



97148

Issued by:

The Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice  
(Nebraska Crime Commission)  
301 Centennial Mall South  
P.O. Box 94946  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Robert Kerrey, Governor

Commission Members

Paul L. Douglas  
John M. Paris  
Mrs. Irene Abernethy  
Charles L. Benson  
Ross DiMauro  
Joseph Friend  
Shirley Howell  
Mrs. Clifford Jorgensen  
Patrick Kelly  
Col. Elmer Kohmetscher  
Norman Krivosha  
Gaylon L. Kuchel  
Shirley J. Kuhle  
Jim Livingston  
W.W. Nuernberger  
William B. Rist  
Joseph C. Steele  
Clyde Storie

Merritt C. Green, Director

Chairman, Attorney General  
Vice-Chairman, Public at Large, Dawes County  
County Commissioner, Hall County  
Director, Nebraska Department of Correctional Services  
Public at Large, Bellevue  
Public Safety Director, Omaha  
Mayor, Fairbury  
Public at Large, Lincoln  
County Attorney, Sarpy County  
Superintendent, Nebraska State Patrol  
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court  
Public at Large, Omaha  
Public at Large, Lincoln  
Chief of Police, Scottsbluff  
Juvenile Justice, Lincoln  
District Court Judge, Beatrice  
State Court Administrator  
County Sheriff, Thurston County

Prepared by:

Mark Murphy

Nebraska Publication Clearinghouse Number L2500S002-1982

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Nebraska Commission on Law  
Enforcement and Criminal Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Juvenile Court Reporting Program.....	4
Referral Background.....	7
Referrals.....	9
Dispositions.....	17
Age.....	21
Sex.....	24
Ethnic Group.....	26
Living Arrangement.....	27
Separate Juvenile Courts.....	29
Appendix.....	32

NCJRS

MAR 98 1988

ACQUISITIONS

## INTRODUCTION

The Juvenile Court Report presents data collected during calendar year 1982 through the Juvenile Court Reporting (JCR) Program concerning young people who were processed by courts with juvenile jurisdiction in the State of Nebraska. These include 90 county courts and the three separate juvenile courts of Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy counties.

The JCR program was instituted in 1971 by the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (hereafter referred to as the Commission). The program is based on the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Juvenile Court Statistics Series begun in 1927. In 1973 this program was assumed by the National Center for Juvenile Justice under a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the parent agency of this Commission. The National Center compiles national statistics on juvenile delinquency using data from state reporting programs such as the one in Nebraska.

In Nebraska, the Commission uses data obtained through the JCR program as a basis for its function of juvenile justice planning. The program is also used as a source of information for agencies and individuals dealing with juvenile delinquency and related issues. Readers are reminded that upon request to the Commission, specific information collected in the program can be provided. While this report presents a large amount of data describing the characteristics of young persons who enter the Nebraska court system, interpretation of the information is beyond its scope.

The many county and juvenile court judges, clerks, probation staff, and other court personnel deserve recognition for their time and effort involved in collecting and reporting case information. Without their cooperation, this publication would not be possible.



## JUVENILE COURT REPORTING PROGRAM

One of the primary purposes of this report is to provide information that accurately reflects the level of juvenile crime in the State of Nebraska. In this report, the particular indicator used is the flow of juveniles through the Nebraska juvenile court system (see Figure 1). The sources of the data are the three separate juvenile courts of Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy counties and the county courts in the remaining 90 counties. Neither the district courts nor the municipal courts in Lincoln and Omaha report juvenile case data to the Commission. District court cases usually involve older juveniles appearing for serious offenses and the volume of such cases is small compared to the number of juvenile cases handled in juvenile and county courts. In addition, the Commission does not collect data on juvenile traffic offenses or citations.

The 93 courts report cases disposed of to the Commission monthly. For each individual juvenile case disposition, the court fills out a Juvenile Court Statistical Form as shown in Figure 2. The following sections of the form are required information on all cases: A. Court Code, E. Age at Time of Referral, F. Sex, G. Ethnic Group, H. Date of Referral, L. Reason Referred, M. Manner of Handling, N. Date of Disposition, and O. Disposition. The remainder of the form is optional, however, the courts are encouraged to include as much information as they possibly can. In the tables contained in this report, references to missing data mean that not all counties completed the section(s) of the form being discussed.

A Juvenile Court Statistical Form Instruction Manual, which is intended to explain how to complete the form, is available to assist persons responsible for its completion.

At this time, the Commission has juvenile court data from all counties from 1974 through 1981 and some partial data from 1973.

It is important to note that the information described in this report pertains to dispositions of juvenile cases by county and juvenile courts during calendar year 1982, and not to referrals during that period. The case may have been referred to the court during 1982 or previously. Thus, an accurate count of the number of referrals for a given period is not possible because a statistical form is not received until a final disposition in the case has been determined.

Figure 1

## JUVENILE COURT REPORTING PROGRAM FLOW DIAGRAM, 1982

SOURCE OF REFERRAL		
Law Enforcement	2022	40.1%
School	111	2.2%
Social Agency	274	5.4%
Probation Office	71	1.4%
Parents, Relatives	297	5.9%
Other Court	365	7.2%
County Attorney	1669	33.1%
Other	228	4.5%
TOTAL	5037	100.0%

DETENTION	COURT INTAKE	NO DETENTION
1308 26.7%		3594 73.3%

WITH PETITION	FILING	NO PETITION
4001 78.4%		1103 21.6%

DISPOSITION		
Waived to Criminal Court	3	0.1%
Dismissed: not proven	583	11.4%
Dismissed: warned	417	8.2%
Case held open	654	12.8%
Formal Probation	1583	31.0%
Referred elsewhere	640	12.5%
Fine/Restitution	179	3.5%
Other-No custody transfer	200	4.0%
Youth Development Center	206	4.0%
Custody to Agency	522	10.2%
Custody to individual	54	1.1%
Other custody transfer	63	1.2%
TOTAL	5104	100.0%

**Nebraska Commission on  
Law Enforcement & Criminal Justice**

# Juvenile Court Statistical Form

<b>A. County</b> <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>E. Age at time of referral</b> <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
<b>B. Child's Number</b> <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 150px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>F. Sex:</b> 1 Male    2 Female <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
<b>C. Census tract of residence (Douglas County only)</b> <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>G. Ethnic Group</b> 1 White 2 Black 3 Indian 4 Mexican-American 5 Oriental 6 Other <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
<b>H. Date of Referral</b> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> </div>		<b>L. Reason Referred (Enter only one code)</b> <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
<b>I. Referred By</b> 1 Law enforcement agency 2 School 3 Social agency 4 Probation officer 5 Parents or relatives 6 Other court 7 County Attorney 8 Other <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>Manner of handling</b> 1 Without petition 2 With petition <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
<b>J. Prior court referrals</b> This calendar year 0 1 2 3 4 5 or more <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div> In prior years 0 1 2 3 4 5 or more <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>N. Date of disposition</b> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> <span style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 20px;"></span> </div>																					
<b>K. Care pending disposition</b> 0. No detention or shelter care overnight Detention or shelter care overnight or longer in: 1. Jail or police station with separate facilities 2. Jail or police station with no separate facilities 3. Detention home 4. Foster or group home 5. Other <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>O. Disposition (Enter only one code)</b> 00 Waived to criminal court; Complaint not substantiated 01 Dismissed; Not proved or found not involved Complaint substantiated No transfer of legal custody 11 Dismissed; Warned, counseled 12 Hold open without further action 13 Formal probation 14 Referred to another agency or individual for service or supervision 15 Runaway returned 16 Fine or restitution 17 Other Transfer of legal custody to: 21 Youth Development Center - Kearney or Geneva 22 Public agency or department (including court or jail) 23 Private agency or institution (Specify) 24 Individual (Specify relationship) 25 Other <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
The following questions refer to status at time of referral.																							
<b>P. Diagnostic Services</b> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="font-size: small;">Indicated and provided</th> <th style="font-size: small;">Indicated but not available</th> <th style="font-size: small;">Not indicated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Psychological</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Psychiatric</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medical</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Indicated and provided	Indicated but not available	Not indicated	Psychological	1	2	3	Psychiatric	1	2	3	Medical	1	2	3	Social	1	2	3	<b>U. Marital status of natural parents</b> 01 Parents married and living together One or both parents dead 02 Both dead 03 Father dead 04 Mother dead Parents separated 05 Divorced or legally separated 06 Father deserted mother 07 Mother deserted father 08 Other reason (Specify) 09 Parents not married to each other 10 Other 11 Unknown <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>	
	Indicated and provided	Indicated but not available	Not indicated																				
Psychological	1	2	3																				
Psychiatric	1	2	3																				
Medical	1	2	3																				
Social	1	2	3																				
<b>Q. School attainment</b> Grade completed (00-12) <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>V. Combined family annual income</b> 1. Receiving public assistance Not receiving public assistance 2. Under \$5,000 3. \$5,000 to \$9,999 4. \$10,000 to \$24,999 5. \$25,000 and over 6. Unknown <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
<b>R. Employment and school status</b> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="font-size: small;">Out of School</th> <th style="font-size: small;">In School</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Not employed</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Employed</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>    Full time</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>    Part time</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Preschool</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Out of School	In School	Not employed	1	5	Employed			Full time	2	6	Part time	3	7	Preschool	4		<b>W. Counsel</b> 1. Court appointed 2. Retained 3. Public defender 4. Not represented 5. Other <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>			
	Out of School	In School																					
Not employed	1	5																					
Employed																							
Full time	2	6																					
Part time	3	7																					
Preschool	4																						
<b>S. Length of residence of child in county</b> 0 Not currently a resident 1 Under one year 2 One year or more <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<b>X. Occupation of primary parent or guardian</b> 01 Professional or technical 02 Managerial or administrative 03 Farmer or rancher 04 Sales worker 05 Craftsman or other skilled laborer 06 Clerical 07 Service workers or other unskilled laborers 08 Unemployed 09 Unknown <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>																					
<b>T. Living arrangement of child in home with</b> 01 Both parents 02 Mother and stepfather 03 Father and stepmother 04 Mother only 05 Father only Outside own home with 06 Relatives 07 Foster or group home 08 Institution 09 Independent arrangement 10 Other 11 Unknown <div style="text-align: center; border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>		<div style="height: 100px; border: 1px solid black;"></div>																					

## REFERRAL BACKGROUND

A juvenile may come under the jurisdiction of a juvenile court or a county court sitting as a juvenile court in Nebraska if it is determined that he or she is described in Sections 43-202(1) through 43-202(6) of the Reissue Revised Statutes of Nebraska, 1943. For purposes of the Juvenile Court Reporting Program, the following sections are applicable:

"(1) ...any child under the age of eighteen years, who is homeless or destitute, or without proper support through no fault of his parent, guardian, or custodian;

"(2) ...any child under the age of eighteen years (a) who is abandoned by his parent, guardian, or custodian; (b) who lacks proper parental care by reason of the faults or habits of his parent, guardian, or custodian; (c) whose parent, guardian, or custodian neglects or refuses to provide proper or necessary subsistence, education, or other care necessary for the health, morals, or well-being of such child; (d) whose parent, guardian, or custodian neglects or refuses to provide special care made necessary by the mental condition of the child; or (e) who is in a situation or engages in an occupation dangerous to life or limb or injurious to the health or morals of such child;

"(3) (a)...any child under the age of sixteen years at the time he has violated any law of the state or any city or village ordinance amounting to an offense other than a felony, traffic offense, or parking violation; (b)...any child under the age of eighteen years at the time he has violated any law of the state constituting a felony; and (c)...any child sixteen or seventeen years of age at the time he has (i) violated a state law or any city or village ordinance amounting to an offense other than a felony or parking violation, and (ii)... any child under sixteen years of age at the time he has committed a traffic offense.

"(4) ...any child under the age of eighteen years (a) who, by reason of being wayward or habitually disobedient, is uncontrolled by his parent, guardian or custodian; (b) who is habitually truant from school or home; or (c) who deports himself so as to injure or endanger seriously the morals or health of himself or others;"

For purposes of this report, referrals to juvenile court are classified into three categories: major offenses, minor offenses, and neglect/dependent cases. Major offense referrals are coded on the Juvenile Court Statistical Form (see Figure 2) under section L as responses 01 through 28. The major offense referrals are typically regarded as "delinquency" offenses. Minor offense referrals are coded in categories 31 through 39. Minor offenses are often referred to as "status" offenses and represent offenses applicable only to individuals under 18 years of age. Neglect/dependent referrals are coded as 51 or 52. "Neglect" refers to juveniles described in Section 43-202(2), while "dependent" refers to juveniles described in Section 43-202(1), Nebraska R.R.S., 1943. The usage of these terms was retained after the definitions of "neglect" and "dependency" were removed from the juvenile code in 1978.

Non-felony motor vehicle-related offense or infraction data are not collected in the JCR program or presented in this report.

After a case comes to the court's attention, a decision is made whether to handle the case unofficially (without petition) or officially (with petition). Most cases handled without petition are generally disposed of by the court intake staff by one of several options. Many of these options are the same as those for cases handled with petition. If it is decided to file a petition (similar to a "complaint" in an adult case) with the clerk of the court, the procedure is most often performed by the county attorney. After a petition is filed, a hearing is conducted for the juvenile by a judge; no jury is present. The hearing proceeds in an informal manner, applying the rules of evidence used by district courts in civil trials without a jury. The judge will decide the case with one of many disposition options.

## REFERRALS

There were 5,104 juvenile court referrals reported to the Commission in the Juvenile Court Reporting Program which reached final disposition in 1982. Of these, 4001 (78.4%) were handled with petition while 1103 (21.6%) were handled without petition.

Referrals for major offense categories accounted for 58.4% or 2,981 of the total number of cases. Minor offense referrals comprised 29.3% and 1,498 of the total, while 625 neglect/dependent cases (12.2% of the total) were reported. Breakdowns of the reasons for referral are given in Tables 1, 2, and 3 for major, minor, and neglect/dependent cases, respectively.

Theft under \$100, burglary, and misdemeanor criminal mischief, respectively, were the three largest major offense referral categories. Approximately 1 in 6 juveniles referred for major offenses were in these categories. For status offenses, minor in possession was the most frequent with about 12% of all referrals in this category.

About 27% of juvenile referrals were detained or placed in a jail facility, detention home, or foster or group home pending disposition of the case. About 3% (140) of all referrals were held, at least temporarily, in a jail facility. The largest majority (82%) of those detained or held, however, were placed in a detention, foster, or group home.

Table 1

## MAJOR OFFENSE FREQUENCIES, 1982

OFFENSE TYPE	FREQUENCY	% OF TOTAL
Murder	2	0.1
Manslaughter	3	.1
Assault 1 and 2	22	.7
Assault 3	152	5.1
Sex Assault 1	10	.3
Sex Assault 2	25	.8
Robbery	37	1.2
Drug Laws (Felony)	23	.8
Drug Laws (Misdemeanor)	148	5.0
Arson (Felony)	11	.4
Arson (Misdemeanor)	8	.3
Burglary	421	14.1
Unauthorized Vehicle Use	110	3.7
Theft over \$1000	48	1.6
Theft \$300-\$1000	100	3.3
Theft under \$300	178	5.9
Theft under \$100	780	26.2
Criminal Mischief (Felony)	37	1.2
Criminal Mischief (Misd)	229	7.7
Trespassing	189	6.3
Forgery (Felony)	16	.5
Forgery (Misdemeanor)	30	1.0
Weapons Laws (Felony)	9	.3
Weapons Laws (Misdemeanor)	5	.2
DWI (3rd Offense)	4	.1
Disturbing the Peace	101	3.4
Other Felony	47	1.6
Other Misdemeanor	236	7.9
TOTAL	2981	100.0

Table 2

## MINOR OFFENSE FREQUENCIES, 1982

OFFENSE TYPE	FREQUENCY	% OF TOTAL
Running Away	88	5.9
Truancy	175	11.7
Curfew Violation	42	2.8
Ungovernable Behavior	446	29.8
Possession/Drinking Alcohol	600	40.0
Other	147	9.8
TOTAL	1498	100.0

Table 3

## NEGLECT/DEPENDENT REFERRAL FREQUENCIES, 1982

REFERRAL	FREQUENCY	% OF TOTAL
Neglect	495	79.2
Dependent	130	20.8
TOTAL	625	100.0



The category of major offenses may be subdivided into smaller categories of offenses against persons and offenses against property (see Table 4). Offenses against persons, which include murder, manslaughter, assault, sexual assault, and robbery, comprised about 8% of major offenses and about 5% of all referrals. Property offenses such as theft and forgery constituted the largest proportion of major and total referrals, representing about 42% of all referrals and 72% of major offense referrals. Other major referrals which could not be categorized as offenses against persons or as property offenses, such as Driving While Intoxicated (DWI), Disturbing the Peace, and drug violations, composed the remainder of major offense referrals (19.2%) and 11% of all referrals.

Table 4  
REASON REFERRED, 1982

REASON REFERRED	Frequency	% of Total	% of Major
All Major Offenses	2981	58.4	100.0
a. Persons	251	4.9	8.4
b. Property	2157	42.3	72.4
c. All other	573	11.2	19.2
Minor Offenses	1498	29.4	--
Neglect/Dependent	625	12.2	--
TOTAL	5104	100.0	100.0

Major, minor and neglect/dependent disposition trends are illustrated in Table 5, along with percentage changes for each year from 1976 to 1982. The positive change from 1979 to 1981 in the number of major offense dispositions reversed a decreasing trend since 1975. However, in 1982 all three categories of referrals showed a decrease. One possible interpretation of this decrease is that fewer jurisdictions were reporting or that some jurisdictions changed their policies or procedures for formal handling of juveniles in juvenile court.

Table 5  
JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITION TRENDS, 1976-1982

DISPOSITION YEAR	MAJOR OFFENSES	MINOR OFFENSES	NEGLECT/ DEPENDENT
1976	3684	1212	463
% chg	-	-	-
1977	3502	1182	428
% chg	( -4.9)	( -2.5)	( -7.6)
1978	2896	962	493
% chg	(-17.3)	(-18.6)	( 15.2)
1979	2862	1045	551
% chg	( -1.2)	( 8.6)	( 11.8)
1980	2992	1161	540
% chg	( 4.5)	( 11.1)	( -2.0)
1981	3439	1545	698
% chg	( 14.9)	( 33.1)	( 29.3)
1982	2981	1498	625
% chg	(-13.3)	( -3.0)	(-10.5)



The number of minor (status) and neglect/dependent referrals to juvenile courts in Nebraska has remained relatively stable since 1976. The seemingly large percentage changes for some years mask the relatively small changes in the absolute number of minor and neglect/dependent cases for a given year.

It should also be noted that these aggregate figures represent the state as a whole and tend to obscure changes that may have occurred over time in individual jurisdictions or groups of jurisdictions in the referral, intake, scheduling, and processing policies that are applied to individual cases.

As will be explained in another section of this report, all state total data are heavily weighted toward the juvenile courts of Douglas, Lancaster and Sarpy counties. In fact, about 56% of all dispositions were reported from these counties. This does not imply, however, that the data are unrepresentative of the state as a whole, but that about 45% of the states estimated juvenile population live in these counties. Also, nearly all of the states's juvenile population is represented in counties which report in the JCR program.

Table 6 includes figures showing the sources of referrals to Nebraska juvenile courts for major, minor, and neglect/dependent cases. The largest number of major offense referrals (55%) were from law enforcement agencies. Referrals from county attorneys comprised the next largest category (852 or 29%) of sources of referral. These rankings are reversed for status offenses where about 25% of referrals were from law enforcement agencies while about 34% were referred by the county attorney. Approximately half of neglect/dependent referrals were from county attorneys while about 40% were from social agencies. Law enforcement agencies referred only about 4% of all neglect/dependent cases.

Table 6  
SOURCE OF COURT REFERRALS, 1982

SOURCE OF REFERRAL	MAJOR OFFENSES (%)	MINOR OFFENSES (%)	NEGLECT/DEPENDENT (%)
Law Enforcement	1630(55.2)	365(24.9)	27( 4.4)
School	3( .1)	107( 7.3)	1( .2)
Social Agency	4( .1)	25( 1.7)	245(39.6)
Probation Office	2( .1)	65( 4.4)	4( .6)
Parents, Relatives	4( .1)	278(19.0)	15( 2.4)
Other Court	296(10.0)	64( 4.4)	5( .8)
County Attorney	852(28.9)	504(34.4)	313(50.6)
Other	161( 5.5)	58( 4.0)	9( 1.5)
T O T A L *	2952(100.0)	1466(100.0)	619(100.0)

\* Does not include 67 cases with missing data.

One measure of recidivism in juvenile involvement in the criminal justice system is the number of prior referrals to juvenile court for a given juvenile. For all juvenile cases disposed of during 1982, about one-third had been referred to the court previously. The largest group of juveniles (823 or 17% of the total) had been referred to court just once previously.

Table 7 presents detailed information on prior referrals for major and minor offense referrals and neglect/dependent cases. It should be noted that this information is based on records of a particular juvenile court jurisdiction for a given juvenile case and may not accurately reflect referrals to court for the juvenile in question in other jurisdictions. Because of this, the data probably represent a conservative estimate with regard to prior court referrals. In addition, data on the nature of previous referrals is not collected and it is therefore not possible to identify repeat offenders for certain offenses or types of referrals. The information in Table 7 does indicate, however, that a significant number of juveniles have appeared previously in juvenile court for one reason or another.

Table 7

TOTAL PRIOR REFERRALS BY REASON FOR REFERRAL, 1982

REASON REFERRED	Total Prior Referrals						TOTAL
	0	1	2	3	4	5+	
All Major Offenses							
a. Persons	141	43	22	17	4	10	237
b. Property	1284	392	159	93	61	113	2102
c. All other	324	91	49	21	12	40	537
Minor Offenses	1017	226	78	31	12	32	1396
Neglect/Dependent	521	71	17	2	0	1	612
T O T A L*	3287	823	325	164	89	196	4884
% of total	(67.3)	(16.9)	(6.7)	(3.4)	(1.8)	(4.0)	(100.0)

\* Does not include 220 cases with missing data.

## DISPOSITIONS

Information on juvenile court disposition activity is contained in Tables 8 and 9. Once a juvenile case has been referred to court, the hearing and adjudication process has taken place, and a final disposition is determined, the court submits a Juvenile Court Statistical Form to the Commission.

The disposition outcomes listed in Table 8 summarize the types of determinations which may be made in most juvenile cases. In general, there are three possible outcomes described on the reporting form: the case may be waived to criminal court (only 3 of the total 1982 cases), it may be dismissed because of insufficient grounds (about 11% of the 1982 total), or a final determination may be reached based on the substantiation of a complaint and/or petition (the remaining 89% of cases were in this category). If the court determines that there is evidence to substantiate the complaint and/or petition, a decision regarding legal custody of the juvenile may be reached. Of these cases, and across all reasons for referral, approximately 17% involved a transfer of legal custody of the juvenile to one of the Youth Development Centers, or some other agency or individual. The remaining 83% of juvenile cases which were not dismissed or waived to criminal court involved no transfer of legal custody, but rather the imposition of a sentence such as probation, restitution, or a fine. determination

The largest number of cases referred to court for major offenses resulted in a disposition of formal probation (31%). This was also true for status offense referrals, of which 30% resulted in a disposition of formal probation. The most frequent disposition category for neglect/dependent referrals was transfer of custody to a public agency. Approximately one in three neglect/dependent referrals were in this disposition category. The proportion of cases dismissed was nearly equal for both major and minor (status) offense referrals: about 20% of cases in both these categories were dismissed. Slightly fewer (17%) of neglect/dependent referrals were dismissed.

Table 8

## JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITIONS, 1982

DISPOSITION	REFERRAL CATEGORY						TOTAL	
	MAJOR Number	%	MINOR Number	%	NEGLECT/DEP Number	%	Number	%
Waived to Criminal Court	3 ( .1)		0 ( - )		0 ( - )		3 ( .1)	
<b>COMPLAINT NOT SUBSTANTIATED</b>								
Dismissed	400 (13.4)		140 ( 9.3)		43 ( 6.9)		583 (11.4)	
<b>COMPLAINT SUBSTANTIATED NO TRANSFER OF LEGAL CUSTODY:</b>								
Dismissed; warned	213 ( 7.1)		143 ( 9.5)		61 ( 9.8)		417 ( 8.2)	
Hold open without further action	524 (17.6)		126 ( 8.4)		4 ( .6)		654 (12.8)	
Formal Probation	1121 (37.6)		449 (30.0)		13 ( 2.1)		1583 (31.0)	
Referred to another Agency or Individual	210 ( 7.0)		228 (15.2)		202 (32.3)		640 (12.5)	
Runaway returned	1 ( .1)		12 ( .8)		0 ( - )		13 ( .3)	
Fine or restitution	86 ( 2.9)		93 ( 6.2)		0 ( - )		179 ( 3.5)	
Other	96 ( 3.2)		74 ( 4.9)		17 ( 2.7)		187 ( 3.7)	
<b>LEGAL CUSTODY TRANSFER TO:</b>								
Youth Development Center	193 ( 6.5)		13 ( .9)		0 ( - )		206 ( 4.0)	
Public Agency or Department	82 ( 2.8)		132 ( 8.8)		212 (33.9)		426 ( 8.3)	
Private Agency or Department	26 ( .9)		56 ( 3.7)		14 ( 2.2)		96 ( 1.9)	
Individual	4 ( .1)		10 ( .7)		40 ( 6.4)		54 ( 1.1)	
Other	22 ( .7)		22 ( 1.5)		19 ( 3.0)		63 ( 1.2)	
T O T A L	2981 (100.0)		1498 (100.0)		625 (100.0)		5104 (100.0)	

Detailed processing times for juvenile court referrals are presented in Table 9. About 4 in 10 of all juvenile court cases (38.4%) were disposed of within 30 days of referral. This proportion was lower for neglect/dependent referrals (16% within 30 days) and higher for status offense referrals (45% within 30 days).

Table 9

ELAPSED TIME IN DAYS BETWEEN  
REFERRAL AND DISPOSITION, 1982

Time Between Referral and Disposition	REFERRAL REASON			TOTAL (%)
	Major Offense	Minor Offense	Neglect/ Dependent	
0 days	99	89	3	191 ( 3.8)
1 - 7 days	240	98	20	358 ( 7.1)
8 - 14 days	323	172	18	513 (10.2)
15- 30 days	526	311	61	898 (17.8)
31- 60 days	790	352	165	1307 (25.9)
61- 90 days	418	158	90	666 (13.2)
91-180 days	351	182	149	682 (13.5)
181+ days	198	124	117	439 ( 8.7)
T O T A L*	2945	1486	623	5054 (100.0)

\* Does not include 50 cases with missing data.



In general, major offense referrals were processed more quickly than minor and neglect/dependent referrals and minor offense referrals were processed sooner than neglect/dependent cases. The average (mean) elapsed time between referral and disposition for major offense referrals was nearly 64 days. The same statistics for minor and neglect/dependent referrals were 74 and 135 days, respectively. There was also less variation in the elapsed time between referral and disposition for major offense referrals than for minor and neglect/dependent referrals.

For the entire 5,054 cases for which data was available for 1982, the overall average time between date of referral and date of disposition was about 76 days.

## AGE

Information concerning the age of juveniles referred to court is presented in Tables 10 and 11. The vast majority (79%) of all juveniles under 10 were referred in the neglect/dependent category. In fact, nearly 60% of all neglect/dependent referrals were under age 10. The under 10 age group as a whole, however, represented only about 9% of all juvenile referrals. Juveniles under age 10 were most likely to be referred to court in status offense and neglect/dependent cases.

The 15 year-old and 16 year-old age groups had the largest proportion of referrals for major offense categories: together, 46% of all major offense referrals involved these age groups. The same was true of status offense cases: about 46% of all status offense referrals involved 15 and 16 year-olds.

In general, older juveniles were referred for more serious offenses. Nearly two-thirds (64%) of juveniles 15 and over were referred for major offenses and about one-third (33%) for status offense. Similarly, about one-half (1009) of those under 15 were referred for major offenses while about 23% (462) were referred for status offenses.

As Table 10 shows, nearly 60% of all neglect/dependent referrals were under 10 years old. The remainder of neglect/dependent referrals were distributed fairly evenly across age categories.

Across all referral categories, the 16 year-old age group accounted for the largest number of referrals (22%) followed by 15 year-olds which comprised nearly 20% of all referrals to juvenile courts.

Table 10  
REASON REFERRED BY AGE, 1982

AGE	REFERRAL CATEGORY						TOTAL Number %	
	MAJOR Number %	MINOR Number %	NEGLECT/DEP Number %					
Under 10	58 ( 1.9)	41 ( 2.7)	368 (59.5)		467 ( 9.2)			
10	33 ( 1.1)	14 ( .9)	28 ( 4.5)		75 ( 1.5)			
11	83 ( 2.8)	17 ( 1.1)	27 ( 4.4)		127 ( 2.5)			
12	139 ( 4.7)	53 ( 3.5)	30 ( 4.8)		222 ( 4.4)			
13	277 ( 9.3)	106 ( 7.1)	38 ( 6.1)		421 ( 8.3)			
14	419 (14.1)	231 (15.5)	37 ( 6.0)		687 (13.5)			
15	625 (21.0)	351 (23.5)	35 ( 5.7)		1011 (19.9)			
16	746 (25.0)	345 (23.1)	36 ( 5.8)		1127 (22.1)			
17	599 (20.1)	336 (22.5)	20 ( 3.2)		955 (18.8)			
T O T A L*	2979 (100.0)	1494 (100.0)	619 (100.0)		5092 (100.0)			

\* Does not include 12 cases with missing data.

Table 11 provides disposition data for the age groups of 11 and under, 12 to 13, 14 to 15, and 16 to 17 years old. Older juveniles (16 to 17 years old) were most likely to receive formal probation, while younger juveniles (nearly 50%) were most often referred to another agency or were placed in the custody of a public agency or department.

Table 11  
DISPOSITION BY AGE, 1982

DISPOSITION	11 & under		12 to 13		14 to 15		16 to 17	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Waived to Criminal Court	0 ( - )		0 ( - )		3 ( .2)		3 ( .1)	
COMPLAINT NOT SUBSTANTIATED								
Dismissed	61 ( 9.1)		64 ( 9.9)		216 (12.7)		240 (11.5)	
COMPLAINT SUBSTANTIATED NO TRANSFER OF LEGAL CUSTODY:								
Dismissed; warned	77 (11.5)		48 ( 7.5)		129 ( 7.6)		160 ( 7.7)	
Hold open without further action	52 ( 7.8)		94 (14.6)		212 (12.5)		295 (14.2)	
Formal Probation...	56 ( 8.4)		201 (31.3)		593 (34.9)		731 (35.1)	
Referred to another Agency or Individual	166 (24.8)		89 (13.8)		164 ( 9.7)		220 (10.6)	
Runaway returned	0 ( - )		3 ( .5)		8 ( .5)		2 ( .1)	
Fine or restitution	3 ( .4)		8 ( 1.2)		44 ( 2.6)		124 ( 5.9)	
Other	26 ( 3.9)		21 ( 3.3)		74 ( 4.4)		66 ( 3.2)	
LEGAL CUSTODY TRANSFER TO:								
Youth Development Center	0 ( - )		14 ( 2.2)		80 ( 4.7)		112 ( 5.4)	
Public Agency or Department	159 (23.8)		59 ( 9.2)		113 ( 6.7)		92 ( 4.4)	
Private Agency or Department	14 ( 2.1)		25 ( 3.9)		38 ( 2.2)		19 ( .9)	
Individual	30 ( 4.5)		7 ( 1.1)		13 ( .8)		4 ( .2)	
Other	25 ( 3.7)		10 ( 1.5)		11 ( .6)		17 ( .8)	
T O T A L*	669 (100.0)		643 (100.0)		1698 (100.0)		2082 (100.0)	

\* Does not include 12 cases with missing data

## SEX

More than two and one-half times as many males were referred to juvenile courts in Nebraska than females in 1982. The 3,688 males comprised about 72% of all referrals while 1,436 females comprised the remainder.

The proportion of male referrals is even higher for major offenses where about 4 of 5 referrals were male. Minor and neglect/dependent referrals were more nearly equal in the proportion of male and female dispositions. About 56% of minor offense referrals were male while the percentage of males and females referred for neglect/dependent reasons was nearly equal.

Males were referred for major offenses nearly three times as often as for minor offenses. Females were more likely to be referred for minor offense and neglect/dependent reasons. Overall, more than two-thirds (68%) of male referrals were for major offenses while only one-third (32%) of female referrals were for major offenses.

As Table 13 indicates, the most frequent disposition category for both males and females was formal probation: about one-third of male referrals resulted in probation while nearly one-quarter of female referrals resulted in probation. It should be noted, however, that the proportions of males and females referred for major and neglect/dependent reasons were quite different and this would have a direct effect on the proportions of males and females in the various disposition categories.

Table 12

## REASON REFERRED BY SEX, 1982

REASON REFERRED	MALE (%)	FEMALE (%)	TOTAL (%)
Major Offenses	2510 (68.4)	471 (32.8)	2981 (58.4)
Minor Offenses	842 (23.0)	656 (45.7)	1498 (29.3)
Neglect/Dependent	316 (8.6)	309 (21.5)	625 (12.2)
T O T A L	3668 (100.0)	1436 (100.0)	5104 (100.0)

Table 13

## DISPOSITION BY SEX, 1982

DISPOSITION	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Waived to Criminal Court	3	(.1)	0	(-)	3	(.1)
COMPLAINT NOT SUBSTANTIATED						
Dismissed	421	(11.5)	162	(11.3)	583	(11.4)
COMPLAINT SUBSTANTIATED NO TRANSFER OF LEGAL CUSTODY:						
Dismissed; warned	270	(7.6)	139	(9.7)	417	(8.2)
Hold open without further action	517	(14.1)	137	(9.5)	654	(12.8)
Formal Probation	1252	(34.1)	331	(23.1)	1583	(31.0)
Referred to another Agency or Individual	407	(11.1)	233	(16.2)	640	(12.5)
Runaway returned	4	(.1)	9	(.6)	13	(.3)
Fine or restitution	125	(3.4)	54	(3.8)	179	(3.5)
Other	122	(3.3)	65	(4.5)	187	(3.7)
LEGAL CUSTODY TRANSFER TO:						
Youth Development Center	183	(5.0)	23	(1.6)	206	(4.0)
Public Agency or Department	230	(6.3)	196	(13.6)	426	(8.3)
Private Agency or Department	61	(1.7)	35	(2.4)	96	(1.9)
Individual	28	(.8)	26	(1.8)	54	(1.1)
Other	37	(1.0)	26	(1.8)	63	(1.2)
T O T A L	3668	(100.0)	1436	(100.0)	5104	(100.0)



## ETHNIC GROUP

Data collected by the Commission on the ethnic group or race of young persons referred to juvenile court included the categories of white, black, Native American, Hispanic, Oriental, and "other". It should be noted that the proportion of minority group juveniles in Nebraska's population is quite small outside counties such as Douglas, Lancaster, Sarpy, and Scotts Bluff. As a result, measures of delinquency among ethnic groups in the state are difficult to estimate. The information contained in Table 14 does suggest, however, that there is some variation among racial groups in the proportion of referrals for major, minor, and neglect/dependent reasons.

Table 14

REASON REFERRED BY ETHNIC GROUP, 1982

ETHNIC GROUP	REFERRAL CATEGORY					
	MAJOR Number	%	MINOR Number	%	NEGLECT/DEP Number	%
White	2479	(83.2)	1320	(88.1)	484	(77.4)
Black	264	( 8.9)	66	( 4.4)	84	(13.4)
Native Am.	77	( 2.6)	32	( 2.1)	23	( 3.7)
Hispanic	107	( 3.6)	42	( 2.8)	13	( 2.1)
Oriental	6	( .2)	4	( .3)	4	( .6)
Other	48	( 1.6)	34	( 2.3)	17	( 2.7)
T O T A L	2981	(100.0)	1498	(100.0)	625	(100.0)

## LIVING ARRANGEMENT

Table 15 presents information concerning the living arrangements of juveniles at the time of referral. For major and minor offense referrals, the most common living situation was at home with both parents; approximately 40% of juveniles referred in these categories lived at home with both parents. The next largest category of major and minor offense referrals was of juveniles living at home with the mother only.

Table 15

REASON REFERRED BY LIVING ARRANGEMENT, 1982

LIVING ARRANGEMENT	REFERRAL CATEGORY					
	MAJOR Number	%	MINOR Number	%	NEGLECT/DEP Number	%
Both parents	1021	(40.6)	510	(42.9)	111	(20.7)
Mother only	708	(28.2)	315	(26.5)	237	(44.3)
Father only	114	( 4.5)	48	( 4.0)	35	( 6.5)
Mother, stepfather	211	( 8.4)	123	(10.3)	27	( 5.0)
Father, stepmother	71	( 2.8)	33	( 2.8)	5	( .9)
Relatives	86	( 3.4)	34	( 2.9)	28	( 5.2)
Foster/Group home	114	( 4.5)	56	( 4.7)	76	(14.2)
Institution	76	( 3.0)	9	( .8)	0	( - )
Independent	30	( 1.2)	5	( .4)	2	( .4)
Other	25	( 1.0)	13	( 1.1)	8	( 1.5)
Unknown	59	( 2.3)	43	( 3.6)	6	( 1.1)
T O T A L*	2515	(100.0)	1189	(100.0)	535	(100.0)

\* Does not include 865 cases with missing data

Approximately one-third of all referrals to juvenile courts in 1982 came from single-parent families. For neglect/dependent referrals the proportion was even higher: about one-half of all referrals were from single-parent families. It is significant to note that for the 1,185 major and minor offense referrals from single-parent families, 86% were from single mother families, while only 14% were from single father families.

#### SEPARATE JUVENILE COURTS

Referrals to the separate juvenile courts of Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy counties constituted nearly 57% of all juvenile court referrals across the state; however, these counties represent only about 45% of the state's total juvenile population. Lancaster County Separate Juvenile Court processed more dispositions (1,546) than any other jurisdiction, while Douglas and Sarpy counties followed with 902 and 432, respectively. It should be noted that the information presented in Tables 16 and 17 (as well as all other data in this report) is based on counts of dispositions during 1982 rather than referrals during 1982, and therefore provides only a partial estimate of the activity of the juvenile court. It is likely that the intake activity of juvenile courts involved many more young persons during a given year than are reflected in these disposition statistics.

The procedures involved in referral to juvenile court may vary across jurisdictions and influence the number of cases reported in the Juvenile Court Reporting Program. In addition, the policies of prosecutors, juvenile service agencies, and judges may vary in different jurisdictions, influencing the nature and number of juvenile referrals reported to the Commission. As an example, the three separate juvenile courts in Nebraska have some differences in processing procedures which result in differing reporting results.

The Douglas County Attorney's office acts as the court intake for all juvenile referrals in Douglas county. This means that the only juvenile cases reported to the Commission are those which are filed with petition by the County Attorney's office.

In Lancaster County, the juvenile probation office serves the court intake function. Cases that come to the attention of the juvenile probation office (regardless of the source of referral) are reported to the Commission. Cases formally disposed of by the court represent those filed with petition, while cases handled informally by the juvenile probation office represent cases handled without petition.

In Sarpy County, the processing of referrals to juvenile court is similar to that in Lancaster county. The juvenile probation office of the court handles the intake function and those cases filed with petition are formally disposed of by the court. Cases handled informally by the probation office are not reported to the Commission.

Differences among the three separate juvenile courts in the receipt of referrals are indicated in Table 16. Although the largest proportion of referrals in the three juvenile courts was received from law enforcement agencies, the percentages vary greatly: 80% of Sarpy county's referrals were from law enforcement agencies, while only about 36% of Lancaster county's referrals were from the same source. Douglas county had a larger proportion of referrals from social agencies than either of the other two courts.

The distribution of disposition categories in the three separate juvenile courts is presented in Table 17. There were several differences among the courts in the distribution of dispositions. This is most likely due to the varying types of cases referred to each court and the court's own policies and practices.

Table 16

SOURCE OF REFERRAL IN DOUGLAS, LANCASTER, SARPY  
SEPARATE JUVENILE COURTS AND ALL OTHER COUNTIES,  
1982

SOURCE OF REFERRAL	DOUGLAS COUNTY	LANCASTER COUNTY	SARPY COUNTY	ALL OTHER COUNTIES
Law Enforcement	403 (44.8)	558 (36.2)	346 (80.3)	715 (33.1)
School	35 ( 3.9)	55 ( 3.6)	10 ( 2.3)	11 ( .5)
Social Agency	188 (20.9)	4 ( .3)	15 ( 3.5)	67 ( 3.1)
Probation Office	0 ( - )	55 ( 3.6)	12 ( 2.8)	4 ( .2)
Parents, Relatives	143 (15.9)	99 ( 6.4)	37 ( 8.6)	18 ( .8)
Other Court	114 (12.7)	224 (14.5)	1 ( .2)	26 ( 1.2)
County Attorney	15 ( 1.7)	444 (28.7)	7 ( 1.6)	1203 (55.7)
Other	1 ( .1)	107 ( 6.9)	3 ( .7)	117 ( 5.4)
T O T A L	899(100.0)	1546(100.0)	431(100.0)	2161(100.0)

\* Does not include 67 cases with missing data

Table 17

DISPOSITIONS IN DOUGLAS, LANCASTER, SARPY  
SEPARATE JUVENILE COURTS AND ALL OTHER COUNTIES,  
1982

DISPOSITION CATEGORY	DOUGLAS COUNTY		LANCASTER COUNTY		SARPY COUNTY		ALL OTHER COUNTIES	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Waived to Criminal Court	0 ( - )		0 ( - )		2 ( .5)		1 ( <.1)	
COMPLAINT NOT SUBSTANTIATED								
Dismissed	230 (25.5)		108 ( 7.0)		52 (12.0)		193 ( 1.7)	
COMPLAINT SUBSTANTIATED NO TRANSFER OF LEGAL CUSTODY:								
Dismissed; warned	26 ( 2.9)		82 ( 5.3)		106 (24.5)		203 ( 9.1)	
Hold open without further action	0 ( - )		623 (40.3)		1 ( .2)		30 ( 1.3)	
Formal Probation	280 (31.0)		246 (15.9)		135 (31.3)		922 (41.5)	
Referred to another Agency or Individual	6 ( .7)		352 (22.8)		78 (18.1)		204 ( 9.2)	
Runaway returned	0 ( - )		9 ( .6)		0 ( - )		4 ( .2)	
Fine or restitution	9 ( 1.0)		0 ( - )		1 ( .2)		169 ( 7.6)	
Other	2 ( .2)		9 ( .6)		8 ( 1.9)		168 ( 7.6)	
LEGAL CUSTODY TRANSFER TO:								
Youth Development Center	50 ( 5.5)		33 ( 2.1)		22 ( 5.1)		101 ( 4.5)	
Public Agency or Department	182 (20.2)		84 ( 5.4)		24 ( 5.6)		136 ( 6.1)	
Private Agency or Department	80 ( 8.9)		0 ( - )		0 ( - )		16 ( .7)	
Individual	35 ( 3.9)		0 ( - )		0 ( - )		19 ( .9)	
Other	2 ( .2)		0 ( - )		3 ( .7)		58 ( 2.6)	
T O T A L	902(100.0)		1546(100.0)		432(100.0)		2224(100.0)	



# A P P E N D I X

TABLE A  
COUNTY ARREST AND JUVENILE COURT DATA, 1982

COUNTY	JUVENILE POPULATION (0-17)	JUVENILE ARRESTS	JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITIONS			
			MAJOR OFFENSES	MINOR OFFENSES	NEGLECT/ DEPENDENT	TOTAL CASES
ADAMS	8737	162	62	37	0	99
ANTELOPE	2585	1	6	0	2	8
ARTHUR	136	-	-	-	-	-
BANNER	269	-	0	0	0	0
BLAINE	270	-	0	0	0	0
BOONE	2180	10	7	18	0	25
BOX BUTTE	4068	99	17	15	5	37
BOYD	806	-	2	0	0	2
BROWN	1247	21	4	7	3	14
BUFFALO	9117	165	29	9	0	38
BURT	2309	10	1	7	1	9
BUTLER	2631	-	5	22	1	28
CASS	6150	56	46	16	16	78
CEDAR	3708	9	4	1	0	5
CHASE	1461	1	11	0	0	11
CHERRY	1906	16	0	0	0	0
CHEYENNE	2766	106	7	18	6	31
CLAY	2335	6	13	4	5	22
COLFAX	2799	33	9	27	2	38
CUMING	3534	38	8	2	0	10
CUSTER	3788	23	-	-	-	-
DAKOTA	5419	59	13	11	2	26
DAWES	2402	66	6	4	0	10
DAWSON	6714	189	85	86	7	178
DEUEL	667	2	-	-	-	-
DIXON	2120	7	2	0	2	4
DODGE	10037	168	20	12	12	44
DOUGLAS	115538	2897	514	193	195	902
DUNDY	698	1	0	1	0	1
FILLMORE	2146	11	19	37	0	56
FRANKLIN	1068	2	-	-	-	-
FRONTIER	1010	11	2	0	0	2
FURNAS	1570	1	4	5	1	10

TABLE A  
COUNTY ARREST AND JUVENILE COURT DATA, 1982  
(continued)

COUNTY	JUVENILE POPULATION (0-17)	JUVENILE ARRESTS	JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITIONS			
			MAJOR OFFENSES	MINOR OFFENSES	NEGLECT/ DEPENDENT	TOTAL CASES
GAGE	6138	279	34	28	11	73
GARDEN	658	1	-	-	-	-
GARFIELD	640	-	0	0	0	0
GOSPER	591	3	5	0	0	5
GRANT	267	3	0	0	0	0
GREELEY	1077	-	9	0	0	9
HALL	14355	580	175	104	29	308
HAMILTON	2818	34	16	9	0	25
HARLAN	1086	5	-	-	-	-
HAYES	393	-	0	0	0	0
HITCHCOCK	1146	7	6	2	0	8
HOLT	4201	20	-	-	-	-
HOOKE	261	10	0	0	0	0
HOWARD	2079	6	3	4	0	7
JEFFERSON	2346	32	4	4	1	9
JOHNSON	1369	4	0	3	0	3
KEARNEY	1933	13	-	-	-	-
KEITH	2725	78	1	0	0	1
KEYA PAHA	385	1	-	-	-	-
KIMBALL	1440	23	-	-	-	-
KNOX	3300	27	17	21	3	41
LANCASTER	47064	2305	1039	322	185	1546
LINCOLN	11192	383	59	25	0	84
LOGAN	309	5	0	0	0	0
LOUP	241	1	1	3	0	4
MADISON	8599	212	41	11	7	59
MCPHERSON	161	-	1	0	0	1
MERRICK	2746	34	-	-	-	-
MORRILL	1751	5	4	3	0	7
NANCE	1394	-	5	18	0	23
NEMAH	2075	32	6	2	1	9
NUCKOLLS	1816	6	-	-	-	-
OTOE	4099	79	25	13	0	38

TABLE A  
COUNTY ARREST AND JUVENILE COURT DATA, 1982  
(continued)

COUNTY	JUVENILE POPULATION (0-17)	JUVENILE ARRESTS	JUVENILE COURT DISPOSITIONS			
			MAJOR OFFENSES	MINOR OFFENSES	NEGLECT/ DEPENDENT	TOTAL CASES
PAWNEE	909	12	4	2	0	6
PERKINS	1029	-	1	1	2	4
PHELPS	2638	27	8	2	1	11
PIERCE	2485	0	2	0	0	2
PLATTE	9002	233	25	29	0	54
POLK	1820	28	-	-	-	-
RED WILLOW	3494	81	24	6	5	35
RICHARDSON	2806	74	7	8	8	23
ROCK	715	-	3	1	0	4
SALINE	3243	73	16	19	0	35
SARPY	30621	1042	274	112	46	432
SAUNDERS	5559	75	31	13	14	58
SCOTTS BLUFF	11580	263	128	62	26	216
SEWARD	4200	71	20	26	7	53
SHERIDAN	2173	44	14	10	1	25
SHERMAN	1251	9	0	13	3	16
SIOUX	518	-	0	0	0	0
STANTON	2227	2	1	4	1	6
THAYER	1941	24	2	10	1	13
THOMAS	297	0	-	-	-	-
THURSTON	2450	-	10	4	2	16
VALLEY	4538	26	3	43	1	47
WASHINGTON	4652	20	16	5	3	24
WAYNE	2317	16	-	-	-	-
WEBSTER	1258	5	2	0	1	3
WHEELER	352	-	0	0	0	0
YORK	4114	225	43	24	6	73
TOTAL	448035	10708	2981	1498	625	5104

- Data not available.

Arrest data from 1982 Nebraska Uniform Crime Report.

**END**