extradited			5 - Tubrication
B = Bail W = Warrant Issued	Adjw - Adjudication Withheld			Pre-trial Motions/
C = Custody in other jurisdiction	Mist = Mistrial - Defendant Discharged			
	DV = Acquitted - Direct Verdict	-		Trial Type =
Type Charge =	Dead = Dead Docketed	-		1 = Non-Jury
F ≈ Felony M = Misdemeanor	NOLP = Nol Prossed			2 = 12 person ju
T = Traffic	Tran = Transferred to another court			3 = 0ther
	HJ = Hung Jury			State of Disposit <sup>*</sup>
Pleas (INITIAL TRIAL & FINAL) =				1 = Before Answe
N = Not Guilty G = Guilty	Stage =			2-= Before Plead
I = Not guilty by reason of insanity	<pre>1 = Before Jury Selection 2 = During Jury Selection or</pre>			3 = On Pre-trial
C = No contest	Trial			4 = Trial prior 5 = After trial
U = Unknown	3 = After Trial/Verdict	1		6 = 0ther
Appearance Type =	4 = Before Trial			
1 = Prelim. Hearing/Commitment	Offender Status =			Judgment in Favor
2 = Arraignment/1st Apperance	A = Adult	• • •		P = Plaintiff D = Defendant
3 = Pretrial Misc. Inquiry	B = First Offender			B = Both
4 = Trial 5 = (plea, dd, np, dism)	C = Youthful Offender (17-25			0 = 0ther
6 = Sentencing	non-capital fel.) D = Juvenile			
7 = Other (Contin.) (Mod. of Sen.)	E = Other			Disposition Method SETL = Settlement
Delegen Action -			a state of the sta	CJUD = Consent Jud
Release Action = A = Incarcerated	Punishment =			DJUD = Default Juc
B = Release w/o bond	Cash BF = Bail Forfeited CfHs = Confinement in Hospital			JUDP = Judgment or
C = Release on own recognizance	CtCt = Court Costs		₩. N	DPRE = Dismissed v DWOP = Dismissed v
D = Release on cash bond	DSEN = Death Sentence			SJUD = Summary Juc
E = Release after posting security F = Professional security bond	Life = Life Sentence			DIRV = Direct Vero
G = Non-professional security bond	Rest = Restitution Fine = Fine			NJTR = Judgment af
H = Release to other authority	Prob = Probation		•	VERD = Verdict JNOV = Judgment no
I = Supervised release	Incr = Incarceration	•		CONS = Consolidate
J = Unknown K = Other - license instead of bail posted	Susp = Suspended Sentence			TRAN = Transferred
is other - ricense instead of Dall posted				0-M = Open - Mist
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				0-HJ = Open - Hung O = Other Open
		•		5-YR = 5 Year Admi

.

•

٩.

## CASE TIME SEQUENCE CIVIL CODING SHEET

number

ions tions

arings =

=

gs Completed otions/hearings verdict or decision

ent ent he Pleadings h Prejudice hout Prejudice ent non-jury trial

ithstanding Verdict with other case o<sub>another</sub> court 3] iry

5-YR = 5 Year Administrative Termination

# CIVIL CASE TIME SEQUENCE - PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS COMPUTER CODE

NISI - Rule NISI CROR - Continue Restraining Order PROO - Protective Order SJUD - Summary Judgment PSJU - Partial Summary Judgment STRK - Motion to Strike Party PJUP - Partial Judgment on the Pleadings ADDD - Motion to Add COMP - Motion to Compel Payment JUDP - Judgment on Pleadings LIMI - Motion in Limine SANC - Motion for Imposition of Sanctions DEFO - Motion to Open Default MITR - Motion for Mistrial RESO - Motion for Restraining Order DIFN - Motion for Distribution of Funds SOTR - Special Order for Trial CONI - Continuance JURY - Jury Demand TREO - Temporary Restraining Order PTRO - Pretrial Order RESO - Motion for Restraining Order SOTR - Special Order for Trial TEMO - Temporary Order PINJ - Preliminary Injunction ADDP - Motion to Add Party INTV - Motion to Intervene PAYM - Motion for Payment STAY - Motion for Stay MOTR - Motion Trial LISP - Lis Pendens WPOS - Writ of Possession DISC - Dismiss Counterclaim CONT - Contempt CONS - Consolidation RELF - Motion for Release of Funds SPEO - Special Order INTO - Interlocutory Order QSRV - Quash Service

.

囊

**.** 

.

SUPB - Supersedeas

Restraining Order NOTT - Notice for Trial DJUD - Motion for Default Judgment RNIS - Motion to Reschedule Hearing CIRE - Certificate for Immediate Review RESJ - Reconsider Summary Judgment ASUM - Amend to Substitute Partv SANC - Sanctions WCON - Withdrawal of Counsel WDIS - Withdrawal of motion to Dismiss REFO - Motion to Reopen Dismissed Case DISM - Motion to Dismiss MGAL - Motion for Guardian Ad Litem

DREO - Motion to Dissolve

NTAX - Notice of Taxes COMA - Motion to Compel Answer WJTR - Waiver of Jury Trial CONO - Consent Order APPG - Appoint Guardian SPMR - Special Master Return SPMO - Special Master Oath



AGENCY ID		
CASE NUMBER FILING DATE		
TYPE OF SERVICE 1 2 3 4 DATE OF SERVICE / /		
ANSWER FILED / /		
LAST PLEADINGS FILED ///		
END OF DISCOVERY/ /		
CRE-TRIAL MOTIONS/HEARINGS		
TYPE DATE FILED	HEA	RD
2		_/
3 / /		
5	/	1
6 / /		
7 / /		
0 / /	1	.7
TRIAL BEGAN / /		
IRIAL ENCED		
TRIAL TYPE 1 2 3		
DISPOSITION .		
DATE / /		
STAGE 1 2 3 4 5 6		
UDGHENT IN FAVOR OF: P D B O		
F1. FA. ISSUED / / .		

AGENCY ID CASE NUMBER FILING DATE //
CASE TYPE 1 2 3
TYPE OF SERVICE 1 2 3 4
NSWER FILED / /
AST PLEADINGS FILED / /
ND OF DISCOVERY //
0.5 70.1

PRE-TRI	IAL I	MOTIONS/HE TYPE	ARINGS			
<u> </u>	1	TYPE	DATE	FILED	HEAR	D
2			/	1	1	7
3			/	1	/	1
4						_4
5						-4
6.			1			4
8			1	1		4
0			/	1	1	7
TRIAL						

TRIAL	_		,	
VOIR DIRE BE	gan		1	/
TRIAL BEGAN			1	1
TRIAL ENDED			7	1
TRIAL TYPE	1	2	3	

UISPUSITIO	11	_						
DATE	1	1						
STAGE 1	2	3	4	5	6			
JUDGMENT 1	N FA	VOR	OF:	P	D	8	0	
HETHOD							<u> </u>	
I. '								

# FI. FA. ISSUED / /

COMMENTS:	

AGENCY ID CASE NUMBER FILING DATE ///	
CASE TYPE 1 2	
TYPE OF SERVICE 1 2 DATE OF SERVICE /	,
ANSWER FILED /	
LAST PLEADINGS FILED	
END OF DISCOVERY	

TRIAL VOIR DIRE BEGAN TRIAL BEGAN TRIAL ENDED IRIAL TYPE 1

FI. FA. ISSUED COMMENTS:

144

COMMENTS:

and a second second

9



COUNTY ID CASE NUMBER FILING DATE // MANNER OF INITIATION 1 2 3 4 5 6

DEFENDANT'S NAME\_\_\_\_\_ DATE OF ARREST\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ DEFENDANT'S STATUS\_J\_B\_W\_C\_\_\_

• •

#CHG.	TYPE CHARGE	INITIAL PLE	A	TRI		I FA	]
2	F M T	NGI (	<u>U</u>	N	G	<u>1 C</u>	U
3	FMT	N G I C	. U	<u>N</u>	<u>_G</u>	<u>I C</u> I C	井
5	FMT	<u>NGIO</u>	U II	N	G	1 0	Ŭ
	PLEA DATE		0	14	7	$\frac{1}{7}$	<u> </u>

APP. APPEARANCE D	TE APPEARANCE TYPE RELEASE ACTIO	<u>TNI</u>
2 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
3 / /	1234567	
4 / /	1234567	-
5 / /	1234567	-1
h//	1234567	

TRIAL #CH	G. FINAL	PLEA COURT DISPOSITION	CTAOL T
TRIAL BEGAN / /	1 NGI	C U	STAGE
TRIAL ENDED / /	<u>2 NGI</u> 3 NGI		1234
	4 NGI	<u> </u>	1234
TRIAL TYPE	5 NGI	ĊŪ	$-\frac{1234}{1224}$
123	PLEA DATE	1 1	1234

#CHG.	PUNISHMENT TYPE OFFENDER STATUS COMMENTS:
2	ABCDE
4	
SENTENCE DATE /	/

COUNTY I CASE NUM FILING D MANNER O 1 2	IBER	/	DEFENDANT DATE OF A DEFENDANT	'S NAME RREST 'S STATUS	) B W C
# CHG. 1 2 3 4 5	TYPE CHARGE F M T F M T F M T F M T F M T PLEA DATE	N G N G N G	L PLEA I C U I C U I C U I C U I C U I C U	TRIAL PLE NGI NGI NGI NGI NGI	A C U C U C U C U C U C U C U
#APP. 1 2 3 4 5	APPEARANCE DAT / / / / / / / / / /	E APPE/ 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2	ARANCE         TYP           3         4         5           3         4         5           3         4         5           3         4         5           3         4         5           3         4         5           3         4         5           3         4         5           3         4         5	E RELEA: 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7	SE ACTION
TRIAL TRIAL BEG/ TRIAL ENDE TRIAL TYPE 1 2 3	1 NGI N/2 NGI D/3 NGI 4 NGI		COURT DISI	<u> </u>	STAGE 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4
₹CHG. 1 2 3	PUNI:	SHMENT TYP		NDER STATUS	s comien

Sec. 44. B. Consequences and Second Second

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF GEORGIA/A.O.C. April 6, 1981

.

4

\*

.

SENTENCE DATE / /

145

a Constant pla constant a second a second constant and a second second second second second second second second

1

×



PROPERTY OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF GEORGIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

.

## TABLE 5

.

## DISTRIBUTION OF CIRCUITS IN SAMPLING STRATUM: NUMBER OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES AND NUMBER OF COUNTIES IN CIRCUIT FY1980 NUMBER OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

	STRATUM I		STRATUM II		STRATU	<b></b>	
FOF COUN- TES	1	2	3	4	7	11	TOTAL
1	Houston	Dougherty	Clayton Rome <u>Gwinnett</u>	Cobb Eastern		Atlanta	8
2		Alcovy Cherokee Conasauga Western			Stone	Mtn.	5
3	Piedmont		Macon	Augusta			3
4	•	Cordele Dublin Flint Griffin Northea'n. Ogeechee Tifton	Lookout M Tallapoos				9
5	Mountain	Alapaha Blue Ridge Middle Northern South Ga.	Southern Brunswick Coweta	\$			9
6	Southw'n. Toombs	Atlantic Oconee Waycross		Chattah'e.			6
7	Pataula				÷		1
8	- <u> </u>		Ocmulgee				1

146

:



