




ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE
ILLINOIS COURTS

1976
ANNUAL REPORT
to the
SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS




ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE ILLINOIS COURTS

1976
ANNUAL REPORT
to the
SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS



SUPREME COURT BUILDING
Springfield, Illinois



JUSTICES OF THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT

The Chief Justice
Daniel P. Ward
1966

Howard C. Ryan
1970

William G. Clark
1976

Robert C. Underwood
1962

Joseph H. Goldenhersh
1970

James A. Dooley
1976

Thomas J. Moran
1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Transmittal from Roy O. Gulley	7
In Memoriam	9
Report of the Administrative Director	11
Judicial Retirements	12
Activities of the Judiciary	15
Supreme Court	15
Jurisdiction	15
Organization	15
Administrative Authority	15
Caseload Summary	16
Supreme Court Rules	16
Justice Schaefer Retires	19
Justice Kluczynski Retires	19
Judicial Appointments	20
Clerk of the Supreme Court	20
1976 Annual Report of the Supreme Court to the General Assembly	20
Appellate Court	26
Jurisdiction	26
Organization	27
Caseload Summary	27
Cases Filed 1972-1976	28
Cases Disposed of 1972-1976	28
Cases Pending at End of Year 1972-1976	28
Cases Disposed of With Full Opinions 1972-1976	28
Number of Opinions 1973-1976	29
Rule 23 Orders	30
Graph of Cases Filed and Disposed of 1964-1976	31
Appellate Court Clerks	32
Assignments	32
Circuit Courts	32
Jurisdiction	32
Organization	32
Caseload Summary	33
Graph of Average Caseload Per Judge	34
Graph of Felony Cases Begun or Reinstated 1972-1976	35
Graph of Misdemeanor and Ordinance Violations Begun or Reinstated 1972-1976	35
Caseload Summary, Circuit Court of Cook County	36
Graph of Cases Begun or Reinstated and Terminated in the Circuit Courts 1964-1976	36
Assignments	41
Rule 295 Assignments	42
Organization Chart, Illinois Judicial System	44
Organization Chart, Circuit Court of Cook County	45
The Judicial Conference	46
1976 Judicial Conference	47
1976 Associate Judge Seminar	48
1976 New Judge Seminar	48
1976 Regional Seminars	48
Criminal Law	48
Civil Law	49
Committee on Judicial Education	49
Judicial Elections	49
Contested Election	49
Retention Election	52
Federal Funding of State Court Programs	53
Court Facility Improvement	53

Cook County Court Facilities	55
Fourth District Facilities	56
Increased Judgeships	56
Conference of Chief Circuit Judges	56
Compulsory Retirement of Judges	61
The Courts Commission	61
The Administrative Office	64
Introduction	64
Personnel	64
Fiscal	64
Chart on State Appropriations	66
Teller of Elections	68
Judicial Economic Statements	68
Judicial Statistics	68
Circuit Court Administrators	69
Recordkeeping	70
Map on Implementation of the Record-keeping Order	71
Official Court Reporters	72
Secretariat	73
Impartial Medical Expert Rule	74
Chart of 1976 Statistical Summary	76
Chart of Cumulative Statistical Summary 1970-1976	77
Representation by Supervised Senior Law Students	78
Chart on Use of Rule 711, 1971-1976	78
Legislation	79
Updating Legislation	80
Continuing Judicial Education	80
Synopsis of Supreme Court Opinions	81
Judicial Visitation Program to Penal Institutions	81
Administrative Secretaries Conference	82
Computer Assisted Transcription Project	83
Eavesdropping Reports	83
Public Information and Publications	84
Membership in Organizations	85
Conclusion	85
1976 Caseloads, Statistical Records and Judicial Officers	86
The Supreme Court	87
Map of Judicial Districts	87
Justices of the Supreme Court	88
Graph of Cases Decided with Full Opinions, 1950-1976	89
Graph of Petitions for Rehearing, 1950-1976	90
Graph of Petitions for Leave to Appeal, 1950-1976	91
Graph of Motions Disposed Of, 1950-1976	92
Trend of Cases in the Supreme Court	93
The Appellate Court	95
Justices of the Appellate Court	95
Chart on Trend of Cases	96
Chart on Cases Disposed Of	97
Chart on Time Lapse Between Date of Filing and Date of Disposition	98
Chart of Time Lapse Between Date Briefs Filed and Date of Disposition	99
Cases Disposed Of Without Opinion Or Order	100
Abstract Summary of Number of Written Opinions	101
The Circuit Courts	102
Map of Judicial Circuits	102
Judges of the Circuit Courts	103
Chart on Ratio of Caseload Per Judge	113
Chart on Number of Cases Begun and Terminated	114
Chart on the Trend of all Cases, Number of Law Jury Verdicts, Time Lapse Between Date of Filing and Date of Verdict, and Average Delay in Reaching Verdict	140

Chart on Disposition of Defendants Charged With Felonies	144
Chart on Sentences Imposed on Defendants Charged With Felonies	148
Statistical Reports on the Circuit Court of Cook County	154
Appendix A - Judicial Article of the Constitution of 1970	174
Appendix B - Summary of Historical Development of the Administrative Office	177
Appendix C - Judicial Salary Structure	178
Appendix D - Genealogy of Judges of the Illinois Supreme Court	179





ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE ILLINOIS COURTS

ROY O. GULLEY
DIRECTOR
SUPREME COURT BUILDING
SPRINGFIELD 62706
217/782-7770

30 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
CHICAGO 60602
312/793-3250

To the Honorable Chief Justice
and Justices of the Supreme Court

I tender herewith the Annual Report of the Administrative Office for the calendar year 1976.

One of the important purposes of this report is to keep the Court apprised of the operation of our courts through the collection and analysis of statistics.

The statistics reported herein, when compared with prior years, reveal that although our judges continue to dispose of more cases, there are two major areas where the pending inventories are rising to disturbing proportions. These two areas include the number of felony and law jury (\$15,000 and over) cases in Cook County.

In the area of felony cases there has been a 258% increase in the pending inventory since 1972. The following comparison reveals this increase:

1972	2,081
1973	2,737
1974	4,778
1975	6,700
1976	7,458


In the law jury division (\$15,000 and over) there has been a 40% increase in the pending inventory since 1972. The following comparison reveals this increase:

1972	28,780
1973	28,171
1974	31,342
1975	35,692
1976	40,156

In the criminal division, the Circuit Court of Cook County has taken steps to deal with the increasing inventory. New courtrooms have been added and additional judges have been assigned. Similar steps have not been taken with regard to the law jury division.

The addition of 30 new circuit judgeships by the General Assembly and the allocation of 10 additional associate judgeships during 1976 should serve to assist in dealing with these large inventories. When the Circuit Court of Cook County's judicial manpower is up to full strength, special efforts should be made to deal with these two areas.

Very truly yours,


Roy O. Gulley

IN MEMORIAM

Supreme Court Judge

Charles H. Davis (Retired)

February 22, 1976

Appellate Court Judges

Joseph J. Drucker, 1st District

November 11, 1976

Samuel O. Smith, (Retired), 4th District

June 20, 1976

Circuit Court Judges

Jack A. Alfeld, 7th Circuit

March 6, 1976

William M. Barth (Retired), Cook County

June 6, 1976

L. Eric Carey (Retired), 19th Circuit

March 21, 1976

William M. Carroll (Retired), 19th Circuit

February 23, 1976

Wilbert F. Crowley (Retired) Cook County

October 2, 1976

Thomas C. Donavan, Cook County

February 22, 1976

Robert E. Higgins, 12th Circuit

July 25, 1976

John S. Massieon (Retired), 13th Circuit

August 23, 1976

Herman W. Snow (Retired), 12th Circuit

June 26, 1976

Associate Judges

George Borovic, 18th Circuit

November 19, 1976

Richard K. Cooper, Cook County

November 19, 1976

Edwin C. Hatfield, Cook County

August 12, 1976

Lester Jankowski (Retired), Cook County

September 14, 1976

Robert F. Jerrick, Cook County

January 23, 1976

Paul C. Kilkelly (Retired), 19th Circuit

February 7, 1976

James E. Murphy (Retired Magistrate), 9th Circuit

March 1, 1976

Herman Ritter, 13th Circuit

January 16, 1976

Joseph T. Suhler, 16th Circuit

September 14, 1976

U.S. Court of Appeals (7th Circuit)

Otto S. Kerner (Retired)

May 9, 1976

**REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR
HON. ROY O. GULLEY**

JUDICIAL RETIREMENTS

A total of 57 Illinois judges retired during 1976. Some retired due to age or failing health, while others retired to return to the practice of law. Two, resigned to accept appointments to the federal bench.

Supreme Court Judges

Thomas E. Kluczynski (1st District)
December 5, 1976
Walter V. Schaefer (1st District)
December 5, 1976

Appellate Court Judges

Thaddeus V. Adesko (1st District)
December 5, 1976
Charles R. Barrett (1st District)
December 5, 1976
Joseph Burke (1st District)
December 5, 1976
Henry L. Burman (1st District)
December 5, 1976
John T. Dempsey (1st District)
December 5, 1976
George N. Leighton (1st District)
February 26, 1976
Leland Simkins (4th District)
December 5, 1976

Circuit Court Judges

J. Waldo Ackerman (7th Circuit)
July 25, 1976
Norman C. Barray (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Jacob Berkowitz (5th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Felix M. Buoscio (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Victor N. Cardosi (12th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Richard T. Carter (20th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
William D. Conway (7th Circuit)
September 15, 1976
Daniel A. Covelli (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
William V. Daly (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Laverne A. Dixon (19th Circuit)
December 5, 1976

George E. Dolezal (Cook County)
December 12, 1976
Robert J. Dunne (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Norman N. Eiger (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Samuel B. Epstein (Cook County)
July 31, 1976
Saul A. Epton (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Harold O. Farmer (20th Circuit)
March 31, 1976
Hyman Feldman (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
James E. Fitzgerald (18th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
John C. Fitzgerald (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Thomas H. Fitzgerald (Cook County)
May 31, 1976
Seely P. Forbes (17th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
William J. Gleason (19th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Richard A. Harewood (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Harry G. Hershenson (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Robert A. Meier, III (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Birch E. Morgan (6th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
F. Emmett Morrissey (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Dan H. McNeal (14th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
David E. Oram (12th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
John S. Peterson (16th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Joseph A. Power (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Everett Prosser (1st Circuit)
December 5, 1976
John T. Reardon (8th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Paul D. Reese (1st Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Charles J. Smith (14th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Harry S. Stark (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Paul C. Verticchio (7th Circuit)
December 5, 1976
Eugene L. Wachowski (Cook County)
December 5, 1976
Minor K. Wilson (Cook County)
December 5, 1976

Associate Judges

George H. Bunge (18th Circuit)

June 30, 1976

Thomas S. Cliffe (16th Circuit)

December 5, 1976

James R. Hansgen (15th Circuit)

December 31, 1976

Marvin E. Johnson (18th Circuit)

December 20, 1976

Irving Kipnis (Cook County)

May 1, 1976

Jack R. Kirkpatrick (9th Circuit)

November 30, 1976

Gordon Moffett (18th Circuit)

June 30, 1976

Robert J. Sprague (20th Circuit)

September 1, 1976

William D. Vanderwater (16th Circuit)

April 26, 1976

ACTIVITIES OF THE JUDICIARY



The Supreme Court

Jurisdiction

The Illinois Supreme Court is the highest court in the Illinois judicial system. It has original and exclusive jurisdiction in cases involving the redistricting of the General Assembly and in cases relating to the ability of the Governor to serve or resume office. It may exercise original jurisdiction in cases relating to revenue, mandamus, prohibition or habeas corpus and as may be necessary to the complete determination of any case on review. It has direct appellate jurisdiction in appeals from judgments of Circuit Courts imposing a sentence of death and as the Court may provide by rule in other cases. Appeals from the Appellate Court to the Supreme Court are a matter of right if a question under the Constitution of the United States or of this State arises for the first time in and as a result of the action of the Appellate Court, or if a division of the Appellate Court certifies that a case decided by it involves a question of such importance that the case should be decided by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court may also provide by rule for appeals from the Appellate Court in other cases. (Ill. Const., Art. VI, Secs. 4 and 9).

Organization

The Supreme Court consists of seven Justices. Three are elected from the First Judicial District (Cook County) and one from each of the other four judicial districts. Four Justices constitute a quorum and the concurrence of four is necessary for a decision. One of the Justices is selected as Chief Justice for a term of three years. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 31, seniority among the Justices is determined by length of continuous service. Supreme Court Justices are elected for terms of 10 years. (Art. VI, Secs. 2, 3, 4 and 10).

The Court holds five terms each year during the months of January, March, May, September and November. At each term, the Court issues opinions, holds conferences, hears oral arguments, rules on motions, considers modifications to Supreme Court rules and meets with the Administrative Director to consider administrative and budgetary matters.

When in session, the Justices reside in the Supreme Court Building in Springfield. In addition, the Court meets regularly in its Chicago quarters in the Civic Center. Once each year the Court hears oral arguments at the University of Chicago Law School and at the University of Illinois College of Law in Champaign.

Administrative and Supervisory Authority

General administrative and supervisory authority over the entire, unified Illinois judicial system is vested in the Supreme Court. This authority is exercised by the Chief Justice in accordance with the Court's rules. An Administrative Director and staff, appointed by the Supreme Court, are provided to assist the Chief Justice in his duties (Art. VI, Sec. 16). This unique, constitutional grant of administrative authority has served as the basis for transforming the Illinois judicial system from an unstructured and undisciplined system into an efficient mechanism for the administration of justice.

The administrative authority of the Supreme Court over the Illinois judicial system is unrestricted. However, in addition to conferring general administrative authority upon the Court, the Constitution identifies specific areas of judicial administration the Court shall or may act upon. These areas include:

- (1) Prescribing the number of Appellate Divisions in each Judicial District;
- (2) Assignment of judges to Appellate Divisions;
- (3) Prescribing the time and place for Appellate Divisions to sit;
- (4) Providing for the manner of appointing Associate Judges;
- (5) Providing for matters assignable to Associate Judges;
- (6) In the absence of a law, filling judicial vacancies by appointment;
- (7) Prescribing rules of conduct for judges;
- (8) Assignment of retired judges to judicial service;
- (9) Appointment of an administrative Director and staff;
- (10) Temporary assignment of judges;
- (11) Providing for an annual Judicial Conference and reporting thereon annually in writing to the General Assembly;
- (12) Appointment of the Supreme Court Clerk and other non-judicial officers of the Court.

In addition, the Court has a number of other administrative functions pursuant to statute or which are inherent in the operation of the Court.

The Court approves, after preparation by the Administrative Director, the annual judicial budget; employs two law clerks for each Justice to assist in researching the law and preparing memoranda; selects a Marshal who attends each term of the Court and performs such other duties, at the direction of the Court, which are usually performed by the sheriff in trial courts; and it appoints the Supreme Court Librarian

who is in charge of keeping the library up-to-date and preserving all books and documents in the library. Also, the Court appoints the State Appellate Defender and two persons to the Appellate Defender Commission; a member of the Board of Commissioners of the Illinois Defender Project (the Court has designated William M. Madden, Deputy Director of the Administrative Office as its appointee); and judicial members of the Board of Trustees of the Judges' Retirement System. Also, from time to time, the Court appoints committees, as the need arises, to study and suggest amendments in substantive and procedural law, Supreme Court rules, and other matters affecting the administration of justice.

Caseload Summary

During the 1976 terms, the Supreme Court sat for a total of 65 days. The seven justices of the Court delivered 236 full opinions and issued 22 supervisory orders; ruled on 76 petitions for rehearing; ruled on 761 petitions for leave to appeal; and ruled on 1,510 other motions. Of the 761 petitions for leave to appeal, 156 or 20.5% were allowed.

The Court received 1,067 new filings as compared with 1,009 in 1975.

In addition the Court admitted 2,146 new lawyers to the practice of law.

Supreme Court Rules

In the exercise of its inherent power to adopt rules governing practice and procedure, supplemented by constitutional directives to exercise that authority in specific areas (Art. VI, Secs. 5, 6, 8, 13, 16 and 17), the Supreme Court, during 1976, added or amended the following rules: Effective July 15, 1976 rules 61(c)(24), 61(c)(25), 62, 64, 66, 67, 70 and 71; Effective November 15, 1976 rules 214, 277(a), 277(f), 284(a), 303(a), 315(b), 315(g), 367(a), 412, 413, 721, 753, 754 and 766.

Amendments to the Supreme Court's rules on judicial ethics are of particular interest and those amended are set forth in their entirety below:

Rule 61 Standards of Judicial Conduct

The Supreme Court of Illinois on January 30, 1970, issued the following Order:

The Standards of Judicial Conduct and Rules for the Regulation of Judicial Conduct set forth below are hereby adopted as the controlling Standards and Rules for the judges of this state. Present Rule 61 is repealed, the Standards are designated as Rule 61, and the rules as Rules 62 through 71 of this court. Except as otherwise indicated they become effective March 15, 1970.

(a) Definitions.

(1) Wherever the word "judge" is used in the Standards and Rules it includes circuit and associate judge and judges of the appellate and Supreme Court. (Amended effective July 1, 1971.)

(2) Wherever the pronoun "he" is used in the Standards and Rules it includes the feminine as well as the masculine form.

(b) Preamble. The assumption of the office of judge imposes upon the incumbent duties in respect to his personal conduct which concern his relation to the state and its inhabitants, the litigants before him, the principles of law, the practitioners of law in his court, and the witnesses, jurors and attendants who aid him in the administration of its functions. In every particular his conduct should be above reproach. He should be conscientious, studious, thorough, courteous, patient, punctual, just, impartial, fearless of public clamor, regardless of public praise, and immune from private, political or partisan pressures. He should administer justice according to law, and deal with his appointments as a public trust. He should not allow other affairs or his private interests to interfere with the prompt and proper performance of his judicial duties, nor should he administer the office for the purpose of advancing his personal ambitions or increasing his popularity.

(c) Standards.

(1) *The Integrity of Our Legal System.* A judge should bear in mind that ours is a government of law and not of men and that his duty is the application of general law to particular instances. He should administer the office with due regard to the integrity of the system of the law itself, remembering that he is not a depositary of arbitrary power, but a judge under the law.

(2) *The Public Interest.* Courts exist to promote justice, and thus to serve the public interest. Their administration should be speedy and careful. Every judge should at all times be alert in his rulings and in the conduct of the court.

(3) *Constitutional Obligations.* It is the duty of all judges to support the federal and applicable state constitutions; in doing so, they should fearlessly observe and apply fundamental limitations and guarantees.

(4) *Avoidance of Impropriety.* A judge's official conduct should be free from impropriety and the appearance of impropriety; he should avoid infractions of law; and his personal behavior, not only upon the bench and in the performance of judicial duties, but also in his everyday life, should be beyond reproach.

(5) *Essential Conduct.* A judge should be temperate, industrious, attentive, patient, impartial, studious of the principles of the law and diligent in endeavoring to ascertain the facts. He shall devote full time to his judicial duties and shall normally conduct morning and afternoon sessions of court for hearing and deciding matters regularly assigned to him.

(6) *Promptness.* A judge should be prompt in the performance of his judicial duties. He should recognize that the time of litigants, jurors and attorneys is of value and that habitual lack of punctuality or diligence creates dissatisfaction with the administration of the court.

(7) *Court Organization.* A judge responsible for administration should organize the court with a view to

the prompt and convenient dispatch of its business. No judge should tolerate abuses or neglect by clerks and other assistants.

All judges should cooperate to promote the satisfactory administration of justice.

It is the duty of a judge to hear and decide all matters regularly assigned to him except in those cases in which he has a conflict of interest.

(8) *Consideration for Counsel and Others.* A judge should be considerate of, and courteous to, counsel, especially the young and inexperienced, jurors, witnesses, and others in attendance upon the court.

He should also require, and so far as his power extends, enforce, on the part of the court personnel and counsel, civility and courtesy to the court, to other counsel, and to jurors, witnesses, litigants and others having business in the court.

(9) *Special Responsibility in Crowded Courtrooms.* In courts having a large volume of cases, tending to crowd the courtrooms, the judge should give serious and careful attention to all decisions, and should take special care to enforce reasonable order and decorum.

(10) *Unprofessional Conduct of Attorneys.* A judge should criticize or discipline with prudence unprofessional conduct of attorneys in matters pending before him, and if such action is not a sufficient corrective, should refer the matter to the proper authorities.

(11) *Appointees of the Judiciary and Their Compensation.* All appointments in judicial proceedings should be made on an impartial basis, with a view of selecting competent persons of good moral character. A judge should avoid nepotism and action tending to create suspicion of impropriety. He should not offend against the spirit of this standard by interchanging appointments with other judges, or by any other device. He should receive and consider suggestions of counsel in proceedings with respect to the appointments of trustees, receivers, guardians and other persons, but should not permit this choice to be improperly influenced, nor his free judgment to be impaired. He should not make unauthorized or unnecessary appointments. While not hesitating to set or approve just amounts a judge should be most scrupulous in granting or approving compensation for services of appointees so as to avoid excessive allowances, whether or not the same be excepted to or complained of. He cannot rid himself of this responsibility by consent of counsel.

(12) *Self-Interest and Freedom from Influence.* A judge should neither perform nor take part in any judicial act in which his personal interests or those of a relative are involved. He should not allow any person to influence him improperly or enjoy his favor; he should not be affected by the kinship, rank, position or influence of any litigant or other person and he should not convey the impression by his conduct that he can be so influenced or affected.

(13) *Independence.* A judge should not be swayed by partisan demands, public clamor, considerations of personal popularity or notoriety, nor permit fear or unjust criticism to influence his judicial action.

(14) *Interference in Conduct of Trial.* A judge should so direct the trial of a case as to prevent unnecessary waste of time but he should bear in mind that his undue interference, impatience, or participation in the examination of witnesses, or a severe attitude on his part toward witnesses, especially those who are excited or terrified by the unusual circumstances of a trial, may tend to prevent the proper presentation of the cause, or the ascertainment of the truth in respect thereto.

The judge should avoid controversies with counsel which are apt to obscure the merits of the dispute between litigants and lead to its unjust disposition. In addressing counsel, litigants, or witnesses, he should avoid a controversial manner or tone. He should give careful attention to the arguments of counsel and should avoid unnecessary interruptions.

(15) *Ex Parte Hearings.* In proceedings where an ex parte hearing is proper, a judge should act only when he is convinced, after a careful examination of the facts and principles of law on which the application is based, that the facts and the law require such action.

(16) *Ex Parte Communications.* Except as permitted by law, a judge should not permit private or ex parte interviews, arguments or communications designed to influence his judicial action in any case, either civil or criminal.

A judge should not accept in any case briefs, documents or written communications intended or calculated to influence his action unless the contents are promptly made known to all parties.

(17) *Continuances.* In considering applications for continuances, a judge, without forcing cases unreasonably or unjustly to trial, should insist upon a proper observance by counsel of their duties to their clients, and to adverse parties and their counsel, so as to expedite the disposition of matters before the court.

(18) *Sentences and Punishments.* In imposing sentence, a judge should follow the law and should not compel persons brought before him to submit to some act or discipline without authority of law, whether or not he may think it would have a beneficial corrective influence. He should endeavor to conform to a reasonable standard of punishment and should not seek popularity or publicity either by exceptional severity or by undue leniency.

(19) *Review.* A trial judge should promptly certify the report of proceedings on timely application if it fully and fairly presents the questions as they arose at the trial.

(20) *Legislation.* A judge has exceptional opportunity to observe the operation of statutes, especially those relating to practice, and to ascertain whether they tend to expedite or impede the just disposition of controversies. Where it is clear that he might contribute to the public welfare, he should advise those in au-

thority of his observation and experience in order that they may remedy defects of procedure.

(21) *Inconsistent Obligations*. A judge should not accept duties or obligations which will interfere, or reasonably appear to interfere, with the proper performance of his official duties.

(22) *Gifts and Favors*. A judge should not accept gifts or favors from litigants, lawyers practicing before him, or others whose causes are likely to be submitted to him for judgment.

(23) *Social Relations*. A judge should be particularly careful to avoid any action that tends reasonably to arouse the suspicion that his social or business relations or friendships influence his judicial conduct.

(24) *Photographing, Broadcasting, or Televising Court Proceedings*. Proceedings in court should be conducted with fitting dignity, decorum, and without distraction. The taking of photographs in the courtroom during sessions of the court or recesses between proceedings detracts from the essential dignity of the sessions, and the broadcasting or televising of court proceedings distracts participants and witnesses in giving testimony, and creates misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

(25) *Conduct of Court Proceedings*. Proceedings in court should be so conducted as to reflect their importance and seriousness. Judicial robes should be worn in court, unless not practicable. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

Rule 62 Violations of Standards

A judge who violates the Standards of Judicial Conduct may be subject to discipline by the Courts Commission. The Standards, due to their general terms, may be inadvertently violated on occasion by a judge and such conduct may be too insignificant to call for official action. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

Rule 64 Abuse of Prestige of Official Position

A judge shall not (a) give grounds for reasonable suspicion that he is using the power or prestige of his office to persuade or influence others to patronize or contribute to the success of any business; or (b) solicit or permit his name to be used in any manner to solicit funds for any purpose, charitable or otherwise, except as provided in Rule 70. A judge should not allow his name to appear on the letterhead of any organization where the stationery is used to solicit contributions, and he should not permit any clerk, bailiff, or attache of his office to solicit on his behalf for any purpose, charitable or otherwise. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

Rule 66 Disqualification for and Disclosure of Financial Conflicts of Interest

A judge, as soon as practicable, shall disqualify himself in any case if (a) he or members of his imme-

diately family (spouse or minor children residing with him) have any substantial financial interest in the result of any therein ruling or decision or (b) he or members of his immediate family have any substantial financial interest in any corporation or business which is a party in said matter or which is identified as provided in this Rule as having a substantial, direct or indirect interest in the outcome of the litigation. A judge cannot rid himself of this responsibility by consent of counsel or the parties to the case. If a judge has any financial interest in any corporation which is a party to the litigation or is identified as having an interest therein, which he believes to be too insubstantial to require disqualification, he shall make a full disclosure of such interest to the parties. In any case in which there are persons or corporations, not parties of record, who have a substantial, direct or indirect, financial interest in its outcome, each party may, within 60 days of the filing of his initial pleading, file a document identifying those persons or corporations. It shall be the duty of the clerk of the court to bring any such document which has been filed to the attention of any judge before whom that case is being heard. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

Rule 67 Disqualification for Other Conflicts of Interest

(a) A judge shall disqualify himself in any case in which a close relative by blood or marriage (first, second or third degree of relationship under the rules of the civil law, see Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 3, §2—1(g), is a party, has an interest, or appears as counsel. Disqualification is required where a lineal descendant or ascendant, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece or spouse thereof is involved. A judge cannot rid himself of this responsibility by consent of counsel or the parties to the case. (b) While a judge should disqualify himself in virtually all cases where a relative by blood or marriage is a party, has an interest, or appears as counsel, this may create an unnecessary hardship if the degree of relationship is remote. Although those relationships beyond the third degree are too remote to cause automatic disqualification, more distant relationships should be disclosed to the parties if they involve any possible conflict of interest. (c) A judge shall not participate in any case in which he has previously acted as counsel. He cannot rid himself of this responsibility by consent of counsel or the parties to the case. (d) A judge shall neither accept any fiduciary duties nor continue to administer or hold any fiduciary position or position of trust after January, 1971, except for those involving persons related to him by consanguinity or affinity. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

Rule 70 Partisan Politics

A judge shall not (a) hold any official position or office in a political party, serve on any party committee, act as a party leader, and except when he is a can-

didate for election or retention in judicial office, take part in political campaigns; (b) become a candidate for a federal, state or local nonjudicial elective office without first resigning his judicial office. A candidate for election to or retention in a judicial office shall not personally solicit campaign contributions, but should establish some method which will not involve him in the direct solicitation of funds. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

Rule 71 Violation of Rules

A judge who violates Rules 63 through 70 may be subject to discipline by the Illinois Courts Commission. (Amended effective July 15, 1976.)

Justice Schaefer Retires

Effective December 6, 1976 Justice Walter V. Schaefer retired from the Supreme Court by reason of an "act relating to the compulsory retirement of judges," Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, §23.71 et seq.

Justice Schaefer was born in Grand Rapids, Michigan on December 10, 1904. He graduated from Hyde Park High School in Chicago, received his college and legal education at the University of Chicago, and was admitted to the Illinois Bar in 1928. He engaged in private practice and served as an assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago from 1937 to 1940. He was a professor of law at Northwestern University School of Law from 1940 until 1951 and was chairman of the Illinois Commission to Study State Government — "Little Hoover Commission" — from 1949 until 1951. He was one of the principal draftsmen of the Illinois Civil Practice Act of 1933.

On March 21, 1951, the late Governor Adlai E. Stevenson II appointed Justice Schaefer to the Illinois Supreme Court to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Justice Francis S. Wilson. On June 4, 1951, he was elected as a Supreme Court Justice from the old Seventh District; he was subsequently re-elected in 1960 and was retained in 1970 as a Justice from the new First Judicial District under the provisions of the amended Judicial Article of 1962. He has served as Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court on two occasions: March 23, 1953 to September 13, 1954 and from September 12, 1960 to September 11, 1961. He has been the Senior Justice of the Supreme Court since July 1, 1965.

Justice Schaefer served as a member of the Supreme Court for nearly 26 years. During that span of time, he has accomplished much to improve the administration of justice. For many years he was the active liaison Justice to the Supreme Court Rules Committee; he was an early advocate (1952) of an annual judicial conference, which came to fruition in 1954 and continues today in its constitutional form as the Illinois Judicial Conference; and he served as chairman of the Illinois Courts Commission. These are only a few illustrations of Justice Schaefer's work beyond the narrow and traditional scope of "judging."

His reputation as a jurist and legal scholar is not confined to the boundaries of Illinois. His papers have been published in many law reviews, and he has lectured frequently, including the Oliver Wendell Holmes Lecture at Harvard Law School; the Benjamin N. Cardozo Lecture before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; the Ernst Freund Lecture Series at the University of Chicago; and the Rosenthal Lecture Series at Northwestern University. In 1969, Justice Schaefer brought high honor not only to himself but to the judiciary of Illinois when he received the American Bar Association's most distinguished award—the ABA Medal.

The primary obligation, of course, of a Justice of the Supreme Court is to make decisions on litigated issues and to reduce to writing the reasons for those decisions. Justice Schaefer's opinions have been described as "models of clarity and judicial learning" which embody "a comprehensive knowledge of the law, a broad vision, and a wide, humanitarian approach"; however, Justice Schaefer's philosophy of the law defies description for "he is neither a liberal nor a conservative, neither a strict constructionist nor an activist." Justice Schaefer's first opinion for the Court was filed on May 24, 1951 in *People v. Walker*, 409 Ill. 232, and his first dissenting opinion was filed on November 27, 1951 in *International Harvester Co. v. Industrial Commission*, 410 Ill. 543 at 551. A quick review of the many, many opinions of Justice Schaefer since 1951 will bear out the above approbation, but a more vivid description of his style of writing, perhaps, is contained in this paraphrased quotation attributed to Mr. Chief Justice Story of the U.S. Supreme Court: "Schaefer has a compass, puts out to sea, and goes directly to the result."

Justice Kluczynski Retires

Effective December 6, 1976 Justice Thomas E. Kluczynski retired from the Supreme Court by reason of an "act relating to the compulsory retirement of judges," Ill. Rev. Stat. ch. 37, §23.71 et seq.

Justice Kluczynski was born in Chicago on September 29, 1903 and attended Chicago public and parochial schools. He graduated from the University of Chicago Law School in 1927 with an LL.B. degree *cum laude* and was admitted to the Illinois Bar in October of 1927. He engaged in the general practice of law specializing in trial work until 1948 when he was appointed a commissioner of the Illinois Industrial Commission.

On December 22, 1950, Justice Kluczynski was appointed by the late Governor Adlai E. Stevenson II as a judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County and in February of 1951, he was assigned to the Criminal Court of Cook County. On June 4, 1951, he was elected to a six-year term as judge of the circuit court and re-elected in 1957. During his tenure on the circuit court bench, Justice Kluczynski served as chief justice of the Criminal Court (1951-1952), as presiding judge of the Family (Juvenile) Court (1952-1954) and thereafter was assigned to the common-law civil trial call. In

1958, he was selected as the chief justice of the circuit court, and thereafter, until September 1962, he was the assignment judge of the circuit court (common-law calendar) and motion judge of the unified motion call of both the Circuit and Superior Courts of Cook County. In 1962, he was named a chancellor (chancery calendar) of the circuit court and served there until November of 1963 when he was assigned by the Supreme Court to the First District Appellate Court. Justice Kluczynski was elected to the Appellate Court in November of 1964 and there served a term as chairman of the executive committee and presiding judge of the First Division of that court. In November of 1966, he was elected as a Justice of the Supreme Court from the First District, and was retained in 1970.

Justice Kluczynski served as a judicial officer for nearly 26 years. His extensive and practical experience as a trial lawyer, trial judge and reviewing court justice has contributed immensely to the administration of justice in Illinois. His sagacious advice and counsel, his quick wit and facile mind have been to the benefit of justice, not only as illustrated in his written opinions, but in other judicially related activities. For example, he served as a member of the Supreme Court Judicial Backlog Committee; he was appointed in December of 1962 to the executive committee of the Illinois Judicial Conference and actively and faithfully served that committee until December of 1966. The Supreme Court appointed Justice Kluczynski as its liaison officer to the executive committee in December of 1970.

Justice Kluczynski's approach to the law and justice is practical. In the very best sense of the phrase, he is a judicial pragmatist who views issues in the light of reality. His many years in the active practice of law and his diverse experience as a judge in the trial courts are reflected in his well-reasoned, thorough and analytical Supreme Court opinions. Again and again, his opinions keenly demonstrate the legal ramifications of ruling for or against plaintiff or defendant, and this seems to be particularly evidenced in cases dealing with the authority or function of a governmental entity. He has through the years carefully balanced the scales of justice. Justice Kluczynski's Supreme Court opinions are contained in 30 volumes of the Official Reports.

Judicial Appointments

The Illinois Constitution, Article VI, Section 12, provides that, in the absence of a law providing for the filling of vacancies in the office of Supreme, Appellate or Circuit Judge, such vacancies may be filled by appointment by the Supreme Court. In the exercise of this authority, the Supreme Court, during 1976, made the following appointments of attorneys and sitting judges (an asterisk (*) after a judge's name indicates that he was a sitting judge who was elevated to higher judicial office):

Appellate Court

John C. Hayes
John M. O'Connor, Jr. (until December 6, 1976)

Circuit Court

John M. O'Connor, Jr., Cook County
Joseph P. Koval, 7th Circuit
L. Keith Hubbard, 7th Circuit
Ben K. Miller, 7th Circuit
Wendell L. Thompson*, 13th Circuit
Delmar O. Koebel, 20th Circuit

Clerk of the Supreme Court

The Constitution of 1970, Art. VI, Section 18, made an important advance in removing the Clerk of the Supreme Court and the Clerk of the Appellate Court, in each Judicial District, from the elective process, effective upon the expiration of the elective terms of the incumbent clerks. Section 18 provides that the Supreme Court and the Appellate Court judges, in each Judicial District, shall appoint a clerk and other non-judicial officers. Pursuant to this provision, the Supreme Court on November 26, 1974, appointed Mr. Clell L. Woods as Clerk of the Supreme Court, effective January 13, 1975.

During 1976, the staff of the Clerk's office totaled fourteen—the Clerk and thirteen deputy clerks.

1976 Annual Report of the Supreme Court to the General Assembly

The Illinois Constitution, Article VI, Section 17, provides:

"The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for an annual judicial conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice and shall report thereon annually in writing to the General Assembly not later than January 31."

Chief Justice Daniel P. Ward, on behalf of the Supreme Court, submitted the 1976 report on January 31, 1977. The text of that report is set forth below:

January 31, 1977

President
Senate of the State of Illinois
Capitol Building
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Honorable William A. Redmond, Speaker
House of Representatives
State of Illinois
Capitol Building
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Gentlemen:

The following report is submitted in accordance with section 17 of article VI of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 which states: "The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for an annual judicial conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the

administration of justice and shall report thereon annually in writing to the General Assembly not later than January 31."

The organization of the Illinois Judicial Conference is defined by Supreme Court Rule 41. The Conference is a continuing body which each year provides a number of seminars and continuing judicial education programs, and other programs, such as visitations by judges, in cooperation with the Director of the Department of Corrections, at various penal institutions. Study and standing committees are active throughout the year and include: Committee on Juvenile Problems, which is in the process of publishing a benchbook for judges on juvenile court procedures; Committee on Criminal Law for Illinois Judges, which is revising and updating its benchbook; Committee on Court Services; Committee on Indemnity, Third Party Actions and Equitable Contributions; Committee on Jury Selection and Utilization; Committee on Judicial Education; Committee on Mental Health; Committee on Enforcement of Support Orders; Committee on Procedures in Quasi-Criminal and Ordinance Violation Cases and Discovery in Misdemeanor Cases; Committee on Bail Procedures; and others.

The attached recommendations include some commented on in past years, and I deem they merit the consideration of the members of the General Assembly.

Sincerely,

(Daniel P. Ward)

Chief Justice

cc: Members of the General Assembly
Secretary of Senate
Clerk of House

Clerks of the Circuit Courts

Circuit Court Clerks Should be Appointed, Not Elected

In 1973 the Supreme Court appointed a committee of respected lawyers and clerks of court to study the laws governing clerks of court and to recommend changes to improve the efficiency and efficacy of the operation of the several clerks' offices. The Committee on Clerks of Court filed a comprehensive report with our Court in January of 1974. The report contained several recommendations to improve the operation of the various circuit court clerks' offices (see *1974 Annual Report of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts to the Supreme Court*, pp. 17, 18.), and stated:

"While circuit clerks perform myriad duties requiring intelligence, discretion, good judgment and management talents, they are not responsible for formulating policy. Their principal responsibility is to faithfully execute policies set forth in statutes, rules, or orders of court—regardless of the reaction of the local electorate, not in response to it. The idea that a

clerk could frustrate the policy objectives of the court he serves on the grounds that he is elected, and therefore 'responsible to the people,' is intolerable. Our Constitution vests general administrative authority over the circuit courts in the Chief Judge, subject only to the general administrative and supervisory power of the Supreme Court. The clerk is an integral part of the judicial team, as are court reporters, for example, and that he should be elected rather than appointed is a historical and political anomaly having little, if anything, to do with promoting the efficiency or effectiveness of his office. The committee, therefore, recommends that circuit clerks become appointed non-judicial officers of the state court system. . . ."

The Supreme Court recognizes that the power to provide for either the election or the appointment of clerks of the circuit court is a matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Assembly. Ill. Const. art. VI, §18(b). Nevertheless, the Supreme Court concurs with its Committee's recommendation that clerks of the circuit court should be appointed by the circuit judges of the respective circuits and urges the General Assembly to consider changing the law in that respect.

The General Assembly Should Consider Alternative Procedures For Dealing With Criminal Defendants Who Are Unfit To Stand Trial But Are Not In Need Of Hospitalization For Mental Treatment

Under Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 38, par. 1005-2-2 (Unified Code of Corrections, §5-2-2), a defendant has a statutory right to release on bail or recognizance if he has been found unfit to stand trial, but has subsequently been found not to be "in need of mental treatment" necessitating his involuntary hospitalization. While par. 1005-2-2 prescribes that the release be subject to such conditions as the trial court finds appropriate, situations occur in which the trial judge is reluctant to release a defendant who has been charged with a violent felony, preferring that the defendant remain in the custody of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities until he is fit to stand trial. Accordingly, the trial judge will remand the defendant to the custody of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, despite the fact that the defendant has been found not to be "in need of mental treatment."

This precise factual situation arose in the recent case of *People ex rel. Martin v. Strayhorn*, 62 Ill. 2d 296, 342 N.E. 2d 5 (1976). There, the petitioner had been indicted for aggravated battery and attempted murder. While this Court followed the statutory mandate and directed the trial judge to conduct a bail hearing, we are aware of the extremely difficult position in which the trial judge was placed.

The Supreme Court suggests that the legislature consider alternative methods for handling potentially dangerous defendants who are unfit to stand trial but yet not "in need of mental treatment."

The General Assembly Should Consider Alternative Procedures For Dealing With Criminal Defendants Acquitted By Reason Of Insanity Which Persists

An equally troublesome matter, somewhat similar to the situation described above, would seem to require legislative consideration. Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 38, §1005-2-4 (Unified Code of Corrections, §5-2-4) provides in pertinent part that where a defendant is acquitted of a criminal offense by reason of insanity, the trial court, upon a finding that the defendant has not recovered from his insanity, shall enter an order finding the defendant to be "in need of mental treatment" and shall order the defendant to be hospitalized in the custody of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Thereafter, the *Mental Health Code* (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 91-1/2, §1-1 *et seq.*) controls the care and treatment, and admission and discharge of the defendant. The *Mental Health Code* provides that the superintendent of the hospital "may at any time grant an absolute discharge . . . and shall do so if the [defendant] is no longer in need of hospitalization." If the hospitalization is pursuant to a court order, the superintendent must notify the court that the defendant has been granted an absolute discharge. Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 91-1/2, §10-4.

Understandably, the trial court is reluctant to order a defendant, charged with a violent felony but acquitted by reason of insanity which persists, to be hospitalized in the custody of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities without providing in its order for further judicial review if the Department later determines that the defendant should be absolutely discharged from its custody. That factual situation occurred in two recent cases decided by the Appellate Court. The Appellate Court ruled that the trial court loses jurisdiction after a finding for the defendant on the ground of not guilty by reason of insanity, and therefore the trial court cannot impose a condition in its order that the Department is not to release or discharge the defendant unless the trial court holds a hearing on whether the defendant has recovered from his insanity. See *People v. Adams*, 35 Ill. App. 3d 810, 343 N.E. 2d 659 (1976); *People v. Javurek*, 40 Ill. App. 3d 218, 351 N.E. 2d 897 (1976). (In both cases, the defendants were charged with murder, and it was implicit from the court's order that the trial judge was concerned about the recovery of the defendants *and* about the safety of the community.)

The Supreme Court recommends that the General Assembly consider appropriate amendatory legislation to provide for judicial review on the question of a defendant's recovery from his insanity, in situations described above, prior to absolute discharge by the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities.

Administrative Agency Or Person, Not Circuit Judge, Should Assess Inheritance Tax

It is provided in Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 120, §385 that a circuit judge, designated and assigned by the

chief judge of the circuit, shall ascertain whether any transfer of any property is subject to an inheritance tax, and if it be subject to the tax, the circuit judge shall assess and fix the cash value of the estates and the tax due. Section 385 further provides that any person dissatisfied with the circuit judge's appraisal, assessment, allowance of fees and expenses, etc. may appeal the circuit judge's ruling to the circuit court. Our Court recently had occasion to decide whether §385 violated the doctrine of separation of powers and the appellate rule-making authority of the Supreme Court as contained in article II, §1 and article VI, §§6, 16 of the 1970 Constitution. *In re Estate of Barker*, 63 Ill.2d 113, 345 N.E.2d 484 (1976).

A majority of our Court determined that §385 was constitutional and that while the assessment of taxes by the circuit judge is a nonjudicial function, §4(d) of the Transition Schedule of our constitution allowed the circuit courts to exercise certain nonjudicial functions vested by law as of December 31, 1963. We further determined that the "appeal" from the circuit judge's assessment order to the circuit court was not an appeal as used in article VI of the constitution but rather a judicial review of administrative action. We concluded, and commend to the General Assembly for its consideration:

"However, that there should be a review of an order of the 'circuit judge' by the 'circuit court' is an anomaly which often results, as was the case here, in a judge incongruously reviewing the correctness of his own order. We consider the legislature should provide for the assessment to be made by an administrative body or person and for a right of review in the circuit court." 345 N.E.2d 484, 488-489.

Illinois Should Adopt A Rule Of Comparative Negligence For Apportioning Damages In Tort Cases

"In court actions based upon defendant's negligent conduct any contributory negligence by the plaintiff is a deterrent to recovery in all judicial systems, based upon the English common law. In some jurisdictions, it is a complete bar. In others, it simply diminishes the plaintiff's damages. In still others, one rule is applied to some types of cases, and another rule, to other types of cases. The practice of diminishing plaintiff's damages to the extent of his contributory negligence, instead of barring his recovery, has come to be known as 'comparative negligence.'

* * *

"The proponents of comparative negligence base their most persuasive arguments on the broad philosophical principle that it is more just. In addition, they contend that it will bring about more jury waivers because plaintiffs will no longer fear the application of the hard rules, frequently ignored by juries, that a plaintiff cannot recover if he is guilty of contributory negligence, no matter how slight. This, they say, will result in more out of court settlements. The opponents of comparative negligence say that any

injustice arising from barring recovery is in practice tempered or compromised by the jury; that if recovery is made easier for the plaintiff, more suits will be filed and insurance rates will be raised. They further argue that fixing exact percentages will confuse juries.

"After a thorough study of comparative negligence, [the Illinois Judicial Conference Committee on Comparative Negligence] is of the opinion that the reasons advanced for this rule rather than the strict contributory negligence rule provide a better standard of justice and are more persuasive.

* * *

"CONFERENCE ACTION:

"Resolution adopted favoring a comparative negligence rule" 1964 Ill. Jud. Conf. Rept. 110, 111, 113, 117.

Illinois continues to adhere to the position that a plaintiff's negligence acts as a complete bar to recovery in a common law action for damages. Several years ago, a majority of our Court declined to judicially revise Illinois law in this regard by rejecting the notion that the Supreme Court should abandon the Illinois rule, long recognized as the law in this State, merely because the Court is of the opinion that it might decide otherwise were the question a new one. *Maki v. Frelk*, 40 Ill.2d 193, 239 N.E.2d 445 (1968):

"After full consideration we think, however, that such a far-reaching change, if desirable, should be made by the legislature rather than by the court. The General Assembly is the department of government to which the constitution has entrusted the power of changing the laws. [citation].

* * *

"Counsel on both sides have argued this case at length, supplying the court with a comprehensive review of many authorities. But we believe that on the whole the considerations advanced in support of a change in the rule might better be addressed to the legislature." *Maki v. Frelk*, 239 N.E.2d 445, 447.

Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that the Supreme Court agrees with the Judicial Conference Report and believes that apportioning damages through a comparative negligence rule is a logical and just method of distributing responsibility according to fault, and the Supreme Court recommends that the General Assembly adopt such a method.

"The hardship of the doctrine of contributory negligence upon the plaintiff is readily apparent. It places upon one party the entire burden of a loss for which two are, by hypothesis, responsible. The negligence of the defendant has played no less a part in causing the damage; the plaintiff's deviation from the community standard of conduct may even be relatively slight, and the defendant's more extreme; the injured man is in all probability, for the very reason of his injury, the less able of the two to bear the financial burden of his loss; and the answer of the law to all this is that the defendant goes scott free of all liability and the plaintiff bears it all." Prosser, *The Law of Torts*, at 443 (3rd ed. 1964).

The Court is unpersuaded by the argument that there are practical considerations which dictate a retention of the contributory negligence rule. Some people assert that the adoption of a rule of comparative negligence would increase litigation and court congestion, encourage negligent driving and cause insurance rates to rise. However, even if there were any basis for such "practical" arguments, the cardinal concern is whether the rule proposed would better serve to attain more just dispositions in negligence cases. The so-called practical problems must properly be considered subordinate to the primary consideration for more just judicial dispositions of these cases.

The Principle Of Contribution Among Joint Tortfeasors Should Be Adopted In Illinois

Illinois is one of only twelve states which continue to adhere to the common law prohibition against contribution among joint tortfeasors. Under Illinois law any one joint tortfeasor may be liable for the entire injury without evaluation of his or her relative fault and without recourse against the other joint tortfeasors, some of whom may be far more culpable. To avoid the harsh results which follow such a principle, over three-quarters of the states have developed a concept of contribution which allows a joint tortfeasor who has paid the full judgment to proceed against his or her fellow joint tortfeasors to distribute the liability among the possible defendants on a more equitable basis.

In suggesting that the General Assembly act to alleviate the inequities of a rule against contribution, the Supreme Court is being consistent with its preceding recommendation that comparative negligence be adopted in Illinois. Though comparative negligence deals with the relation of plaintiff-defendant and contribution deals only with the relation among joint tortfeasors, the basic concern under both concepts is to assure just results by a factual assessment of the relative fault of the various parties.

The Illinois Judicial Conference appointed a Study Committee on Indemnity, Third Party Actions and Equitable Contributions which studied in detail the operation of the current Illinois law, the endeavors of other jurisdictions to provide a workable concept of contribution, and the feasibility of the adoption of a rule of contribution in Illinois relative to the existing statutory framework.

In September of 1976 a comprehensive report was filed by the Committee. The Committee unanimously recommended the adoption of contribution among joint tortfeasors in Illinois with liability to be apportioned on the basis of pure relative fault. The Committee specifically observed that implementation of the change by "legislative enactment [would] present the opportunity to view the area as a whole, rather than on a case by case basis, and at one time propose answers to those problems which may be foreseen." In balloting on the recommendations contained in the Committee report, the circuit and appellate judges of Illinois voted 173-6 in favor of the proposition that the current Illinois law precluding contribution between multiple tortfeasors

should be substantially changed and that the contribution among the tortfeasors should be assessed on pure relative fault rather than a pro-rata basis.

Judicial Salaries

PART A

Judicial Salaries Should Be Increased

There can be little doubt that when a successful lawyer becomes a judge in Illinois, he does so despite the fact that he knows that he and his family will thereby suffer a financial loss. A competent lawyer in Illinois can anticipate a substantially higher annual income and substantially greater income tax advantages than he would receive as an Illinois judge. The Illinois Constitution and the rules of the Supreme Court severely proscribe, and rightly so, the sources of a judge's income. He must devote fulltime to his judicial duties and cannot practice law (Ill. Const. art. VI, §13(b)); he cannot assume an active role in the management of any business nor serve as an officer or director of any for-profit corporation (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 110A, §63); and he cannot accept compensation of any kind for service performed except his judicial salary, although he may accept reasonable compensation for lecturing, teaching, writing or similar activities (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 110A, §65). The consequence of these proscriptions is that most judges must support their family solely from the salary provided by law.

The General Assembly last favorably considered judicial salaries on December 4, 1974 (Public Act 78-1283, approved January 8, 1975, effective July 1, 1975). (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 53, §3 *et seq.*) While that Act raised judges' salaries and eliminated the disparity in salaries between trial judges in single county circuits and those in multi-county circuits, a good percentage of the salary increase has been eroded by inflation. The U.S. Department of Labor reports, for example, that the consumer price index has risen nationally more than 73% since 1967. While judges' salaries increased just over 40%, the consumer price index has risen over 73%. More recently, comparing the consumer price index for the year 1974 to the year 1976 through October, the index rose 17.3%.

Maintaining judicial salaries at adequate levels is also a serious concern in the federal judiciary. In its report to the President of the United States, filed in December of 1976, the Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries, chaired by the former Secretary of Commerce, Peter G. Peterson, recommended the federal judges' salaries be increased as follows: U.S. District Court Judges—\$62,000 (a 47.6% increase); U.S. Court of Appeals Judges—\$65,000 (a 45.7% increase); and U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justices—\$77,500 (a 23.0% increase). See *The Report of the Commission on Executive, Legislative and*

Judicial Salaries, Table I, following page 19 (December, 1976). Illinois judges, not unlike their federal counterparts, have heavy judicial responsibilities and families to support.

Judicial salaries should be maintained at a level which will attract qualified lawyers to the bench and which will enable us to retain the most qualified members of the present judiciary. The Supreme Court recommends that the General Assembly favorably consider increasing judicial salaries to a level approximating the recent increases in the consumer price index.

PART B

Single Source of Judicial Salaries

Since January 1, 1964, the effective date of the amended Judicial Article to the 1870 Constitution, Illinois has had a unified court structure, which has been exemplified by legal scholars and national court and judicial organizations as the model court system. The heart of our court system is the jurisdiction of the circuit court, which possesses virtually unlimited "original jurisdiction of all justiciable matters." Ill. Const. art VI, §9. That jurisdiction, of course, is exercised by the judge and associate judges of the circuit court, and when so exercised, it is not confined, generally, to kinds of cases or the geographical area where a particular circuit court is situated. Ill. Const. art VI, §16; *People ex rel. Phillips Petroleum Company v. Gitchoff et al.*, 65 Ill.2d 249, 357 N.E.2d 534 (1976). Trial judges, like the judges of the Supreme and Appellate Courts, are State officers and the source of their salary should reflect that fact.

Public Act 78-1283 (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 53, §§3.2, 3.3) provides in substance that the salaries of the circuit and associate judges are to be borne by both the State and by the counties. In particular, the Act provides that part of the salaries of circuit judges (\$7,500) and of associate judges (\$4,500) in multi-county circuits shall be reimbursed to the State Treasury by the counties within the circuit on a pro-rata formula based on the total population in the circuit and on the population of each county within the circuit. Many years ago the General Assembly passed legislation, which provided for a similar reimbursement plan, but said plan was apparently determined not to be susceptible to effective administration for the General Assembly repealed that part of the statute. See, e.g., Ill. Rev. Stat. 1967, ch. 53, §3. Similar administrative difficulties seemingly have now occurred in collecting the reimbursement from the affected counties as illustrated by legislation introduced in the 79th General Assembly. e.g., Senate Bill 1064 and House Bill 437 (vetoed by the Governor) and House Bill 3226.

The Supreme Court believes that the salaries of circuit and associate judges should be paid directly by the State without requiring each county in multi-county circuits to reimburse, on a pro-rata basis, the State Treasury for a portion of those judges' salaries.

Salaries Of Official Court Reporters

The maximum salary that an official court reporter may receive is \$16,000 per year. That maximum level was set by the General Assembly, effective October 1, 1973. (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 37, par. 658.) Senate Bill 985 (passed by both Houses of the 79th General Assembly) would have raised the maximum to \$19,000 per year but was vetoed by the Governor.

Official court reporters are hard-working, dedicated professionals who occupy an important position in the circuit court system. To retain these professionals and to attract additional qualified candidates for the position of official court reporter, it is necessary to maintain a competitive salary structure. Furthermore, official court reporters are prohibited by our Administrative Regulations from engaging in private reporting employment.

The Supreme Court recommends that the General Assembly consider amending §8 of The Court Reporter Act (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 37, par. 658(a)) by increasing the maximum salary for official court reporters. If the General Assembly should increase the maximum salary, our Administrative Director, in computing the amount of salary increment for individual official court reporters, will be guided by proficiency, experience, and the population of the area to which an official court reporter is normally assigned. A raise in the maximum payable will not, therefore, automatically result in a raise for any reporter, but will only empower this Court to authorize higher salaries for those who, by reason of demonstrated proficiency, experience and workload, clearly are entitled to higher salaries.

The General Assembly Should Consider Adopting Legislation Which Will Provide For Payment By The State Of The Expense Of Operating The Chief Circuit Judges' Offices In Multi-County Circuits and For Other Administrative Needs Of Our Court System

"Subject to the authority of the Supreme Court, the Chief Judge shall have general administrative authority over his court, including authority to provide for divisions, general or specialized, and for appropriate times and places of holding court." Ill. Const. art. VI, §7(c).

This constitutional provision places broad administrative authority in the chief circuit judge. To properly execute that authority, the chief judge needs personnel, office equipment, supplies and other items traditionally associated with management. In multi-county circuits, an individual county board is reluctant to assume the full responsibility for paying the expenses of a chief judge's office which serves the management needs of counties within the circuit other than the chief judge's county of residence. Understandably, the county boards believe they cannot justify spending their county's taxpayers' funds for the expenses of the office of a chief judge who has circuit-wide manage-

ment responsibilities. Most chief judges in multi-county circuits estimate the cost of operating their office to be modest.

The General Assembly pays the salary and travel expenses of each chief judge's administrative secretary (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 37, §§72.4-1, 72.4-2) but none of the other expenses associated with the chief judge's office is borne by the State. The Supreme Court believes that the expenses of the office of the chief judge (a constitutional officer) in multi-county circuits should be paid out of State appropriations and that the General Assembly should consider legislation providing same.

If the Supreme Court is to carry out its constitutional mandate to administer and supervise the Illinois court system, more resources than those urged above will be needed. It is important that each chief circuit judge receive adequate funding with which to operate an efficient, responsive office in each circuit. It is, however, equally important that the Supreme Court receive adequate funding with which its Administrative Director can operate an efficient, responsive State-wide administrative structure for all the courts of this State.

Programs of continuing judicial education have blossomed from a single seminar involving 140 judges in 1964 to nine judicial education programs with anticipated attendance by 1093 judges and various other educational programs for related personnel in 1976. Our Administrative staff is increasingly preoccupied with organizing, preparing for and presenting such programs to the detriment of other, equally important, responsibilities. The staff of the Supreme Court's Administrative Office should be enlarged so that professional staff personnel may carry out frequent personal visits—inspection tours, if you wish—to each county, under the supervision of the Administrative Director.

Some of the administrative staff does have regular contact with selected members of the judiciary (for example, there are monthly meetings of the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges and the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference), but they rarely have an opportunity to visit with other circuit and associate judges outside of educational seminars. Even rarer are the opportunities for the Administrative staff to meet with clerks of the circuit court, court reporters, probation personnel, public defenders, state's attorneys and other personnel operating within or affecting the operation of the judicial branch of government.

Unfortunately, the startling growth of its responsibility for continuing judicial education, the growing volume of other materials which must be processed by the Administrative Office and the increasing number of meetings which must be attended by the staff has made it increasingly more difficult for the Administrative staff to make regular personal visits to each county.

Additional resources will be necessary if the Administrative Office is to maintain personal contact with the day-to-day functions of the circuit courts throughout the State.

The General Assembly Should Consider Legislation To Implement The Constitutional Guarantee To A Prompt Preliminary Hearing In Criminal Cases

"No person shall be held to answer for a crime punishable by death or by imprisonment in the penitentiary unless either the initial charge has been brought by an indictment of a grand jury or the person has been given a prompt preliminary hearing to establish probable cause." Ill. Const. art. I, §7.

Under this constitutional provision an accused held on a criminal charge punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary must be afforded a prompt hearing to determine the existence of probable cause. Violation of the right to a prompt preliminary hearing has been complained of in several cases presented to this Court since the effective date of our new constitution. Similarly, cases alleging violation of this right are being presented to the Appellate Court. See *People v. Kilgore*, 39 Ill. App. 3d 1000, 350 N.E. 2d 810 (1976). Considering the frequency of the violations and the possibility of future abuse, the time is appropriate to fashion sanctions to assure and protect the right to a prompt preliminary hearing guaranteed by §7 of article I.

In *People v. Howell*, 60 Ill. 2d 117, 324 N.E. 2d 403 (1975), this Court concluded:

"We consider the delays in giving an accused a prompt preliminary hearing to be a serious deprivation of his constitutional rights and we are deeply concerned about the number of cases in which an accused has not had a prompt probable-cause determination. We consider this a subject for appropriate legislative action and we strongly urge the General Assembly to consider the prompt implementation of this constitutional provision." 324 N.E. 2d 403, 405-406.

The Supreme Court is aware of a measure passed by the 79th General Assembly (i.e., House Bill 3420, vetoed by the Governor); however, the Court again

strongly recommends appropriate legislative action to implement the constitutional guarantee of a prompt preliminary hearing to establish probable cause in every case in which a person is charged with an offense punishable by death or imprisonment in the penitentiary.

The General Assembly Should Consider Legislation To Allow Counties To Recover The Costs Of Defender Services From Certain Defendants

In Illinois, the trial courts are obliged by law to appoint counsel, either the public defender or a private attorney, to represent a defendant, who is indigent, in all criminal cases except where the penalty is a fine only. The cost of providing appointed counsel to an indigent defendant is, of course, borne by the county. Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 38, §113-3. To assist the trial court in determining whether a defendant is indigent, the defendant is required to execute an affidavit of assets and liabilities. However, if it is later discovered that in fact the defendant was not indigent, that he had the financial resources to retain counsel of his choosing at the time of executing the affidavit, there is no statutory authorization for the county to recover its costs from the defendant for the legal services rendered by the public defender or other defense counsel appointed by the trial court. This precise factual situation recently arose in the Appellate Court in the case of *County of Champaign v. Hanks*, 41 Ill. App. 3d 679, 353 N.E. 2d 405 (1976).

The Supreme Court recommends for the General Assembly's consideration legislation which would provide statutory authorization for a county to recover the cost of legal defense services provided at trial to a defendant who falsely represented himself to be indigent. The General Assembly may wish to consider legislation similar to the recovery of funds provision contained in section 11 of the State Appellate Defender Act. Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 38, §208-11.

The Appellate Court Jurisdiction

The Appellate Court is the intermediate court of review in the Illinois judicial system. Appeals from final judgments of a Circuit Court may be taken as a matter of right to the Appellate Court, except in cases appealable directly to the Supreme Court. There is no appeal from a judgment of acquittal in a criminal case.

The Appellate Court may exercise original jurisdiction when necessary to the complete determination of any case on review, and it may also review administrative actions, as may be provided by law, (Art. VI, Sec. 6). Pursuant to the constitutional provision concerning review of administrative actions, the legislature has enacted two such statutes: (1) the Environmental Protection Act, Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 111-1/2, § 1041, effective July 1, 1970, provides that "final orders or determina-

tions” of the Pollution Control Board may be appealed directly to the Appellate Court; and (2) the Election Code, Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 46, § 9-22, effective October 1, 1974, provides that “judgments” of the State Board of Elections concerning disclosure of campaign contributions and expenditures may be appealed directly to the Appellate Court.

In general, Articles III and VI of the Supreme Court Rules govern the mechanics of appellate procedure in civil and criminal cases. Of particular note, is Rule 335 which controls direct appeals from administrative actions to the Appellate Court.

It is interesting to observe that Illinois is only one of a few states that provides for appeal as a matter of constitutional right in the intermediate court of review. Furthermore, the Constitution in Article VI, Section 16 directs that the Supreme Court implement the right of appeal by promulgating rules “for expeditious and inexpensive appeals” to the Supreme and Appellate Courts. Thus, it may be fairly stated that an aggrieved litigant, who disagrees with the decision of the Circuit Court, can appeal the judgment to the Appellate Court. This right of appeal applies equally to the defendant who is adjudged guilty of violating a traffic ordinance, as well as to the plaintiff who has lost a \$1,000,000 personal injury lawsuit. In addition, a litigant has a right to appeal from a decision of the Appellate Court to the Supreme Court if the Appellate Court issues a certificate of importance or a question arises under the Federal or State Constitutions for the first time as a result of the action of the Appellate Court.

Organization

The Constitution (there are only a handful of states which constitutionally provide for an intermediate appellate court), Art. VI, Sec. 5, provides: (1) the number of Appellate Judges to be selected from each judicial district shall be provided by law; (2) the Supreme Court shall prescribe by rule the number of appellate divisions in each judicial district; (3) each appellate division shall have at least three judges; (4) assignments of judges to divisions shall be made by the Supreme Court; (5) a majority of a division constitutes a quorum and the concurrence of a majority of the division is necessary for a decision; (6) there shall be at least one division in each judicial district; and (7) each division shall sit at times and places prescribed by rules of the Supreme Court. Appellate Court judges, like Supreme Court judges, are elected for 10 year terms. (Art. VI, Sec. 10)

As of December 31, 1974 the General Assembly has provided for the election of 18 Appellate Judges from the First District and 4 from each of the other four districts. The fourth judgeship in each of the four downstate appellate districts was established effective October 1, 1973 (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, § 25). These new judgeships were filled at the November, 1974 general election.

Pursuant to Section 5 of Article VI, the Supreme Court has adopted Rule 22 which establishes the organization of the Appellate Court. The rule contains the following provisions:

Divisions—The Appellate Court shall sit in divisions of three judges. In the First District there shall be five divisions which shall sit in the City of Chicago; in the Second District two divisions, which shall sit in the City of Elgin; the Third through the Fifth Districts shall each have one division which shall sit in Ottawa, Springfield and Mount Vernon, respectively. The Appellate Court in each district shall be in session throughout the year and each division shall sit periodically as its judicial business requires.

Assignments—The Supreme Court shall assign judges to the various divisions.

Decisions—Three judges must participate in the decision of every case, and the concurrence of two shall be necessary to a decision.

Presiding Judge—The judges of each division shall select one of their number to serve for one year as presiding judge.

Executive Committee—The presiding judges of the divisions shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Appellate Court.

Executive Committee of the First Appellate District—There shall be an Executive Committee of the First District composed of five members, one selected by the judges of each division from among their members, which committee shall exercise general administrative authority; the Executive Committee shall select one of their number as chairman.


Caseload Summary

From 1964 through 1976, the Appellate Court has seen a steady and dramatic increase in its caseload. Initially, this increase was partly the result of the Appellate Court's expanded jurisdiction under the Judicial Article of 1964 and the Constitution of 1970. Thereafter, however, the continued increase simply reflects the overall increase in litigation in our courts. During 1964, the Appellate Court had 1,211 new cases filed, disposed of 889 and had 859 pending at the end of the year. During 1976, the Appellate Court had 3,973 new cases filed, disposed of 3,935 and had 4,111 cases pending at the end of the year. These figures represent increases of 228% in new cases filed, 343% in cases disposed of, and 379% in cases pending at the close of the year, over this 13 year period.

The number of new cases filed, cases disposed of, cases pending at the end of the year, cases disposed of with full opinions, and the number of majority and per curiam opinions, for 1976, are set forth in the charts at pages 96-100. A year by year comparison of those figures with the figures for the four previous years (1972-1976) presents a clear picture of the recent trend of cases in the Appellate Court.


(Cases Filed)

During 1972, 3,020 cases were filed as compared with 3,973 in 1976—an increase of 32% in five years:




(Cases Pending at End of Year)

In 1972, there were 3,310 cases pending at the end of the year as compared with 4,111 in 1976, an increase of 24% in five years:




(Cases Disposed Of)

During 1972, 2,526 cases were disposed of, as compared with 3,935 in 1976—an increase of 56% in five years:



(Cases Disposed of With Full Opinions)


In 1972, 1,763 cases were disposed of with full opinions, as compared with 1,952 in 1976, an increase of 12% in five years:



(Number of Opinions)

In 1973, the Administrative Office began reporting the number of opinions written by the Appellate Court judges. (This category is to be distinguished from the number of cases disposed of with full opinions, supra.)

During 1976, a total of 1,853 majority and per curiam opinions were written. A comparison of the total number of such opinions written in the four years these figures have been reported is as follows:



The number of Appellate Court opinions (including majority, per curiam, specially concerning, dissenting and supplemental) written by each full-time Appellate Court judge (by District and Division) during 1976, are as follows:

First District

(First Division)

Opinions	41
	46
	22
	49
Total	<u>158</u>

(Second Division)

Opinions	47
	22
	21
	6
	36
Total	<u>132</u>

(Third Division)

Opinions	47
	51
	42
	50
Total	<u>190</u>

(Fourth Division)

Opinions	27
	36
	55
	43
	1
Total	<u>162</u>

(Fifth Division)

Opinions	36
	27
	51
	53
Total	<u>167</u>

Second District

(First Division)

Opinions	61
	37
	61
Total	<u>159</u>

(Second Division)

Opinions	55
	48
	62
Total	<u>165</u>

Third District

Opinions	93
	77
	81
	84
	14
Total	<u>349</u>

Fourth District

Opinions	71
	79
	31
	75
	52
Total	<u>308</u>

Fifth District

Opinions	63
	74
	60
	57
Total	<u>254</u>

(Rule 23 Orders)

Effective July 1, 1975, Supreme Court Rule 23 was amended to provide for the disposition of certain cases, in the Appellate Court, by order rather than opinion:

"Rule 23. Disposition of Cases by Order in the Appellate Court. When the Appellate Court determines that an opinion would have no precedential value, that no substantial question is presented, or that jurisdiction is lacking, it may dispose of the case by an order briefly stating the reasons for its decision."

In commenting upon the adoption of this rule, Justice Kluczynski, in his address to the 1975 Judicial Conference, stated:


"This amendment broadens considerably the power of the Appellate Court to dispose of cases without opinion. However, the rule will still require that in every case disposed of, the litigants be given some statement of the reasons. The length of such a statement will vary with the circumstances of the case. For example, when the issue involved is clearly covered by binding authority, it would suffice to cite the controlling authority. But other cases may require a more complete reason for the decision."

During 1976, the following number of Rule 23 orders was entered:

	Rule 23 Orders
First District	
First Division	98
Second Division	83
Third Division	60
Fourth Division	45
Fifth Division	99
Second District	
First Division	76
Second Division	57
Third District	60
Fourth District	252
Fifth District	<u>157</u>
State Total	987

CASES FILED AND DISPOSED OF IN THE APPELLATE COURT

— Filed
— Disposed of



Appellate Court Clerks

Pursuant to the Illinois Constitution (Art. VI, Sec. 18), Appellate Court Clerks are appointed by the Appellate Judges, in each appellate district. As of December 31, 1976 the Appellate Court Clerks were:

First District - Ralph L. Siegel (Acting Clerk)
Second District - Loren J. Strotz
Third District - Joseph Fennessy
Fourth District - Robert L. Conn
Fifth District - Walter T. Simmons

Assignments

The Illinois Constitution, Art. VI, Sec. 16 gives the Supreme Court authority to "assign a judge temporarily to any court. . . ." Pursuant to this authority, the Supreme Court, in 1976, assigned 6 Circuit Judges to hear specific cases and 30 Appellate Judges (10 panels of 3 judges) to hear 17 cases from other districts. Also, the following specific assignments were made:

Walter Dixon (retired Appellate Judge) assigned to the 2nd District through November 30, 1976;
Albert E. Hallett (retired Appellate Judge) assigned to the 2nd District through November 30, 1976;
John C. Hayes assigned to the 1st District through December 5, 1976;
Mel R. Jiganti assigned to the 1st District on March 1, 1976 until further order;
James J. Mejda assigned to the 1st District through December 5, 1976;
Richard T. Carter assigned to the 5th District January 1, 1976 through January 15, 1976 and September 1, 1976 through December 5, 1976;
John T. Reardon assigned to the 4th District May 15, 1976 through December 5, 1976;
Albert Scott assigned to the 3rd District until further order;
John M. O'Connor, Jr., assigned to the 1st District on December 6, 1976 until further order;
Richard T. Carter (retired Circuit Judge) assigned to the 5th District on December 6, 1976 until further order;
John T. Reardon (retired Circuit Judge) assigned to the 4th District on December 6, 1976 until further order.

Circuit Courts

Jurisdiction

The court of general jurisdiction or trial level court, in Illinois, is known as the Circuit Court. It has original jurisdiction of all justiciable matters, except: (1) in matters relating to redistricting of the General Assembly and to the ability of the Governor to serve or resume office; (2) where the Supreme Court exercises its discretionary original jurisdiction in cases relating to

revenue, mandamus, prohibition or habeas corpus; and (3) by statute, the review of orders of the Pollution Control Board and certain orders of the State Board of Elections. There are no courts of special or limited jurisdiction in Illinois. (Ill. Const. Art. VI, Sec. 9; Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 111-1/2, §1041).

Organization

The State is divided into 21 judicial circuits by statute (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, §72.1). Two circuits, Cook County and the 18th Circuit, each consist of a single county. The other 19 judicial circuits are composed of two or more contiguous counties as provided by law (see map at page 102). Each judicial circuit has but one, unified Circuit Court.

There are two categories of judges in the Circuit Courts: (1) Circuit Judges, and (2) Associate Judges. Both categories of judges have the full constitutional jurisdiction conferred on the Circuit Courts, however, the Supreme Court, by rule, provides for the matters to be assigned to Associate Judges. At the present time, under Supreme Court Rule 295, the Chief Judge of a circuit may assign Associate Judges to hear any matters except the trial of criminal cases in which the defendant is charged with an offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year.

The number of Circuit Court judges is provided by law (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, §72.2). At the present time, there are 377 authorized Circuit judgeships in the State. Unless otherwise provided by law, there must be at least one Circuit Judge from each county. Circuit Judges are initially elected, either on a circuitwide basis or from the county where they reside (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, §§72.2; 72.42-1). In the Cook County Circuit, Circuit Judges are elected from the City of Chicago, from the entire county or from the area outside of Chicago (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, §72.42).

Associate Judges are appointed on a merit basis by the Circuit Judges in their respective circuits. Supreme Court Rule 39 establishes the procedure for nominating and appointing attorneys who have applied for the position of Associate Judge. The number of Associate Judges is also provided by law. At the present time there are 279 authorized Associate judgeships (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, §160.2).

Circuit Judges are elected for six-year terms and Associate Judges are appointed for four-year terms (Art. VI, Sec. 10). All judges must be licensed attorneys (Art. VI, Sec. 11).

The Circuit Judges in each Circuit select by secret ballot a Chief Judge from their number to serve at their pleasure. Subject to the authority of the Supreme Court, the Chief Judge has general administrative authority over his court, including authority to provide for divisions, general or specialized, and for appropriate times and places of holding court (Art. VI, Sec. 7).

Appeals from the Circuit Court are to the Appellate Court or to the Supreme Court, depending upon the

nature of the case (Art. VI, Secs. 4 and 5). No judge of the Circuit Court has the power to review the decision of another and there are no trials *de novo*. Appeals are based on the trial court record, except where the

reviewing court may exercise its original jurisdiction as may be necessary for the complete determination of the case on review (Art. VI, Secs. 4 and 5).

Caseload Summary

The total number of cases begun or reinstated in the Circuit Courts during 1976 was 3,484,572. In 1964 the total number of cases begun or reinstated was 2,250,233. A comparison of these two figures reveals an overall increase of 55% in litigation over this thirteen year period.

The number of trial court judges in 1964 was 556 with an average caseload (based on new cases filed) of 4,053 cases per judge. The number of trial court judges in 1976 was 603, with an average caseload of 5,746 cases per judge. This represents an increase of


judicial manpower of only 8% over 1964, whereas there was a 42% increase in the average caseload per judge.

For statistical purposes, the cases begun and terminated in the Circuit Courts are divided into twenty categories. A comparison of several of these categories for the years 1964 and 1976 reflects the general overall increase indicated above, as well as very substantial increases in the number of felony, misdemeanor and ordinance violation cases. The increase in criminal cases, in particular, is most apparent and indicative of the tremendous burden placed upon our courts in recent years.

Category	1964	1976	%Increase
Law Cases	131,004	158,440	21%
Small Claims	136,415	185,911	36%
Chancery	12,927	20,650	60%
Divorce	35,834	69,634	94%
Felony*	9,202	34,845	279%
Misdemeanor and Ordinance Violation	283,272	478,110	69%
Traffic	1,476,211	2,305,483	56%


*Some of the increase in felony cases is due to the expanded definition of "felony" in the Unified Code of Corrections, Ill. Rev. Stat., Ch. 38, §1005-1-9, effective January 1, 1973.

AVERAGE CASELOAD PER JUDGE




(Felony Cases)

Comparison of the number of felony cases begun or reinstated in the five years for 1972 through 1976 reveals a 103% increase:



(Misdemeanor and Ordinance Violations)

Comparison of the number of misdemeanor and ordinance violation cases begun or reinstated in the five years from 1972 through 1976 reveals a 23% increase:



Caseload Summary Circuit Court of Cook County

On January 1, 1964, the amended Judicial Article of the 1870 Constitution became effective. Amended Article VI created a truly unified, statewide court structure which was confirmed and preserved with the adoption of the 1970 Constitution. Perhaps, the single most important advance in judicial administration brought about by the 1962 Judicial Article was the organization of the circuit courts into a single integrated trial court with original jurisdiction of all justiciable matters and general administrative authority, subject only to the authority of the Supreme Court, vested in the chief

judge. It is the circuit court, with its many component parts—judges, lawyers, prosecutors, public defenders, clerks, bailiffs, court reporters, witnesses, litigants, courtrooms, etc.—which the public, whether as observers or participants in the litigation process, equates with justice. It is the circuit court which is the initial, and in most cases the final, judicial forum for resolving disputes. It is the circuit court which touches a great number of lives and has a great impact on individuals.

Since January of 1964, the Circuit Court of Cook County has been the place for the doing of justice for many, many people, as illustrated below:

Year	Average Number of Cases* (Filings) per Judge	Total Cases Added In (Filings/Re-instatements)	Total Cases* Terminated
1964	6,769	1,617,822	2,173,265
1965	7,156	1,753,182	1,769,799
1966	7,078	1,734,204	1,774,336
1967	6,898	1,628,075	1,671,477
1968	7,157	1,767,865	1,740,180
1969	8,032	1,935,813	1,819,724
1970	7,608	1,965,324	1,881,089
1971	8,424	2,090,302	2,033,996
1972	7,517	1,951,758	1,937,949
1973	8,079	2,043,994	1,907,152
1974	7,687	2,043,914	1,945,142
1975	8,479	2,238,642	2,116,443
1976	8,901**	2,269,085	2,092,699

* Does not include post-termination and ancillary matters, e.g., post-decree matters in divorce cases, post-conviction hearing act petitions, etc.

** Based on number of judges sitting on May 1, 1976.

The statistical data above demonstrate why the Cook County Circuit Court has been described by commentators as one of the largest and busiest trial courts in the nation, if not in the world. During 1976, the Circuit Court received nearly 2,270,000 cases in new filings and reinstatements, which is the greatest number of cases added in, in any one year, during 13 years under court unification. This represents an increase of 40.3% in cases added in as compared to 1964 and an increase of 1.4% as compared to 1975. Correspondingly, the average number of cases filed per judge per year also reached an all-time high in 1976, when compared to the preceding 12 years. The 8,901 cases filed per judge is an increase of 31.5% over 1964 and an increase of 5% over 1975. The number of cases terminated, nearly 2,093,000 for 1976, is third only to the years 1964 and 1975, but 1.1% fewer cases were terminated in 1976 than in 1975.

The types of cases for which this office maintains inventory ("pending") information reveals the following:

Year	Cases Pending at End of Period	% of change over preceding year
1964	148,823	-----
1965	148,707	-0.08%
1966	142,720	-4.03%
1967	137,746	-3.48%
1968	138,849	+0.80%
1969	131,342	-5.41%
1970	137,379	+4.60%
1971	135,028	-1.71%
1972	137,792	+2.05%
1973	191,175	+38.74%
1974	218,701	+14.40%
1975	242,441	+10.86%
1976	290,431	+19.79%

During the six year period - 1970 through 1975 - the average number of cases terminated per year was 1,970,295. Notwithstanding the 2,092,699 cases terminated in 1976, the number of cases filed and reinstated totaled 2,269,085 versus an average of 2,055,655 during the six year period. The inventory of cases, for which data is kept, was 290,431 cases in 1976 versus an average of 177,086 cases during the six year period. The substantial increase (nearly 20% over 1975) in the 1976 inventory can be traced in part to tax cases pending in the County Division and in the Municipal Department. While the number of tax cases filed in 1976 negligibly appreciated in the County Division (36,085 versus 35,311 in 1975) and actually decreased in the Municipal Department (66,955 versus 72,296 in 1975), the number of tax cases terminated in 1976 decreased in the County Division (24,165 versus 35,597 in 1975 - a 32.1% decline) and in the Municipal Department (56,035 versus 70,291 in 1975 - a 20.3% decline). (Actually the First Municipal District terminated nearly 5,800 more tax cases in 1976 than in 1975, but Districts Two through Six terminated 20,040 less tax cases in 1976 than in 1975.) The fewer tax case terminations in 1976, of course, resulted in more pending tax cases and consequently in an increase in inventory. Of the 42,255 case increase in the total inventory, 25,781 (61%) are due to tax cases in the County Division and in the Municipal Department.

During 1976, the Circuit Court lost some ground in the termination of law jury cases by verdict (less than 4% of all law jury cases disposed of are terminated by verdict). Based on 753 verdicts during 1976, the average elapsed time from date of filing to date of

verdict was 36.95 months in law jury cases terminated in the Law Division and in the Municipal Department. (528 verdicts in the Law Division with an average elapsed time of 40.91 months and 225 verdicts in the Municipal Department with an average elapsed time of 27.66 months.) The 36.95 month average is more than a two month increase over 1975 (34.8 month average), and more particularly, the average elapsed time of law jury verdicts in the Law Division is creeping up; e.g., 39.13 months in 1974, 39.3 months in 1975 and 40.91 months in 1976. Too, the number of pending law jury cases in the Law Division has reached 40,156 - the first time since the end of calendar year 1969 that the number of pending law jury cases has exceeded 40,000. While the overall 36.95 month average is an increase over 1975 (34.8 months) and 1974 (34.4 months), it is still an improvement over other years; e.g., 37.1 months in 1973; 42.0 months in 1972; 48.4 months in 1971. Also, the 1976 average elapsed time from date of filing to date of disposition (e.g., disposition by verdict, settlement and dismissal) for all law jury cases in the Law Division was a favorable 27.4 months.

Litigation in the court system is, perhaps, the most exacting mirror of society. In very recent times, some of society's major concerns have been centered on serious "street crime" and on the family as an integral component of the societal structure. When such concerns are placed in the court system in the form of litigation, then the judges of the court rule with justice on each, individual case. The tables below compare selected dispositions of felony cases and divorce cases since 1970 in the Circuit Court of Cook County.

Defendants Convicted of Felonies in The Circuit Court of Cook County

Year	Number of Defendants		% of change over preceding year
	Criminal Division	Municipal Department	
1970	2701*	-	-----
1971	2703*	-	+ .01%
1972	2417*	-	- 10.6%
1973	5214	-	+ 115.7%
1974	7838	-	+ 50.3%
1975	5605	4284	+ 26.2%
1976	6604	3851	+ 5.7%

*Charged by indictment only.

Dissolution* of Marriages in The Divorce Division

Year	Judgments	% of change over preceding year
1970	17,211	-----
1971	19,255	+11.9%
1972	21,494	+11.6%
1973	21,418	-0.4%
1974	22,277	+4.0%
1975	23,105	+3.7%
1976	22,809	-1.3%

*Includes divorce, separate maintenance and annulment.

The magnitude of cases filed last year and carried over into the new year presents a challenge to the Circuit Court in the year 1977. Last year thirty newly created circuit judgeships and ten newly created associate judgeships were filled on December 6 and July 1, respectively. That increased the number of authorized judicial officers in the Circuit Court to over 300 judges. However, the immediate net gain was only nineteen additional judges out of the forty vacancies to be filled, for twenty-one associate judges were elected to circuit or appellate judgeships. (Also, five circuit judges were elected to the Appellate Court and only one of five circuit court vacancies has been filled.) Shortly, most of the associate judge vacancies will be filled and the Circuit Court will have nearly a full complement of judicial officers. We are confident, as we

have been in the past, that the new judges and the veteran judges will put forth their determined efforts to effectively and efficiently administer justice, but be ever-mindful that "in the doing of justice a judge has no mean duties, and in a proper sense, no case in which a judge presides is of greater importance than another". Too, the concluding remarks of Judge Gulley, the Director of the Administrative Office, delivered in his address at the 1976 meeting of the Illinois Judicial Conference seem to be apropos here: "If each and every judge . . . would firmly and irrevocably rededicate himself to reduce the time in the disposition of litigation, I am confident that within a relatively brief period, we could overcome man's primary obstacle to achieving justice - the delay from commencement of action, be it civil or criminal, to final disposition."

AVERAGE DELAY
IN MONTHS

Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
1975											
Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
1976											

70


60

50

40


30

20



GRAPH PLOTTING
AVERAGE ELAPSED TIME BETWEEN DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF VERDICT
IN THE
LAW DIVISION (LAW JURY TRIAL SECTION), CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
BETWEEN JANUARY, 1975 and DECEMBER, 1976

CASES BEGUN OR REINSTATED AND TERMINATED IN THE CIRCUIT COURTS 1964—1976



*Number of terminations unavailable

Assignments

The disposition of large numbers of cases and the remarkable progress towards achieving currency in the Law Division in the Circuit Court of Cook County is partially due to the Supreme Court's use of its constitutional authority to assign sitting and retired judges to those circuits in need of additional manpower (Art. VI, Sec. 16).

During 1976, on behalf of the Supreme Court, the Director temporarily assigned 90 Circuit Judges (for a total of 176 weeks and 4 days) and 84 Associate Judges (for a total of 182 weeks and 1 day) to Cook County. This represents the equivalent of 7-1/2 additional full-time judges in Cook County for the year.

In the other circuits, the Director temporarily assigned 36 Circuit Judges (for a total of 19 weeks and 3 days) and 7 Associate Judges (for a total of 3 weeks and 4 days).

The assignment of downstate Circuit judges to serve temporarily in Cook County may, at first glance, seem to be a relatively simple matter. However, a number of considerations are involved, particularly that the assignments from the various circuits be proportionately equal and fair. In order to accomplish proportionate equality a formula was developed during 1976. The essence of this formula is set forth in the following memorandum from the Deputy Director to the Chief Circuit Judges:

“TO: The Chief Circuit Judges
FROM: William M. Madden
DATE: March 16, 1976

“A Formula for Assigning Downstate Judges to Cook County

“If we define a work year for judges as 46 weeks, our most recently published statistical report shows that each downstate judge disposes of an average of 70.26 cases per week. Each Cook County judge, on the other hand, disposes of an average of 167.10 cases per week. That does not necessarily mean that the average Cook County judge works harder than the average downstate judge. It simply means that there are more cases to be disposed of in Cook County and relatively fewer judges available to deal with them.

“If 307 downstate judges were permanently assigned to Cook County and a like number of their Cook County colleagues were permanently assigned to the posts left vacant downstate, we would see—after a brief period of readjustment—absolutely no change in the rate at which cases are disposed of, either in Cook County or downstate. The downstate judges assigned to Cook would dispose of an average of approximately 167.10 Cook County cases each week and the transplanted Cook County judges would dispose of an average of approximately 70.26 downstate cases each week. And each judge would be as fully occupied in his new role as he was in his last.

“Why? Because the time it takes to complete any task expands and contracts in direct proportion to the

time allocated to complete it. Or, as C. Northcote Parkinson observed:

“Work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion. . . .

“A lack of occupation is not necessarily revealed by a manifest idleness. The thing to be done swells in importance and complexity in a direct ratio to the time to be spent. This fact is widely recognized, but less attention has been paid to its wider implications, more especially in the field of public administration.”

Disposition rates are systemic: Each judicial community disposes of as many cases as it must to avoid developing a significant backlog. No one plots that performance standard in advance. It just happens. It is systemic.

Optimum Disposition Rates

“Somewhere between the leisurely pace evidenced by a disposition rate of 36.89 cases per judge per week in the 2nd Circuit and the frenetic disposition rate of 167.10 cases per judge per week in Cook County lies an *optimum disposition rate* which can act as our guide to determining how much judge-time each downstate circuit could reasonably free up for duty in Cook County. For the sake of having some place to start, I will arbitrarily suggest that—given optimum conditions—we could reasonably set the optimum disposition rate at the statewide average of 118.68 cases per judge per week. And starting with that presumption, I will calculate how many judge-weeks each downstate circuit can be expected to provide to Cook County for the remainder of this year.

“However, because of varying circumstances in each circuit, we must first adjust this arbitrary optimum disposition rate to accommodate such things as: (1) necessary travel time within and other factors affecting large circuits, (2) growing backlogs in some circuits and (3) the increasing workload in all circuits.

Geographical Area

“It is almost impossible to calculate the actual handicap suffered by Chief Judges who have to service a large geographical area with few judges. Each circuit handles the problem somewhat differently. In some circuits a resident judge may regularly sit in the county of his residence hearing every case that arises in that county. In other circuits judges are *always* travelling—rarely if ever sitting in their county of residence. We will never be able to devise a uniformly perfect factor to account for the geographical handicap. However, to accommodate the probability that judges in circuits having a large geographical area will, on an average, be able to dispose of fewer cases per week than judges in compact circuits, we will—in circuits in which the area per judge exceeds 100 square miles—reduce the optimum disposition rate in each such circuit by one case per judge per week for each 25 square miles of land in excess of 100 square miles per judge. Thus, for example, instead of assuming that

every judge in the 4th Circuit can dispose of 118.68 cases per judge per week, we will—because of the size of that circuit—reduce our optimum disposition rate for that circuit to 108.00 cases per judge per week.

Growing Backlogs

“In circuits in which the number of cases per judge added during the year exceeds the number of cases per judge terminated, we have an incipient backlog problem. In order to avoid aggravating an already troublesome backlog problem in any circuit, we will build into our equation a factor to recognize the fact that circuits threatened by a rising backlog cannot realistically be expected to contribute as large a share of their judicial manpower to out-of-circuit assignments as circuits which have stable or declining case inventories. Some might complain that this factor rewards circuits which allow backlogs to develop, and there might be some substance to that charge. However, lack of diligence is not the sole cause of backlogs. Such matters as unusually high case filings in a given year, judicial vacancies, illness, having circuit judges assigned to the Appellate Court and other factors can contribute to the rise of a backlog in any circuit. Therefore, in every case in which filings exceed terminations, we will further reduce the optimum disposition rate for that circuit by one case per judge per week for every 50 cases per judge, or fraction thereof, by which filings exceeded terminations during the preceding year.

Assessing Proportionate Responsibility

“The proportionate responsibility of each downstate circuit for providing judicial manpower for Cook County will be calculated by deducting the total number of judge-weeks each circuit would require to dispose of all the cases pending at the beginning of and filed during the year in that circuit at the optimum disposition rate for that circuit, from the 46 judge-weeks we calculate as being available to the circuit during the coming year. The ratio which the excess judge-weeks available in any circuit bears to the total number of excess judge-weeks available downstate will determine the proportion of judge-weeks which will be expected from each circuit.

“That is, if every judge in every circuit were to dispose of cases at the optimum rate for that circuit each week, how many excess judge-weeks would be available in each circuit after the circuit’s entire yearly inventory of cases was depleted? And what is the proportion of excess judge-weeks in that circuit to the total excess judge-weeks available throughout downstate Illinois?”

Based on these factors the following formula was developed:

$$Y - ((P_1 + F_1) + J_1 \times (E - a_1 - b_1)) = C_1$$

The formula stated above determines the number of “Excess Judge Weeks” available in each of the downstate circuits. The formula does not imply that each of

the circuits actually has excess judge weeks available, it is simply a shorthand way of expressing the following concept: If each downstate circuit were to dispose of its Total Anticipated Case Inventory during the coming year at an “Optimum Disposition Rate” per judge per week, how many weeks would be left after the entire inventory was depleted?

When we determine the relationship that the total “Excess Judge Weeks” in each circuit bears to the total excess judge weeks available throughout downstate, we then know what %-age of the judicial manpower the Supreme Court authorizes for assignment to Cook County will be the responsibility of each downstate circuit.

Notes:

- (1) Subscripts (i.e. P_1 through P_{20}) relate to the circuit numbers.
- (2) “Y” = Judges’ work year (Arbitrarily set at 46 weeks for these calculations).
- (3) “P” = Pending Case Load in each circuit at the end of previous year.
- (4) “F” = Total cases filed in each circuit last year.
- (5) “J” = Number of Judges in each circuit.
- (6) “E” = Average Disposition Rate Statewide during the past year—118.68 cases per judge per week during 1974, the period used for these calculations.
- (6) “a” = Square mileage differential for each circuit.
- (7) “b” = Backlog factor for each circuit.
- (8) “C” = Excess Available Judge-Weeks per circuit, per year.
- (9) When “C” is a negative number, the circuit will be responsible for only a token assignment—usually not more than three judge weeks per year.”


Rule 295 Assignments

In implementing the expanded assignability of Associate Judges, the Supreme Court has adopted a policy of limiting such authorization to limited periods of time, not to exceed six months. During 1976, 132 Associate Judges were authorized to hear criminal cases in which the defendant was charged with an offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year. The number of Associate Judges so authorized in 1976 and their respective circuits are as follows:
Cook County - 72 Associate Judges for 6 months.

Downstate


- 1st Circuit - 2 Associate Judges for 6 months.
- 4th Circuit - 7 Associate Judges for 6 months;
1 Associate Judge for 2 months.
- 7th Circuit - 6 Associate Judges for 6 months.
- 9th Circuit - 1 Associate Judge for 4 months.
- 10th Circuit - 3 Associate Judges for 8-1/2 months.
- 12th Circuit - 1 Associate Judge for 6-1/2 months;
2 Associate Judges for 5 months.

13th Circuit - 2 Associate Judges for 6 months;
2 Associate Judges for 3 months;
1 Associate Judge for 1 month.
14th Circuit - 1 Associate Judge for completion of a trial.
17th Circuit - 4 Associate Judges for 6 months;
4 Associate Judges for 4 months.
18th Circuit - 1 Associate Judge for 2-1/2 months.
19th Circuit - 2 Associate Judges for 1-1/2 months.
20th Circuit - 7 Associate Judges for 6 months;
13 Associate Judges for 3 months.



The
ILLINOIS JUDICIAL SYSTEM
1975

CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY



The Judicial Conference

The Illinois Constitution provides in Section 17 of Article VI that there shall be "an annual judicial conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice." Supreme Court Rule 41 implements Section 17 by establishing membership in the Conference, creating an executive committee to assist the Court in conducting the Conference, and appointing the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts as secretary of the Conference. The text of the rule follows:

"RULE 41. (a) *Duties.* There shall be a Judicial Conference to consider the business and the problems pertaining to the administration of justice in this State, and to make recommendations for its improvement.

(b) *Membership.* The judges of the Supreme Court, the judges of the Appellate Court, and the judges of the circuit courts shall be members of the conference.

(c) *Executive Committee.* The Supreme Court shall appoint an executive committee to assist it in conducting the Judicial Conference.

(1) The committee shall consist of six judges from Cook County, the First Judicial District, and six judges from the other judicial districts outside Cook County. A designated Justice of the Supreme Court shall be an *ex officio* member of the committee. Members shall be appointed for a term of three years.

(2) Each year the Supreme Court shall designate one of the members of the committee to act as chairman.

(3) The committee shall meet at such time and such place as may be necessary, or at the call of the Supreme Court.

(4) The committee shall recommend to the Supreme Court the appointment of such other committees as are necessary to further the objectives of the conference.

(5) At least 60 days prior to the date on which the Judicial Conference is to be held the committee shall submit to the Supreme Court a suggested agenda for the annual meeting.

(d) *Meetings of Conference.* The conference shall meet at least once each year at a place and on a date to be designated by the Supreme Court.

(e) *Secretary.* The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts shall be secretary of the conference."

The Judicial Conference membership includes all Supreme Court justices, Appellate Court judges and Circuit Court judges. From this pool of judges, the Supreme Court designates six judges from Cook County and six judges outside Cook County as members of the Executive Committee.

As of November 30, 1976, the Executive Committee consisted of Frederick S. Green, Chairman, Nicholas J. Bua, Vice-Chairman, Jay J. Alloy, Joseph J. Butler, William C. Calvin, Harry G. Comerford, Mel R. Jiganti,

George W. Kasserman, Jr., Daniel J. McNamara, Joseph A. Power, Daniel J. Roberts, George W. Unverzagt, and Thomas E. Kluczynski, Liaison Officer.

The Executive Committee meets regularly every month and supervises the organization of the annual Conference, annual Associate Judge Seminar, the New Judge Seminar, regional seminars and the work of the various Judicial Conference committees. In addition, the Executive Committee considers recommendations relating to the improvement of the administration of justice which are developed at the Conference and seminars and by the committees. Those recommendations found to be meritorious are submitted to the Supreme Court for its consideration. Some of the Executive Committee's activities, during 1976, are reflected in the following actions:

(1) Appointed the Committee on Judicial Education, effective July 1, 1976.

(2) Appointed a sub-committee for the purpose of considering a unified Judicial Conference, to include Associate Judges.

(3) Appointed new liaison officers to the various Conference committees.

(4) Considered the report of the Study Committee on the Effect of *Sniadach* and *Fuentes* on Illinois Law and approved of the recommendation that confession of judgments should be abolished by legislative action.

(5) Selected the 1976 Judicial Conference seminar committees.

(6) Added an optional Thursday evening session to the 1976 Judicial Conference.

(7) Approved the new and expanded format for the regional seminars.

(8) Arranged for tours by associate judges of the new federal Metropolitan Correctional Center in Chicago.

(9) Appointed liaison officers to the 1976 Conference seminar committees.

(10) Made new appointments of members to various Conference committees.

(11) Decided that a judge would serve with the law professors as cofaculty in the new regional seminar format.

(12) Decided that a unified Judicial Conference with Associate Judges was not feasible at this time.

(13) Approved the topics and faculty for the 1976-77 series of regional seminars.

(14) Approved a questionnaire to be sent to all Circuit judges soliciting questions for discussion at the optional Thursday evening session.

(15) Considered and disapproved of a proposal that post-trial motions be abolished as a condition precedent to appeal.

(16) Agreed to present to the Supreme Court a request for the creation of a study committee on the appointment of fiduciaries where any question of favoritism might be raised.

(17) Appointed new members to the Associate Judge Seminar Coordinating Committee.

(18) Approved the topics for the 1976 Judicial Conference.

(19) Approved of an informational letter to be sent to all Illinois judges to keep them informed of the status of study committee reports, development of bench books and the new regional seminar format.

(20) Approved the Trial Judges Writing Program at the University of Colorado Law School on July 25-30, 1976, for attendance by Illinois judges.

(21) Selected the dates for the 1977 Associate Judge Seminar.

(22) Authorized the Committee on Court Services to consider and propose minimum standards for the selection of adult probation officers.

(23) Approved proposed Rule 416 on misdemeanor discovery and forwarded the proposal to the Supreme Court.

(24) Approved the agenda for the 1976 Judicial Conference.

(25) Approved the study committee and seminar topics for the 1977 Associate Judge Seminar.

(26) Selected the panel members for the optional Thursday evening session at the 1976 Judicial Conference.

(27) Approved the 7th Annual Institute on Law, Psychiatry and the Mentally Disordered Offender for attendance by Illinois judges.

(28) Considered various proposals for the improvement of the annual Conference and annual Associate Judge Seminar.

(29) Approved the creation of a sub-committee to study the problems of search warrant processing.

(30) Selected topics for the 1977 Judicial Conference.

1976 JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

The twenty-third annual Judicial Conference was held in Chicago on September 8, 9 and 10, 1976. Chief Justice Daniel P. Ward opened the Conference with remarks in which he commented on the state-wide court facility study now in progress. Justice Ward explained that the purposes of the study are to obtain a complete inventory of existing court facilities; provide an assessment of needed facilities; provide an overall plan for development and improvement of court facilities; and to provide recommendations for short-term improvements and future development of our court facilities.

A special address on court administration was presented by the Director who, among other things, emphasized the responsibility of each judge for good court administration and the need for timely disposition of cases:

"Earlier I mentioned that judges are court administrators because they control the progression of litigation. Let me now turn to that matter. While I have briefly discussed the administrative significance of the chief judge—the most important person in the administration of the court's business is the trial judge.

"Each judge has an individual responsibility to put forth his best efforts to improve the efficiency of court

administration in his trial call, in his county, in his circuit, in other circuits, where necessary, and in the entire court system.

"Our Supreme Court has stated in general terms in its rules some of those individual responsibilities a judge should faithfully discharge in the performance of his judicial and administrative duties. Let me read them to you:

(1) The administration of justice should be speedy and careful;

(2) A judge shall devote full time to his judicial duties:

(3) A judge should be prompt in the performance of his judicial duties and should avoid habitual lack of punctuality or diligence which creates dissatisfaction with the administration of the court;

(4) A judge responsible for administration should organize the court with a view to the prompt and convenient dispatch of its business;

(5) A judge should so direct the trial of a case as to prevent unnecessary waste of time;

(6) A judge in considering applications for continuances should insist, but without unreasonableness, upon a proper observance by counsel of their duties so as to expedite the disposition of matters before the court.

(7) A judge should promptly certify the report of trial proceedings on timely application, so that appeals may be perfected.

"You will note that the aforesaid standards have a common concept—*time* and *the passage of time*. That concept which I exemplified at the beginning of my talk is, I believe, the primary reason why the discipline of court administration has evolved in recent years.

While it may be true that the passage of time—the delay between the filing of a case and its final disposition—has on occasion been overstressed by the legal academies, court administrators and judges, nevertheless, I think that it is the most important and most constant cause of dissatisfaction with the court system and the legal process."

Study Committee on Indemnity, Third Party Actions and Equitable Contributions

The Study Committee on Indemnity, Third Party Actions and Equitable Contributions, consisting of James A. Geroulis, Chairman, Calvin R. Stone, Vice-Chairman, James H. Felt, Alfred E. Woodward, Minor K. Wilson, Mel R. Jiganti, Liaison Officer, Professor Nina S. Appel and Professor Richard A. Michael, Reporters, presented its report to the entire conference. The committee had been appointed in 1975 to study and survey the status of Illinois law on indemnity, third party actions and equitable contributions. After the presentation of the report to the entire conference, the judges discussed the report in smaller groups and then voted on whether to adopt the committee's recommendations. The results of the balloting were then forwarded to the Executive Committee for its consideration. The report of the committee and results of

the balloting can be found in the 1976 Report of the Judicial Conference.

Educational Topics

The continuing judicial education portion of the Conference offered six topics:

- I. Evidence
- II. Recent Developments in Civil Law
- III. Professional Malpractice
- IV. Emerging Theories of Recovery, Punitive Damages, Emotional Distress, and Invasion of Privacy
- V. Recent Developments in Criminal Law
- VI. Family Law

1976 Associate Judge Seminar

The 1976 Associate Judge Seminar was held on March 31, April 1 and 2, 1976 in Chicago. The seminar was planned and organized by the Coordinating Committee which consisted of Joseph F. Cunningham, Chairman, Robert C. Buckley, Vice-Chairman, Ronald J. Crane, Rita B. Garman, Paul F. Gerrity, Meyer H. Goldstein, John A. Holtzman, Marilyn R. Komosa, Albert S. Porter, Charles L. Quindry, John P. Shonkwiler, and Daniel J. McNamara, Liaison Officer.

The Associate Judges were addressed by Chief Justice, Daniel P. Ward, who discussed the causes of dissatisfaction with the administration of justice and the eminent responsibility of judges in the maintenance and development of our society. In his remarks Justice Ward stated:

"People expect judicial officers to be endowed by certain humane qualities, certain virtues, and in a sense, they are. These qualities certainly include integrity, learning, fairness, compassion, understanding and dignity. And I suppose that a daily prayer that each of us might say is that when we leave the office we are temporarily occupying, it may be said that under us it became larger and greater because we held it."

A special feature of the Seminar was an address by psychiatrist, Dr. Bernard Rubin, on the development of a sense of justice.

Study Committee on Mental Health

The Study Committee on Mental Health, consisting of Lawrence Genesen, Chairman, Roland J. De Marco, Vice-Chairman, Cornelius J. Collins, John F. Michela, Robert J. Saunders, Joseph Schneider, Consulting Member, Rita B. Garman, Liaison Officer and Professor Donald H. J. Hermann, Reporter, presented its report to the entire Seminar. This committee had been appointed to survey the mental health law, current problems, proposals for reform and to make recommendations for consideration and possible approval by the Associate Judge Seminar. The judges then discussed the report in smaller groups and voted on the recommendations. The results of the balloting were then forwarded to the Executive Committee for its

consideration. The report of the Committee and results of the balloting can be found in the 1976 Report of the Judicial Conference.

Study Committee on Procedures in Quasi-Criminal And Ordinance Violation Cases And Discovery in Misdemeanor Cases

The Study Committee on Procedures in Quasi-Criminal and Ordinance Violation Cases and Discovery in Misdemeanor Cases, consisting of Thomas R. Doran, Chairman, Anthony S. Montelione, Vice-Chairman, Peter Bakakos, William C. Calvin, John B. Cunningham, Allen Hartman, Robert A. Nolan, John A. Ouska, John P. Shonkwiler, Liaison Officer, Joseph F. Cunningham, Ex-Officio, and Professor Vincent F. Vitullo, Consultant, presented its report to the entire seminar. The judges then discussed the report in smaller groups and voted on the recommendations. The results of the balloting were then forwarded to the Executive Committee for its consideration. The report of the Committee and the results of the balloting can be found in the 1976 Report of the Judicial Conference.

Educational Topics

The continuing education portion of the Seminar consisted of five topics:

- I. Evidence
- II. Recent Developments in the Law
- III. Motion Practice
- IV. Sentencing and Probation
- V. Forcible Entry and Detainer and Supplementary Proceedings

1976 New Judge Seminar

The Illinois Judicial Conference conducted its fifth seminar for new judges on December 8, 9 and 10, 1976 in Chicago. The seminar was attended by over 100 judges who had been elected or appointed since January of 1974. The program consisted primarily of lecture and discussion of the following topics:

- I. Videotape: *Trial Chronology*, produced by the American Academy of Judicial Education
- II. The Illinois Judicial System: Its Structure and Operation - Hon. Roy O. Gulley
- III. Opportunities and Responsibilities of Public Service - Dr. Carl S. Winters
- IV. Judicial Ethics - Panel Discussion
- V. Evidence
- VI. Criminal Law and Procedure
- VII. Function and Authority of the Trial Judge

1976 REGIONAL SEMINARS

Criminal Law Seminars

During 1976, the Committee on Criminal Law for Illinois judges, consisting of Hon. Richard Mills, Chairman; Hon. Richard J. Fitzgerald, Vice-chairman; Hon.

William C. Calvin; Hon. Louis B. Garippo; Hon. John F. Hechinger; Hon. Alvin H. Maeys, Jr.; Hon. Keith F. Scott; Hon. Fred G. Suria, Jr.; Hon. Alfred E. Woodward; and Mel R. Jiganti, Liaison Officer, conducted its fifth series of regional criminal law seminars. Five seminars were conducted: January 30-31, at Carbon-dale; February 27-28, at Springfield; March 26-27, at Morris; April 23-24, at Rockford; and May 28-29, at Chicago.

The topics and faculty for these seminars were as follows:

Mental Health and Criminal Procedures

Hon. Robert L. Gagen

Hon. Fred G. Suria

Prof. Jerry L. Norton

Jury Selection Problems

Hon. Richard J. Fitzgerald

Hon. Wayne C. Townley

Prof. Vincent F. Vitullo

Pleas of Guilty

Hon. John F. Hechinger

Hon. John E. Sype

Prof. Robert E. Burns

A total of 136 judges (including faculty) attended the seminars.

Civil Law Seminars

During 1976 the Committee on Civil Law Seminars, consisting of Hon. Paul C. Verticchio, Chairman; Hon. George J. Schaller, Vice-chairman; Hon. Earl Arkiss; Hon. Nathan M. Cohen; Hon. Harry G. Comerford; Hon. Robert E. Hunt; Hon. Henry Lewis; and Hon. Roger H. Little, presented its fourth series of regional civil law seminars. Three seminars were conducted: April 30-May 1, at Mt. Vernon; May 14-15, at Champaign; and June 11-12, at Rockford.

The topics and faculty for these seminars were as follows:

What Every Trial Judge Should Know About Appeals—

Protecting The Record

Hon. John J. Stamos

Hon. Harold Clark

Prof. Richard Michael

Creditor and Debtor Rights and Duties

Hon. Myron Gomberg

Hon. Howard Lee White

Prof. Don Garner

Zoning Litigation

Hon. Robert E. Hunt

Hon. Raymond Berg

Prof. John McCormack

A total of 125 judges (including faculty) attended the seminars.

Committee on Judicial Education

Effective July 1, 1976, the Judicial Conference's newly created Committee on Judicial Education assumed the responsibility for sponsoring and coordinating all regional and specialized seminars.

During the second half of 1976 the Committee, consisting of Mel R. Jiganti, Chairman, George W. Unverzagt, Harry D. Strouse, Jr., Harry G. Comerford, and Paul C. Verticchio conducted two seminars.

Pursuant to the report of an earlier sub-committee on judicial education, the Committee on Judicial Education was formed and undertook to modify the program of regional seminars. Rather than presenting a large number of 1-1/2 day seminars, fewer seminars of longer duration and greater depth were adopted by the Committee. The new seminars are designed to present comprehensive and sophisticated treatment of selected basic legal topics. Correspondingly, the seminars have been increased to 3 days duration, and the reading materials are more extensive. Judges attending are expected to read the materials in advance and be prepared to actively participate in the sessions.

The topics of Civil Procedure, Civil Remedies and Criminal Law were selected for the 1976-1977 fall-spring seminars. Each topic was presented twice, once in Collinsville and once in Rockford.

During the fall of 1976, two of the new seminars were presented.

The first was held at Rockford on October 14, 15 and 16, 1976, with 40 judges in attendance. The topic and faculty for this seminar were as follows:

Civil Remedies

Hon. Allen Hartman

Professor Donald H. J. Hermann

Professor Vincent F. Vitullo

The second seminar in this series was held at Collinsville on November 11, 12 and 13, 1976, with 50 judges in attendance. The topic and faculty for this seminar were as follows:

Criminal Law

Hon. Louis B. Garippo

Professor Robert E. Burns

Professor James B. Haddad

Judicial Elections

Contested Election

The Illinois Constitution, Article VI, Section 12 (a) provides:

"(a) Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Judges shall be nominated at primary elections or by petition. Judges shall be elected at general or judicial elections as the General Assembly shall provide by law. A person eligible for the office of Judge may cause his name to appear on the ballot as a candidate for Judge at the primary and at the general or judicial elections by submitting petitions. The General Assembly shall prescribe by law the requirements for petitions."

The results of the November 2, 1976 judicial election were as follows (single asterisk (*) indicates that the successful candidate was a sitting judicial officer who was elected to a higher judicial office, and a double asterisk (**) indicates that the successful candidate was a Supreme Court appointee to fill a judicial vacancy):

Candidates Elected
Judge of Supreme Court

FIRST DISTRICT
(Vacancy of Thomas Kluczynski)
William G. Clark (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Walter Schaefer)
James A. Dooley (D., Chicago)

SECOND DISTRICT
(Vacancy of Charles Davis)
*Thomas J. Moran (R., Waukegan)

Candidates Elected
Judge of Appellate Court

FIRST DISTRICT
(Vacancy of Thaddeus Adesko)
*Nicholas J. Bua
(D., Melrose Park)

(Vacancy of Joseph Burke)
*James J. Mejda (D., Burr Ridge)

(Vacancy of Henry Burman)
Maurice Perlin (D., Northbrook)

(Vacancy of John Dempsey)
*Kenneth E. Wilson (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Joseph Drucker)
*David Linn (D., Skokie)

(Vacancy of Edward Egan)
*Philip Romiti (D., Hillside)

(Vacancy of Robert English)
*Helen F. McGillicuddy
(D., Chicago)

FOURTH DISTRICT
(Vacancy of Samuel Smith)
*Richard Mills (R., Virginia)

Candidates Elected
Judge of Circuit Court

FIRST CIRCUIT
Jackson County Only
(Vacancy of Everett Prosser)
Bill F. Green (D., Murphysboro)

Union County Only
(Vacancy of Paul Reese)
D. D. Bigler (D., Anna)

SECOND CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Randall Quindry)
Robert W. Whitmer (D., Robinson)

(Vacancy of William Eovaldi)
Robert S. Hill (D., Benton)

(Vacancy of Charles Jones)
**Albert W. McCallister
(D., Carmi)

THIRD CIRCUIT
Madison County Only
(Vacancy of Fred Schuman)
**Horace L. Calvo
(D., Granite City)

FOURTH CIRCUIT
Shelby County Only
(Vacancy of Robert Sanders)
William L. Turner (R., Shelbyville)

SIXTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Frederick Green)
**Harold L. Jensen (R., Urbana)

(Vacancy of Birch Morgan)
Robert J. Steigmann
(D., Champaign)

SEVENTH CIRCUIT
Macoupin County Only
(Vacancy of Francis Bergen)
**Joseph P. Koval (D., Staunton)

Sangamon County Only
(Vacancy of William Conway)
James T. Londrigan
(D., Springfield)

EIGHTH CIRCUIT
Brown County Only
(Vacancy of Edward Turner)
**David K. Slocum
(R., Mt. Sterling)

NINTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Keith Scott)
**William L. Randolph
(R., Macomb)

Henderson County Only
(Vacancy of Earle Kloster)
**Stephen G. Evans
(R., Gladstone)

TENTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of J. Richards)
**Stephen K. Covey (R., Dunlap)

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Leland Simkins)
**Luther H. Dearborn
(R., Bloomington)

Livingston County Only
(Vacancy of Milton Erlenborn)
**Charles E. Glennon (R., Dwight)

TWELFTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Robert Higgins)
*Charles P. Connor (R. Joliet)

(Vacancy of Victor Cardosi)
*John F. Michela (R., Kankakee)

FOURTEENTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Dan McNeal)
*Jay M. Hanson (R., Geneseo)

Mercer County Only
(Vacancy of Charles Carlstrom)
David Mason (D., Aledo)
Rock Island County Only

(Vacancy of Richard Stengel)
David DeDoncker (D., E. Moline)

SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Alfred Kirkland)
**Joseph M. McCarthy (R., Elgin)

(Vacancy of John Peterson)
Marvin D. Dunn (R., Batavia)
Kendall County Only

(Vacancy of Robert Seals)
**Wilson D. Burnell (R., Oswego)

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of Seely Forbes)
Philip G. Reinhard (R., Rockford)

EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of LeRoy Rechenmacher)
*Helen C. Kinney (R., Hinsdale)

(Additional Judgeship)
John J. Bowman (R., Oak Brook)

NINETEENTH CIRCUIT
(Vacancy of William Gleason)
*Roland A. Herrmann
(R., McHenry)

TWENTIETH CIRCUIT
St. Clair County Only
(Vacancy of James Gray)
Patrick J. Fleming (D., O'Fallon)

COOK COUNTY
(Vacancy of Charles Barrett)
**Earl Arkiss (D., Park Forest)

(Vacancy of Norman Barry)
**Garland W. Watt (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Abraham Brussell)
Vincent Bentivenga (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Daniel Covelli)
Thomas J. O'Brien
(D., Park Ridge)

(Vacancy of Wilbert Crowley)
*John J. Moran (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of William Daly)
*Thomas J. Cawley
(D., Park Ridge)

(Vacancy of Thomas Donovan)
Joseph Gordon (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Robert Downing)
**John J. Crown (D., Winnetka)

(Vacancy of Robert Dunne)
*Robert J. Dempsey (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Samuel Epstein)
Charles J. Fleck Jr. (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Hyman Feldman)
Thomas R. Fitzgerald
(D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Thomas Fitzgerald)
Allen A. Freeman (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Harry Hershenson)
Charles E. Freeman (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of F. Emmett Morrissey)
*Lawrence I. Genesen
(D., Glenwood)

(Vacancy of Harry Stark)
Albert Green (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Eugene Wachowski)
*Arthur N. Hamilton (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Harold Ward)
Monica D. Reynolds (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Alfonse Wells)
Lawrence P. Hickey (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Minor Wilson)
**Louis J. Hyde (D., Chicago)

(15 Additional Judgeships)
Mary H. Hooton (D., Chicago)
John A. McElligott (D., Chicago)
*Aubrey F. Kaplan (D., Chicago)
Arthur J. Cieslik (D., Chicago)
Jerome Lerner (D., Skokie)
*Francis J. Mahon (D., Oak Park)
*Howard M. Miller (D., Chicago)
*Marilyn R. Komosa (D., Chicago)
*Adam N. Stillo (D., River Forest)
R. Eugene Pincham (D., Chicago)
Mary Ann McMorro
(D., Chicago)

*Richard L. Samuels
(D., Flossmoor)
Gerald L. Sbarboro (D., Chicago)
Theodore M. Swain (D., Chicago)
*Anthony J. Scotillo (D., Chicago)

City of Chicago Only
(Vacancy of Felix Buoscio)
Philip J. Carey (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Norman Eiger)
Harold M. Nudelman
(D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Joseph Hermes)
*Marion W. Garnett (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of David Lefkovits)
*James L. Griffin (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of John Pavlik)
*Thomas J. Janczy (D., Chicago)

(Vacancy of Ben Schwartz)
**Roger J. Kiley Jr. (D., Chicago)

(10 Additional Judgeships)
William Cousins Jr. (D., Chicago)
*John H. McCollom (D., Chicago)
Sylvester C. Close (D., Chicago)
*William E. Peterson (D., Chicago)
*John F. Reynolds (D., Chicago)
**Raymond S. Sarnow
(D., Chicago)

*Raymond C. Sodini (D., Chicago)
James Traina (D., Chicago)

**Jose R. Vazquez (D., Chicago)
**Warren D. Wolfson
(D., Chicago)

Outside of City of Chicago Only
(Vacancy of Thomas Barrett)
Donald E. Joyce (R., River Forest)

(Vacancy of Norman Korfist)
Marion E. Burks (R., Evanston)

(Vacancy of Alvin Kvistad)
**John A. Nordberg (R., Golf)

(Vacancy of Anton Smigiel)
Robert L. Sklodowski
(R., Northbrook)

(5 Additional Judgeships)
Brian B. Duff (R., Wilmette)
Richard J. Petrarca (R., Flossmoor)
Romie J. Palmer (R., Blue Island)
Edward C. Hofert
(R., Mt. Prospect)
George M. Marovich
(R., South Holland)

Judicial Retention Election

The Illinois Constitution, Article VI, Section 12(d), provides that a Supreme, Appellate or Circuit Judge who has been elected to that office may file a declaration of candidacy to succeed himself. The names of judges seeking retention are submitted to the voters, separately and without party designation, on the sole question whether each judge shall be retained in office. A judge who seeks retention "runs on his record" and without opposition. The affirmative vote of three-fifths (60%) of those voting on the question is required to elect the judge to another term. On November 2, 1976, sixty-six judges stood for retention. All, except one, were retained in office. The results of the retention election are as follows:

	% of "Yes" Votes
SUPREME COURT JUDGE	
Third Judicial District	
Hon. Howard C. Ryan	80.2
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES	
First Judicial Circuit	
Hon. John Clayton	77.9
Hon. Peyton Kunce	75.1
Hon. William Lewis	78.1
Second Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Frank Hanagan	67.3
Third Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Joseph Barr	83.1
Hon. Harold Clark	82.8
Fourth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Daniel Dailey	72.5
Hon. Paul Hickman	73.1
Hon. Raymond Horn	73.3
Sixth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Rodney Scott	82.9
Hon. Albert Webber III	79.6
Seventh Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Harvey Beam	78.4
Eighth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Richard Mills	84.1
Hon. Richard Scholz	75.3
Ninth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Gale Mathers	80.8
Hon. Albert Scott	82.8
Tenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Robert Hunt	83.1
Hon. Calvin Stone	83.1
Hon. Ivan Yontz	82.7
Eleventh Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Wayne Townley Jr.	79.2

Thirteenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Thomas Clydesdale	75.3
Hon. Leonard Hoffman	82.0
Fourteenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Conway Spanton	80.9
Fifteenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. James Bales	83.7
Hon. John Moore	81.9
Sixteenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. John Krause	73.4
Hon. Carl Swanson Jr.	77.1
Seventeenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. William Nash	79.3
Eighteenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Phillip Locke	65.7
Hon. George Unverzagt	73.4
Hon. Alfred Woodward	76.9
Nineteenth Judicial Circuit	
Hon. Harry Strouse Jr.	77.7
Hon. Lloyd VanDeusen	78.6
Cook County Judicial Circuit	
Hon. L. Sheldon Brown	74.7
Hon. Nicholas Bua	78.6
Hon. Archibald Carey Jr.	79.6
Hon. Robert Collins	81.0
Hon. Harry Comerford	76.0
Hon. Irving Eiserman	76.0
Hon. Paul Elward	63.0
Hon. Philip Fleischman	78.7
Hon. James Geocaris	79.1
Hon. Jacques Heilingoetter	78.6
Hon. Reginald Holzer	80.0
Hon. Harry Iseberg	61.8
Hon. Mel Jiganti	78.3
Hon. William Kane	80.0
Hon. Anthony Kogut	79.8
Hon. Frank Machala	77.9
Hon. Nicholas Matkovic	74.8
Hon. John McGury	79.1
Hon. James Murray	77.7
Hon. Benjamin Nelson	75.6
Hon. Donald O'Brien	68.6
Hon. Wayne Olson	76.4
Hon. Maurice Pompey	78.3
Hon. Joseph Power	58.8
Hon. Edith Sampson	61.9
Hon. George Schaller	77.0
Hon. Chester Strzalka	60.1
Hon. Fred Suria Jr.	78.8
Hon. Vincent Tondryk	77.8
Hon. Raymond Trafelet	78.1
Hon. Kenneth Wilson	80.4
Hon. Joseph Wosik	75.5

It should be observed that Judge Richard Carter, Twentieth Judicial Circuit, filed a declaration of can-

didacy to succeed himself (that is, to be retained in office) but withdrew the declaration before the election. Effective December 6, 1976, he retired as a circuit judge.

The 1975 report related that in the case of *Lefkovits, et al v. State Board of Elections*, 400 F. Supp. 1005 (N.D. Ill. 1975), a three judge federal panel upheld the 60% affirmative vote requirement of the Illinois Constitution for retention in judicial office. An appeal was filed in the U.S. Supreme Court (No. 75-758) in late 1975. On February 24, 1976, the U.S. Supreme Court, by summary action, affirmed the judgment below. 44 L.W. 3463.

Federal Funding of State Court Programs

During 1976, the U. S. Congress extended the life of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for another three years. Since its inception in 1968, the LEAA, through a system of state planning agencies in each state, has awarded grants of funds for the purpose of improving law enforcement and criminal justice, under the federal Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

The largest percentage of federal funds has been awarded to law enforcement and correctional agencies. Grants to the courts were generally minimal in most states. The principal reason for this low level funding of the courts seems to have been a reluctance on the part of the various state court systems to accept funding from a state planning agency created and controlled by the executive branch of the state government. In an effort to correct this situation and encourage greater court participation, the Crime Control Act of 1976 included some significant provisions relating to the state courts. Among these new provisions are the following:

1. The state planning agency must include as judicial members, at a minimum, the chief judicial officer or other officer of the court of last resort, the chief judicial administrative officer of the state, and a local trial court judicial officer.
2. Any executive committee of a state planning agency must include in its membership the same proportion of judicial members as the total membership of the state planning agency.
3. Establishment of a judicial planning committee for the preparation of an annual state judicial plan which shall:
 - (a) establish priorities for the improvement of the courts of the state;
 - (b) define, develop and coordinate programs and projects for the improvement of the courts of the state; and
 - (c) develop an annual state judicial plan for the improvement of the courts of the state to be included in the state comprehensive plan.
4. The judicial planning committee shall submit to the state planning agency its annual plan for the improvement of the courts of the state. Except to

the extent that the state planning agency determines that such a plan or part thereof is not in accordance with the federal act, is not in conformance with, or consistent with, the statewide comprehensive plan, or does not conform with the fiscal accountability standards of the state planning agency, the state planning agency shall incorporate such plan in the state comprehensive plan.

Although Illinois has had a judicial planning committee (Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs) since 1970 and has participated in the Crime Control Act program through the acceptance of grants for various court programs, the changes indicated above should serve to give the courts a greater voice in how the federal funds might best be used to meet the needs of the Illinois judicial system.

Court Facility Improvement

In his 1975 report to the General Assembly, the Chief Justice pointed out the need for court facility improvement in many of our counties. Among other things, he stated:

"While this is not to say that every county has neglected its courthouse needs—indeed, an appreciable number has provided new facilities or are in the process of doing so—the lack of adequate court facilities in many areas is a major handicap to the effective administration of our judicial system.

"It is particularly distressing to realize that millions of dollars in federal money have been allocated to Illinois in recent years which, if it could have been used for the priority programs identified by our court, could have made significant inroads in dealing with these problems. Our court has consistently maintained that federal funds allocable to the courts to improve the administration of criminal and juvenile justice could most fruitfully be applied to funding capital improvements—building, repairing and remodeling courthouses."

As a first step toward meeting the need to provide adequate court facilities, the Administrative Office, during 1976, applied for and was awarded the sum of \$150,000 for the first phase of a courthouse facility study of all 101 downstate counties. The scope and objectives of this project are set out in greater detail in the following excerpts from the grant application filed with the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission.

"The problem of inadequate court facilities has concerned Illinois judges for many decades. Not until 1963, however, was an organized effort made to look at facility needs. In anticipation of the unification of the court system, a Supreme Court Committee on Courthouses and Related Court Facilities in Downstate Illinois was appointed that year. Assisted by Professor Rubin G. Cohn of the University of Illinois College of Law as Secretary, the Committee was directed to appraise the adequacy of the physical facilities of all courts then existing: circuit, county, probate, city, town,

village, municipal, and justice of the peace; to consider how those facilities might be allocated among the new judiciary; to recommend improvements needed, and to investigate capital funding possibilities.

"The Committee reported its preliminary findings and conclusions to the 1963 Illinois Judicial Conference. (See 1963 Annual Report of the Illinois Judicial Conference, pages 79-102.) After describing facility conditions in detail, the Committee stated flatly that courtrooms and related facilities in most of 101 downstate counties were seriously deficient when measured by minimum acceptable standards, and that in all such counties some measure of improvement was needed.

"The Committee continued its work in 1964, reporting that substantial improvements had been made or were in progress in a few counties (Peoria, Sangamon, Will, Alexander, and Calhoun), but little or no effort had been made to upgrade facilities in most counties downstate. (See 1964 Annual Report of the Illinois Judicial Conference, pages 181-196).

"The Committee was disbanded in 1964, and the subject was dormant as a broad-scale issue until 1972, when William G. Bohn, then a member of the ILEC staff, again surveyed downstate court facilities in connection with a research paper he prepared for the Institute for Court Management (See William G. Bohn, Illinois Courtrooms 1972, published by the Illinois Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs with funds awarded by ILEC).

"Mr. Bohn's work again focused attention upon grossly inadequate court facilities in many counties. Concerning the state of facilities, Mr. Bohn said (at page 4):

'Generally speaking, it would have to be said that the majority of the courtrooms within the State of Illinois provide an inadequate atmosphere for the proper dispensing of criminal or civil justice. The majority of courtrooms, while they might have been remodeled within the last 10 to 12 years, still would leave the viewer with the impression that an old, dark, dingy room was the stage for the proceedings....'

"An analysis of courthouse longevity prepared by the 1963-64 study committee indicated that the majority of courthouses dated from the 19th Century:

Pre - 1900	62
1900 - 1940	30
1940 - 1963	9
Total	101

"Mr. Bohn updated that survey and revised the distribution to include recent remodeling efforts. He found the following changes:

Pre - 1900	6
1900 - 1940	18
1940 - 1963	9
1964 - 1972	68
Total	101

"As the later information indicates, some work has been done since 1963 in a majority of the courthouses. A few, such as Lake and St. Clair Counties, are new. The others have been refurbished to a greater or lesser

extent, but the work has been piecemeal, and more of a crisis response than an organized, well-conceived attempt at facility planning.

"The later information also indicates that Illinois judges have persisted in their efforts to obtain adequate facilities, and continue to do so today. Minimal results and inaction can be traced to a variety of reasons:

In some counties, voters have refused to approve bond referenda which would provide the funds for construction or remodeling.

In some counties, the governing bodies are unwilling, disinterested, or hostile.

In other counties, particularly those south of Springfield, tax resources are not sufficient to pay the cost, even on a long-term basis.

Because of ILEC's moratorium on construction, grant funds available from LEAA cannot be used where needed.

"Meanwhile, the caseload experience of the courts has aggravated the problem. In 1964, for example, the 20 Judicial Circuits downstate reported 632,411 new cases filed during the year: 49,267 criminal, 159,713 civil, and 423,431 municipal.

"By 1974, however, the caseload had increased by 73 percent. New filings totaled 1,095,057 cases: 104,457 criminal cases (112 percent increase), 210,305 civil cases (32 percent increase), and 780,295 municipal cases (84 percent increase).

"As a result of continuing discussions within the judiciary, the Director of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts determined that the facility problem would have to be brought under control. He asked ILEC for funding to support a comprehensive study of facilities and facility needs. ILEC approved the concept as a two-year project and allocated the first increment of funding in the State's 1976 plan.

"With funding potentially available, the Director submitted the concept to the Supreme Court of Illinois and obtained the Court's approval and authorization to seek funds.

"To initiate the competitive bidding process, a Request for Proposal was prepared, approved by the Director, and submitted to and approved by the Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs on February 13, 1976. The RFP was sent to prospective bidders later in February and in early March.

"The bidder's list was composed of consultants recommended by the Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project of the American University Institute for Advanced Studies in Justice (the Project was contacted upon advice of LEAA Region V office), and of consultants who had communicated directly with the Administrative Office.

"The list included the following firms and organizations:

Touche, Ross and Company, Chicago
SUA, Incorporated, Los Angeles
Space Management Consultants, Inc., Honolulu
Architectural Planning Research Associates, Washington, D.C.

PBA Associates, Champaign
Real Estate Research Corporation, Chicago
Arthur Andersen and Company, Chicago
National Clearinghouse on Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture

"By the final submission date, March 22, 1976, proposals had been received from the following five consultants, listed in descending bid order:

SUA, Incorporated	\$452,367
Real Estate Research Corporation	\$300,000
National Clearinghouse on Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture	\$296,016
PBA Associates	\$291,835
Space Management Consultants, Inc.	\$277,000

"At the request of the Director, the Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs reviewed the bids on April 9, 1976 and recommended selection of Space Management Consultants, Inc., as qualified lowest bidder.

"Subsequent to the April 9, 1976 review by the Committee, Paltiel J. Bach of PBA Associates, by letter dated April 23, 1976, asked the Committee for leave to amend his proposal, which amendment resulted in a reduction of his bid price to \$266,935.

"On May 10, 1976, Walter Sobel, FAIA and Associates submitted a proposal to the Administrative Office. Prices were quoted for two options, one at \$899,558, and the other at \$569,504.

"The Director again referred the matter to the Committee for its further consideration. At the meeting of May 14, 1976, the Committee reaffirmed its recommendation of April 9, 1976. The Director thereupon selected Space Management Consultants, Inc. as project consultant, contingent upon the availability of funds from ILEC.

Scope of the Project

"As envisioned by the Director, the study will extend to all space and facility needs of the Circuit Courts and the Appellate Courts in the four Judicial Districts downstate. The Circuit Court of Cook County and the Appellate Court, First Judicial District, are not included because Appellate Court facilities are adequate in the First District, and the facilities of the Circuit Court of Cook County were the subject of a previous study (Grant No. 364, awarded January 28, 1972).

"The project will address such space needs as courtrooms; chambers; offices for Clerks, State's Attorneys, Public Defenders, and court reporters; jury assembly and deliberation; attorney-client conferences; prisoner detention; file storage; administrative support; and probation activities.

"The study will include central and satellite facilities now in use or needed, and it will consider the present basis for capital funding and assess the availability and need of other funding opportunities.

"The study also will consider the desirability and

detriments of locating court facilities separately from county administration headquarters, and the feasibility of regionalizing court facilities and services.

"As a product of this work, the Supreme Court and the Director expect to obtain:

1. A complete inventory of all facilities now in use, central and satellite.
2. An assessment of facility needs projected through the year 2000.
3. A master plan for the development and improvement of court facilities.
4. Recommendations for short-term improvements which can be implemented quickly at minimal cost.
5. A comprehensive plan for long-term facility development.
6. A manual of space standards and design guidelines.
7. A catalogue of facility information."

Using this study as a guide, it is hoped that through a combination of local, state and federal funds, the court facilities in every Illinois county can be improved wherever necessary.

Cook County Court Facilities

Over the past several years Cook County has taken major steps to provide badly needed courtrooms in Chicago and the suburban districts.

The largest of the facility projects is the Criminal Court Complex at 2600 South California Avenue. The project is well underway with the remodeling of the existing Criminal Courts Building. The remodeling includes new lighting, air conditioning, and new courtroom fixtures and appointments.

A new Criminal Administration Building will be located to the south of the Criminal Courts Building. The new building will be on a site area of approximately 215,900 square feet. The building will have a cruciform configuration utilizing a service core to the side of the tower to facilitate maximum flexibility for internal space planning. The tower will be fourteen stories high with an additional two floors below ground. The new building will house the following offices which are currently in the Criminal Courts Building and Daley Center: Psychiatric Institute, Social Service, State's Attorney, Sheriff, Public Defender, Clerk of the Circuit Court, Jury Assembly Room, Adult Probation, Official Court Reporters and the Chicago Police Department.

Placing all of these agencies in the new building will free the first three floors of the Criminal Courts Building which will then be renovated to provide twenty new courtrooms.

(1st Municipal District)

Ten new courtrooms will be available with the completion of the new district headquarters for Chicago Police Areas 2 through 6. There will be two new courtrooms at each of these new area headquarters. The new facilities at areas four and six have been completed and are presently in use.

In addition, eleven new courtrooms will be available

in early 1977 in the remodeled ITT building at 1340 South Michigan Avenue.

(Municipal Districts 2-6)

The building program is not limited to the County Department and the 1st Municipal District. The county is also constructing facilities in suburban districts 2-6.

A mini-civic center has been completed and is in use in the 4th Municipal District in Maywood. The building contains ten courtrooms, 5 jury and 5 non-jury. In addition to the courtrooms there is space for the State's Attorney's Office, Office of the Public Defender, Clerk of the Circuit Court, Adult Probation, Court Reporters, Sheriff's Office, Law Library, the Psychiatric Institute, and Juvenile Probation.

A second mini-civic center is underway in the 6th Municipal District in Markham. It will contain 16 courtrooms and be modeled after the facility in Maywood.

New facilities are also in the planning stage for Municipal Districts 2, 3 and 5.

(Financing)

The above facility projects are unique because of the method being used to finance their construction. The usual method of financing government construction in the past has consisted of having the job estimated and seeking a bond issue for an amount slightly larger than the estimate to provide for any unexpected expenses. Interest on such bonds is paid on the full amount of the bond issue, although not all of the money is needed at the outset. Under the new method, five major Chicago banks will provide the funds on a loan basis as needed. Interest will be paid only on the money actually in use by the County. When the project is completed, an exact amount of money may be asked for in a bond issue, thus saving the County a large amount of money in interest payments. This unique system is being used in the building of the Criminal Court Complex and the 4th and 6th Municipal District buildings.

New Fourth District Appellate and Circuit Court Facilities

Senate Bill 1742, passed in the 1975 session of the 79th General Assembly appropriates over \$15 million for construction, land acquisition, planning, and site improvement, for a courts complex for Circuit and Appellate Courts and for paralegal and legal education in Springfield. It is hoped that the educational facilities might become a center for continuing judicial education.

Increased Judgeships

The number of Circuit and Associate Judges is provided by law (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch 37, §72.2 and ch. 37, §160.2). However, unless otherwise provided by law, the Constitution, Art. VI, Sec. 7, requires that there shall be at least one Circuit Judge from each county and, in Cook County, that there be at least twelve chosen at large from the area outside Chicago and at least thirty-six chosen at large from within Chicago.

During 1975, the General Assembly increased the number of Circuit and Associate judgeships.

HB-2625 (PA 79-843) made the following increases: (1) Cook County - 15 additional Circuit Judges to be elected at large; 10 additional Circuit Judges to be elected from within the City of Chicago; 5 additional Circuit Judges to be elected from the area outside the City of Chicago; and (2) 18th Judicial Circuit (Du Page County) - 3 additional Circuit Judges to be elected at large (2 of these 3 judgeships may not be filled until on or after July 1, 1977). All of these judgeships, with the exception of 2 in the 18th Circuit, were filled at the November, 1976 general election.

SB-0883 (PA 79-687) increased the number of additional Associate Judgeships from 40 to 50, to be filled as directed by the Supreme Court.

Conference of Chief Circuit Judges

Committee on Traffic Rules

At its January 16, 1976 meeting, the Conference reactivated the Conference Committee on Traffic Rules and appointed Chief Judge Harry D. Strouse, Jr., 19th Judicial Circuit, as a committee of one and chairman to study proposals and recommended changes in Art. V of the Supreme Court Rules. In addition, Judge Strouse was given the responsibility and authority to review and revise the Uniform Citation and Complaint form and advise the State Police of the decision of the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges in that regard. The decision was that the ticket be amended to provide in bold, red type on the face of the ticket "notice-the trial will not be given on the date set below-read the back of this ticket."

Mental Health Hearings

The Conference considered the problem of counties failing to reimburse Randolph County for the costs of processing mental health hearings when non-resident indigents are committed to the institution at Chester. It was suggested that Randolph County send a copy of all such bills to the Chief Judge of the circuit as well as to the county board. In that way every Chief Judge could keep track of which counties in his circuit are paying and which are not.

Attachment Act

The Conference considered the opinion of the U.S. District Court (N. Dist. E. Div., Case #74C3473, *Hernandez v. Finley*) wherein the court held the Illinois *Attachment Act* unconstitutional. A copy of that opinion and the order in the case were distributed to every Chief Judge. Copies of the opinion and order were also mailed to every clerk and sheriff in the state by the Administrative Office.

Jury Demand Fee

The Conference adopted a motion that the statute

be amended to add a civil jury demand fee of \$50 to the downstate clerk's fee statute.

Service in Cook County

Chief Judges agreed to cooperate in providing judges to Cook County for the coming year.

Uniform Citation and Complaint Form

At the February 20, 1976 meeting of the Conference copies of the proposed new Uniform Citation and Complaint form which was developed in cooperation with the State Police were distributed.

Appearance Date in Traffic Cases

The Conference was advised of the decision of the Appellate Court, 1st Dist., in *Village of Park Forest v. Fagan*, ___Ill.App.3rd___, 340 N.E.2d 596 (1975) which ruled that Supreme Court Rule 504, which provides in pertinent part that: "The date set by an arresting officer for a defendant's appearance in court shall not be less than 10 days but within 45 days after the date of an arrest, whenever practicable" must be strictly complied with and that the words "whenever practicable" mean within the 10 to 45 day period. In the absence of a ruling to the contrary by another District of the Appellate Court, it would appear that all circuits are bound to follow the *Fagan* case until the Supreme Court either reverses it or amends its rule.

The Conference adopted a motion that Rule 504 be amended to provide that the period be modified, as follows: "The first appearance date shall be not less than 10 days but within 60 days after the date of the arrest, whenever practicable."

On February 4, 1976, a petition for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court was filed in the *Fagan* case (Supreme Court docket #48241). The Supreme Court granted leave to appeal on March 25, 1976.

Speedy Trial Statute

The Conference adopted a motion that the Conference recommends to the General Assembly that the effective date of PA 79-842 (speedy trial statute) be amended to read July 1, 1977 (from July 1, 1976).

Supervision

The Conference discussed *People v. Breen*, wherein the Supreme Court held that an order of "supervision" is not an authorized order and recommended that the General Assembly consider the social merit of allowing orders of supervision.

State Reimbursement of Juvenile Probation Personnel

Judge Boyle appointed a committee comprised of Judge Scholz as chairman, with Judges Roberts and Yontz, and asked them to review the Conference's

standards on state reimbursement of probation personnel.

Procedures for Mailing Supreme and Appellate Court Opinions

It was unanimously agreed that the Clerk of the Supreme Court should be asked to send a copy of the slip opinion in each case to the trial judge and the Chief Judge of the Circuit. On the Appellate Court level, each Chief Judge will contact the Appellate Clerk in his District and ask for the appellate opinions in cases that arose in his circuit.

Jury Certificates

It was agreed that it would be a good idea for the Chief Judge to issue certificates to jurors for their service.

Property Taxes - Compromise Agreements

At its March 19, 1976 meeting there was a discussion of the binding effect on the court of compromise tax agreements worked out between the objector and the State's Attorney. It was concluded that the judge is not bound by an agreement which calls for him to sign an order. If he does not agree with the compromise, he may simply refuse to enter the order, thus requiring the parties to renegotiate.

Uniform Circuit Court Rules

The Chief Judges considered the proposed uniform rules and unanimously approved their content. The Conference unanimously voted to recommend to the Illinois State Bar Association Assembly that it approve the uniform rules submitted to it by its committee and unanimously agreed to recommend to the Supreme Court that the rules be adopted as Supreme Court Rules.

Probationary Appointment of Court Reporters

The Conference discussed the hiring of court reporters on a probationary period and the propriety of doing so. There was general agreement that such a procedure could and should be followed if there was any doubt about the competence of the appointee.

Consideration of Scope and Interpretation of Supreme Court Rule 70

At the April 23, 1976 meeting, the issue of how much political activity was permissible under Rule 70 for judges seeking retention was discussed. It was suggested in light of the dilemma created by the uncertainty of the situation, that it might be the proper prerogative of the Conference to pass a resolution covering the major areas of concern. However, no further action was taken on the issue of interpretation of Rule 70.

Report of the Committee on Changes in Article V

Judge Strouse distributed a new ticket form which had been developed by the committee in conjunction with representative police agencies. Following brief discussion, the Conference unanimously approved the proposed ticket form without modification.

Refusal of County Boards to Pay County Share of Judicial Salary

Judge Gulley reported that he was aware of twelve counties to date in which the county board has indicated an intention to refuse to pay the county share of judicial salaries. Judge Gulley simply noted the pendency of the problem and expressed his anticipation of possible legal action to compel the counties to make payment pursuant to the statute.

Burden of Recordation of Grand Jury Testimony

It was generally agreed that the statute requires the county to pay the cost of recording the grand jury proceedings and, therefore, the court should appoint a reporter when the State's Attorney fails to provide one. Of course, the State's Attorney should carry the primary burden in complying with the recording requirements of the statute.

Voice Writing

At its May 21, 1976 meeting, the Conference was presented with a demonstration of the voice writing techniques. The minutes of the meeting were taken in this fashion.

Ethics Committee Report

The Conference adopted a motion to the effect that the Supreme Court consider and take some action on the report of the Judicial Conference Study Committee on Ethics. This was done with the hope that it would result in some clarification of Rule 70.

Conditions on Bail

The Conference discussed the situation where a defendant commits another crime while out on bail. The question presented was whether the bail could be revoked. The Conference arrived at no conclusion on this question.

Report of the Subcommittee on Minimum Standards for Juvenile Probation Personnel

The Conference adopted a report of the subcommittee on standards and guidelines for who should receive state reimbursement for juvenile rehabilitative work.

Disposing of Decedent Estates

The Conference recognized the problem existing in

many circuits wherein old estates were not being closed. The Conference discussed various methods which might be used to insure that estates are closed on a timely basis.

Supervision

The Conference discussed the social merits of the disposition known as "supervision" then pending in the legislature. The Conference was generally in favor of "supervision" as a disposition in misdemeanor cases.

Court Facilities Study

The Conference was advised of the forthcoming, downstate court facilities study to be undertaken by the Administrative Office, through the use of a consultant. The project will be funded by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission.

At the September 8, 1976 meeting, Dr. Michael Wong, President of Space Management Consultants, Inc., was invited to bring the Chief Judges up-to-date on the court facilities study. He explained that employees of his office had started to do on-site studies of the court facilities and that the questionnaire previously sent out had been received, with the exception of four counties.

Holidays

The Conference adopted a motion adopting the holidays defined by Ill. Rev. Stat., 1975, ch. 98, paras. 18, 19, 20, 20a, 20b, 20c and 20d.

Mental Health

At Judge Gulley's request, the Chief Judges were asked to favorably consider the possibility of sending two judges from each circuit to participate in the 7th Annual Institute on Law, Psychiatry and the Mentally Disordered Defendant which was held in Carbondale on November 9, 10 and 11, 1976.

A motion was adopted that the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges endorse the program and will cooperate fully in sending judges to attend it.

Processing Search Warrants

A motion was adopted that the Chief Judges unanimously agreed to request that an appropriate committee of the Illinois Judicial Conference study the problems of search warrants and make a report and recommendation to the Judicial Conference.

Overweight Tickets

A motion was adopted that the overweight ticket forms presently used by the State Police be approved for use in all counties, except Cook County.

Expungement of Records

A motion was adopted that a committee of Chief

Judges should be appointed to study the problems surrounding the expungement statute, and to make recommendations for uniform procedures and forms. Judge Boyle appointed a committee consisting of Judges Scholz, Roberts and Strouse.

Allowable Conditions for Probation

Judge Boyle appointed a subcommittee consisting of Judges Bales, Clark and McCullough to study the matter of discretionary probation conditions and to report back to the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges at the earliest opportunity.

Clerk's Fees

Judge Gulley reported on the passage of S.B. 1560. Among other things, the Bill provides a \$10 clerk's fee for "marriages in court." Some clerks believe this means that whenever a person is married by a judge, the clerk is entitled to a fee of \$10, in addition to the \$10 fee payable to the marriage fund under Supreme Court Rule 41. Judge Gulley expressed his opinion that this was an erroneous interpretation of that statute.

The clerk's fee for minor traffic, conservation or ordinance violation cases has been raised from \$5 to \$10, with no provision being made to amend either Supreme Court Rule 551 or the Uniform Traffic Ticket. There will be considerable confusion in the distribution of fees and fines until those changes can be made. In addition, the fee for a traffic offense case when a court appearance is required has been raised from \$10 to \$15.

Attorney Fees for Representing Indigents in Juvenile Cases

There was general discussion concerning the measure of fees to be paid to an attorney appointed to represent a juvenile in a delinquency matter. It was generally agreed that the fees for representing a juvenile on a delinquency petition should be calculated in the same way as are fees paid to an attorney who represents an indigent criminal defendant.

Court Holidays

At its October 15, 1976 meeting, the Conference adopted a motion that any State holiday defined in Chapter 98 which falls on a Saturday will be celebrated as a court holiday on the preceeding Friday.

Attorneys Fees

The Conference generally discussed the setting of attorneys fees in cases where the court is required to approve the fee. It was generally agreed that an hourly basis was preferable to a percentage basis for setting the attorneys fees. In criminal cases it was agreed that the statutory amounts should be adhered to when setting fees.

Continuing Legal Education Policy

The Conference was advised that the Illinois Institute for Continuing Legal Education has forwarded to Judge Gulley a new policy concerning judges' attendance at Institute Programs: Judges may attend Institute programs on a complimentary basis. However, if they wish to receive the materials sold in connection with the seminar, they must be purchased at the regular purchase price. Judges need not pre-register for any course. They need only appear at the seminar registration desk, identify themselves as members of the judiciary and be admitted.

Department of Corrections

Mr. Madden advised the Conference that he received a letter from Lawrence X. Pusateri, one of the attorneys for the Department of Corrections in which he asks the Chief Judges to discuss the problem the Department is having in cases in which inmates are unable to obtain from the clerks of various courts a record of credit they have for their county jail time. Mr. Pusateri reminds the Conference that Section 1005-4-1(d) of the Code of Corrections provides that:

"The clerk of the court shall transmit to the Department the number of days, if any, which the defendant has been in custody and for which he is entitled to credit against the sentence, which information shall be provided to the clerk by the sheriff."

The Chief Judges voted to have the Secretary advise Mr. Pusateri that the matter of clerks' failure to provide a report on the time served by defendants in a county jail was discussed by the Chief Judges and that each Chief Judge will attempt to insure that each circuit clerk conforms with the statute.

Mental Health - Criminal Procedure

Judge Boyle advised the Conference that Cook County had adopted general order 1-2.1 which reads as follows:

"VII. Criminal Division"

"The Criminal Division hears criminal actions and prosecutions commenced by indictment or information *and related matters arising under the Mental Health Code of 1967...*" (Emphasis supplied)

Under this revision to the general order, the same judge who hears the criminal case against a defendant alleged to be incapable of cooperating with counsel will also hear the civil commitment and determine whether the defendant is in need of hospitalization for further mental treatment.

Supreme Court Rule Changes

The Conference was advised of several Supreme Court Rule changes: Rule 214 the amendment merely adds testing or sam-

pling as a purpose for production of specified documents.

Rule 277(a) adds the word judgment before the word debtor and deletes certain language.

Rule 277(f) changes the method of calculating the time for termination of supplementary proceedings.

Rule 284(a) increases mailing fee from \$1.50 to \$2.25 for each defendant served in small claims cases.

Rule 330(a) requires the Circuit Court Clerks to transmit a copy of the notice of appeal to the court to which the appeal is being taken within five days after the filing of the notice of appeal.

Rules 315(b), (g), and 376(a) deal with extensions of time in appellate procedures.

Rule 412 adds to the information a criminal defendant is entitled to at discovery.

Rule 413 requires a defendant relying on alibi defense to disclose the place where he maintains he was at the time of the offense.

Lawyers Publicizing Commencement of Disciplinary Proceedings Against Judges

The Conference adopted a motion to propose to the Supreme Court the adoption of a rule which would read substantially as follows:

"No attorney shall directly or indirectly make public the filing or the intention to file a complaint with the Judicial Inquiry Board, unless and until the Judicial Inquiry Board has filed a complaint with the Courts Commission."

Bail on Minor Traffic Offenses

After some discussion the Conference moved to recommend to the Supreme Court that bail in all minor traffic offenses, under Supreme Court Rule, be raised to \$35.

Article V

At its November 19, 1976 meeting, Judge Strouse, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Consider Revision of Article V of the Supreme Court Rules, reported on the meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. He reviewed the committee's activities and the changes it would be recommending in Article V.

Uniform Mittimus

Judge Boyle reported that William Gainer, Esq., Counsel to the Circuit Clerk of Cook County will look into the possibility of creating a uniform mittimus form and report back to the Chief Judges at his earliest convenience.

Jury System

Judge Boyle briefly explained the jury selection system being used in Houston, Texas and Detroit, Michigan. In Houston, a juror is called and, if selected to serve on a jury he is free to go home after comple-

tion of service on the first jury on which he is sworn. If he is questioned on *voir dire* for a jury, but is rejected for any reason, he is also free to go. There is no set period of time for which jurors are called. In Detroit, a similar system is used except that a juror must remain for at least one full day even if rejected for more than one jury during that day.

Court Reporters' Transcript Fees - Both Indigent and Non-Indigent Cases

The Conference discussed the problem of whether it is necessary for court reporters to attend the arraignment for every accused who, upon conviction, may be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary and shall take the plea or change of plea, the admonishments given by the court, and the inquiries made by the court on matters required by Rules 401 and 402 of the Supreme Court, and transcribe these notes. No consensus was reached.

Error and Omission Insurance Coverage for Circuit Clerks

The Conference discussed the question of whether or not the statutory \$5,000 fidelity bond (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975, ch. 25 §4) required of clerks of the circuit court is adequate. It was observed that the amount in the statute is a minimum. There is no question that the judges of the court can raise that amount if they wish. There was general consensus that the fidelity bond required of the clerk should reasonably reflect the responsibility that officer has for handling the court's money and his responsibility to litigants.

Article V

At its December 2, 1976 meeting, Judge Strouse presented the final draft of the proposed revisions to Article V of the Supreme Court Rules.

CHIEF JUDGES (as of December 31, 1976)

Circuit	Name
1st	Hon. John H. Clayton
2nd	Hon. Philip B. Benefiel
3rd	Hon. Harold R. Clark
4th	Hon. Bill J. Slater
5th	Hon. Ralph S. Pearman
6th	Hon. Rodney A. Scott
7th	Hon. Byron E. Koch
8th	Hon. Richard F. Scholz, Jr.
9th	Hon. Daniel J. Roberts
10th	Hon. Ivan L. Yontz
11th	Hon. John T. McCullough
12th	Hon. Michael A. Orenic
13th	Hon. William P. Denny
14th	Hon. Paul E. Rink
15th	Hon. James E. Bales
16th	Hon. Ernest W. Akemann

17th	Hon. John E. Sype
18th	Hon. George W. Unverzagt
19th	Hon. Harry D. Strouse, Jr.
20th	Hon. Joseph F. Cunningham
Cook County	Hon. John S. Boyle

Compulsory Retirement of Judges

Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 37, §23.71 et seq. provides for compulsory retirement of judges upon the attainment of age 70. Although this statute was enacted in 1965, it has affected only a few judges thus far because it contained a delayed effective date as to judges in office who had not served long enough to qualify for full pension benefits. However, in 1976 a number of sitting judges attained compulsory retirement status. Two Supreme Court Justices, five Appellate Court Justices, twenty-two Circuit Judges and six Associate Judges were affected.

The full text of the compulsory retirement statute is as follows:

“23.71 Automatic retirement—Conclusion of pending matters. §1. A judge is automatically retired on the first Monday of December next after the general election at which members of the General Assembly are elected immediately following the attainment of age 70 of such judge. Such judge shall conclude all matters pending before him unless the Supreme Court makes other provisions for the disposition of such matters.

23.72 Continuance in office—Conditions—Date of retirement. §2. The provisions of Section 1 of this Act are suspended, however, with respect to any judge in office on the effective date of this Act. Such judge may continue to serve until the occurrence of one of the 3 following dates whichever occurs last: (1) January 1, 1976; or (2) the date upon which such judge completes 18 years of judicial service in courts of record including all such service rendered prior to, on, and after the effective date of this Act; or (3) the date upon which such judge reaches age 70. The provisions of Section 1 of this Act are also suspended as to any judge in office on June 30th, 1973 who cannot fulfill the minimum eligibility requirements under the Judges Retirement System of Illinois, Article 18 of the Illinois Pension Code, on the day of his becoming age 70, but who can do so by remaining in office after age 70 for the balance of his current term.

“Upon reaching the date provided in this Section 2, whichever is appropriate, such judge is retired on the first Monday in December next after the general election for members of the General Assembly occurring immediately after such retirement date except that such judge shall complete all matters pending before him unless the Supreme Court makes other provisions for the disposition of such matters.”

The Courts Commission

In prior annual reports to the Supreme Court, particularly the *1975 Annual Report*, the history and course of judicial discipline in Illinois were extensively

related and will not, therefore, be repeated here. Since July 1, 1971, disciplinary proceedings against judicial officers have been bifurcated: the Judicial Inquiry Board, composed of nine members, which includes four lay-persons and three lawyers appointed by the Governor, and two circuit judges appointed by the Supreme Court, conducts investigations against judges, files formal voted complaints against judges with the Courts Commission, and prosecutes the voted complaints before the Courts Commission. The Courts Commission, composed of five judges, is limited to hearing the complaints filed by the Judicial Inquiry Board, to making findings, and to entering dispositive orders of dismissal or of imposition of sanctions. Upon a finding against a respondent-judicial officer, the Courts Commission, after notice and public hearing, may “remove from office, suspend without pay, censure or reprimand a Judge or Associate Judge for willful misconduct in office, persistent failure to perform his duties, or other conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice or that brings the judicial office into disrepute, or . . . to suspend, with or without pay, or retire a Judge or Associate Judge who is physically or mentally unable to perform his duties.” Ill. Const. art. VI, §15(e).

The judicial officers who have been appointed as members of the judicial disciplinary entities are, as of December 31, 1976:

Appointed by the Supreme Court to the Judicial Inquiry Board

Circuit Judge Walter P. Dahl, Cook County
Vacancy created by the retirement of Circuit Judge John T. Reardon, Eighth Judicial Circuit. It is anticipated Judge Reardon's vacancy will be filled in January of 1977.

Appointed by the Supreme Court to the Courts Commission

*Supreme Court Judge Joseph H. Goldenhersh (chairman)
*Circuit Judge Robert E. Hunt, Tenth Judicial Circuit
*Circuit Judge James C. Murray, Cook County
Circuit Judge Rodney A. Scott, Sixth Judicial Circuit (alternate)
Circuit Judge Arthur L. Dunne, Cook County (alternate)

Appointed by the Appellate Court to the Courts Commission—

*Appellate Court Judge Edward C. Eberspacher, Fifth Judicial District
*Appellate Court Judge John J. Stamos, First Judicial District
Appellate Court Judge Glenn K. Seidenfeld, Second Judicial District (alternate)
Appellate Court Judge Thomas A. McGloon, First Judicial District (alternate)
*Present members of the Courts Commission.

Pursuant to rule of the Commission, the Administrative Director, Roy O. Gulley, is the Commission secretary.

During 1976, four formal complaints were filed by the Judicial Inquiry Board with the Courts Commission; one complaint filed in 1975 was adjudicated in 1976; and one complaint filed in 1976 was carried over into 1977. The Commission, upon a finding against a respondent-judge and after a public hearing, may discipline the judge by removal from office, suspension with or without pay, retirement, censure or reprimand. The 1976 activities of the Illinois Courts Commission were:

(1) Complaint 75-CC-4 alleged that a Cook County associate judge brought the judicial office into disrepute by engaging a married woman in a private conversation in the respondent's chambers and there made a proposal "demeaning" to the woman, to the respondent and to his judicial office.

Prior to a hearing by the Commission, the respondent resigned, effective December 31, 1975, from judicial office. The Commission dismissed the complaint on January 16, 1976.

(2) Complaint 76-CC-1 charged a certain associate judge of the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit with willful misconduct in office, conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice and conduct which brought the judicial office into disrepute in that he proceeded to an apartment building in which he had an ownership interest, and there he, armed with a handgun, apprehended a former tenant who was creating a disturbance. The associate judge then caused the police to be summoned, caused the said tenant to be arrested for criminal trespass, and caused him to be taken to the police station where the associate judge noticed that the said tenant had in his possession a key to the apartment building. The said tenant was charged with theft, and the associate judge then had the said tenant execute a plea of guilty. Thereafter, in the police station, the associate judge held court, tried the said tenant on the plea and sentenced him to eight months of incarceration. All of the above events occurred between 11:00 P.M. and midnight.

On April 26, 1976, the Commission determined that the charges were proved "by clear and convincing evidence" and ordered the respondent-judge removed from office.

(3) Complaint 76-CC-2 alleged that a Cook County circuit judge brought the judicial office into disrepute with willful misconduct in office and conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice by setting excessive bail in misdemeanor cases, continuing motions to reduce bail until the day of trial and excluding a defense attorney from the courtroom.

On September 13, 1976, the Commission held that on the "whole record, the Commission finds that the charges have been proved by clear and convincing evidence" and ordered the respondent suspended for one month without pay.

(4) Complaint 76-CC-3 complained that the conduct of a certain circuit judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit was willful misconduct in office, prejudicial to the administration of justice and brought the judicial office

into disrepute; viz., he ordered male defendants convicted of traffic or related offenses to obtain haircuts as a condition of probation in violation of statute; and he ordered defendants convicted of misdemeanor and traffic offenses to surrender their driver's license to the court as a condition of probation and in lieu of the license, he caused to be issued to said defendants a certificate which contained language to the effect that the bearer of the certificate had posted his valid driver's license with the court.

On December 3, 1976, the Commission ruled, one member of the Commission filing a vigorous dissent as to the jurisdiction of the Commission to hear the case, that the respondent "be suspended for a period of one month" without pay.*

(5) Complaint 76-CC-4 charged a certain circuit judge of the Twelfth Judicial Circuit with willful misconduct in office, other conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice and conduct which brought the judicial office into disrepute in that he was discourteous to and inconsiderate of a young attorney who appeared before him and in that he appeared before the Judicial Inquiry Board and while under oath did make "willful, knowing and deliberate misrepresentations of fact."

The Commission is expected to set a hearing on the complaint during March of 1977.

During the period July 1, 1971 through December 31, 1976, the Judicial Inquiry Board had filed 22 formal complaints with the Courts Commission. The dispositions of the complaints by the Commission were as follows:

Respondents removed from office	- 3
Respondents suspended without pay	- 7
Respondents censured	- 3
Respondents reprimanded	- 4
Complaints dismissed	- 4
Complaint pending	- 1

The Judicial Inquiry Board in its *1975 Annual Report* and supplement states that since July 1, 1971 it had closed 605 files, of which 128 were closed during 1976. The report further states that each communication complaining about a judge's conduct is carefully examined; however, "relatively few of the communications justify further action by the Board" because persons "who have had a disappointing experience in the courts or have lost a case . . . are sometimes inclined to an exaggerated idea of the power of the Board to rectify what they regard as a miscarriage of justice".

Nevertheless, the power of the Board and the application of that power has caused some concern, particularly among the judiciary. That concern has been expressed by Justice Robert C. Underwood in a law review article, 47 *Notre Dame Lawyer* 247:

"While the creation of the Judicial Inquiry Board was opposed by the members of the Supreme Court as unnecessary, and as creating a potential threat to the independence of the judicial branch of government, I am sure that the members to be appointed will be selected with care and will be sincere, conscientious individuals, aware of the seriousness of their respon-

sibilities. It is their constitutional obligation to maintain the confidentiality of all complaints until such time as a formal charge, if warranted, is filed against a judge. A working knowledge of the judicial process will be imperative for the Board members if they are to distinguish between improper judicial conduct as opposed to mere dissatisfaction with a judicial ruling or opinion. While a potential threat to judicial independence has been created, I trust that will never become a reality. That independence can, in fact, be enhanced if the Board performs its duties in a responsible, impartial

and nonsensational manner.”

What the future holds for the judges of Illinois relating to the regulation of the judiciary is difficult to perceive. The overwhelming majority of judicial officers are men and women of high integrity, honesty, virtue and self-discipline for hard work and devotion to their judicial duties. Judges are human beings with the same virtues and failings of other professional people; but because they are public servants, they are rightly held to a high degree of trust and confidence.

*The jurisdiction of the Courts Commission in Complaint 76-CC-3 has been challenged by respondent in a petition for a writ of mandamus filed in the Supreme Court.

The Administrative Office

Introduction

The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (see Appendix B for historical development) is established pursuant to Article VI, Section 16 of the Constitution of 1970, to assist the Chief Justice carry out his duties in exercising the administrative and supervisory authority of the Supreme Court over all the courts.

The functions of the Administrative Office cannot be exhaustively delineated, for the Supreme Court's administrative authority encompasses every aspect of the judicial system. However, these functions can be generally described as including personnel, fiscal management, continuing judicial education, records and statistics, secretariat, liaison with the legislative and executive branches, management of court facilities and equipment, and research and planning. Within each of these categories fall the specific functions of the Administrative Office which are reported in greater detail in this report. It is interesting to note that the functions of the Administrative Office, as they have developed since 1959, correspond very closely to those established in the 1974 A.B.A. Standards Relating to Court Organization (Standard 1.41) for state court administrative offices:

"(1) Preparation of standards and procedures for the recruitment, evaluation, promotion, in-service training, and discipline of all personnel in the court system, other than judges and judicial officers.

(2) Financial administration of the system, including budget preparation and administration, accounting and auditing.

(3) Management of the court system's continuing education programs for judges, judicial officers, and non-judicial personnel.

(4) Promulgation and administration of uniform requirements concerning records and information systems and statistical compilations and controls.

(5) Secretariat, including acting as secretary to the judicial council and judicial conference and their committees, arranging meetings of the judiciary, disseminating reports, bulletins, and other official information, and rendering annual and other periodic reports on behalf of the court system.

(6) Liaison for the court system as a whole with the legislature and the chief executive, and with the bar, the news media, and the general public.

(7) Supervision of construction of major physical facilities and establishment of standards and procedures for acquisition of equipment, incidental facilities, and purchased services.

(8) Research for planning for future needs.

(9) Management of the staff of the central administrative office."

The Administrative Office is also responsible for the administration of several programs pursuant to specific Supreme Court rules: (1) temporary licensing of senior law students (Rule 711); (2) impartial medical expert program (Rule 215); (3) teller of elections of Associate

Judges (Rule 39); (4) secretary to the Judicial Conference (Rule 41); (5) custodian of judicial statements of economic interest (Rule 68) and (6) repository of Appellate and Circuit Court rules (Rule 21). Also, the Illinois Courts Commission has designated the Administrative Office as secretary in all proceedings before the Commission.

Personnel

The Administrative Office maintains two offices, the headquarters in Springfield and the other in Chicago.

During 1976, the staff of the Administrative Office totaled twenty-eight persons. In addition to the Director, the staff included the Deputy Director (attorney); four Assistant Directors (3 attorneys and 1 non-attorney); one Supervisor V; one Administrative Assistant I; one Administrative Assistant; one Assistant Supervisor; two Statisticians; two Accountants III; seven Accountants II; two Accountants I; one Secretary I; two Secretaries; one File Clerk; and one messenger.

Fiscal

The Administrative Office's unified accounting division was established on October 1, 1963. The organization of the accounting division served as the basis for transforming the former fragmented system of accounting for funds expended by the court system into an integrated system accountable for all funds appropriated by the General Assembly to the State judicial system. Upon the establishment of the accounting division, the Supreme Court appointed Jeanne Meeks as supervisor who, with the assistance of her staff, has maintained strict control of the disbursement of appropriated funds. The division is located in the Springfield office.

General Revenue funds appropriated to the Supreme Court which are monitored by the accounting division cover salaries for all judges, appellate law clerks, court reporters, clerks of the Supreme and Appellate Courts and related personnel. In addition, there are appropriations for payment of the operational costs for the Supreme and Appellate Courts, Administrative Office, Judicial Conference, Impartial Medical Program, travel for judges and court reporters, transcription fees, and other allied miscellaneous accounts. There are forty-two separate appropriations which, in Fiscal Year 1977, totaled \$44,029,529. Of this figure, \$36,398,644 was appropriated for judicial and related personnel salaries and \$8,464,514 for the operational costs of the previously identified judicial divisions.

It is interesting to note that of the total FY '77 State budget (\$10,026,000,000), the portion appropriated to the judicial system was only four-tenths of one percent. (See dollar chart.)

It is not possible to exhaustively define the many

duties of the accounting division, for the accounting procedures of documenting, verifying and summarizing are indeed numerous. The accounting division's primary function is to properly approve, audit, process and record all judicial expenditures drawn on each of the forty-two appropriations.

Though the division operates as a unit, its functions can be categorized as budget, payroll, vouchers, insurance, property control, fiscal reports, deposits of funds, and finally, reconciliation of the division's ledgers as opposed to Comptroller printouts.

A brief description of each of the previously mentioned components will identify the accountability of the division.

Some of the rudiments in computing annual budgets are perusing and comparing expenditures over a three year span, incorporating specific needs over and above the ordinary obligatory requirements, and applying the cost of living index wherever necessary. Each new budget is prepared when only three months of the current fiscal year have passed. Expenses incurred in the first month of a new fiscal year are generally not received for processing until the second month. This fact results in the availability of merely two months of expenses as a basis for accumulating supportive data for the preparation of the new budget.

Budget forms represent the anticipated funds which will be needed to operate the judicial system in the new Fiscal Year. Each appropriation is studied and carefully computed, using expenditures for past, current, and anticipated future costs as a barometer. Each line item within the total budget is calculated as nearly as possible for the exact amounts required. Requests in each of the line items for each appropriation are justified with a succinct written explanation which accompanies the completed budget forms. All budget forms, object code forms, back-up sheets, written justifications, etc. are arranged in book form. After much detailed compilation, the annual budgets for the Supreme Court and allied appropriations are finalized and delivered to the Bureau of the Budget. The completion date for submitting budgets to the Bureau of the Budget is December of each year.

The accounting division prepares the necessary appropriation legislation. Staff members of the Senate and House of Representatives review the budget carefully for the purpose of recommending reductions, approvals or disapprovals of every budgetary request contained within the total budget. Conferences are held with these staff members prior to the committee hearings. The Supervisor then appears with the Director before the appropriation committees of the General Assembly to provide information and answer questions relating to the proposed budget.

The payroll section computes all deductions affecting warrants such as Federal and State withholding tax, judicial and state employees' retirement, bonds, and state employees' insurance. This section adds new employees to respective payrolls, deletes resigned, retired, and deceased personnel on a semi-

monthly and monthly basis. Other payroll functions of the accounting division are to maintain payroll controls, registers, and ledgers, and make monthly entries in posting ledgers for each employee with a cumulative balance. Salaries for judicial and related personnel average \$2,650,000 monthly.

House Bill 2518 (PA 78-1283) amended the statute on judicial salaries (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 53, §§3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3), effective July 1, 1975, to provide a salary increase for judges. In addition to the increase, this amendment provided that a portion of the salaries of Circuit Judges and Associate Judges is to be paid by the respective counties. In single county circuits this portion is paid directly to the judges by the county. In multi-county circuits, however, the county portion is initially paid out of the State Treasury and the counties making up the circuit are required to reimburse the State Treasury, annually, on a pro-rata population formula. The statute requires the Administrative Office to compute the sums to be paid by the counties in each circuit. Prorating portions of judicial salaries is not new to the accounting division. However, this Act has expanded the procedure on a statewide basis and has generated a great deal of additional recordkeeping in the accounting division.

Although statutorily the fiscal year ends June 30th of each year, there is a three month extension of time to allow for payment of all encumbrances contracted prior to July 1st. This means that during the period July through September of each year, the need for careful accounting is greater as there are two fiscal years for which funds are being disbursed.

All vouchers submitted are categorized according to the fiscal year and are thoroughly checked against vendor records to avoid duplicate payment. Routinely, each voucher must be audited according to the administrative standards set within the office. Any discrepancies concerning statements or vouchers are corrected through correspondence or returned for correction. The pre-audit procedures are extensive and are applied before the voucher is processed for payment. The accounting division processes approximately 17,000 vouchers per annum. Included in this figure are vouchers for judges and court reporters travel expenses as well as transcription fee vouchers. Each of the travel vouchers is checked for proper charges for mileage, lodging, food, receipts and signatures. Transcription fees are audited pursuant to the number of transcript pages and are checked against previous vouchers to avoid duplicate payment.

Passage of the State Employees' Insurance Act mandates that all state employees are entitled to insurance coverage pursuant to the master policy on file with the Insurance Commission. Additional duties created by this statute fall within the division. Each employee's record must be perused monthly to establish age, which affects insurance rates. Accordingly, changes in rates automatically dictate adjustments in the payrolls. Also, requests for insurance claims must be handled in the division. There are detailed insur-

ance reports covering transactions under the various options contained in the types of health and life insurance for which each member has subscribed. These intricate reports are furnished to the Insurance Commission on a semi-monthly and monthly basis.

All equipment purchased with State funds must be procured in accordance with the State Property Act of Illinois. Tag numbers are affixed to each item, recorded and reported to the Property Control Agency promptly upon payment to the vendors. Monthly reports are reconciled and any discrepancy is pursued and corrected.

Each month all ledgers are balanced with internal controls and those figures are transferred in report form. Copies of the monthly report reflecting the expenditures from each appropriation are furnished to the members of the Supreme Court and the Director. The section of the report relating to each budgetary division in the judicial system is provided to its administrative head.

Subsequent to the close of business of each fiscal year, all ledgers and in-house records are closed and a final fiscal report is filed with the appropriate department. This report discloses the amount of the appropriation, expenditures, and lapses in the appropriation. This report, coupled with in-house statistics, also serves to aid in projecting costs for the forthcoming year.

Pursuant to statute, all cash received in the various departments is deposited in the State Treasury under its respective account number. Ledgers are maintained and all monthly reports are reconciled with the Comptroller and Treasurer. Typical examples of the intake of cash are filing fees, appearance fees, etc.

This division complies with the fiscal policies, accounting principles, controls, operating procedures and reporting requirements of the Comptroller's Unified Statewide Accounting System. Monthly printouts which are produced by the State Comptroller pertinent to

cash receipts, obligations, contracts, and appropriation expenditures are reconciled with the in-house records maintained in the accounting division.

The Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs was established in 1970 and designated as the principal agency within the Illinois judicial system to plan, coordinate, administer and supervise grant-funded programs designed to improve criminal and juvenile justice. Some of the current grants to the committee include judicial education, court personnel training, the operations of the committee and its staff, the Circuit Court Administrator-Pilot Project, and computer transcription of court reporter notes. Expenditures relating to these federal grants are processed within this division, records are maintained and reports furnished in compliance with the ILEC regulations on a monthly basis.

The Illinois Constitution of 1970 initiated a fundamental change in the auditing program for the State of Illinois. The new Constitution abolished the office of the Auditor of Public Accounts and established the office of the Comptroller and the office of the Auditor General.

The Auditor General is responsible for the post-audit function in state government and is mandated to do a financial audit of every state agency at least every two years.

In 1973, the Illinois General Assembly passed the Illinois State Auditing Act and expanded the concept of auditing. It includes not only financial and fiscal auditing but also performance and managerial auditing. Effectiveness and efficiency are the bywords of auditing today. It is no longer concerned simply with accounting, but more importantly, with accountability.

To date, the accounting division has maintained a high degree of efficiency and accountability for proper administration of funds and has received favorable audits entirely void of recommendations for amending its procedures.

FISCAL NOTE JUDICIAL AND RELATED PERSONNEL July 1, 1963 through June 30, 1977

Period	Appropriation (in millions of dollars)	Expended (in millions of dollars)
July 1, 1963 - June 30, 1965 73rd Biennium	\$16.3	\$14.7
July 1, 1965 - June 30, 1967 74th Biennium	\$27.4	\$24.5
July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1969 75th Biennium	\$35.0	\$32.7
July 1, 1969 - June 30, 1970 76th G. A. - 1st Half	\$23.1	\$20.1
July 1, 1970 - June 30, 1971 76th G. A. - 2nd Half	\$23.4	\$21.0
July 1, 1971 - June 30, 1972 77th G. A. - 1st Half	\$27.6	\$23.3
July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1973 77th G. A. - 2nd Half	\$27.8	\$26.0
July 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974 78th G. A. - 1st Half	\$29.2	\$27.8
July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975 78th G. A. - 2nd Half	\$39.6*	\$31.1
July 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976 79th G. A. - 1st Half	\$41.7	\$39.2
July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977 79th G. A. - 2nd Half	\$44.0	

*Includes Supreme and Appellate Court Clerks' budgets beginning July 1, 1974.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

Appropriated funds for Fiscal Year 1977 - in millions of dollars \$10,026.

INVESTING IN EDUCATION

3,374
33.7%

ALL OTHER PURPOSES

1,904
19%

INCOME SUPPORT

1,175
11.7%



TRANSPORTATION

1,938
19.3%

HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES

1,635
16.3%



JUDICIAL*
(44.0)
.4¢

*The cost of administering the Judicial System is .4 of 1 percent of the total State Budget for Fiscal Year 1977

Prepared by Jeanne Meeks

Teller of Elections

Supreme Court Rule 39 provides that a vacancy in the office of Associate Judge shall be filled by an elective process among the Circuit Judges. In general, the number of Associate Judges each circuit may have is determined by population (one Associate Judge for every 35,000 inhabitants in the circuit or fraction thereof) and by need. In the latter instance, the Chief Judge files with the Director a statement supporting the circuit's need for an additional Associate Judge, and the Director then makes a recommendation to the Supreme Court which may allocate an additional Associate Judge to the circuit. The "permissive" Associate judgeships are in addition to those authorized under the population formula, and the Supreme Court can authorize new Associate judgeships in those circuits where litigation is particularly heavy.

Once a vacancy exists in the ranks of Associate Judge, whether by death, resignation or authorization of additional Associate Judges, the Chief Judge notifies the bar of the circuit that a vacancy exists and that it will be filled by the Circuit Judges. Any Illinois licensed attorney may apply for the position by completing an application and filing it with the Chief Judge and the Director. In circuits having a population of more than 500,000, a nominating committee selects, from the applicants, twice as many names of qualified candidates as there are vacancies to be filled. The names of the applicants are certified to the Director, who then places the names on a ballot which is mailed to the Circuit Judges. The Director tabulates the ballots and certifies the results to the Chief Judge, maintaining the secrecy of the ballots. The applicant receiving the majority of votes is then declared appointed to the Associate Judge vacancy.

During 1976, the Director certified that the following persons had been selected as Associate Judges:

- 1st Circuit - Arlie O. Boswell, Jr.
Thomas W. Haney
- 3rd Circuit - William E. Johnson
- 9th Circuit - Richard C. Ripple
Charles H. Wilhelm
- 12th Circuit - Thomas M. Ewert
- 13th Circuit - Fred P. Wagner
James L. Waring
- 16th Circuit - James K. Marshall
Fred M. Morelli, Jr.
Richard Weiler
- 18th Circuit - Kevin P. Connelly
Robert A. Cox
Samuel Keith Lewis
James R. Sullivan
- 19th Circuit - Michael J. Sullivan
Alfonse F. Witt
- 20th Circuit - Robert A. Hayes
Milton S. Wharton
- Cook County - Clarence Bryant
Henry A. Budzinski
William J. Callahan
Robert J. Downey

Edward M. Fiala, Jr.
Charles C. Leary
Edward H. Marsalek
Michael E. McNulty
Nicholas T. Pomaro
Frank V. Salerno
Marjan Peter Staniec
Jack G. Stein
Frank G. Sulewski
Eugene R. Ward
Stephen R. Yates

Judicial Economic Statements

Supreme Court Rule 68 provides that the Administrative Director shall be the custodian of certain statements of economic interest which must be filed annually by Illinois judges. The rule provides that judges must file annually with the Director: "(1) a sealed, verified, written statement of economic interests and relationships of himself and members of his immediate family and (2) an unsealed, verified, written list of the names of the corporations and other businesses in which he or members of his immediate family have a financial interest."

The sealed statements shall be opened only by the Supreme Court or by the Illinois Courts Commission when specifically authorized by the Supreme Court for use in proceedings of the Commission. As to the unsealed statements, within 30 days after an order has been entered in any case, any party may request information concerning whether the most recent unsealed list of the judge entering that order contains the name of any specific person, corporation or other business which is a party to the case or which has an interest in its outcome as described in Rule 66.

Judicial Statistics

The Administrative Office collects, compiles and analyzes statistics relating to the number, kind and disposition of cases in the Illinois judicial system. The value of these court statistics lies in their ability to measure how well the court system is functioning in terms of the orderly and timely disposition of cases and to serve as the basis for administrative decisions. For example, the assignment of judges to heavier volume circuits and determining the need for more or fewer judges in a particular circuit are made possible by analyzing caseloads and the age of cases as revealed by the statistics. In addition to their use within the court system, the court statistics are of value to persons outside the court system who are interested in the social and economic implications of increases in various types of litigation.

The statistical reports currently maintained by the Administrative Office and published in this report are as follows:

Supreme Court

- (1) Number of New Filings
- (2) Number of Cases Decided With Full Opinions
- (3) Number of Petitions for Rehearing
- (4) Number of Petitions for Leave to Appeal
- (5) Number of Motions Disposed Of

Appellate Court

- (1) Trend of Cases
 - Number of Cases Pending at End of Year
 - Number of New Cases Filed
 - Number of Cases Disposed Of
 - Number of Cases Disposed of With Full Opinions
 - Gain or Loss in Currency
- (2) Cases Disposed Of
 - Affirmed
 - Reversed
 - Affirmed in Part
 - Modified
 - Rule 23 Orders
 - Without Opinion
 - Dismissed with Opinion
- (3) Time Lapse Between Date of Filing and Date of Disposition
- (4) Time Lapse Between Date Briefs Were Filed and Date of Disposition
- (5) Number of Opinions Written by Judges of the Appellate Court
- (6) Cases Disposed of Without Opinion

Circuit Courts

- (1) Ratio of Caseload Per Judge
- (2) Number of Cases Begun and Terminated (divided into 20 separate categories)
- (3) The Trend of All Cases
 - Cases Begun or Reinstated
 - Cases Terminated
 - Number of Law Jury Verdicts
 - Time Lapse Between Date of Filing and Date of Verdict and the Average Delay (in months) In Reaching Verdict
- (4) Disposition of Defendants Charged With Felonies
- (5) Sentences Imposed on Defendants Charged With Felonies

In addition to the above, more specific statistical reports are received and maintained with respect to the Circuit Court of Cook County, by division and department.

The Administrative Office also receives and maintains monthly reports from judges in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Law Division and Divorce Division and the 20 downstate circuits, which show the amount of time spent on their cases. Monthly reports showing the trend of cases in Cook County are issued, in addition to this annual report.

All the reports received from the circuits are analyzed for correctness and tabulated by Mr. Clarence Hellwig in the Chicago Office and Mr. Jerry Gott in the Springfield office.

Circuit Court Administrators

A steady increase in the volume of cases (civil and criminal) filed in the Illinois court system has placed burdens upon our courts unanticipated a generation ago. In addition to increased civil litigation, the courts have had to bear the brunt of a 150% increase in criminal cases in the last decade.

As the work of the courts has grown, the need for improved court management has become apparent. The modern court is a complex public institution employing many persons performing a variety of professional and clerical tasks. The management of busy trial courts calls for careful planning, system and organization. In addition to handling an increasing volume of cases, the courts must supervise official court reporters, probation officers, clerks, jury systems, court budgets, collection of statistics, and the receipt and disbursement of large sums of money.

Recognizing the growing need to provide assistance to Chief Circuit Judges in carrying out their administrative responsibilities, the Illinois Supreme Court in 1974 authorized the initiation of a trial court administrator program on an experimental basis. Pursuant to that authorization, the Administrative Office selected two circuits (3rd and 19th) in which to establish this program.

The Circuit Administrators are responsible to both the Chief Circuit Judge and the Director for carrying out their respective assignments. The Director has established overall policies and exercises general supervision. The day to day activities of the Circuit Administrators are subject to the direction and control of the Chief Judge.

Subject to the direction and supervision of the Director and the Chief Judge, the functions of the Circuit Court Administrators include (but are not limited to) the following:

- (1) Implementation of policies established by the Supreme Court, the Director or the Chief Judge in administrative matters;
- (2) Preparation of the budget for the Circuit Court;
- (3) Assisting the Chief Judge in recruiting, hiring, training, evaluation and supervising the non-judicial personnel of the Circuit Court;
- (4) Management of space, equipment and facilities of the Circuit Court;
- (5) Procurement of supplies and services for the Circuit Court;
- (6) Preparation of reports, as required, concerning the administrative operation of the Circuit Court;
- (7) Juror management;
- (8) Study and improvement of caseload and calendaring;
- (9) Development of improved methods for court operations, particularly the adoption of applicable modern business and data processing techniques.

The project is funded with federal funds granted through the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. Third year funding of the project was awarded during

1976. However, future funding of the Circuit Court Administrators will have to be sought elsewhere as ILEC has placed a three year limit on funding.

At the end of the project's second year, the Administrative Office and the Chief Judges for the two circuits evaluated it and sent their report to the ILEC. In general, the evaluation found that the project was meeting most of the goals set forth above. The evaluation concluded:

"It is apparent from the Chief Judges' reports and evaluations, the monthly narrative reports and our own monitoring of the project, that the Circuit Administrators, in the relatively brief span of 20 months, have performed surprisingly well in most of the functional areas initially developed for this project. Considering the brief period of time in which they have been working and the difficulty of attempting to achieve fundamental changes, particularly in the areas of case management and application of data processing, we are of the opinion that the Circuit Administrators have achieved a highly satisfactory level of accomplishment. As an experimental program, the project is proving to be successful. The presumed value of Circuit Court Administrators in downstate judicial circuits is being demonstrated.

Although the precise role and the effectiveness of trial court administrators will, undoubtedly, be subject to a process of continuing growth and development, the project is demonstrating that:

- (1) The assistance of a qualified administrator can aid a Chief Circuit Judge in the more efficient carrying out of his administrative responsibilities;
- (2) The specific duties and responsibilities of a trial court administrator, outlined above, can be assumed by a qualified administrator, subject to the supervision of the Chief Circuit Judge and the Administrative Office;
- (3) The establishment of the position of Circuit

Court Administrator, in circuits having sufficient population and caseload, can contribute to the improved administration of justice and would justify a request to the General Assembly for the additional funds required."


Recordkeeping

The basic recordkeeping procedures, prescribed by statutes first enacted in 1874, had remained largely unchanged until the Supreme Court, in 1968, adopted its General Administrative Order on Recordkeeping in the Circuit Courts. Having pioneered in the unification of the trial court, it was appropriate that Illinois should also lead the way in developing and implementing a modern and efficient system for uniformly maintaining the records of that court—a system which continues to attract nation-wide interest.

The recordkeeping system provided by the Supreme Court Order has, and continues to, become effective in counties at such time as the Director of the Administrative Office specifies. During 1976, a year in which clerks of the circuit courts were concerned more with getting nominated and re-elected to office than with improving or changing their office procedures, the Administrative Office supervised the implementation of the uniform recordkeeping system in the Circuit Court Clerks' offices of Macoupin County in the 7th judicial circuit and in the counties of Ford and Woodford in the 11th judicial circuit. This brings to 73 the number of counties in which the uniform procedures have been implemented and with the addition of Ford and Woodford Counties, all of the counties in the 11th judicial circuit are now included.

Preliminary discussion and arrangements with the clerks in Clark and Cumberland Counties were also completed in order to have the system become effective in those counties during 1977.

UNIFORM RECORDKEEPING IN THE CIRCUIT COURTS



Official Court Reporters

July 1, 1976

Testing Programs

The Administrative Office prepares and presents Official Court Reporters Proficiency Examinations to determine the qualifications of applicants for the position of Official Court Reporter. Class B or Class C reporters already in the employ of the Supreme Court as Official Court Reporters may also take tests to achieve a Class A or Class B rating which will result in a higher salary, under the salary schedule adopted by the Supreme Court pursuant to law. Tests are administered by the Administrative Office at least twice each year (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975 Ch. 37, Par. 657). To date, 1,553 persons have attempted to qualify either for appointment as Official Court Reporters or for advancement to a higher pay level within the Official Court Reporter ranks. A proficiency test has three parts: "A" "B" and "C". The "A" part requires the greatest proficiency while the other two tests are less demanding. Each test consists of a two-voice Q & A section and a legal opinion section. Each test is dictated by professional readers. Candidates who pass the proficiency examinations may be appointed to the post of Official Court Reporter by any Chief Judge of any Circuit Court. By statute, the Supreme Court determines the number of Official Court Reporters in each circuit (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1975 ch. 37, par. 653). The Court may increase or decrease the number of court reporters in any circuit after considering various factors provided for by statute. As of December 31, 1976, there were 486 official court reporters in Illinois, - - - of which 32 were part time.

During 1976 six Official Court Reporter Proficiency Examinations were administered. Three in Chicago and three at Illinois State University in Normal. Of 344 applicants, 87 passed part "A" of the examination and 34 passed part "B". Three people passed Part "C". Of the remainder of those scheduled to take the examination during 1976, 43 failed to appear for testing, 107 failed part "A" of the examination, 40 failed part "B" of the examination and 15 failed part "C" of the examination. Twenty people failed to turn in any transcript at all after having taken the examination.

Throughout the years of our testing program, we have continued to have problems with people who apply to take our test but fail to appear when scheduled to do so. For example, during calendar year 1975, 96 out of 381 applicants, or 25%, failed to appear when scheduled. Because that problem did not appear to abate during calendar year 1976, we established new standards and procedures for scheduling candidates to take the test. On July 1, 1976, William M. Madden, Deputy Director in our Chicago Office, forwarded the following letter to all candidates for the Official Court Reporter Proficiency Examination.

To Candidates for the Official Court Reporter Proficiency Examination

During the past 12 months this office has offered seven Official Court Reporter Proficiency Examinations—three in Chicago and four in Normal. A total of 417 applicants have been scheduled to take those examinations. Only 326 of the 417 who applied for and were scheduled to take the examinations actually appeared. Ninety-one applicants (almost 22%) simply failed to appear.

Of the 326 candidates who did appear, 87 (or 27%) passed the "A" test, 32 (10%) passed the "B" test and three (1%) passed the "C" test. A whopping 62-1/2% (204 candidates) failed to pass any part of the test (See attached chart).

It is manifest:

- (1) That almost one-fourth of our applicants have been casual about their obligation to actually appear to be tested after they have applied for and have been scheduled for our test, and
- (2) That many applicants simply do not appear to be qualified to pass our test.

If candidates continue to disregard our notices to appear for testing I will recommend that all applicants be required to make a cash deposit which will be returned to them only when they appear for testing at the time and place designated in the notice.

Of greater concern at this time, however, is the fact that students and others who are not already employed within our reporting system and who may not yet be fully qualified for official reporting duties appear to be using our testing procedures as practice sessions. It is expensive, time-consuming and frightfully injurious to the image of the reporting profession in Illinois for so great a percentage of our candidates to fail even the most elementary tests.

HEREAFTER:

- (A) No person will be scheduled to take the "A" part of the Official Court Reporter Proficiency Examination unless he or she:
 1. Is a Class "B" Official Court Reporter presently in the employ of the State of Illinois who is striving to achieve a higher proficiency rating, or
 2. Possesses an unrestricted Illinois CSR Certificate, or
 3. Presents a certificate from an accredited reporting school certifying passage of at least 180 wpm. Q & A for a period of 5 minutes with 95% accuracy or better, or
 4. Presents a certificate signed by an official court reporter of this State certifying that he or she has passed a test administered by or witnessed by said official court reporter which equals or exceeds the standards set out in paragraph 3 above.

(B) No person will be scheduled to take the "B" part of the Official Court Reporter Proficiency Examination unless he or she:

1. Is a Class "C" Official Court Reporter presently in the employ of the State of Illinois who is striving to achieve a higher proficiency rating, or
2. Possesses an unrestricted Illinois CSR Certificate, or
3. Presents a certificate from an accredited reporting school certifying passage of at least 140 wpm. Q & A for a period of 5 minutes, with 95% accuracy or better, or
4. Presents a certificate signed by an official court reporter of this State certifying that he or she has passed a test administered by or witnessed by said official court reporter which equals or exceeds the standards set out in paragraph 3 above.

(C) No person will be scheduled to take the "C" part of the Official Court Reporter Proficiency Examination unless he or she is an Official Court Reporter presently in the employ of the State of Illinois who has previously passed no other part of the examination.

Exceptions to these requirements may be granted only upon the written request of a Chief Circuit Judge specifying the reasons an exception is necessary. Exceptions will be rare.

Please complete and return the attached certificate at your earliest convenience. Those who demonstrate qualifications for testing will be scheduled for testing in the order in which the certificates are received in this office.

Sincerely,

William M. Madden
Deputy Director

WMM:ddl

cc: All Chief Circuit Judges
Attachment

Computer Transcription of Court Reporters' Notes

During Calendar year 1976, our program of experimentation with computerized transcription of court reporters' notes was delayed temporarily. It remains clear that the major barrier to a successful experiment is our continuing inability to recruit fully qualified Official Court Reporters who are both able and willing to be tuned for computer transcription and to actually use the computer system of transcription over an extended period under actual work conditions.

It is clear that not just any stenotypist can successfully participate in such an experiment. Those who will make good computer-aided stenotypists must have a high degree of skill on the stenotype machine which will enable them to write precisely the same way under all circumstances, at high speed under crowded and sometimes confusing courtroom conditions. Because the need for such discipline in writing techniques had not existed prior to the introduction of computer-assisted transcription, most of our older reporters have not developed such a disciplined system of writing. We hope that through loaning computer stenotype machines to various schools throughout the Chicago area that a generation of official court reporters will be graduating who can enter the system and carry this experiment to a successful conclusion.

Secretariat

The Administrative Office serves as secretary to the Judicial Conference and a host of committees and sub-committees. In addition to arranging meetings, recording minutes and keeping records, the office acts as a fact finding body, does research, conducts surveys and appraises judges of recent developments in procedural and substantive law. Some of the committees served by the Administrative Office during 1976 included:

1. The Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference. Supreme Court Rule 41 designates the Administrative Office as secretary to the Conference. The office handles all details for the regular monthly meetings of the Executive Committee, including research, drafting of minutes, preparing agendas, arranging meetings and assisting the chairman with his correspondence. The office implements plans for the annual Conference, the annual Associate Judge Seminar and the regional seminars. The office also acts as secretary to all the study and seminar committees. During 1976 alone, there were fourteen such study and seminar committees.

2. Conference of Chief Circuit Judges. The office prepares agendas, arranges the monthly meetings, maintains close liaison with the chairman and prepares a synopsis of bills introduced in the General Assembly.

3. Courts Commission. The Director, pursuant to Rule 2 of Rules of Procedure of the Commission, is the secretary in all proceedings before the Commission. He performs the duties ordinarily performed by Circuit Court clerks, preserves the records, and prepares subpoenas returnable before the Commission.

4. Administrative Committee of the Appellate Court. The office arranges meetings, assists in drafting proposed rule changes, and provides research assistance.

5. The Committee on Juvenile Problems. This is a standing committee of the Judicial Conference and is responsible for studying problems relating to juvenile proceedings. This committee has developed forms for use in juvenile proceedings, conducted seminars, drafted Supreme Court rules and developed a benchbook for use in juvenile proceedings.

6. The Committee on Court Services. This is a standing committee of the Judicial Conference, established in 1975 to study, evaluate and make recommendations concerning court services such as probation, mental health, clerks, social and other ancillary court services.

7. The Committee on Criminal Law for Illinois Judges. This is a standing committee of the Judicial Conference and is responsible for studying problems in criminal law and recommending changes in practice and procedure to improve the administration of criminal justice. The committee also conducted regional seminars on criminal law until that function was taken over by the Committee on Judicial Education.

8. Committee on Civil Law Seminars. This committee was responsible for conducting regional seminars in civil law until that function was taken over by the Committee on Judicial Education.

9. Supreme Court Committee on Rules of Evidence. This committee was established in 1975 and meets regularly to review the rules of evidence applicable to Illinois courts and to suggest such revisions as it may deem advisable.

10. Study Committee on Jury Selection and Utilization. This is a study committee of the judicial conference established for the purpose of studying and reporting on specific problems relating to jury selection and utilization.

11. Study Committee on Mental Health. This was a special study committee created for the purpose of studying problems of the mental health law and reporting thereon at the 1976 Judicial Conference.

12. Study Committee on Indemnity, Third Party Actions and Equitable Contributions. This was a special study committee created for the purpose of studying the matters indicated in the title and reporting thereon at the 1976 Judicial Conference.

13. Study Committee on Procedures in Quasi-Criminal and Ordinance Violation Cases and Discovery in Misdemeanor Cases. This was a special study committee created for the purpose of studying the matters indicated in the title and reporting thereon at the 1976 Associate Judge Seminar.

Impartial Medical Expert Rule

The Administrative Office is charged with administration of Supreme Court Rule 215(d). The statistical summary on pages 76 and 77 provides a profile of the use of Rule 215(d) in the Circuit Courts of Illinois during 1976.

It should be explained again this year that the statistical breakdown is divided, necessarily, into the

categories of "orders", "examinations" and "costs". The orders refer to orders entered by the court in 1976. Some of the examinations ordered in 1976 took place in 1977 and therefore those examinations are not contained in these statistics while the orders for those examinations are contained in these statistics. Similarly, some examinations scheduled in 1976 were scheduled on the basis of orders entered in 1975. In the category of costs, the average cost per case refers to cases in which an order for an impartial medical examination was entered in 1976. The average cost per exam refers to exams actually performed in 1976.

The statistical breakdown indicates that there was a slight decrease in the use of Rule 215(d) for impartial medical examinations during 1976. This decrease may be due in part to an effort by the Administrative Office to restrict the use of the rule to its intended purpose. It became apparent that the rule was being used more and more simply for the purpose of obtaining advisory medical opinions, rather than seeking an impartial medical examination in cases where there might be conflicting medical testimony. Because of this, the following letter was sent to all judges who used the rule in the preceding year (the letter is self-explanatory):

October 24, 1975

"To: All Judges Using Rule 215(d) During the 12 Month Period Ending October 24, 1975

"This office has been receiving increasingly large numbers of requests for Impartial Medical Examinations under Supreme Court Rule 215(d) in cases in which it is clear that the parties to be examined have not previously been examined by a privately retained physician or by a physician designated under Rule 215(a). In such cases, and even in some cases in which prior examinations have been made, there appears to be little likelihood that the parties will present conflicting medical testimony which will need to be clarified, refuted or put into proper perspective by an Impartial Medical Examiner's testimony.

"And the sole purpose for examinations under Rule 215(d) is understood by me to be to clarify, refute or put into proper perspective conflicting medical testimony offered by the parties. It is not intended as a means to allow medical examinations of litigants or others involved in litigations when the parties are unable or unwilling to bear the cost of such examinations. Nor is it intended to be a means by which the trial judge may obtain advisory medical opinions to guide him in reaching a decision when he is the finder of fact.

"The question at this point is not whether our system *ought* to have the means to accomplish either of the last-stated objectives, the question is whether Rule 215(d) is designed to accomplish either of those goals and, if it is not, whether we can continue to suffer its use in a purpose for which it was never intended. I think the answer is "no" on both counts.

“Henceforth, we will accept requests for Impartial Medical Examinations only in cases in which the judge expressly finds that the parties have, will or most probably will present conflicting medical testimony concerning the physical or mental condition of one or more persons involved in the case. (See Draft Order, attached).

“I will be happy to work with any judge who has

found Rule 215(d) useful as a tool to accomplish the objectives for which I believe it was not intended to devise alternative procedures for accomplishing those objectives.

Sincerely,

William M. Madden
Deputy Director”

**IMPARTIAL MEDICAL EXPERTS - SUPREME COURT RULE 215(d)
1976 STATISTICAL SUMMARY**

Subject	Statistical Breakdown										Totals
Orders											
Orders Entered During 1976	Downstate 10		Attorney Registration 1		Cook County 26					37	
ACTION	Lawyer Discipline 1		Civil Personal Injury-10		Divorce Child Custody-26					37	
Specialties Required	Ophthalmology 1	Cardiology 1	Internal Medicine 1	Plastic Surgery 1	Orthopedics 7	Neurology 1	Psychiatry 26			38*	
	*In one case 2 specialties were required										
Frequency of Use of Rule 215(d) By Judges	15 Judges Ordered 215(d) Exams in 1 Case	2 Judges Ordered 215(d) Exams in 3 Cases	1 Judge Ordered 215(d) Exams in 4 Cases	1 Judge Ordered 215(d) Exams in 5 Cases	1 Judge Ordered 215(d) Exams in 7 Cases	20 Judges Ordered 215(d) Exams in a Total of 37 Cases					
Disposition of Orders Entered During 1976	All Examinations in the Case Cancelled 4		Order for Examinations Vacated 1		Some or All Examinations Ordered in the Case Were Performed 32					37	
Examinations											
IME Examinations Scheduled in 1976	Vacated By Order 2	Cases Settled Before Trial 2	Examinations Cancelled For Other Reasons 4	Examinations Actually Performed 70 (Downstate 11) (Cook County 59)							78
Specialties Required Exams Actually Performed	Cardiology 1	Ophthalmology 1	Neurology 1	Orthopedics 6	Internal Medicine 2	Psychiatry 59				70	
Number of Exams Performed By Individual IME Frequency of Use Of Panelists	7 I.M. Experts Performed 1 Exam	7 I.M. Experts Performed 2 Exams	1 I.M. Expert Performed 3 Exams	1 I.M. Expert Performed 4 Exams	1 I.M. Expert Performed 5 Exams	1 I.M. Expert Performed 15 Exams	1 I.M. Expert Performed 22 Exams			19 I.M. Experts Performed Total of 70 Exams	
Cost											
Average Cost Per 1976 Case	Downstate \$226.28		Cook County \$248.80								\$243.87
Average Cost Per 1976 Exam	Downstate \$144.00		Cook County \$105.42								\$111.48
Number of Cases In Which Testimony Is Required at Trial In 1976 (Average Cost Per Case)	Ophthalmology 1 (\$200.00)		Psychiatry 1 (\$100.00)								2 (\$150.00)

CUMULATIVE STATISTICAL SUMMARY


January 1970 - December 1976

Subject	Statistical Breakdown												Totals			
Orders																
Total Orders Entered	Downstate 71			Attorney Registration 3			Cook County 436						510			
Action	Mental Health 4	Probate 3	Juvenile 2	Adoption 4	Criminal 27	Civil-Personal Injury 143	Divorce-Child Custody 327					510				
Testimony Required At Trial													37			
Examinations																
IME Examinations Scheduled	Cases Settled Before Trial 23			Cancelled Exams 101			Examinations Actually Performed 890						1014			
Specialties Required-Examinations Actually Performed	Obstetrics 2	Cardio-logy 3	General Practice 8	Geriatric 1	Plastic Surgery 1	Pedi-atrics 2	Radi-logy 1	Urology 1	Ophthal-mology 10	Otolaryn-gology 6	Internal Medicine 17	Neuro-logy 34	Ortho-pedics 61	Allergies 1	Psy-chiatry 742	890
Cost																
Average Cost Per Exam Actually Performed	Including Ancillary Cost & Testimony												\$103.25			

Representation By Supervised Senior Law Students

During 1976, 530 temporary licenses were issued. Since the rule's inception in May, 1969, a total of 3,205 senior law students have participated in this legal internship program.

The comparative chart below indicates the use of Rule 711 in the last six years.



Illinois Supreme Court Rule 711 provides for the temporary licensing of law students who are certified by their dean as having received credit for work representing at least two thirds of the total hourly credits required for graduation from the law school. The student must be in good academic standing and be eligible under the school's criteria to undertake the activities authorized by the rule.

The services authorized by the rule may only be carried on in the course of the student's work with one or more of the following:

- "(1) A legal aid bureau, legal assistance program, organization, or clinic chartered by the State of Illinois or approved by a law school located in Illinois;
- (2) The office of the public defender;
- (3) A law office of the State or any of its subdivisions."

Under the supervision of a member of the bar of this State, and with the written consent of the person on whose behalf he is acting, an eligible law student may render the following services:

- "(1) He may counsel with clients, negotiate in the settlement of claims, and engage in the preparation and drafting of legal instruments.
- (2) He may appear in the trial courts and adminis-

trative tribunals of this State, subject to the following qualifications:

- (i) Appearances, pleadings, motions, and other documents to be filed with the court may be prepared by the student and may be signed by him with the accompanying designation "Senior Law Student" but must also be signed by the supervising member of the bar.
- (ii) In criminal cases, in which the penalty may be imprisonment, in proceedings challenging sentences of imprisonment, and in civil or criminal contempt proceedings, the student may participate in pretrial, trial, and post-trial proceedings as an assistant of the supervising member of the bar, who shall be present and responsible for the conduct of the proceedings.
- (iii) In all other civil and criminal cases the student may conduct all pretrial, trial, and post-trial proceedings, and the supervising member of the bar need not be present.
- (3) He may prepare briefs, excerpts from record, abstracts, and other documents filed in courts of review of the State, which may set forth the name of the student with the accompanying designation "Senior Law Student" but must be filed in the name of the supervising member of the bar."

The number of temporarily licensed law students and their law schools for 1976 are as follows:

John Marshall Law School	85
University of Illinois	74
IIT—Chicago Kent	73
DePaul University	67
Loyola University	63
Southern Illinois University	44
University of Chicago	35
Northwestern University	26
St. Louis University	22
Washington University	9
University of Texas	4
University of Michigan	4
Hamline University	4
Harvard University	2
Boston College	1
George Washington University	1
Vermont Law School	1
Suffolk University	1
Golden Gate University	1
Notre Dame University	1
Georgetown University	1
University of Nebraska	1
Marquette University	1
Drake University	1
Hofstra University	1
Southern Methodist University	1
Marshall-Wythe School of Law	1
University of Arkansas	1
Ohio Northern University	1

Northeastern University	1
American University	1
Tulane University	<u>1</u>
Total:	530

Agencies with which temporarily licensed students were associated during 1976 are as follows:

Public Agencies

State's Attorneys' Offices	130
Public Defender Offices	85
Southern Illinois University Prison Legal Aid	35
Illinois Attorney General's Office	30
Municipal Legal Departments	24
State Appellate Defender	5
Department of Children and Family Services	4
Department of Mental Health	3
Chicago Transit Authority	2
Department of Public Aid	1
Lake Michigan Federation	1
CTA	1

Private Agencies

Mandel Legal Aid Clinic	32
Cook County Legal Assistance Foundation	30
Northwestern U. Legal Assistance Clinic	23
DePaul Law Clinic	20
Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago	20
Criminal Defense Consortium of Cook County	19
Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation	15
Chicago Volunteer Legal Services Foundation	14
Illinois Migrant Legal Assistance Project	8
Illinois State's Attorneys Appellate Assistance Service	7
Prisoners' Legal Assistance Project	4
Legal Aid Bureau	3
West Town Legal Services	2
Legal Referral Bureau of Lake County	2
Cook County Special Bail Project	2
Cabrini Green Legal Aid Clinic	1
Will County Legal Assistance Program	1
The Ark	1
Peoria Court Counseling Program	1
Criminal Defense Services	1
Macon County Legal Aid Society	1
Federal Defender Program	1
St. Louis U. Appellate Practice Clinic	1

Legislation

Each year, numerous bills affecting the practice of law, criminal and juvenile justice, the operation of the court system and court personnel are introduced in the General Assembly. Because of the impact such bills would have upon the judicial system, in the event they are enacted into law, it is necessary for the Administrative Office to be familiar with them and follow their

progress through the legislature very closely. A synopsis of bills affecting the courts is prepared by the administrative Office each year. The progress of pending bills is noted and the synopsis is continuously updated. At the conclusion of the legislative session and after the Governor has acted upon the bills, a copy of the synopsis is sent to each judge in the state.

During 1976, the following bills affecting the courts and judicial administration were enacted into law (references are to Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. ____, § ____:

(Clerks and Fees)

SB-1560 (ch. 25, adds pars. 27.1, 27.2, 27.3; and ch. 53, pars. 37a and 49; rep. pars. 31, 31.1, 32, 32.1, 51, 51.1 and 82) amends various acts regarding the fees and salaries of clerks of the Circuit Court by changing the fee structure and salary schedule, inserting new provisions into "An Act to revise the law in relation to clerks of court" and deleting provisions relating to such fees and salaries presently in acts contained in ch. 53. (PA 79-1445)

HB-3191 (ch. 81, par. 81) provides that the county board of any county may establish and maintain a county law library, to be located in any county building or public building at the county seat. A library fee of up to \$2 is authorized to pay for such libraries. (PA 79-1336)

HB-3436 (ch. 53, pars. 71, 72, 73 and 81) amends an Act concerning fees of the sheriff, recorder and clerk in counties over 1,000,000 population; exempts units of local government and school districts from paying fees; and also amends an Act concerning fees for appeals in the same manner. (PA 79-1414)

(Courthouse Construction)

SB-1742 makes reappropriations for permanent improvement and related grants to the Capital Development Board for various State agencies, including authorization for construction of a Circuit and Appellate Courts complex and for legal and paralegal education in Springfield. (PA 79-1325)

HB-3976 provides that any county with a population of more than 450,000 by resolution of its county board may incur indebtedness for the reconstruction and remodeling of an existing courthouse or the construction of a new courthouse and related facilities at the same or a new location and for the acquisition of land and fixtures therefor, issue and sell general obligation bonds therefor and levy taxes upon all taxable property of the county sufficient to pay the principal on the bonds at maturity and to pay interest thereon as it falls due. (PA 79-1467)

(Criminal Law)

SB-1997 (ch. 38, pars. 206-5, 1005-6.1, 1005-6-4; adds pars. 1005-1-21, 1005-6-3.1) permits a court to place a person charged with a misdemeanor or traffic offense under "supervision" for up to 2 years. If the

person successfully completes the period of supervision, the court shall dismiss the case. It also provides that this procedure does not result in a conviction of a crime for purposes of Illinois law. (PA 79-1334)

HB-3856 (ch. 38, par. 103-5) amends the Code of Criminal Procedure by extending from July 1, 1976 to March 1, 1977 the effective date of PA 79-842 relating to the effect of delay caused by the defendant on the period in which the case must be tried. (PA 79-1237)

SB-1881 (ch. 56-1/2, pars. 703, 711, 715, 1102 and 1410) amends a number of acts to transfer the Dangerous Drugs Commission the primary responsibility for drug abuse programs and related duties. (PA 79-1465)

(Judicial Elections)

HB-3810 (ch. 46, par. 17-18.1) amends the Election Code to provide, on a permanent basis, a system of extra or special judges of election for the purpose of tallying and canvassing the votes cast in certain elections of judges, when the number of judges or judge candidates, or both, exceeds 15 in number at any election. (PA 79-1473)

(Juvenile Court Act)

HB-3308 (ch. 37, par. 704-2) amends the Juvenile Court Act to provide that when a juvenile is in detention and the petition alleges a violent crime (defined), the State may request that the adjudicatory hearing be postponed for up to 10 additional days. (PA 79-1478)

HB-3512 (ch. 37, par. 706-1) amends the Juvenile Court Act to require the probation department to maintain financial records related to juvenile detention. (PA 79-1416)

(Medical Malpractice)

HB-3957 (ch. 51, pars. 71, 73, 101; et al.) amends various acts to make changes in laws related to medical practice and recovery for malpractice. It also provides that in every case where damages for injury to the person are assessed by the jury, the verdict shall be itemized so as to reflect the monetary distribution among economic loss and non-economic loss, if any. (PA 79-1434)

HB-3958 (ch. 10, par. 101; ch. 73, adds pars. 768.20, 768.21), the Malpractice Arbitration Act, establishes special requirements in relation to agreements to arbitrate claims for damages arising from injuries alleged to have been received by a patient due to the negligence of a hospital or other health care provider and in relation to proceedings under such agreements. It also amends the Uniform Arbitration Act to include reference to this act. Among other things, the act also provides that every malpractice arbitration agreement may be cancelled by any signatory within 60 days of its execution or 60 days of patient's discharge from the hospital, whichever is later. (PA 79-1435)

Updating Legislation

The Illinois General Assembly has taken action to streamline the body of law contained in the Illinois Revised Statutes. P.A. 79-662 provides for the creation of the Law Revision Commission, which consists of twelve members appointed by the General Assembly. The Commission is charged with making "a thorough study of the statutory law of Illinois with a view to determining what laws are obsolete, outdated or unnecessary and should be repealed." The Commission is further directed to "call upon State officers, departments and agencies to review the various statutory provisions they have responsibility for administering, to evaluate their necessity and relevance, and to make recommendations as to which of such provisions, if any, no longer serve any purpose and should be repealed."

The Public Act states that "the promiscuous spawning of legislation without any corresponding effort to repeal archaic, outmoded and unnecessary laws has caused a steady increase in the bulk of the statutory law of Illinois" and that "it seems highly likely that among the Illinois statutes are many laws the existence of which is unknown not only to members of the general public but even to the officers who are charged with their enforcement."

The Commission has named Harry G. Fins of Chicago as counsel.

Continuing Judicial Education

In its capacity as secretariat to the Judicial Conference, the staff of the Administrative Office is responsible for implementing the programs of continuing judicial education developed by the Executive Committee and the Subcommittee on Judicial Education.

Between 1964 and 1971, continuing judicial education in Illinois consisted largely of seminars on various legal topics held in conjunction with the annual Judicial Conference, the annual Associate Judge Seminar (begun in 1966) and the New Judge Seminar (begun in 1968 and held every two years). However, beginning in 1971, the continuing judicial education program was expanded to include regional seminars on criminal law. Based on the success of these regional seminars, the program was expanded to include regional seminars on juvenile law and civil law topics. By 1976 as many as ten regional seminars were conducted in addition to the annual programs. The regional seminars were sponsored and conducted by the Committee on Criminal Law for Illinois Judges, the Juvenile Problems Committee and the Committee on Civil Law Seminars. Recognizing the growth of the regional seminar program and the need for greater coordination, the Judicial Conference's Executive Committee, in early 1976, established the Subcommittee on Judicial Education. This committee now has the full responsibility to conduct the program of regional seminars.

During 1976, the following continuing judicial edu-

cation programs were held:

- I Annual Judicial Conference
- II Annual Associate Judge Seminar
- III New Judge Seminar
- IV Regional Criminal Law Seminars (5)
- V Regional Civil Law Seminars (5)

Originally, the regional seminars were 1-1/2 days in duration. Under the reorganized program of the Subcommittee on Judicial Education the regional seminars are now 3 days in duration and are devoted to basic legal subjects such as Civil Remedies, Criminal Law, and Civil Procedure.

Attendance at the annual Conference, Associate Judge Seminar and New Judge Seminar is mandatory. Attendance at the regional seminars is not mandatory, but an effort is made, through the Chief Circuit Judges, to have those judges attend who have recently been assigned to those areas to be covered at the seminars and who would benefit most from attending.

The staff of the Chicago office has spent an increasing amount of time (approximately one-half) in meeting with seminar committees and making arrangements for these programs.

As secretary to the various seminar committees and faculties, the staff arranges all committee meetings, conducts surveys to determine preferred topics, retains law professors to serve on the faculties, and arranges for seminar facilities. In addition the staff provides for the duplication and distribution of all reading and reference materials used at the seminars.

Synopsis of Supreme Court Opinions

In connection with its continuing judicial education function, the Administrative Office, for several years, has reviewed the recent decisions of the Supreme and Appellate Courts and mailed copies or a synopsis of some opinions to Illinois judges before the cases were available in the advance sheets. This service continued to grow, and in 1975 the Administrative Office began to regularly prepare and distribute to all Illinois judges a synopsis of particularly significant Supreme Court decisions, after each term of court. During 1976, summaries of 45 Supreme Court opinions were included in the synopsis.

Judicial Visitation Programs To Penal Institutions

Events which have occurred in the first years of this decade have catapulted the condition of the national and state prisons to the forefront of public concern. Indeed, probing questions have been raised by the general public and governmental officials as to the objectives and purposes of incarceration. Too, the recent wave of serious "street crime" has been portrayed by the news media, penologists, prosecutors and police agencies as a national nightmare. The result has been billions of dollars poured into "people programs" and hardware to combat crime. Predictably, penologists and other "experts" on crime and the

criminal justice process have reached into their grab bag of answers and proposed a variety of plans, invariably known as "criminal justice or correctional models", which suggest that "flat sentencing" or "decriminalizing" victimless offenses is the answer to reducing criminal activity. Today, the emphasis clearly is on protecting society by incarcerating convicted defendants rather than on rehabilitation.

No person has a greater responsibility and burden of determining whether a convicted defendant will be imprisoned than the sentencing judge. It is he who must decide whether the convicted defendant will lose his freedom by imprisonment. In making that decision the judge considers many factors including the feasibility of rehabilitation, reintegration of the defendant into society and the best forum to accomplish these objectives.

Recognizing that judges must be familiar with the State's penal system and programs, the Director of the Administrative Office and the Director of the Illinois Department of Corrections formulated plans for organized visits by judges to the various correctional facilities. During the period 1971-1975, nine programs were held and in 1976 one additional program was conducted. On June 4, 1976 judges visited the Correctional Center at Menard and the Mental Health Center at nearby Chester. Including the 31 judges who attended the 1976 program, a total of 331 Illinois judges has participated in the organized tours. The program ran for a full day, and the judges generally had access to institutional buildings, including vocational workshops, classrooms, cellhouses, etc. The visit ended with a question and answer period in which institutional administrators participated.

The Menard facility consists of two separate and distinct institutions - the correctional institution itself which houses ordinary inmates and the psychiatric center which houses sexually dangerous inmates and those diagnosed as mentally ill. The entire complex is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections. At the correctional component at Menard, the judges were told that the inmate capacity is 1050 (one man per cell) but there were 2011 inmates presently incarcerated; that by late 1976, it is anticipated 2600 inmates will be housed; that 345 inmates were confined to the segregation and isolation unit because of a recent riot; that 515 persons were employed by the Department, of whom 298 were assigned to correctional duties; that if the inmate population continues to rise, inmate idleness will increase because the institution can only provide 800 meaningful jobs for inmates; and that it is expected that 300 inmates will be transferred to a nearby building at Chester which formerly housed persons committed to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities.

At the psychiatric center of the Menard facility, which immediately adjoins the correctional center, the judges were told that each cell houses only one inmate; that inmates here do not commingle with inmates at the correctional center; that 250 inmates are housed in the

center, of whom 40 have been committed as sexually dangerous and the remainder having been assigned to the center after psychological and psychiatric testing which indicated that an inmate required treatment for mental illness; that one-half of the inmates were regularly treated with tranquilizers; and that the parole rate for inmates at the center was very low.

At the Mental Health Center, near Chester, which is operated by the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, the judges inspected the newest major maximum security mental health facility in the nation. The facility had been operational for only seven weeks at the time of the visit. The judges were told that the facility was constructed at a cost of \$8 million; that it has a \$750,000 security system which includes a radar detection and monitoring system; and that windows are screened with finely meshed stainless steel wires with a capability of absorbing extremely high impact. It was also stated by staff that 60% of the inmate population had been adjudicated as unfit to stand trial on charged criminal offenses and that 40% were transferees from other mental institutions; that within 72 hours after admission, each person is given a work-up and a treatment plan is devised. The Mental Health Center is, perhaps, the most secure

institution ever visited by the judges.

Although not a part of the visit, many judges did inspect the new Randolph County Courthouse in Chester. In addition to housing county offices, the building contains two courtrooms which reflect modernistic yet functional architectural design.

Administrative Secretaries Conference

On September 24, 1976, the Administrative Office sponsored the fourth annual conference for Administrative Secretaries to Chief Circuit Judges. The conference was held in Morton, Illinois at the Towne House Inn and was attended by eighteen of the Administrative Secretaries.

The purpose of this annual conference is to assist the Administrative Secretaries develop a more thorough understanding of the Illinois judicial system and administrative procedures. The conference is also designed to provide the Administrative Secretaries with the opportunity to raise questions and discuss mutual problems arising out of their day to day duties. The agenda, topics and discussion leaders for the conference were as follows:

AGENDA

9:00 A.M.	Welcoming Remarks Overview of the Illinois Judicial System and the Administrative Office	Hon. Roy O. Gulley, Director
9:45 A.M.	Role of the Administrative Secretary	Judith W. Beverlin (12th Circuit) Nancy Myhre (17th Circuit) Elvera Palmer (18th Circuit)
10:45 A.M.	Coffee Break	
11:00 A.M.	Role of the Chief Judge	Hon. Joseph F. Cunningham (20th Circuit) Hon. Harry D. Strouse, Jr. (19th Circuit) Hon. George W. Unverzagt (18th Circuit)
12:15 P.M.		Luncheon
1:30 P.M.	Role of the Circuit Court Administrator	Michael Henkhaus (3rd Circuit) Jerry Klebe (19th Circuit)
2:15 P.M.	Role of the Clerk of the Circuit Court	John T. Curry (Macon County) Carl B. Mast (Adams County)
3:00 P.M.	Testing, Certifying and Administration of Court Reporters	William M. Madden, Deputy Director

Computer Assisted Transcription Project

Grant #1576, in the amount of \$80,934 was awarded to the Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, on January 3, 1975. The purpose of this grant was to demonstrate the use of computer assisted translation and transcription of machine shorthand notes. The results of the project, to date, have been disappointing.

The project was based on a proposal from the Stenograph Machines Corporation of Skokie. A vital portion of Stenograph's original proposal consisted of a substantial amount for training of reporters who would be chosen to cooperate in this experiment. Recommendations made by the National Center for State Courts caused the grant to be amended downward to exclude a substantial portion of the training money that Stenograph thought was important to the project. It is very likely that training was one of the most vital aspects of the project and failure to include it may have been a fatal defect in structuring the experiment.

The project began on a good note. We purchased six electronic stenograph machines from Stenograph Co. and arranged for the rental of a Linolex Word Processing Mini-Computer to provide efficient editing during the experiment.

We then recruited a reporter with the Circuit Court of Cook County. Her credentials were impeccable. She holds both the Certificate of Proficiency and the Certificate of Merit from the National Shorthand Reporters' Association. The first case this reporter submitted was a criminal case tried before Judge Saul Epton on September 15, 1975. The first pass through the computer produced a remarkably accurate transcript of proceedings. It was clear that with just a little adjustment of the transcription program and a little work with the reporter, we could expect very successful results from her participation in the experiment. We were thoroughly convinced that the computer and Stenograph's program were capable of accurately transcribing the notes of qualified, disciplined stenotypists. However, it was then that our problems began. The Governor vetoed a pay raise bill which would have allowed us to pay official court reporters up to \$19,000 per year. The reporter mentioned above and other reporters who were potential participants in the computer assisted transcription experiment promptly indicated that they were no longer interested in cooperating with the program. Many reporters fear that if they become computer compatible, that will lay the ground work for future action to deprive them of transcript fees. In addition, reporters who are obviously never going to be able to achieve computer compatibility are antagonistic towards the experiment. They fear that if it is successful it will compromise their position as official reporters.

What amounts to resistance by the court reporters has left our experiment in precarious shape. We have six Stenograph machines—one remains in our office, one is on loan to Triton College, two are on loan to the

Chicago College of Commerce (for training reporting students) and two have been allocated to reporters in the 19th Judicial Circuit. These reporters, while evidencing interest in the program, have not yet demonstrated that they can become computer compatible without substantial retraining.

The result of the above is that we were unable to expend the bulk of the grant funds prior to the grant expiration date. We did, however, receive ILEC permission to purchase the Linolex word processor, located in the Chicago Office. This will permit us to continue the experiment beyond the grant deadline date. The balance of the unused funds were returned to ILEC.

It seems now that only as time goes by will we be able to continue the experiment. When (and only when) willing, qualified reporters graduate from schools in which they are now being taught computer assisted transcription will we be able to foster meaningful development of computer assisted transcription in Illinois. In the meantime our experimental program will be reduced from six reporters to two.

Eavesdropping Reports

With the passage of Illinois' new eavesdropping statute (Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 38, §108A-1 et seq.) an added responsibility was placed upon the Administrative Office. Within 30 days after the expiration of an order authorizing the use of an eavesdropping device, or within 30 days after the denial of an application, the issuing or denying judge must report certain information to the Administrative Office. Also, in January of each year, the States' Attorney of each county in which eavesdropping devices were used must report certain detailed information to the Administrative Office concerning the use of such eavesdropping devices. Thereafter, in April of each year, the Director of the Administrative Office must transmit to the General Assembly a report summarizing the information he has received on the use of eavesdropping devices during the preceding calendar year. The section of the statute creating these responsibilities is as follows:

108A—11. §108A-11. Reports Concerning Use of Eavesdropping Devices.

(a) Within 30 days after the expiration of an order and each extension thereof authorizing the use of an eavesdropping device, or within 30 days after the denial of an application or disapproval of an application subsequent to any alleged emergency situation, the issuing or denying judge shall report to the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts the following:

- (1) the fact that such an order, extension, or subsequent approval of an emergency was applied for;
- (2) the kind of order or extension applied for;
- (3) a statement as to whether the order or extension was granted as applied for was modified, or was denied;
- (4) the period authorized by the order or extension.

sions in which an eavesdropping device could be used;

(5) the felony specified in the order extension or denied application;

(6) the identity of the applying investigative or law enforcement officer and agency making the application and the State's Attorney authorizing the application; and

(7) the nature of the facilities from which or the place where the eavesdropping device was to be used.

(b) In January of each year the State's Attorney of each county in which eavesdropping devices were used pursuant to the provisions of this Article shall report to the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts the following:

(1) the information required by subsections (a) (1) through (a) (7) of this Section with respect to each application for an order or extension made during the preceding calendar year;

(2) a general description of the uses of eavesdropping devices actually made under such order to overhear or record conversations, including: (a) the approximate nature and frequency of incriminating conversations overheard, (b) the approximate nature and frequency of other conversations overheard, (c) the approximate number of persons whose conversations were overheard, and (d) the approximate nature, amount, and cost of the manpower and other resources used pursuant to the authorization to use an eavesdropping device;

(3) the number of arrests resulting from authorized uses of eavesdropping devices and the offenses for which arrests were made;

(4) the number of trials resulting from such uses of eavesdropping devices;

(5) the number of motions to suppress made with respect to such uses, and the number granted or denied; and

(6) the number of convictions resulting from such uses and the offenses for which the convictions were obtained and a general assessment of the importance of the convictions.

(c) In April of each year, the Director of the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts shall transmit to the General Assembly a report including information on the number of applications for orders authorizing the use of eavesdropping devices, the number of orders and extensions granted or denied during the preceding calendar year, the convictions arising out of such uses, and a summary of the information required by subsections (a) and (b) of this Section. Added by P.A. 79—1159 §2, eff. July 1, 1976.

Public Information and Publications

Citizens, judges, lawyers, court administrators from other states, and persons from foreign nations visit the Administrative Office and the Illinois courts. An impor-

tant function of the Administrative Office is to explain the Illinois court system to the visitors and arrange visits to courthouses and with judges.

The Director and the staff are also asked to address civic groups, bar associations, legislative commissions, and court reform groups concerning the structure and operation of Illinois' unified court system.

Some of the events the Director addressed or attended, during 1976, included the courthouse dedication, Stephenson County; Associate Judge Seminar, Chicago; Probation Services Council, Springfield; Hands Up Spring-board Conference, Springfield; Sons of the American Revolution, Springfield; Court Reporter Development Seminar, Chicago; National Conference of State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators, Seattle; National Conference of State Court Administrators, Philadelphia; Illinois Judicial Conference, Chicago; Administrative Secretaries Conference, Morton; Police Training Academy, Springfield; Award Banquet, Illinois Probation and Court Services, Peoria; Kansas Judicial Conference, Wichita; LEAA Conference, Kansas City, Missouri; and the New Judge Seminar, Chicago.

The Administrative Office also publishes and/or distributes several books or pamphlets which are available to the public. These publications can be obtained by contacting the Springfield or Chicago office.

- (1) A Short History of the Illinois Judicial System;
- (2) Manual on Recordkeeping;
- (3) Annual Report of the Administrative Office;
- (4) Annual Report of the Judicial Conference;
- (5) Article V of the Supreme Court Rules (relating to trial court proceedings in traffic cases);
- (6) A series of handbooks for jurors in grand jury proceedings, in criminal cases and in civil cases;
- (7) A pamphlet relating the history of the Supreme Court Building in Springfield;
- (8) Illinois Supreme Court Rules;
- (9) Interim Report: Experimental Video-Taping of Courtroom Proceedings;
- (10) Rules of Procedure of the Illinois Courts Commission;
- (11) Chief Circuit Judge's Manual On Guidelines For the Administration Of Circuit Courts (draft form only);
- (12) Benchbook (Criminal Cases) for Illinois Judges;
- (13) Reading and Reference Materials used at seminars and conferences sponsored by the Judicial Conference;
- (14) Report of the Supreme Court Committee on Video-taping Court Proceedings;
- (15) Administrative Regulations Governing Court Reporters in the Illinois Courts;
- (16) Illinois Courtrooms, Bohn, William G., Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs (1972).

Membership in Organizations

The Administrative Office, the Director and/or his assistants are members of the following organizations and committees:

- (1) By statute, the Director is a member of the Governor's Traffic Safety Coordinating Committee.
- (2) The Conference of State Court Administrators. The Director served as Chairman of the Conference's Executive Board from August, 1973 until August, 1974.
- (3) The American Judicature Society. The Director served on the Board of Directors and is currently a member of the Programs and Services Committee.
- (4) The Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs. By order of the Supreme Court, the Director is an *ex officio* member. This committee has an executive secretary and staff and is charged with the responsibility of developing grant funded programs in the area of criminal and juvenile justice. The committee is funded by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission.
- (5) Council of State Governments
- (6) Probation Services Council of Illinois
- (7) National Association of Trial Court Administrators
- (8) Institute of Judicial Administration.
- (9) American, Illinois State and Chicago Bar Associations and the Chicago Council of Lawyers
- (10) Uniform Circuit Rules Committee of the Illinois State Bar Association
- (11) Judicial Administration Section of the Illinois State Bar Association
- (12) The Illinois Parole, Probation and Correctional Association
- (13) The Illinois Law Enforcement Commission's Advisory Task Force on Criminal Justice Training
- (14) Board of Commissioners of the Illinois Defender Project

Conclusion

One of the important purposes of this report is to keep the Court apprised of the operation of our courts through the collection and analysis of statistics.

The statistics reported herein, when compared with prior years, reveal that although our judges continue to dispose of more cases, there are two major areas where the pending inventories are rising to disturbing proportions. These two areas include the number of felony and law jury (\$15,000 and over) cases in Cook County.

In the area of felony cases there has been a 258% increase in the pending inventory since 1972. The following comparison reveals this increase:

1972	2,081
1973	2,737
1974	4,778
1975	6,700
1976	7,458

In the law jury division (\$15,000 and over) there has been a 40% increase in the pending inventory since 1972. The following comparison reveals this increase:


1972	28,780
1973	28,171
1974	31,342
1975	35,692
1976	40,156

In the criminal division, the Circuit Court of Cook County has taken steps to deal with the increasing inventory. New courtrooms have been added and additional judges have been assigned. Similar steps have not been taken with regard to the law jury division.

The addition of 30 new circuit judgeships by the General Assembly and the allocation of 10 additional associate judgeships during 1976, should serve to assist in dealing with these large inventories. When the Circuit Court of Cook County's judicial manpower is up to full strength, special efforts should be made to deal with these two areas.

1976
CASE LOADS
AND
STATISTICAL RECORDS

JUDICIAL OFFICERS
OF THE
STATE OF ILLINOIS



THE JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF ILLINOIS SUPREME AND APPELLATE COURTS

SUPREME COURT (1976)

Walter V. Schaefer
(Retired December 6, 1976)
Chicago, Illinois
Thomas E. Kluczynski
(Retired December 6, 1976)
Daniel P. Ward*
Chicago, Illinois
William G. Clark
(Elected November 2, 1976)
Chicago, Illinois
James A. Dooley
(Elected November 2, 1976)
Chicago, Illinois

SECOND DISTRICT

Caswell J. Crebs
(Retired judge serving by assignment
until December 6, 1976)
Thomas J. Moran
(Elected November 2, 1976)
Waukegan, Illinois

THIRD DISTRICT

Howard C. Ryan
Tonica, Illinois

FOURTH DISTRICT

Robert C. Underwood
Bloomington, Illinois

FIFTH DISTRICT

Joseph H. Goldenhersh
East St. Louis, Illinois

*Chief Justice


**SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS
NUMBER OF CASES DECIDED WITH FULL OPINIONS
1950-1976**




**SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS
NUMBER OF PETITIONS FOR REHEARING
1950—1976**



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS
NUMBER OF PETITIONS FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL
1950—1976



**SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS
NUMBER OF MOTIONS DISPOSED OF
1950—1976**



**TREND OF CASES IN THE SUPREME COURT
DURING 1976**

Type of Case		Pending at Start	Filed	Disposed of	Pending at End	Inventory Increase (+) Decrease (-)
Petitions for Leave to Appeal	Civil	61	392	388*	65	+4
	People	86	388	393*	81	-5
Public Interest (Rule 302(b) Motions)	Civil	0	56	56*	0	—
	People	0	6	6*	0	—
Original Actions (incl. Rule 381 Motions)	Civil	0	45	43*	2	+2
	People	1	16	15*	2	+1
Statute Held Invalid (Rules 302(a)(1), 603)	Civil	15	9	14	10	-5
	People	7	16	12	11	+4
Certificate of Importance (Rule 316)	Civil	1	3	2	2	+1
	People	0	0	0	0	—
Industrial Commission (Rule 302(a)(2))	Civil	39	41	46	34	-5
	People	—	—	—	—	—
Attorney Discipline	Civil	—	—	—	—	—
	People	5	11	10	6	+1
Death Penalty (Rule 603)	Civil	—	—	—	—	—
	People	1	0	0	1	—
Miscellaneous	Civil	0	4	4	0	—
	People	0	11	11	0	—
Totals	Civil	116	550	553	113	-3
	People	100	448	447	101	+1

* Includes orders granting petitions for leave to appeal, motions for direct appeal and motions in original action cases.

TREND OF CASES IN THE SUPREME COURT AFTER ALLOWANCE OF PETITIONS FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL, MOTIONS FOR DIRECT APPEALS & MOTIONS IN ORIGINAL ACTION CASES DURING 1976

Type of Case		Pending at Start	Appeals & Motions Allowed	Disposed of	Pending at End	Inventory Increase (+) Decrease (-)
Leave to Appeal Allowed	Civil	59	71	80	50	-9
	People	36	86	68	54	+18
Motion in Public Interest Case Allowed (Rule 302(b))	Civil	23	36	37	22	-1
	People	0	6	3	3	+3
Motion to File Original Action Allowed (incl. Rule 381 Motions)	Civil	4	11	8	7	+3
	People	2	2	3	1	-1
Totals	Civil	86	118	125	79	-7
	People	38	94	74	58	+20

TREND OF ALL CASES FILED & DISPOSED OF IN THE SUPREME COURT DURING 1976

All Cases		Pending at Start	Filed	Disposed of	Pending at End	Inventory Increase (+) Decrease (-)
Grand Total.	Civil	202	550	560	192	-10
	People	138	448	427	159	+21

APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
(May 1, 1976)

FIRST DISTRICT

First Division

Mayer Goldberg, Presiding Justice
Joseph Burke
Seymour Simon
John M. O'Connor

Second Division

John J. Stamos, Presiding Justice
Robert J. Downing
John C. Hayes
Mel Jiganti

Third Division

James J. Mejda, Presiding Justice
Thomas A. McGloon
John T. Dempsey
Daniel J. McNamara

Fourth Division

Glenn T. Johnson, Presiding Justice
Henry W. Dieringer
Thaddeus V. Adesko
Henry L. Burman

Fifth Division

Francis S. Lorenz, Presiding Justice
Charles R. Barrett
Joseph J. Drucker
John J. Sullivan

SECOND DISTRICT

First Division

William L. Guild, Presiding Justice
Albert E. Hallett
Glenn K. Seidenfeld

Second Division

Thomas J. Moran, Presiding Justice
Walter Dixon
L. L. Rechenmacher

THIRD DISTRICT

Jay J. Alloy, Presiding Justice
Richard Stengel
Allan L. Stouder
Tobias Barry

FOURTH DISTRICT

Harold F. Trapp, Presiding Justice
James C. Craven
Frederick S. Green
John T. Reardon

FIFTH DISTRICT

John M. Karns, Presiding Justice
Charles E. Jones
Edward C. Eberspacher
George J. Moran
Richard T. Carter

THE TREND OF CASES IN THE APPELLATE COURT DURING 1976

Appellate District		No. of Cases Pending 1-1-76	No. of Cases Filed During 1976	No. of Cases Disposed of During 1976	No. of Cases Disposed of During 1976 With Full Opinions	No. of Cases Pending 12-31-76	Gain or Loss in Currency	
							Gain	Loss
First	Civil	911	896	734	430	1,073	—	162
	Criminal .	976	835	949	398	862	114	—
Second	Civil	307*	312	323	209	296	11	—
	Criminal .	268	273	281	127	260	8	—
Third	Civil	155	232	202	134	185	—	30
	Criminal .	242	322	311	171	253	—	11
Fourth	Civil	207	194	210	122	191	16	—
	Criminal .	442	360	436	141	366	76	—
Fifth	Civil	223	224	209	120	238	—	15
	Criminal .	342	325	280	100	387	—	45
Total	Civil	1,803	1,858	1,678	1,015	1,983	—	180
	Criminal .	2,270	2,115	2,257	937	2,128	142	—

*Adjusted (—) from number pending 12/31/75

**CASES DISPOSED OF IN THE APPELLATE COURT
1976**

Appellate District		Affirmed 1. By Opinion 2. By Order*	Reversed 1. By Opinion 2. By Order*	Affirmed in Part 1. By Opinion 2. By Order*	Modified 1. By Opinion 2. By Order*	Dismissed 1. By Opinion 2. By Order*	Disposed of without Opinion or Order*	Totals
First	Civil	238 20	139 20	38 4	6 1	9 3	256	734
	Criminal	233 274	99 50	36 19	29 15	1 4	189	949
Second	Civil	118 10	65 7	20 —	1 —	5 1	96	323
	Criminal	97 102	15 6	11 8	4 1	— —	37	281
Third	Civil	71 2	47 —	10 —	3 —	3 —	66	202
	Criminal	120 58	27 —	5 —	15 —	4 —	82	311
Fourth	Civil	68 18	40 2	13 1	— —	1 3	64	210
	Criminal	73 176	40 18	27 30	— —	1 4	67	436
Fifth	Civil	53 20	48 11	12 1	2 —	5 2	55	209
	Criminal	46 98	28 8	13 6	9 3	4 2	63	280
Totals	Civil	548 70	339 40	93 6	12 1	23 9	537	1,678
	Criminal	569 708	209 82	92 63	57 19	10 10	438	2,257

* Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 23, as amended, effective July 1, 1975

**TIME LAPSE BETWEEN DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF
DISPOSITION OF CASES DECIDED IN THE
APPELLATE COURT DURING 1976**

Appellate District		Time Elapsed					
		Under 6 Mos.	6-12 Mos.	1-1½ Years	1½-2 Years	2-3 Years	Over 3 Years
First¹	Civil	119	187	271	106	38	13
	Criminal ..	76	200	467	123	69	14
Second²	Civil	87	82	99	38	17	—
	Criminal ..	55	99	95	27	5	—
Third	Civil	63	70	59	9	—	1
	Criminal ..	87	129	74	20	1	—
Fourth	Civil	52	35	75	30	18	—
	Criminal ..	54	133	148	76	25	—
Fifth	Civil	85	83	29	7	4	1
	Criminal ..	80	74	94	17	12	3
Total	Civil	406	457	533	190	77	15
	Criminal ..	352	635	878	263	112	17

**TIME LAPSE BETWEEN DATE BRIEFS WERE FILED AND
DATE OF DISPOSITION OF CASES DECIDED IN
THE APPELLATE COURT DURING 1976**

Appellate District		Time Elapsed					
		Under 6 Mos.	6-12 Mos.	1-1½ Years	1½-2 Years	2-3 Years	Over 3 Years
First	Civil	355	209	102	66	2	—
	Criminal ...	550	233	106	59	1	—
Second	Civil	165	131	22	3	2	—
	Criminal ...	143	120	19	—	—	—
Third	Civil	75	59	7	—	1	—
	Criminal ...	146	35	4	—	—	—
Fourth	Civil	87	80	36	6	1	—
	Criminal ...	263	149	18	6	—	—
Fifth	Civil	113	36	3	1	—	1
	Criminal ...	186	26	5	—	—	—
Total	Civil	795	515	170	76	6	1
	Criminal ...	1,288	563	152	65	1	—

**CASES DISPOSED OF WITHOUT OPINION OR ORDER PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 23
1976**


	Appellate District	Dismissed			Dismissed on Court's Own Motion				Leave to Appeal Denied ¹	Motion for Leave to File Late Notice of Appeal Denied ²	Summary Reversal	Reversed and Remanded	Remanded With Direction For Further Proceeding	Summary Reduction or Modification of Sentence	Bail Order Entered	Confession of Error	Transferred to Proper Court	Other Dispositions	Totals
		Motion of Appellant	Motion of Appellee	Stipulation of Parties	For Want of Prosecution/No Documents Filed	Failure to Comply With Rules	Lack of Jurisdiction/No Final Appealable Order	Failure to Comply With Court's Order											
First	Civil	54	48	42	70	—	—	—	17	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	—	256
	Criminal . .	49	15	1	56	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	22	40	4	—	189
Second . .	Civil	22	17	18	1	7	1	21	8	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	96
	Criminal . .	10	7	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	37
Third	Civil	24	7	11	—	3	—	8	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	66
	Criminal . .	22	4	2	—	1	—	16	7	13	—	1	—	—	6	—	3	6	82
Fourth . . .	Civil	16	6	7	2	7	2	6	5	2	—	—	5	—	—	—	5	1	64
	Criminal . .	23	9	—	6	10	1	4	—	5	—	—	2	—	1	5	—	1	67
Fifth	Civil	18	4	10	—	6	3	2	7	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	55
	Criminal . .	22	1	—	—	12	2	3	—	14	1	1	—	—	6	—	—	—	63
Total . . .	Civil	134	82	88	73	23	6	37	45	7	—	2	6	—	—	—	26	3	537
	Criminal . .	126	36	5	64	25	4	26	8	35	3	2	2	—	35	45	8	8	438

¹ Includes Denial of Permissive Interlocutory

² Includes Denial to File Late Record

**ABSTRACT SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF OPINIONS
WRITTEN BY JUDGES OF THE APPELLATE COURT
DURING 1976**

Appellate District	TYPE OF OPINION					
	Majority	Per Curiam	Specially Concurring	Dissenting	Supplemental	Total
First District	759	1	9	28	13	810
Second District . . .	314	—	1	5	4	324
Third District	302	3	8	20	—	333
Fourth District	263	—	15	39	6	323
Fifth District	209	2	8	41	6	266
Total	1,847	6	41	133	29	2,056



THE JUDICIAL CIRCUITS OF ILLINOIS

**CIRCUIT COURT JUDICIAL OFFICERS OF THE
STATE
(May 1, 1976)**

COOK COUNTY

Circuit Judges

John S. Boyle, Chief Judge

Earl Arkiss
Marvin E. Aspen
James M. Bailey
Frank W. Barbaro
Norman C. Barry
Raymond K. Berg
L. Sheldon Brown
Nicholas J. Bua
Robert C. Buckley
Felix M. Buoscio
Joseph J. Butler
David A. Canel
Archibald J. Carey, Jr.
David Cerda
Robert E. Cherry
Nathan M. Cohen
Robert J. Collins
Daniel P. Coman
Harry G. Comerford
Daniel A. Covelli
James D. Crosson
John J. Crown
Richard L. Curry
Walter P. Dahl
William V. Daly
Russell R. DeBow
Francis T. Delaney
George E. Dolezal
Raymond P. Drymalski
Arthur L. Dunne
Robert J. Dunne
Charles J. Durham
Norman N. Eiger
Irving W. Eiserman
Herbert A. Ellis
Paul F. Elward
Samuel B. Epstein
Saul A. Epton
Hyman Feldman
James H. Felt
George Fiedler
John C. Fitzgerald

Richard J. Fitzgerald
Thomas H. Fitzgerald
Philip A. Fleischman
Herbert R. Friedlund
Louis B. Garippo
James A. Geocaris
James A. Geroulis
Paul F. Gerrity
Louis J. Giliberto
Charles J. Grupp
Richard A. Harewood
Allen Hartman
John C. Hayes (assigned to
Appellate Court - 1st District)
Edward F. Healy
John F. Hechinger
Jacques F. Heilingoetter
Harry G. Hershenson
George A. Higgins
Reginald J. Holzer
Charles P. Horan
Robert L. Hunter
Louis J. Hyde
Harry A. Iseberg
Mel R. Jiganti (assigned to
Appellate Court - 1st District)
Mark E. Jones
Sidney A. Jones, Jr.
William B. Kane
Nathan J. Kaplan
Roger J. Kiley, Jr.
Anthony J. Kogut
Norman A. Korfist
Walter J. Kowalski
Franklin I. Kral
Irving Landesman
Richard F. LeFevour
Robert E. McAuliffe
Helen F. McGillicuddy
John P. McGury
Frank B. Machala
Benjamin S. Mackoff

Robert L. Massey
Nicholas J. Matkovic
Robert A. Meier, III
James J. Mejda (assigned to
Appellate Court - 1st District)
F. Emmett Morrissey
James E. Murphy
James C. Murray
Gordon B. Nash
Benjamin Nelson
John A. Nordberg
Irving R. Norman
Donald J. O'Brien
Wayne W. Olson
Margaret G. O'Malley
William F. Patterson
John E. Pavlik
Edward E. Plusdrak
Maurice D. Pompey
Albert S. Porter
Joseph A. Power
Philip Romiti
Thomas D. Rosenberg
Daniel J. Ryan
Edith S. Sampson
Raymond S. Sarnow
George J. Schaller
Joseph Schneider

Ben Schwartz
Harold A. Siegan
Joseph A. Solan
Pasquale A. Sorrentino
Harry S. Stark
Earl E. Strayhorn
James E. Strunck
Chester J. Strzalka
Harold W. Sullivan
Robert J. Sulski
Fred G. Suria, Jr.
Vincent W. Tondryk
Raymond Trafelet
Jose R. Vazquez
Eugene L. Wachowski
Garland W. Watt
Alfonse F. Wells
Kenneth R. Wendt
Louis A. Wexler
Daniel J. White
William Sylvester White
Frank J. Wilson
Kenneth E. Wilson
Minor K. Wilson
Warren D. Wolfson
Joseph Wosik
Arthur V. Zelezinski

Associate Judges

Charles A. Alfano
Peter Bakakos
Francis Barth
Lionel J. Berc
Walter B. Bieschke
Nicholas J. Bohling
Anthony J. Bosco
John E. Bowe
John M. Breen, Jr.
James J. Brennan
Martin F. Brodtkin
Jerome T. Burke
Francis P. Butler
Thomas R. Casey, Jr.
Thomas P. Cawley
Irwin Cohen
Cornelius J. Collins
James A. Condon
Francis X. Connell

Richard K. Cooper
Peter F. Costa
Ronald J. Crane
John W. Crilly
Brian Crowe
John J. Crowley
Robert E. Cusack
Robert J. Dempsey
Russell J. Dolce
John T. Duffy
Rosemary Duschene
Ben Edelstein
Nathan Engelstein
William F. Fitzpatrick
John M. Flaherty
John Gannon
Marion W. Garnett
Lawrence Genesen
Joseph R. Gill

Francis W. Glowacki
 Meyer H. Goldstein
 Myron T. Gomborg
 Ben Gorenstein
 James L. Griffin
 Jacob S. Guthman
 Arthur N. Hamilton
 Edwin C. Hatfield
 John J. Hogan
 Thomas J. Janczy
 Rudolph L. Janega
 Eddie C. Johnson
 Michael S. Jordan
 Richard H. Jorzak
 Benjamin J. Kanter
 Aubrey F. Kaplan
 Wallace I. Kargman
 Helen J. Kelleher
 John J. Kelley, Jr.
 Irving Kipnis
 Marilyn R. Komosa
 Edwin Kretske
 Albert H. LaPlante
 Joseph T. Lavorci
 Archibald LeCesne
 Reuben J. Liffshin
 John J. Limperis
 David Linn
 Frank S. Loverde
 Martin G. Luken
 Robert G. Mackey
 Francis J. Maher
 Francis J. Mahon
 Erwin L. Martay
 John H. McCollom
 John J. McDonnell
 William J. McGah, Jr.
 Dwight McKay
 Anthony J. Mentone
 Howard M. Miller
 Joseph W. Mioduski
 Anthony S. Montelione
 Joseph C. Mooney

John J. Moran
 Matthew J. Moran
 John M. Murphy
 Benjamin E. Novoselsky
 Paul A. O'Malley
 John A. Ouska
 William E. Peterson
 Marvin J. Peters
 Frank R. Petrone
 James P. Piragine
 Bernard A. Polikoff
 Simon S. Porter
 Francis X. Poynton
 Seymour S. Price
 John F. Reynolds
 Emanuel A. Rissman
 Allen F. Rosin
 Joseph A. Salerno
 Richard L. Samuels
 Harry A. Schrier
 Joseph R. Schwaba
 Anthony J. Scotillo
 Samuel Shamberg
 David J. Shields
 Frank M. Siracusa
 Jerome C. Slad
 Raymond C. Sodini
 Milton H. Solomon
 Robert C. Springsguth
 Adam N. Stillo
 Arthur A. Sullivan, Jr.
 James N. Sullivan
 Robert A. Sweeney
 John F. Thornton
 Alvin A. Turner
 Thomas M. Walsh
 James M. Walton
 Jack A. Welfeld
 Willie Mae Whiting
 Bernard B. Wolfe
 James A. Zafiratos
 George J. Zimmerman
 Michael F. Zlatnik

FIRST CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

John H. Clayton, Chief Judge

Robert H. Chase
 Stewart Cluster

Peyton H. Kunce
 Duane T. Leach

Snyder Howell
Harry L. McCabe
George Oros
Robert B. Porter
Everett Prosser

William A. Lewis
Paul D. Reese
Richard E. Richman
Dorothy W. Spomer

Associate Judges

Thomas W. Haney
Michael P. O'Shea

Robert W. Schwartz

SECOND CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Philip B. Benefiel, Chief Judge

John D. Daily
Don Al Foster
Charles Woodrow Frailey
F. P. Hanagan
A. Hanby Jones
Henry Lewis

Albert W. McCallister
Clarence E. Partee
Wilburn Bruce Saxe
Alvin Lacy Williams
Carrie LaRoe Winter
Harry L. Ziegler

Associate Judges

William A. Alexander
Roland J. DeMarco

Charles L. Quindry

THIRD CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Joseph J. Barr, Chief Judge

William L. Beatty
Horace L. Calvo
Harold R. Clark
John L. DeLaurenti

John Gitchoff
Moses W. Harrison, II
Victor J. Mosele

Associate Judges

John W. Day
Edward C. Ferguson
Robert D. Francis
Thomas R. Gibbons
Merlin Gerald Hiscott

William E. Johnson
A. Andreas Matoesian
Philip J. Rarick
Clayton R. Williams

FOURTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Bill J. Slater, Chief Judge

Daniel H. Dailey
William A. Ginos
Arthur G. Henken
Paul M. Hickman
Raymond O. Horn
George W. Kasserman, Jr.

George R. Kelly
James E. McMackin, Jr.
Gail E. McWard
Jack M. Michaelree
Robert J. Sanders
E. Harold Wineland

Associate Judges

Don E. Beane
Ronald A. Niemann

William H. Spitler, Jr.

FIFTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Jacob Berkowitz, Chief Judge

Caslon K. Bennett
Thomas M. Burke
Carl A. Lund
Frank J. Meyer
Ralph S. Pearman

James Kent Robinson
William J. Sunderman
James R. Watson
Paul M. Wright

Associate Judges

Lawrence T. Allen, Jr.
Rita B. Garman
Tom E. Grace

Matthew Andrew Jurczak
Richard E. Scott

SIXTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Rodney A. Scott, Chief Judge

William C. Calvin
Frank J. Gollings
Harold L. Jensen
Roger H. Little
Birch E. Morgan
Donald W. Morthland

Joseph C. Munch
James N. Sherrick
John P. Shonkwiler
Creed D. Tucker
Albert G. Webber, III

Associate Judges

Henry Lester Brinkoetter
John L. Davis
Wilbur A. Flessner
W. B. Kranz

Sarah McAllister Lumppp
Jerry L. Patton
George Richard Skillman
Andrew Stecyk

SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Byron E. Koch, Chief Judge

J. Waldo Ackerman
Harvey Beam
William D. Conway
George P. Coutrakon

Simon L. Friedman
Paul C. Verticchio
Howard Lee White
John B. Wright

Associate Judges

Richard J. Cadagin
Eugene O. Duban
Imy J. Feuer
Jerry S. Rhodes

Charles J. Ryan
Dennis L. Schwartz
Gordon D. Seator

EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Richard F. Scholz, Jr., Chief Judge

Cecil J. Burrows
Lyle E. Lipe
Richard Mills
Alfred L. Pezman
J. Ross Pool

John T. Reardon
Fred W. Reither
David K. Slocum
Ernest H. Utter
Guy R. Williams

Associate Judges

Leo J. Altmix
Edward B. Dittmeyer

Paul A. Kolodziej
Virgil W. Timpe

NINTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Daniel J. Roberts, Chief Judge

U.S. Collins
Steven G. Evans
Scott I. Klukos
Gale A. Mathers

Francis P. Murphy
Albert Scott
Wm. L. Randolph
Max B. Stewart

Associate Judges

Kenneth L. Bath
Jack R. Kirkpatrick
Lewis D. Murphy

William K. Richardson
Keith Sanderson
Charles H. Wilhelm

TENTH CIRCUIT
Circuit Judges

Ivan L. Yontz, Chief Judge

Steven J. Covey
Richard E. Eagleton
Edward E. Haugens
James D. Heiple
Robert E. Hunt

Charles W. Iben
Albert Pucci
Calvin R. Stone
Charles M. Wilson

Associate Judges

Robert A. Coney
Carl O. Davies
Arthur H. Gross
John A. Holtzman
Peter J. Paolucci

William John Reardon
John D. Sullivan
John A. Whitney
Espey C. Williamson
William H. Young

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
Circuit Judges

John T. McCullough, Chief Judge

William T. Caisley
Keith E. Campbell
Luther H. Dearborn
Charles E. Glennon

Samuel Glenn Harrod, III
John T. McCullough
Wendell E. Oliver
William M. Roberts
Wayne C. Townley, Jr.

Associate Judges

William D. DeCardy
Ivan Dean Johnson
Joseph H. Kelley

James A. Knecht
Darrell H. Reno
Robert Leo Thornton

TWELFTH CIRCUIT
Circuit Judges

Victor N. Cardosi, Chief Judge

Robert R. Buchar
Patrick M. Burns
Wayne P. Dyer
Robert E. Higgins

Robert J. Immel
David E. Oram
Michael A. Orenic
Angelo F. Pistilli

Associate Judges

Roger A. Benson
Charles P. Connor
Emil DiLorenzo
Thomas M. Ewert
Thomas P. Faulkner
Louis K. Fontenot

John F. Gnadinger
Daniel W. Gould
Michael H. Lyons
John F. Michela
John Verklan
Thomas W. Vinson

THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

William P. Denny, Chief Judge

Thomas R. Clydesdale
Thomas R. Flood
Leonard Hoffman

Robert W. Malmquist
Wendell L. Thompson
C. Howard Wampler

Associate Judges

John J. Clinch, Jr.
Fred P. Wagner
James L. Waring

James J. Wimbiscus
Robert G. Wren
John D. Zwanzig

FOURTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Dan H. McNeal, Chief Judge

Glenn W. Appleton
Robert M. Bell
Joseph G. Carpentier
L. E. Ellison
Robert J. Horberg
Wilbur S. Johnson

John D. O'Shea
John Louis Poole
Paul E. Rink
Charles J. Smith
Conway L. Spanton

Associate Judges

Walter E. Clark
John B. Cunningham
John R. Erhart
Jay M. Hanson

Ivan Lovaas
Edwin Clare Malone
Henry W. McNeal
Frederick P. Patton

FIFTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

James E. Bales, Chief Judge

Thomas E. Hornsby
Everett E. Laughlin
Robert D. Law
Lawrence F. Lenz

John L. Moore
John W. Rapp, Jr.
James B. Vincent

Associate Judges

Alan W. Cargerman
James R. Hansgen
Martin D. Hill

Dexter A. Knowlton
Lawrence A. Smith

SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Ernest W. Akemann, Chief Judge

James E. Boyle
Wilson D. Burnell
John A. Krause
Neil E. Mahoney
Joseph M. McCarthy

Rex F. Meilinger
John S. Page
John S. Petersen
Paul W. Schnake
Carl A. Swanson, Jr.

Associate Judges

Donald T. Anderson
James W. Cadwell
Thomas S. Cliffe
William H. Ellsworth

Barry E. Puklin
James F. Quetsch
Joseph T. Suhler
William D. Vanderwater

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

John E. Sype, Chief Judge

David R. Babb
Seely P. Forbes
John S. Ghent

Robert C. Gill
John C. Layng
William R. Nash

Associate Judges

Harris H. Agnew
John T. Beynon
Robert J. French
Galyn W. Moehring

Michael R. Morrison
John W. Nielsen
Alford R. Penniman
David F. Smith

EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

George W. Unverzagt, Chief Judge

Edwin L. Douglas
Bruce R. Fawell
James E. Fitzgerald

William V. Hopf
Philip F. Locke
Alfred E. Woodward

Associate Judges

William E. Black
George Borovic, Jr.
George Herbert Bunge
Carl F. J. Henninger
Fredrick Henzi
Marvin E. Johnson
Helen C. Kinney
Edward W. Kowal

Gordon Moffett
Lewis V. Morgan, Jr.
Robert A. Nolan
Charles R. Norgle, Sr.
Charles W. Spencer
John S. Teschne
George B. VanVleck

NINETEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Harry D. Strouse, Jr., Chief Judge

James H. Cooney
LaVerne A. Dixon
Thomas R. Doran
Fred H. Geiger
William J. Gleason

John L. Hughes
John J. Kaufman
Charles S. Parker
Lloyd A. Van Deusen

Associate Judges

William D. Block
Leonard Brody
Bernard E. Drew, Jr.
Conrad F. Floeter
Warren Fox
Harry D. Hartel, Jr.

Roland A. Herrmann
William F. Homer
Robert K. McQueen
Charles F. Scott
Alvin I. Singer
Robert J. Smart

TWENTIETH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Joseph F. Cunningham, Chief Judge

Robert Bastien
Carl H. Becker
Richard T. Carter (assigned
to Appellate Court)
William P. Fleming

Robert L. Gagen
John J. Hoban
Alvin H. Maeys, Jr.
Francis E. Maxwell

Associate Judges

David W. Costello
Jerry D. Flynn
Richard R. Goldenhersh
Robert A. Hayes
Kenneth J. Juen

Billy Jones
Stephen M. Kernan
Thomas P. O'Donnell
Robert J. Saunders
Robert J. Sprague

**RATIO OF CASELOAD PER JUDGE
IN THE CIRCUIT COURTS OF ILLINOIS DURING 1976**

Circuit	Number of Counties	Population (1970 Federal Census)	Area (Square Miles)	Total Number of Cases Filed During 1976	Number of Circuit Judges, Associate Judges	Average No. of Cases per Judge
Cook	1	5,492,369	954	2,252,048	257	8,763
1st	9	191,873	3,228	38,049	17	2,238
2nd	12	199,194	4,796	30,371	16	1,898
3rd	2	264,946	1,114	56,672	17	3,334
4th	9	226,934	5,424	39,464	16	2,467
5th	5	192,441	2,884	35,573	15	2,372
6th	6	353,035	3,177	70,942	20	3,547
7th	6	283,668	3,485	52,689	16	3,293
8th	8	149,507	3,918	27,661	15	1,844
9th	6	193,514	3,904	35,145	15	2,343
10th	5	339,786	2,129	76,399	20	3,820
11th	5	223,011	3,863	47,672	16	2,980
12th	3	380,280	2,647	102,428	21	4,878
13th	3	176,485	2,453	32,342	13	2,488
14th	4	300,122	2,492	67,255	20	3,363
15th	5	170,717	3,136	37,249	13	2,865
16th	3	349,033	1,472	95,681	19	5,036
17th	2	272,063	803	81,506	15	5,434
18th	1	491,882	331	100,239	22	4,556
19th	2	494,193	1,068	122,695	22	5,577
20th	5	368,923	2,652	62,667	18	3,482
Downstate Total	101	5,621,607	54,976	1,212,699	346	3,505
State Total	102	11,113,976	55,930	3,464,747	603	5,746

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
1st ...	Alexander	Begun	5	3	8	29	4	27	—	10	—	17	98
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	5	3	8	29	4	27	—	10	—	17	98
		Terminated	9	2	2	34	2	26	2	19	1	17	92
	Jackson	Begun	54	33	22	158	68	29	20	33	—	—	346
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	+18	-18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	54	33	40	140	68	29	20	33	—	—	346
		Terminated	61	26	24	154	79	53	3	51	1	—	337
	Johnson	Begun	9	7	1	9	9	10	1	13	—	—	54
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	10	6	3	7	9	10	1	13	—	—	54
		Terminated	5	3	7	5	3	6	3	3	—	—	52
	Massac	Begun	21	1	10	16	7	18	—	17	3	—	140
		Reinstated	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	22	—	11	16	7	18	—	17	3	—	140
		Terminated	16	—	2	22	8	11	—	14	3	—	153
	Pope	Begun	—	3	1	6	3	—	—	2	—	—	19
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+2	-2	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	2	1	2	5	3	—	—	2	—	—	19
		Terminated	2	2	1	9	5	—	—	3	—	—	28
	Pulaski	Begun	4	2	1	26	2	9	1	4	—	1	70
		Reinstated	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+2	-2	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	6	—	2	26	2	10	2	4	—	1	70
		Terminated	1	1	4	29	3	8	1	3	—	—	70
	Saline	Begun	35	13	4	69	22	14	—	38	—	8	206
		Reinstated	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	35	15	4	69	22	14	—	38	—	8	206
		Terminated	31	9	4	79	26	9	2	40	—	8	208
	Union	Begun	19	2	4	33	23	3	1	11	—	676	108
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	19	2	4	33	23	3	1	11	—	676	108
		Terminated	15	5	2	16	5	8	1	2	—	672	78
	Williamson	Begun	67	24	17	189	67	52	1	—	1	3	395
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	67	24	17	189	68	52	1	—	1	3	395
		Terminated	47	18	11	125	41	54	1	5	3	1	349
1st ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	214	88	68	535	205	162	24	128	4	705	1,436
		Reinstated	—	2	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+6	-6	+22	-22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	220	84	91	514	206	163	25	128	4	705	1,436
		Terminated	187	66	57	473	172	175	13	140	8	698	1,367

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
33	57	114	525	90	62	—	2,094	142	3,318 Begun Alexander	... 1st
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-37	+37	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
33	57	77	562	90	62	—	2,094	142	3,318 Net Added		
25	39	129	694	77	30	1	1,925	114	3,240 Terminated		
170	38	138	394	640	128	1,440	7,358	33	11,102 Begun Jackson	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-46	+46	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
170	38	92	440	640	128	1,440	7,358	33	11,102 Net Added		
165	59	197	497	613	117	1,502	7,161	29	11,129 Terminated		
13	4	40	121	65	25	—	2,208	17	2,606 Begun Johnson	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-5	+5	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
13	4	35	126	65	25	—	2,208	17	2,606 Net Added		
5	5	34	145	58	7	—	2,067	19	2,427 Terminated		
32	17	63	257	83	41	43	1,398	42	2,209 Begun Massac	
—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	3 Reinstated		
—	—	-16	+16	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
32	18	47	273	83	41	43	1,399	42	2,212 Net Added		
26	22	79	327	87	32	62	1,405	31	2,300 Terminated		
4	7	23	55	16	12	—	209	37	397 Begun Pope	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-7	+7	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
4	7	16	62	16	12	—	209	37	397 Net Added		
4	6	20	90	19	26	—	187	36	438 Terminated		
40	25	47	177	79	21	16	1,587	30	2,142 Begun Pulaski	
—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4 Reinstated		
—	—	-12	+12	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
40	26	35	189	79	21	16	1,587	30	2,146 Net Added		
24	23	33	171	105	14	17	1,558	29	2,094 Terminated		
64	60	132	207	450	96	473	1,797	36	3,724 Begun Saline	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
64	60	132	207	450	96	473	1,797	36	3,726 Net Added		
61	66	190	245	411	106	437	1,669	36	3,637 Terminated		
29	28	68	165	185	66	38	1,605	32	3,096 Begun Union	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-22	+22	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
29	28	46	187	185	66	38	1,605	32	3,096 Net Added		
21	17	39	153	192	46	31	1,482	30	2,815 Terminated		
122	143	218	718	858	165	202	6,137	76	9,455 Begun Williamson	
—	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	5 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
122	145	219	719	858	165	202	6,137	76	9,460 Net Added		
83	62	236	619	766	170	191	6,127	79	8,988 Terminated		
507	379	843	2,619	2,466	616	2,212	24,393	445	38,049 Begun Circuit Totals	... 1st
—	4	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	14 Reinstated		
—	—	-145	+145	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
507	383	699	2,765	2,466	616	2,212	24,394	445	38,063 Net Added		
414	299	957	2,941	2,328	548	2,241	23,581	403	37,068 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
2nd	Crawford	Begun	9	15	—	73	39	9	—	10	—	6	154
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	10	14	1	72	39	9	—	10	—	6	154
		Terminated	9	13	4	57	19	5	—	51	—	6	143
	Edwards	Begun	—	1	—	12	10	3	—	18	3	—	46
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	—	1	—	12	10	3	—	18	3	—	46
		Terminated	—	3	—	8	4	2	—	21	1	—	42
	Franklin	Begun	31	21	10	136	27	11	2	2	5	6	321
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	31	21	10	136	27	11	2	2	5	6	321
		Terminated	29	7	8	131	30	10	—	14	11	—	331
	Gallatin	Begun	3	3	—	24	5	2	—	14	—	—	61
		Reinstated	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	3	3	—	25	5	2	—	14	—	—	64
		Terminated	15	8	6	30	33	2	3	10	1	—	56
	Hamilton	Begun	3	—	—	18	5	6	2	1	—	—	47
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	4	-1	2	16	5	6	2	1	—	—	47
		Terminated	5	—	3	12	5	7	—	—	—	—	45
	Hardin	Begun	3	1	—	6	3	4	—	7	—	—	27
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	3	1	—	6	3	4	—	7	—	—	27
		Terminated	2	—	1	2	—	4	—	5	—	—	25
	Jefferson	Begun	42	28	7	161	38	12	1	42	2	45	216
		Reinstated	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
		Transferred	+3	-3	+5	-5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	46	25	13	157	38	12	1	42	2	45	218
		Terminated	33	21	14	134	17	12	—	31	2	47	219
	Lawrence	Begun	12	10	1	36	11	3	1	2	—	3	91
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	12	10	1	36	11	3	1	2	—	3	93
		Terminated	8	14	1	32	3	2	5	11	—	2	90
	Richland	Begun	9	10	3	52	19	12	—	4	—	16	136
		Reinstated	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+3	-3	+4	-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	12	7	7	50	19	12	—	4	—	16	136
		Terminated	12	6	6	39	8	12	—	8	—	16	125
	Wabash	Begun	2	14	1	26	10	14	—	3	—	1	99
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	2	14	1	26	10	14	—	3	—	1	99
		Terminated	—	11	2	87	41	13	—	8	—	1	137

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
29	4	49	270	219	135	84	1,047	14	2,166 Begun Crawford	2nd
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-14	+14	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
29	4	35	284	219	135	84	1,047	14	2,166 Net Added		
22	14	44	417	187	123	93	983	15	2,205 Terminated		
16	3	24	136	88	38	13	657	30	1,098 Begun Edwards	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-5	+5	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
16	3	19	141	88	38	13	657	30	1,098 Net Added		
15	4	18	120	81	35	7	633	24	1,018 Terminated		
95	55	118	330	430	185	194	4,352	84	6,415 Begun Franklin	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-22	+22	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
95	55	96	352	430	185	194	4,352	84	6,415 Net Added		
73	108	120	354	427	126	208	4,848	77	6,912 Terminated		
10	24	31	116	162	32	88	1,029	9	1,613 Begun Gallatin	
—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	6 Reinstated		
—	—	-15	+15	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
10	24	18	131	162	32	88	1,029	9	1,619 Net Added		
5	18	20	125	122	22	83	1,024	6	1,589 Terminated		
9	10	16	92	80	57	—	727	19	1,092 Begun Hamilton	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-4	+4	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
9	10	12	96	80	57	—	727	19	1,092 Net Added		
9	13	12	80	52	48	—	748	17	1,056 Terminated		
2	11	17	45	10	19	1	88	3	247 Begun Hardin	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-1	+1	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
2	11	16	46	10	19	1	88	3	247 Net Added		
4	7	7	53	10	13	1	101	3	238 Terminated		
54	34	180	161	392	85	237	2,809	46	4,592 Begun Jefferson	
—	2	5	2	10	—	—	—	—	24 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
54	36	185	163	402	85	237	2,809	46	4,616 Net Added		
49	14	68	67	386	82	268	2,750	40	4,254 Terminated		
34	17	77	234	227	98	73	1,078	50	2,058 Begun Lawrence	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-26	+26	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
34	17	51	260	227	98	73	1,078	50	2,060 Net Added		
14	16	79	192	246	57	56	994	45	1,867 Terminated		
26	41	46	411	268	90	1	2,074	25	3,243 Begun Richland	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-5	+5	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
26	41	41	416	268	90	1	2,074	25	3,245 Net Added		
22	55	26	357	271	89	2	1,881	24	2,959 Terminated		
18	47	111	444	171	60	125	921	26	2,093 Begun Wabash	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
18	47	111	444	171	60	125	921	26	2,093 Net Added		
28	50	138	685	323	49	89	1,103	34	2,799 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury							
	Wayne	Begun	15	11	2	66	17	3	—	44	2	1	127
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	+3	-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	16	10	5	63	17	3	—	44	2	1	127
		Terminated	15	3	3	51	13	3	—	51	—	4	114
	White	Begun	7	2	1	23	10	12	3	9	2	2	149
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	7	2	1	23	10	12	3	9	2	2	149
		Terminated	3	3	2	28	5	9	—	10	—	2	158
2nd ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	136	116	25	633	194	91	9	156	14	80	1,474
		Reinstated	1	—	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
		Transferred	+9	-9	+15	-15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	146	107	41	622	194	91	9	156	14	80	1,481
		Terminated	131	89	50	611	178	81	8	220	15	78	1,485
3rd ...	Bond	Begun	2	6	1	42	5	8	2	27	—	8	82
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	2	6	1	42	5	8	2	27	—	8	82
		Terminated	1	—	—	13	1	5	—	7	1	7	80
	Madison	Begun	742	186	390	713	213	327	35	611	19	228	1,889
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	743	185	390	713	213	327	35	611	19	228	1,889
		Terminated	650	130	435	706	226	252	69	33	19	176	1,696
3rd ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	744	192	391	755	218	335	37	638	19	236	1,971
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	745	191	391	755	218	335	37	638	19	236	1,971
		Terminated	651	130	435	719	227	257	69	40	20	183	1,776
4th ...	Christian	Begun	19	17	15	85	24	15	—	6	—	1	201
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	+1	—	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	19	18	15	84	24	15	—	6	—	1	201
		Terminated	24	28	7	110	17	16	—	4	—	1	208
	Clay	Begun	5	8	—	42	23	11	—	7	—	—	70
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	5	8	—	42	23	11	—	7	—	—	70
		Terminated	10	9	1	34	25	9	—	10	—	—	69
	Clinton	Begun	18	5	2	38	16	5	1	6	—	3	59
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	18	5	2	38	16	5	1	6	—	3	59
		Terminated	8	—	5	34	12	—	1	1	—	1	54
	Effingham	Begun	21	7	—	89	11	20	6	7	1	5	141
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	21	7	—	89	11	20	6	7	1	5	141
		Terminated	13	5	—	75	10	18	—	5	—	2	130

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
22	25	38	149	295	60	46	1,510	52	2,485 Begun Wayne	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-5	+5	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
22	25	33	154	295	60	46	1,510	52	2,485 Net Added		
18	7	24	138	422	57	41	1,430	47	2,441 Terminated		
33	26	75	282	292	106	133	2,068	34	3,269 Begun White	
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 Reinstated		
—	—	-21	+21	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
33	26	55	303	292	106	133	2,068	34	3,270 Net Added		
28	33	59	322	336	76	122	2,076	27	3,299 Terminated		
348	297	782	2,670	2,634	965	995	18,360	392	30,371 Begun Circuit Totals	.. 2nd
—	2	8	2	10	—	—	—	—	35 Reinstated		
—	—	-118	+118	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
348	299	672	2,790	2,644	965	995	18,360	392	30,406 Net Added		
287	339	615	2,910	2,863	777	970	18,571	359	30,637 Terminated		
24	30	42	205	248	70	13	2,132	11	2,958 Begun Bond	... 3rd
—	—	—	5	—	—	—	1	—	6 Reinstated		
—	—	-1	+1	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
24	30	41	211	248	70	13	2,133	11	2,964 Net Added		
14	24	31	159	308	15	15	1,684	11	2,376 Terminated		
746	463	1,450	2,399	4,682	880	6,044	31,616	81	53,714 Begun Madison	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-333	+333	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
746	463	1,117	2,732	4,682	880	6,044	31,616	81	53,714 Net Added		
546	352	966	3,078	4,904	1,101	5,864	31,631	90	52,924 Terminated		
770	493	1,492	2,604	4,930	950	6,057	33,748	92	56,672 Begun Circuit Totals	... 3rd
—	—	—	5	—	—	—	1	—	6 Reinstated		
—	—	-334	+334	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
770	493	1,158	2,943	4,930	950	6,057	33,749	92	56,678 Net Added		
560	376	997	3,237	5,212	1,116	5,879	33,315	101	55,300 Terminated		
42	66	108	324	328	204	18	4,346	72	5,891 Begun Christian	... 4th
—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-13	+13	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
42	66	96	338	328	204	18	4,346	72	5,893 Net Added		
44	60	88	303	325	201	18	4,314	61	5,829 Terminated		
14	35	72	163	324	94	5	1,219	14	2,106 Begun Clay	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-10	+10	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
14	35	62	173	324	94	5	1,219	14	2,106 Net Added		
11	43	57	181	259	65	1	1,195	13	1,992 Terminated		
31	20	90	242	212	149	44	2,449	146	3,536 Begun Clinton	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-2	+2	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
31	20	88	244	212	149	44	2,449	146	3,536 Net Added		
10	17	46	286	115	92	42	2,506	142	3,372 Terminated		
30	72	66	621	345	152	1	4,986	29	6,610 Begun Effingham	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-11	+11	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
30	72	55	632	345	152	1	4,986	29	6,610 Net Added		
22	42	73	644	402	107	2	4,829	25	6,404 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
	Fayette	Begun	11	3	3	38	6	20	—	36	—	2	115
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	11	3	3	38	6	20	—	36	—	2	115
		Terminated	4	3	3	27	6	14	—	25	1	1	99
	Jasper	Begun	4	4	—	30	15	7	—	1	—	—	38
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	4	4	—	30	15	7	—	1	—	—	38
		Terminated	2	1	1	25	13	4	—	—	—	—	40
	Marion	Begun	48	14	13	141	16	21	—	2	5	18	287
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+4	-4	+4	-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	52	10	17	137	16	21	—	2	5	18	287
		Terminated	48	12	15	94	9	17	—	14	1	10	287
	Montgomery	Begun	27	13	4	49	9	25	2	2	—	9	151
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	27	13	4	49	9	25	2	2	—	9	151
		Terminated	20	5	6	77	13	20	10	8	—	5	126
	Shelby	Begun	8	2	—	55	11	4	—	23	2	1	83
		Reinstated	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	11	—	—	55	12	4	—	23	2	1	83
		Terminated	11	—	—	38	9	1	2	17	—	—	77
4th ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	161	73	37	567	131	128	9	90	8	39	1,145
		Reinstated	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+6	-5	+4	-5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	168	68	41	562	132	128	9	90	8	39	1,145
		Terminated	140	63	38	514	114	99	13	84	2	20	1,090
5th ...	Clark	Begun	6	6	1	44	15	6	—	2	—	—	83
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	6	6	1	44	15	6	—	2	—	—	83
		Terminated	10	7	1	33	10	3	—	16	—	—	71
	Coles	Begun	45	29	8	229	21	28	—	1	—	3	319
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	45	29	8	229	21	28	—	1	—	3	319
		Terminated	30	12	5	154	19	11	—	4	—	6	297
	Cumberland	Begun	—	—	—	9	4	—	—	—	—	2	40
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	—	—	—	9	4	—	—	—	—	2	40
		Terminated	5	—	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	2	40
	Edgar	Begun	8	10	1	74	14	6	1	4	—	—	129
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	8	10	2	73	14	6	1	4	—	—	129
		Terminated	9	4	—	52	7	4	1	4	—	—	121

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
37	49	89	198	156	134	218	2,829	79	4,023 Begun Fayette	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-21	+24	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
37	49	65	222	156	134	218	2,829	79	4,023 Net Added		
25	20	69	192	153	118	160	2,527	81	3,528 Terminated		
9	24	30	110	87	63	72	1,646	10	2,150 Begun Jasper	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-3	+3	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
9	24	27	113	87	63	72	1,646	10	2,150 Net Added		
9	15	31	100	81	51	38	1,605	12	2,028 Terminated		
84	119	154	550	375	211	95	4,280	46	6,479 Begun Marion	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-39	+39	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
84	119	115	589	375	211	95	4,280	46	6,479 Net Added		
57	120	152	602	349	158	107	3,954	37	6,043 Terminated		
62	93	120	372	270	189	11	4,141	26	5,575 Begun Montgomery	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-18	+18	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
62	93	102	390	270	189	11	4,141	26	5,575 Net Added		
48	57	89	342	269	154	17	4,070	29	5,365 Terminated		
24	26	40	274	173	142	132	1,919	175	3,094 Begun Shelby	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-8	+8	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
24	26	32	282	173	142	132	1,919	175	3,096 Net Added		
14	12	13	259	116	71	114	1,819	146	2,719 Terminated		
333	504	769	2,854	2,270	1,338	596	27,815	597	39,464 Begun Circuit Totals...	4th
—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	4 Reinstated		
—	—	-128	+128	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
333	504	642	2,983	2,270	1,338	596	27,815	597	39,468 Net Added		
240	386	618	2,909	2,069	1,017	499	26,819	546	37,280 Terminated		
30	8	26	229	283	104	9	5,194	25	6,071 Begun Clark...	5th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
30	8	26	229	283	104	9	5,194	25	6,071 Net Added		
33	3	23	221	282	88	9	4,542	25	5,377 Terminated		
80	114	232	521	775	232	350	5,643	18	8,648 Begun Coles	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-37	+37	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
80	114	195	558	775	232	350	5,643	18	8,648 Net Added		
73	82	168	565	1,147	194	381	5,643	18	8,809 Terminated		
5	16	31	135	41	32	—	978	—	1,293 Begun Cumberland	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
5	16	31	135	41	32	—	978	—	1,293 Net Added		
1	9	20	84	38	18	—	822	—	1,043 Terminated		
32	33	56	211	333	156	4	1,956	37	3,065 Begun Edgar	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-19	+19	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
32	33	37	230	333	156	4	1,956	37	3,065 Net Added		
47	24	31	335	291	227	4	1,943	32	3,136 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATED

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
	Vermilion	Begun	62	25	14	546	44	72	5	110	—	68	756
		Reinstated	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	63	24	14	547	44	72	5	110	—	68	756
		Terminated	62	18	8	483	47	57	8	352	—	53	792
5th ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	121	70	24	902	98	112	6	117	—	73	1,327
		Reinstated	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	122	69	25	902	98	112	6	117	—	73	1,327
		Terminated	116	41	14	725	84	75	9	376	—	61	1,321
6th ...	Champaign	Begun	173	68	16	597	114	74	5	14	—	69	1,093
		Reinstated	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	173	68	17	597	114	74	5	14	—	69	1,094
		Terminated	161	26	20	419	85	61	7	14	—	49	1,037
	DeWitt	Begun	17	7	3	34	13	6	—	15	2	—	73
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	17	7	3	34	13	6	—	15	3	—	74
		Terminated	14	2	5	33	6	4	—	7	—	—	73
	Douglas	Begun	17	8	3	47	16	4	1	31	—	2	108
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	17	8	3	47	16	4	1	31	—	2	108
		Terminated	9	7	4	50	20	5	1	30	—	2	116
	Macon	Begun	151	40	43	952	78	52	9	1	46	34	1,003
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	151	40	43	952	78	52	9	1	46	34	1,003
		Terminated	83	44	31	957	106	65	11	1	47	74	960
	Moultrie	Begun	12	1	3	52	3	1	—	6	—	—	69
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	12	1	5	50	3	1	—	6	—	—	69
		Terminated	2	—	5	45	3	1	—	—	—	—	72
	Piatt	Begun	9	3	2	23	7	9	1	15	—	1	80
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	9	3	2	23	7	9	1	15	—	1	80
		Terminated	8	1	5	23	7	6	1	4	—	1	79
6th ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	379	127	70	1,705	231	146	16	82	48	106	2,426
		Reinstated	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	2
		Transferred	—	—	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	379	127	73	1,703	231	146	16	82	49	106	2,428
		Terminated	277	80	70	1,527	227	142	20	56	47	126	2,337
7th ...	Greene	Begun	11	—	9	21	4	6	—	19	—	4	79
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	11	—	9	21	4	6	—	19	—	5	81
		Terminated	16	1	11	41	—	4	—	8	—	5	81

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
347	251	250	821	1,481	368	1,189	9,857	230	16,496 Begun Vermilion	
—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	5 Reinstated		
—	—	-5	+5	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
347	251	245	826	1,485	368	1,189	9,857	230	16,501 Net Added		
223	130	240	707	1,453	313	1,173	9,574	200	15,893 Terminated		
494	422	595	1,917	2,913	892	1,552	23,628	310	35,573 Begun Circuit Totals...	5th
—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	5 Reinstated		
—	—	-61	+61	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
494	422	534	1,978	2,917	892	1,552	23,628	310	35,578 Net Added		
377	248	482	1,912	3,211	840	1,567	22,524	275	34,258 Terminated		
779	192	565	895	2,845	612	2,398	23,469	15	33,993 Begun Champaign...	6th
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 Reinstated		
—	—	-196	+196	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
779	192	370	1,091	2,845	612	2,398	23,469	15	33,996 Net Added		
414	189	518	1,004	2,241	274	1,369	22,613	60	30,561 Terminated		
46	39	80	196	362	113	37	1,613	3	2,659 Begun DeWitt	
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
46	39	81	196	362	113	37	1,613	3	2,662 Net Added		
23	36	55	177	340	107	27	1,479	3	2,391 Terminated		
20	17	38	147	257	108	—	2,783	12	3,619 Begun Douglas	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
20	17	38	147	257	108	—	2,783	12	3,619 Net Added		
20	13	36	151	227	86	—	2,781	13	3,571 Terminated		
446	428	571	1,702	1,978	454	946	16,682	70	25,686 Begun Macon	
—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
446	428	574	1,702	1,978	454	946	16,682	70	25,689 Net Added		
108	361	427	1,586	2,182	428	820	17,046	59	25,396 Terminated		
9	22	36	100	206	87	4	1,570	119	2,300 Begun Moultrie	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-7	+7	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
9	22	29	107	206	87	4	1,570	119	2,300 Net Added		
6	17	43	108	204	66	4	1,556	120	2,252 Terminated		
19	37	51	159	222	86	53	1,885	23	2,685 Begun Piatt	
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 Reinstated		
—	—	-12	+12	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
19	37	40	171	222	86	53	1,885	23	2,686 Net Added		
12	28	39	163	220	261	54	1,888	23	2,823 Terminated		
1,319	735	1,341	3,199	5,870	1,460	3,438	48,002	242	70,942 Begun Circuit Totals...	6th
—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 Reinstated		
—	—	-215	+215	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
1,319	735	1,132	3,414	5,870	1,460	3,438	48,002	242	70,952 Net Added		
583	644	1,118	3,189	5,414	1,222	2,274	47,363	278	66,994 Terminated		
26	36	59	152	149	117	—	1,761	22	2,475 Begun Greene...	7th
—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	4 Reinstated		
—	—	-26	+26	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
26	36	33	178	150	117	—	1,761	22	2,479 Net Added		
17	45	28	188	150	60	—	1,732	17	2,404 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			July	Non-July	July	Non-July							
	Jersey	Begun	16	7	7	44	13	24	4	3	—	2	99
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	16	7	7	44	13	24	4	3	—	2	99
		Terminated	22	10	13	52	13	19	4	6	—	2	113
	Macoupin	Begun	41	8	2	73	26	14	2	13	—	—	257
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	41	8	2	73	26	14	2	13	—	—	257
		Terminated	43	8	4	62	19	6	—	—	—	—	229
	Morgan	Begun	25	13	9	118	13	21	—	27	—	40	217
		Reinstated	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	25	13	9	125	13	21	—	27	—	40	218
		Terminated	19	11	2	112	20	18	5	56	—	23	280
	Sangamon	Begun	193	95	54	1,412	207	208	55	90	—	275	1,303
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	193	95	54	1,412	207	208	55	90	—	275	1,303
		Terminated	159	59	53	1,302	115	152	87	78	—	200	1,204
	Scott	Begun	1	2	—	9	4	—	—	11	—	4	16
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	1	2	2	7	4	—	—	11	—	4	16
		Terminated	3	—	1	7	—	—	—	8	—	3	17
7th	Circuit Totals	Begun	287	125	81	1,677	267	273	61	163	—	325	1,971
		Reinstated	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	1	3
		Transferred	—	—	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	287	125	83	1,682	267	273	61	163	—	326	1,974
		Terminated	262	89	84	1,576	167	199	96	156	—	233	1,924
8th	Adams	Begun	38	11	24	223	36	47	1	7	—	11	395
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+4	-4	+5	-5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	42	7	29	218	36	47	1	7	—	11	395
		Terminated	45	5	27	185	19	46	5	5	—	1	378
	Brown	Begun	1	4	—	23	1	3	2	9	—	1	42
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
		Transferred	+1	-1	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	2	3	1	22	1	3	3	9	—	1	43
		Terminated	5	2	2	18	2	5	6	10	—	—	40
	Calhoun	Begun	—	1	—	6	3	3	—	3	3	1	17
		Reinstated	—	1	1	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	5
		Transferred	—	—	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	—	2	2	5	5	3	—	3	3	1	22
		Terminated	1	3	2	8	3	1	—	3	2	5	26
	Cass	Begun	8	3	6	28	8	12	—	9	—	3	87
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+4	-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	12	-1	6	28	8	12	—	9	—	3	87
		Terminated	7	1	1	21	4	6	—	4	—	3	82

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
39	42	76	362	166	97	43	1,805	125	2,974 Begun Jersey	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-14	+14	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
39	42	62	376	166	97	43	1,805	125	2,974 Net Added		
41	137	83	442	260	55	15	1,690	106	3,083 Terminated		
56	80	119	344	481	270	111	3,990	17	5,904 Begun Macoupin	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
56	80	119	344	481	270	111	3,990	17	5,904 Net Added		
36	118	89	355	384	154	96	4,015	16	5,634 Terminated		
49	48	99	309	432	207	57	5,654	40	7,378 Begun Morgan	
—	—	—	—	107	4	—	—	—	119 Reinstated		
—	—	-21	+21	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
49	48	78	330	539	211	57	5,654	40	7,497 Net Added		
48	29	74	290	631	153	49	5,368	38	7,226 Terminated		
386	219	773	2,221	3,484	527	163	21,593	75	33,333 Begun Sangamon	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-28	+28	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
386	219	745	2,249	3,484	527	163	21,593	75	33,333 Net Added		
249	193	666	2,215	3,227	530	154	20,365	59	31,067 Terminated		
4	14	12	53	48	38	—	403	6	625 Begun Scott	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-5	+5	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
4	14	7	58	48	38	—	403	6	625 Net Added		
11	9	14	66	42	37	—	383	9	610 Terminated		
560	439	1,138	3,441	4,760	1,256	374	35,206	285	52,689 Begun Circuit Totals...	... 7th
—	—	—	—	108	4	—	—	—	123 Reinstated		
—	—	-94	+94	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
560	439	1,044	3,535	4,868	1,260	374	35,206	285	52,812 Net Added		
402	531	954	3,556	4,694	989	314	33,553	245	50,024 Terminated		
91	180	184	440	931	383	1,728	6,908	55	11,693 Begun Adams...	... 8th
—	—	3	1	—	4	—	—	—	8 Reinstated		
—	—	-15	+15	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
91	180	172	456	931	387	1,728	6,908	55	11,701 Net Added		
85	167	207	539	972	442	1,679	6,715	57	11,579 Terminated		
6	3	15	46	86	34	—	853	34	1,163 Begun Brown	
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 Reinstated		
—	—	-3	+3	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
6	3	13	49	86	34	—	853	34	1,166 Net Added		
7	2	9	45	75	55	—	775	22	1,080 Terminated		
6	12	29	123	14	25	3	860	54	1,163 Begun Calhoun	
—	—	2	5	2	—	—	—	—	18 Reinstated		
—	—	-2	+2	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
6	12	29	130	16	25	3	860	54	1,181 Net Added		
8	10	32	123	20	38	4	880	53	1,222 Terminated		
34	32	30	206	218	67	86	1,572	77	2,486 Begun Cass	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-10	+10	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
34	32	20	216	218	67	86	1,572	77	2,486 Net Added		
23	25	21	176	218	119	66	1,437	71	2,285 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATED

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
	Mason	Begun	13	7	2	43	6	37	—	5	1	2	120
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	14	6	3	42	6	37	—	5	1	2	120
		Terminated	12	7	7	47	9	35	6	8	1	1	114
	Menard	Begun	7	5	—	17	6	5	1	5	—	—	49
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+2	-2	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	9	3	1	16	6	5	1	5	—	—	49
		Terminated	8	2	2	17	7	3	1	3	—	—	54
	Pike	Begun	3	8	—	65	11	19	—	13	—	2	84
		Reinstated	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	3	9	1	64	11	19	—	13	—	2	84
		Terminated	5	9	1	59	9	18	12	10	1	1	94
	Schuyler	Begun	2	—	—	10	4	3	—	1	1	—	36
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	2	—	—	10	4	3	—	1	1	—	36
		Terminated	4	1	1	12	1	2	—	3	1	—	37
8th ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	72	39	32	415	75	129	4	52	5	20	830
		Reinstated	—	2	1	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	6
		Transferred	+12	-12	+10	-10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	84	29	43	405	77	129	5	52	5	20	836
		Terminated	87	30	43	367	54	116	30	46	5	11	825
9th ...	Fulton	Begun	41	12	10	167	17	20	2	15	—	1	302
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	42	11	10	167	17	20	2	15	—	1	302
		Terminated	30	3	3	157	21	17	4	15	—	1	289
	Hancock	Begun	14	1	—	54	18	22	—	—	—	1	133
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	14	1	—	54	18	22	—	—	—	1	133
		Terminated	15	—	—	56	13	20	—	8	—	—	119
	Henderson	Begun	4	7	2	35	11	4	—	6	—	4	55
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	4	7	2	35	11	4	—	6	—	4	55
		Terminated	7	1	1	19	10	—	—	6	—	2	48
	Knox	Begun	51	27	9	277	44	32	1	18	—	88	507
		Reinstated	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	+9	-9	+8	-8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	61	18	18	270	44	32	1	18	—	88	510
		Terminated	54	20	20	283	46	32	1	2	—	82	645
	McDonough	Begun	9	12	5	71	14	21	—	36	—	1	180
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	9	12	5	71	14	21	—	36	—	1	180
		Terminated	17	8	1	87	13	27	—	23	—	1	176

N THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
39	26	88	261	220	110	46	2,916	73	4,015 Begun Mason	
—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-35	+35	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
39	26	53	297	221	110	46	2,916	73	4,017 Net Added		
31	28	55	305	217	134	54	3,041	67	4,179 Terminated		
21	16	22	67	226	74	15	1,317	10	1,863 Begun Menard	
—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-3	+3	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
21	16	19	70	226	76	15	1,317	10	1,865 Net Added		
14	21	14	69	174	77	12	1,294	13	1,785 Terminated		
23	31	56	270	201	103	47	2,808	98	3,842 Begun Pike	
—	—	12	1	—	—	—	—	—	14 Reinstated		
—	—	-8	+8	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
23	31	60	279	201	103	47	2,808	98	3,856 Net Added		
24	18	60	302	252	231	36	2,749	104	3,995 Terminated		
8	8	19	63	104	40	11	1,084	41	1,435 Begun Schuyler	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-2	+2	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
8	8	17	65	104	40	11	1,084	41	1,435 Net Added		
8	10	14	60	97	68	7	1,105	29	1,460 Terminated		
228	308	443	1,476	2,000	836	1,936	18,318	442	27,660 Begun Circuit Totals	8th
—	—	18	8	3	6	—	—	—	47 Reinstated		
—	—	-78	+78	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
228	308	383	1,562	2,003	842	1,936	18,318	442	27,707 Net Added		
200	281	412	1,619	2,025	1,164	1,858	17,996	416	27,585 Terminated		
64	71	126	312	677	260	383	4,060	157	6,697 Begun Fulton	9th
—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-28	+28	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
64	71	99	341	677	260	383	4,060	157	6,699 Net Added		
55	18	216	341	656	200	214	4,062	149	6,451 Terminated		
31	32	44	207	192	177	143	1,860	24	2,953 Begun Hancock	
—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-9	+9	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
31	32	35	216	192	179	143	1,860	24	2,955 Net Added		
30	34	39	227	158	126	127	1,752	25	2,749 Terminated		
15	30	32	181	222	43	122	960	93	1,826 Begun Henderson	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-7	+7	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
15	30	25	188	222	43	122	960	93	1,826 Net Added		
6	9	26	237	209	22	104	978	91	1,776 Terminated		
102	44	143	715	837	334	991	7,342	92	11,654 Begun Knox	
—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	11 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
102	44	143	715	842	334	991	7,342	92	11,665 Net Added		
99	55	208	693	794	314	951	7,361	89	11,749 Terminated		
41	34	100	435	351	151	673	4,448	38	6,620 Begun McDonough	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-13	+13	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
41	34	87	448	351	151	673	4,448	38	6,620 Net Added		
6	7	88	406	481	138	385	4,793	31	6,688 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
	Warren	Begun	10	15	4	57	11	7	1	2	2	5	135
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	10	15	4	57	11	7	1	2	2	5	135
		Terminated	13	6	2	50	7	8	1	—	—	—	126
9th	Circuit Totals	Begun	129	74	30	661	115	106	4	77	2	100	1,312
		Reinstated	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	+10	-10	+8	-8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	140	64	39	654	115	106	4	77	2	100	1,315
		Terminated	136	38	27	652	110	104	6	54	—	86	1,403
10th	Marshall	Begun	7	2	—	28	14	3	—	23	—	—	61
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	7	2	—	28	14	3	—	23	—	—	61
		Terminated	4	5	2	21	8	—	—	14	—	—	50
	Peoria	Begun	486	87	65	952	157	182	3	40	—	375	1,621
		Reinstated	—	—	23	—	—	—	18	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+7	-7	+19	-19	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	493	80	107	933	157	182	21	40	—	375	1,621
		Terminated	612	256	144	904	167	209	21	178	—	420	1,673
	Putnam	Begun	6	—	4	15	4	3	—	4	—	—	19
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	6	—	5	14	4	3	—	4	—	—	19
		Terminated	11	3	4	24	5	3	—	4	—	—	21
	Stark	Begun	1	3	—	10	3	3	—	10	—	2	33
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+2	-1	+2	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	3	2	2	9	3	3	—	10	—	2	33
		Terminated	3	—	1	9	4	2	—	1	—	2	29
	Tazewell	Begun	168	29	33	353	53	74	—	31	—	—	827
		Reinstated	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	+16	-16	+14	-14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	187	13	48	339	53	74	—	31	—	—	830
		Terminated	186	15	32	318	71	78	6	73	—	—	893
10th	Circuit Totals	Begun	668	121	102	1,358	231	265	3	108	—	377	2,561
		Reinstated	3	—	24	—	—	—	18	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	+25	-24	+36	-35	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	696	97	162	1,323	231	265	21	108	—	377	2,564
		Terminated	816	279	183	1,276	255	292	27	270	—	422	2,666
11th	Ford	Begun	17	9	10	45	9	8	—	2	—	1	79
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	17	9	10	45	9	8	—	2	—	1	79
		Terminated	12	7	6	50	23	6	—	8	—	1	77
	Livingston	Begun	48	3	4	117	24	33	10	56	5	8	228
		Reinstated	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	48	3	4	119	24	33	10	56	5	8	228
		Terminated	54	9	13	99	68	36	15	48	2	6	207

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
36	80	178	354	328	182	98	3,842	48	5,395 Begun Warren	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-8	+8	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
36	80	170	362	328	182	98	3,842	48	5,395 Net Added		
28	57	115	327	316	99	89	3,882	77	5,203 Terminated		
289	291	623	2,204	2,607	1,147	2,410	22,512	452	35,145 Begun Circuit Totals	... 9th
—	—	1	1	5	2	—	—	—	15 Reinstated		
—	—	-65	+65	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
289	291	559	2,270	2,612	1,149	2,410	22,512	452	35,160 Net Added		
224	180	692	2,231	2,614	899	1,870	22,828	462	34,616 Terminated		
42	1	59	117	144	85	—	1,023	28	1,637 Begun Marshall	... 10th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-22	+22	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
42	1	37	139	144	85	—	1,023	28	1,637 Net Added		
34	18	45	171	131	82	—	1,046	28	1,659 Terminated		
517	318	1,009	2,983	5,527	974	1,735	27,470	79	44,580 Begun Peoria	
—	—	3	—	—	1	—	—	—	45 Reinstated		
—	—	-67	+67	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
517	318	945	3,050	5,527	975	1,735	27,470	79	44,625 Net Added		
478	314	796	2,188	5,327	688	1,286	26,967	61	42,689 Terminated		
8	5	6	13	36	29	4	657	6	819 Begun Putnam	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
8	5	6	13	36	29	4	657	6	819 Net Added		
11	5	6	14	37	13	8	529	6	704 Terminated		
6	7	13	44	29	57	5	454	5	685 Begun Stark	
—	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	3 Reinstated		
—	—	-3	+3	-2	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
6	7	10	47	28	57	5	456	5	688 Net Added		
6	3	6	38	34	62	4	450	5	659 Terminated		
240	166	191	689	986	435	1,691	22,531	181	28,678 Begun Tazewell	
—	—	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	18 Reinstated		
—	—	-1	+1	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
240	166	201	690	986	435	1,691	22,531	181	28,696 Net Added		
188	133	216	689	1,056	342	1,803	22,055	184	28,338 Terminated		
813	497	1,278	3,846	6,722	1,580	3,435	52,135	299	76,399 Begun Circuit Totals	... 10th
—	—	14	—	1	1	—	2	—	66 Reinstated		
—	—	-93	+93	-2	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
813	497	1,199	3,939	6,721	1,581	3,435	52,137	299	76,465 Net Added		
717	473	1,069	3,100	6,585	1,187	3,101	51,047	284	74,049 Terminated		
21	21	65	195	120	105	240	1,501	40	2,488 Begun Ford	... 11th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-26	+26	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
21	21	39	221	120	105	240	1,501	40	2,488 Net Added		
22	14	37	226	140	51	257	1,446	37	2,420 Terminated		
60	134	212	646	388	250	127	7,912	82	10,347 Begun Livingston	
—	—	4	—	2	—	—	—	—	8 Reinstated		
—	—	-11	+11	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
60	134	205	657	390	250	127	7,912	82	10,355 Net Added		
62	134	204	665	324	178	89	8,350	61	10,624 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury							
	Logan	Begun	25	6	13	152	31	11	1	25	—	3	165
		Reinstated	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
		Transferred	+1	-1	+3	-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	26	5	16	152	31	11	1	25	—	3	167
		Terminated	25	6	8	183	11	8	1	19	—	—	172
	McLean	Begun	130	32	35	378	65	76	29	14	—	9	595
		Reinstated	4	1	3	33	—	1	—	—	—	—	36
		Transferred	+13	-11	+26	-19	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	147	22	64	392	65	77	29	14	—	9	631
		Terminated	131	21	65	339	63	76	15	50	1	8	654
	Woodford	Begun	18	23	—	38	15	2	—	17	—	1	147
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	18	23	—	38	15	2	—	17	—	1	147
		Terminated	14	26	7	42	19	3	—	18	—	1	143
11th...	Circuit Totals	Begun	238	73	62	730	144	130	40	114	5	22	1,214
		Reinstated	4	1	3	38	—	1	—	—	—	—	38
		Transferred	+14	-12	+29	-22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	256	62	94	746	144	131	40	114	5	22	1,252
		Terminated	236	69	99	713	184	129	31	143	3	16	1,253
12th...	Iroquois	Begun	24	2	12	65	14	15	—	20	—	1	133
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	24	2	12	65	14	15	—	20	—	1	133
		Terminated	19	2	10	92	13	19	—	—	—	1	147
	Kankakee	Begun	60	95	7	501	75	140	8	218	—	94	614
		Reinstated	2	1	—	27	2	—	—	1	—	—	6
		Transferred	+6	-6	+48	-48	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	68	90	55	480	77	140	8	219	—	94	620
		Terminated	88	50	108	539	68	146	4	215	—	85	810
	Will	Begun	301	351	45	1,779	384	206	25	98	3	184	1,786
		Reinstated	13	5	4	119	9	1	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+195	-189	+125	-117	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	509	167	174	1,781	393	207	25	98	3	184	1,786
		Terminated	467	108	148	1,839	299	173	59	82	2	178	1,692
12th...	Circuit Totals	Begun	385	448	64	2,345	473	361	33	336	3	279	2,533
		Reinstated	15	6	4	146	11	1	—	1	—	—	6
		Transferred	+201	-195	+173	-165	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	601	259	241	2,326	484	362	33	337	3	279	2,539
		Terminated	574	160	266	2,470	380	338	63	297	2	264	2,649
13th...	Bureau	Begun	27	15	5	125	19	31	12	26	4	1	170
		Reinstated	1	4	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	2
		Transferred	+3	-3	+4	-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	31	16	9	122	20	31	12	26	4	1	172
		Terminated	45	15	19	128	19	23	1	17	5	1	175
	Grundy	Begun	19	26	4	85	25	20	41	47	1	6	193
		Reinstated	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+20	-20	+9	-9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	40	6	13	77	25	20	41	47	1	6	193
		Terminated	45	4	12	60	20	16	13	46	—	3	204

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
34	44	123	232	795	217	7	4,378	16	6,278 Begun Logan	
—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	6 Reinstated		
—	—	-37	+37	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
34	44	87	269	795	217	7	4,378	16	6,284 Net Added		
30	52	113	301	701	181	7	4,138	17	5,973 Terminated		
305	208	428	1,753	1,976	659	502	16,018	43	23,255 Begun McLean	
—	—	17	108	126	—	5	101	—	435 Reinstated		
—	—	-1	+1	-9	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
305	208	444	1,862	2,093	659	507	16,119	43	23,690 Net Added		
256	225	481	1,809	2,257	666	400	15,567	35	23,119 Terminated		
22	50	107	390	171	156	10	4,092	45	5,304 Begun Woodford	
—	—	1	2	16	1	—	—	—	20 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
22	50	108	392	187	157	10	4,092	45	5,324 Net Added		
26	61	107	375	215	154	5	3,886	35	5,137 Terminated		
442	457	935	3,216	3,450	1,387	886	33,901	226	47,672 Begun Circuit Totals...	11th
—	—	23	110	144	1	5	101	—	469 Reinstated		
—	—	-75	+75	-9	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
442	457	883	3,401	3,585	1,388	891	34,002	226	48,141 Net Added		
396	486	942	3,376	3,637	1,230	758	33,387	185	47,273 Terminated		
36	43	76	336	210	230	23	7,110	97	8,447 Begun Iroquois...	12th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-21	+21	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
36	43	55	357	210	230	23	7,110	97	8,447 Net Added		
39	58	51	421	184	199	27	7,132	122	8,536 Terminated		
414	137	253	1,070	1,168	324	979	15,949	214	22,320 Begun Kankakee	
8	32	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	86 Reinstated		
—	—	-2	+2	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
422	169	257	1,073	1,168	324	979	15,949	214	22,406 Net Added		
434	233	222	1,047	1,223	245	1,115	14,847	205	21,684 Terminated		
621	433	431	1,718	3,970	476	3,623	54,750	477	71,661 Begun Will	
11	—	5	8	212	2	30	533	—	952 Reinstated		
—	—	-5	+5	-14	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
632	433	431	1,731	4,168	478	3,653	55,283	477	72,613 Net Added		
519	435	427	1,617	4,109	408	4,228	55,087	582	72,459 Terminated		
1,071	613	760	3,124	5,348	1,030	4,625	77,809	788	102,428 Begun Circuit Totals...	12th
19	32	11	9	212	2	30	533	—	1,038 Reinstated		
—	—	-28	+28	-14	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
1,090	645	743	3,161	5,546	1,032	4,655	78,342	788	103,466 Net Added		
992	726	700	3,085	5,516	852	5,370	77,066	909	102,679 Terminated		
59	33	85	466	434	216	137	5,288	20	7,173 Begun Bureau...	13th
1	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	13 Reinstated		
—	—	-30	+30	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
60	34	55	496	434	216	137	5,290	20	7,186 Net Added		
65	36	42	529	415	192	175	5,173	24	7,099 Terminated		
49	89	53	370	283	121	146	3,130	109	4,817 Begun Grundy	
—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	4 Reinstated		
—	—	-27	+27	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
49	89	26	397	285	121	146	3,130	109	4,821 Net Added		
42	60	33	431	236	97	143	3,185	114	4,764 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
	LaSalle	Begun	202	97	25	433	98	106	59	49	1	3	662
		Reinstated	—	—	1	5	3	—	—	—	—	—	2
		Transferred	—	—	—	+2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	202	97	26	440	101	106	59	49	1	3	664
		Terminated	200	93	27	432	96	42	27	41	6	6	668
13th ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	248	138	34	643	142	157	112	122	6	10	1,025
		Reinstated	2	4	1	7	4	—	—	—	—	—	4
		Transferred	+23	-23	+13	-11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	273	119	48	639	146	157	112	122	6	10	1,029
		Terminated	290	112	58	620	135	81	41	104	11	10	1,047
14th ...	Henry	Begun	32	22	12	123	14	36	—	2	—	22	307
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	32	22	12	123	14	36	—	2	—	22	308
		Terminated	16	11	5	124	14	39	2	2	—	22	277
	Mercer	Begun	10	15	5	30	14	10	—	—	—	9	104
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	10	15	6	29	14	10	—	—	—	9	104
		Terminated	7	21	2	27	17	12	1	—	—	9	107
	Rock Island	Begun	158	127	44	522	114	86	1	332	—	275	1,358
		Reinstated	6	1	3	—	1	1	—	—	—	47	8
		Transferred	+14	-14	+21	-21	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	178	114	68	501	115	87	1	332	—	322	1,366
		Terminated	197	60	98	495	95	60	15	245	—	322	1,233
	Whiteside	Begun	31	45	3	156	26	29	20	12	1	5	380
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	31	45	3	156	26	29	20	12	1	5	380
		Terminated	11	57	1	166	33	28	1	9	—	3	357
14th ...	Circuit Totals	Begun	231	209	64	831	168	161	21	346	1	311	2,149
		Reinstated	6	1	3	—	1	1	—	—	—	47	9
		Transferred	+14	-14	+22	-22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	251	196	89	809	169	162	21	346	1	358	2,158
		Terminated	231	149	106	812	159	139	19	256	—	356	1,974
15th ...	Carroll	Begun	9	6	2	62	16	13	—	31	2	16	91
		Reinstated	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	10	5	2	63	16	13	—	31	2	16	91
		Terminated	5	5	2	68	11	13	—	17	2	14	103
	Jo Daviess	Begun	6	13	—	56	15	10	1	11	—	3	100
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	6	13	—	56	15	10	1	11	—	3	103
		Terminated	6	2	2	46	8	9	3	19	—	3	109
	Lee	Begun	18	21	14	170	35	14	—	47	—	13	182
		Reinstated	3	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	6
		Transferred	+6	-6	+3	-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	27	15	17	167	35	15	—	48	—	13	188
		Terminated	26	13	18	170	27	17	5	40	—	—	162

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
168 — — 168 413	126 — — 126 115	223 — -42 181 154	1,179 — +42 1,221 926	1,289 122 -2 1,409 1,440	415 — — 415 508	1,235 — — 1,235 1,170	13,837 — — 13,837 11,869	145 — — 145 128	20,352 133 — 20,485 18,361 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated LaSalle	
276 1 — 277 520	248 1 — 249 211	361 — -99 262 229	2,015 — +99 2,114 1,886	2,006 124 -2 2,128 2,091	752 — — 752 797	1,518 — — 1,518 1,488	22,255 2 — 22,257 20,227	274 — — 274 266	32,342 150 — 32,492 30,224 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Circuit Totals	.. 13th
88 — — 88 96	60 — — 60 35	93 — -41 52 63	334 — +41 375 340	517 — — 517 485	334 4 — 338 283	210 — — 210 223	7,151 — — 7,151 7,230	110 — — 110 99	9,467 5 — 9,472 9,366 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Henry	.. 14th
29 — — 29 20	26 — — 26 28	58 — -6 52 36	193 — +6 199 186	96 — — 96 126	106 — — 106 68	166 — — 166 137	1,035 — — 1,035 1,110	109 — — 109 110	2,015 — — 2,015 2,024 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Mercer	
284 39 — 323 307	276 72 — 348 367	695 38 -45 688 526	3,055 1 +45 3,101 3,226	3,209 32 — 3,241 2,961	625 — — 625 451	1,084 — — 1,084 1,094	33,241 — — 33,241 32,781	216 — — 216 227	45,702 249 — 45,951 44,760 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Rock Island	
126 — — 126 117	83 — — 83 78	267 — -36 231 261	1,176 — +36 1,212 1,224	526 — — 526 474	323 — — 323 244	73 — — 73 46	6,630 — — 6,630 6,629	159 — — 159 151	10,071 — — 10,071 9,890 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Whiteside	
527 39 — 566 540	445 72 — 517 508	1,113 38 -128 1,023 886	4,758 1 +128 4,887 4,976	4,348 32 — 4,380 4,046	1,388 4 — 1,392 1,046	1,533 — — 1,533 1,500	48,057 — — 48,057 47,750	594 — — 594 587	67,255 254 — 67,509 66,040 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Circuit Totals	.. 14th
26 — — 26 35	39 — — 39 32	101 — -1 100 84	271 — +1 272 271	120 — — 120 132	90 — — 90 118	104 — — 104 97	2,023 — — 2,023 1,970	51 — — 51 50	3,073 1 — 3,074 3,029 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Carroll	.. 15th
33 1 — 34 31	78 — — 78 59	110 1 -29 82 105	431 1 +29 461 527	220 — — 220 217	153 — — 153 146	255 — — 255 285	3,036 — — 3,036 3,204	174 — — 174 175	4,705 6 — 4,711 4,956 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Jo Daviess	
57 — — 57 57	108 — — 108 128	237 5 -47 195 177	903 5 +47 955 935	449 1 — 450 437	621 1 — 622 515	54 — — 54 42	9,138 — — 9,138 8,975	94 — — 94 76	12,175 23 — 12,198 11,820 Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated Lee	

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATE

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury							
	Ogle	Begun	21	40	3	174	29	23	21	33	1	7	272
		Reinstated	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	21	40	3	176	29	23	21	33	1	7	275
		Terminated	39	25	2	185	21	22	5	11	1	7	286
	Stephenson	Begun	17	14	3	145	33	15	—	13	—	22	257
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+2	-2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	19	12	3	145	33	15	—	13	—	22	257
		Terminated	21	11	—	156	37	26	1	11	—	21	278
15th ..	Circuit Totals	Begun	71	94	22	607	128	75	22	135	3	61	902
		Reinstated	3	—	—	3	—	1	—	1	—	—	12
		Transferred	+9	-9	+3	-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	83	85	25	607	128	76	22	136	3	61	914
		Terminated	97	56	24	625	104	87	14	98	3	45	938
16th ..	DeKalb	Begun	39	43	10	214	39	46	1	13	—	21	387
		Reinstated	—	—	1	2	1	3	1	1	—	—	2
		Transferred	+10	-8	+8	-10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	49	35	19	206	40	49	2	14	—	21	389
		Terminated	72	36	23	213	49	50	6	12	—	23	369
	Kane	Begun	425	264	143	2,053	301	179	17	602	6	592	1,894
		Reinstated	15	19	3	48	5	4	2	3	—	—	30
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	440	283	146	2,101	306	183	19	605	6	592	1,924
		Terminated	427	275	119	1,977	298	181	21	558	6	576	2,038
	Kendall	Begun	33	15	3	119	23	20	—	11	1	5	141
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+3	-3	+4	-4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	36	12	7	115	23	20	—	11	1	5	141
		Terminated	26	5	6	83	25	18	—	6	1	1	119
16th ..	Circuit Totals	Begun	497	322	156	2,386	363	245	18	626	7	618	2,422
		Reinstated	15	19	4	50	6	7	3	4	—	—	32
		Transferred	+13	-11	+12	-14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	525	330	172	2,422	369	252	21	630	7	618	2,454
		Terminated	525	316	148	2,273	372	249	27	576	7	600	2,526
17th ..	Boone	Begun	14	10	4	75	23	7	—	4	—	5	218
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	14	10	4	75	23	7	—	4	—	5	218
		Terminated	19	10	13	86	28	17	—	—	—	2	194
	Winnebago	Begun	300	85	64	1,262	271	183	18	91	—	405	1,864
		Reinstated	6	1	2	18	7	6	—	2	—	—	7
		Transferred	+15	-15	+33	-33	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	321	71	99	1,247	278	189	18	93	—	405	1,871
		Terminated	298	50	70	967	357	196	35	86	—	552	1,649
17th ..	Circuit Totals	Begun	314	95	68	1,337	294	190	18	95	—	410	2,082
		Reinstated	6	1	2	18	7	6	—	2	—	—	7
		Transferred	+15	-15	+33	-33	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	335	81	103	1,322	301	196	18	97	—	410	2,089
		Terminated	317	60	83	1,053	385	213	35	86	—	554	1,843

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
40	68	173	685	719	223	141	5,580	173	8,426 Begun Ogle	
—	—	7	5	—	—	—	1	—	18 Reinstated		
—	—	-16	+16	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
40	68	164	706	719	223	141	5,581	173	8,444 Net Added		
38	56	155	672	707	149	127	5,550	181	8,239 Terminated		
90	158	241	715	620	290	557	5,658	22	8,870 Begun Stephenson	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2 Reinstated		
—	—	-38	+38	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
90	158	203	753	620	290	557	5,660	22	8,872 Net Added		
96	145	198	732	657	339	563	5,463	23	8,778 Terminated		
246	451	862	3,005	2,128	1,377	1,111	25,435	514	37,249 Begun Circuit Totals....	15th
1	—	13	11	1	1	—	3	—	50 Reinstated		
—	—	-131	+131	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
247	451	744	3,147	2,129	1,378	1,111	25,438	514	37,299 Net Added		
257	420	719	3,137	2,150	1,267	1,114	25,162	505	36,822 Terminated		
106	104	287	1,770	881	229	233	15,332	22	19,777 Begun DeKalb....	16th
23	45	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	81 Reinstated		
—	—	-4	+4	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
129	149	283	1,774	883	229	233	15,332	22	19,858 Net Added		
129	109	298	1,818	817	209	223	14,515	28	18,999 Terminated		
918	374	1,375	4,796	5,012	682	1,598	49,465	170	70,866 Begun Kane	
24	2	1	—	37	—	—	—	—	193 Reinstated		
—	—	-261	+261	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
942	376	1,115	5,057	5,049	682	1,598	49,465	170	71,059 Net Added		
705	320	876	5,044	4,845	389	1,652	50,869	67	71,243 Terminated		
47	76	61	241	157	106	7	3,878	94	5,038 Begun Kendall	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-1	+1	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
47	76	60	242	157	106	7	3,878	94	5,038 Net Added		
28	70	74	249	142	82	2	3,756	94	4,787 Terminated		
1,071	554	1,723	6,807	6,050	1,017	1,838	68,675	286	95,681 Begun Circuit Totals....	16th
47	47	1	—	39	—	—	—	—	274 Reinstated		
—	—	-266	+266	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
1,118	601	1,458	7,073	6,089	1,017	1,838	68,675	286	95,955 Net Added		
862	499	1,248	7,111	5,804	680	1,877	69,140	189	95,029 Terminated		
82	85	80	511	317	93	153	5,569	12	7,262 Begun Boone....	17th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-21	+21	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
82	85	59	532	317	93	153	5,569	12	7,262 Net Added		
67	31	78	503	294	69	175	5,446	10	7,042 Terminated		
2,262	678	1,020	4,276	5,344	900	4,228	50,913	80	74,244 Begun Winnebago	
—	—	2	6	2	4	—	—	—	63 Reinstated		
—	—	-206	+206	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
2,262	678	816	4,488	5,346	904	4,228	50,913	80	74,307 Net Added		
1,536	452	835	4,767	5,720	529	4,228	50,175	80	72,582 Terminated		
2,344	763	1,100	4,787	5,661	993	4,381	56,482	92	81,506 Begun Circuit Totals....	17th
—	—	2	6	2	4	—	—	—	63 Reinstated		
—	—	-227	+227	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
2,344	763	875	5,020	5,663	997	4,381	56,482	92	81,569 Net Added		
1,603	483	913	5,270	6,014	598	4,403	55,621	90	79,624 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATED

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			July	Non- July	July	Non- July							
18th...	DuPage	Begun	589	787	116	3,149	535	320	28	1,481	18	15	2,939
		Reinstated	6	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+333	-333	+184	-184	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	928	457	301	2,965	535	320	28	1,481	18	15	2,939
		Terminated	1,553	474	344	1,455	181	157	48	1,406	9	4	2,557
18th...	Circuit Totals	Begun	589	787	116	3,149	535	320	28	1,481	18	15	2,939
		Reinstated	6	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+333	-333	+184	-184	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	928	457	301	2,965	535	320	28	1,481	18	15	2,939
		Terminated	1,553	474	344	1,455	181	157	48	1,406	9	4	2,557
19th...	Lake	Begun	477	352	66	2,161	415	255	114	35	10	115	2,457
		Reinstated	12	20	4	3	14	7	—	—	—	—	1
		Transferred	+8	-8	+3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	497	364	73	2,164	429	262	114	35	10	115	2,458
		Terminated	517	307	107	1,683	462	276	72	40	21	114	2,329
	McHenry	Begun	169	13	7	590	132	39	2	14	1	—	757
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
		Transferred	—	—	+34	-34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	169	13	41	556	132	39	2	14	1	—	760
		Terminated	119	10	34	536	119	29	8	4	1	—	854
19th...	Circuit Totals	Begun	646	365	73	2,751	547	294	116	49	11	115	3,214
		Reinstated	12	20	4	3	14	7	—	—	—	—	4
		Transferred	+8	-8	+37	-34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	666	377	114	2,720	561	301	116	49	11	115	3,218
		Terminated	636	317	141	2,219	581	305	80	44	22	114	3,183
20th...	Monroe	Begun	19	10	2	30	5	6	—	4	6	2	69
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	+3	-3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	20	9	5	27	5	6	—	4	6	2	69
		Terminated	11	8	2	30	3	4	—	6	6	1	73
	Perry	Begun	12	6	1	49	5	9	2	6	—	1	109
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
		Transferred	—	—	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	12	6	2	48	5	9	2	6	—	1	113
		Terminated	11	2	5	38	9	9	1	8	—	1	130
	Randolph	Begun	23	11	2	38	16	44	1	14	—	78	174
		Reinstated	1	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	25	10	3	40	16	44	1	14	—	78	175
		Terminated	18	8	6	31	15	45	1	6	—	112	157
	St. Clair	Begun	736	126	151	877	319	188	8	301	—	—	1,701
		Reinstated	26	3	10	28	3	4	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+11	-11	+53	-53	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	773	118	214	852	322	192	8	301	—	—	1,701
		Terminated	691	76	264	712	240	191	9	451	2	—	1,279
	Washington	Begun	5	4	1	10	9	1	—	11	—	5	45
		Reinstated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Transferred	+1	-1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	6	3	1	10	9	1	—	11	—	5	45
		Terminated	6	1	1	15	6	—	1	9	—	3	38

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
725	487	2,484	5,066	4,829	908	11,540	64,204	19	100,239 Begun	DuPage	18th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 Reinstated		
—	—	-1,670	+1,670	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
725	487	814	6,736	4,829	908	11,540	64,204	19	100,249 Net Added		
516	443	843	6,561	4,628	672	11,890	64,231	9	97,981 Terminated		
725	487	2,484	5,066	4,829	908	11,540	64,204	19	100,239 Begun	Circuit Totals	18th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 Reinstated		
—	—	-1,670	+1,670	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
725	487	814	6,736	4,829	908	11,540	64,204	19	100,249 Net Added		
516	443	843	6,561	4,628	672	11,890	64,231	9	97,981 Terminated		
909	401	512	7,147	4,254	1,554	6,392	66,667	482	94,775 Begun	Lake	19th
5	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	67 Reinstated		
—	—	—	—	-3	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
914	401	513	7,147	4,251	1,554	6,392	66,667	482	94,842 Net Added		
794	398	396	4,888	4,701	1,981	6,201	62,449	420	88,156 Terminated		
226	235	455	2,068	1,588	404	606	20,451	163	27,920 Begun	McHenry	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 Reinstated		
—	—	-80	+80	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
226	235	375	2,148	1,588	404	606	20,451	163	27,923 Net Added		
165	223	432	2,143	1,620	408	508	19,859	163	27,235 Terminated		
1,135	636	967	9,215	5,842	1,958	6,998	87,118	645	122,695 Begun	Circuit Totals	19th
5	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	70 Reinstated		
—	—	-80	+80	-3	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
1,140	636	888	9,295	5,839	1,958	6,998	87,118	645	122,765 Net Added		
959	621	828	7,031	6,321	2,389	6,709	82,308	583	115,391 Terminated		
10	5	52	175	135	114	40	1,457	4	2,145 Begun	Monroe	20th
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-6	+6	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
10	5	46	181	135	114	40	1,457	4	2,145 Net Added		
10	3	31	149	119	256	35	1,439	4	2,190 Terminated		
17	16	70	105	199	104	79	1,440	13	2,243 Begun	Perry	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4 Reinstated		
—	—	-6	+6	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
17	16	64	111	199	104	79	1,440	13	2,247 Net Added		
27	7	62	109	182	92	69	1,360	12	2,134 Terminated		
60	31	116	313	230	174	71	2,758	29	4,183 Begun	Randolph	
—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	6 Reinstated		
—	—	-34	+34	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
60	31	82	347	230	175	71	2,758	29	4,189 Net Added		
47	21	76	343	362	189	79	2,741	25	4,282 Terminated		
1,138	849	961	4,557	3,756	728	4,259	31,127	101	51,883 Begun	St. Clair	
—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	76 Reinstated		
—	—	-116	+116	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
1,138	849	847	4,673	3,756	728	4,259	31,127	101	51,959 Net Added		
787	687	952	3,948	2,814	588	3,020	29,712	77	46,500 Terminated		
15	11	44	56	140	111	3	1,726	16	2,213 Begun	Washington	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	— Reinstated		
—	—	-3	+3	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
15	11	41	59	140	111	3	1,726	16	2,213 Net Added		
12	13	30	58	136	94	1	1,719	16	2,159 Terminated		

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATED

Circuit	County		Law Over \$15,000		Law \$15,000 and Under		Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce
			Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury							
20th	Circuit Totals	Begun	795	157	157	1,004	354	248	11	336	6	86	2,098
		Reinstated	27	3	11	30	3	4	—	—	—	—	5
		Transferred	+14	-14	+57	-57	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	836	146	225	977	357	252	11	336	6	86	2,103
		Terminated	737	95	278	826	273	249	12	480	8	117	1,677
	Downstate Totals	Begun	3,858	17,934	7,352	87,409	15,083 ^(a)	1,737	160	118,407	58	4,479	29,465
		Reinstated	567	545	985	1,950	604	152	10	5,240	—	—	2,997
		Transferred	+12,587	-12,587	+2,287	-2,217	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	17,012	5,892	10,624	87,142	15,687	1,889	170	123,647	58	4,479	32,462
		Terminated	12,615	4,726	8,074	84,709	12,460	1,683	195	99,148	17	4,468	29,518
	Cook	Begun	6,925	3,713	1,676	24,991	4,913	3,928	592	5,251	160	3,988	37,031
		Reinstated	102	62	62	309	50	29	23	8	1	48	141
		Transferred	+714	-702	+663	-645	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	7,741	3,073	2,401	24,655	4,963	3,957	615	5,259	161	4,036	37,172
		Terminated	7,999	2,713	2,548	21,506	4,342	3,487	661	4,932	162	3,998	35,841
	State Totals	Begun	10,783	21,647	9,028	112,400	19,996	5,665	752	123,658	218	8,467	66,496
		Reinstated	669	607	1,047	2,259	654	181	33	5,248	1	48	3,138
		Transferred	+13,301	-13,289	+2,950	-2,862	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Net Added	24,753	8,965	13,025	111,797	20,650	5,846	785	128,906	219	8,515	69,634
		Terminated	20,614	7,439	10,622	106,215	16,802	5,170	856	104,080	179	8,466	65,359

FOOTNOTES - The following notes are made for the statistics of the Circuit Court of Cook County: (a) The chancery category includes housing cases, e.g., cases requiring appointment of trustees in receivership during rehabilitation or demolition of buildings; (b) The felony category includes cases initiated as felonies but may have been reduced to misdemeanors; (c) The misdemeanor category

PRINTER'S ERRATA

The heading "Downstate Totals" and the heading "Cook" on pages 138 and 139 should be reversed, i.e.,

Cook
Downstate Totals

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1976

Family	Juvenile	Felony	Misdemeanors	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Violations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
1,240	912	1,243	5,206	4,460	1,231	4,452	38,508	163	62,667 Begun Circuit Totals...	20th
—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	86 Reinstated		
—	—	-165	+165	—	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
1,240	912	1,080	5,371	4,460	1,232	4,452	38,508	163	62,753 Net Added		
883	731	1,151	4,607	3,613	1,219	3,204	36,971	134	57,265 Terminated		
5,957	15,486	11,574	341,981 ^(a)	102,403	10,426	(e)	1,478,279	(e)	2,252,048 Begun	.. Downstate Totals	
—	156	2,279	23	1,529	—	(e)	—	(e)	17,037 Reinstated		
—	—	(b)	(d)	-70	—	(e)	—	(e)	— Transferred		
5,957	15,642	13,853	342,004	103,862	10,426	(e)	1,478,279	(e)	2,269,085 Net Added		
4,967	17,644	13,039	267,453	103,326	8,494	(e)	1,420,163	(e)	2,092,699 Terminated		
14,738	9,931	20,852	74,029	81,294	23,081	61,887	826,561	7,157	1,212,698 Begun Cook	
112	158	140	155	685	26	35	643	—	2,789 Reinstated		
—	—	-4,200	+4,200	-30	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
14,850	10,089	16,792	78,384	81,949	23,107	61,922	827,204	7,157	1,215,487 Net Added		
11,532	8,885	16,373	74,644	80,835	20,509	58,886	809,460	6,826	1,176,139 Terminated		
20,695	25,417	32,426	416,010	183,697	33,507	61,887	2,304,840	7,157	3,464,746 Begun State Totals	
112	314	2,419	178	2,214	26	35	643	—	19,826 Reinstated		
—	—	-4,200	+4,200	-100	—	—	—	—	— Transferred		
20,807	25,731	30,645	420,388	185,811	33,533	61,922	2,305,483	7,157	3,484,572 Net Added		
16,499	26,529	29,412	342,097	184,161	29,003	58,886	2,229,623	6,826	3,268,838 Terminated		

includes ordinance and conservation violation cases, and (d) preliminary hearings in felony cases (also see footnote (j) at page 154); and (e) in the ordinance violation and conservation violation categories reference should be made to footnote (c).

**THE TREND OF ALL CASES, THE NUMBER OF LAW-JURY CASE VERDICTS, TIME LAPSE BETWEEN
DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF VERDICT AND THE AVERAGE DELAY (IN MONTHS) IN REACHING
VERDICT IN LAW-JURY CASES TRIED DURING 1976**

Circuit	County	Total Cases Begun or Reinstated	Total Cases Terminated	Currency		Number of Law-Jury Cases Terminated by Verdict	Number of Cases Terminated by Verdict Which Involve A Death or Personal Injury	Time Lapse								Average Time Elapsed (Months)
				Gain	Loss			Under 1 Year	1 Year to 1 1/2 Years	1 1/2 Years to 2 Years	2 Years to 2 1/2 Years	2 1/2 Years to 3 Years	3 Years to 3 1/2 Years	3 1/2 Years to 4 Years	Over 4 Years	
1st	Alexander	3,318	3,240	—	78	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Jackson	11,102	11,129	27	—	13	11	—	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	14.2
	Johnson	2,606	2,427	—	179	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	46.3
	Massac	2,212	2,300	88	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29.5
	Pope	397	438	41	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.6
	Pulaski	2,146	2,094	—	52	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	48.7
	Saline	3,726	3,637	—	89	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.5
	Union	3,096	2,815	—	281	3	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.6
	Williamson	9,460	8,988	—	472	3	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29.3
1st	Circuit Total	38,063	37,068	—	995	25	18	8	7	3	3	—	2	2	1	19.8
2nd	Crawford	2,166	2,205	39	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	26.9
	Edwards	1,098	1,018	—	80	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Franklin	6,415	6,912	497	—	7	1	—	2	1	—	—	1	—	1	26.4
	Gallatin	1,619	1,589	—	30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Hamilton	1,092	1,056	—	36	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Hardin	247	238	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Jefferson	4,616	4,254	—	362	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.5
	Lawrence	2,060	1,867	—	193	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Richland	3,245	2,959	—	286	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	38.2
	Wabash	2,093	2,799	706	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Wayne	2,485	2,441	—	44	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.2
	White	3,270	3,299	29	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34.0
2nd	Circuit Total	30,406	30,637	231	—	15	6	2	3	4	1	1	2	—	1	25.7
3rd	Bond	2,964	2,376	—	588	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Madison	53,714	52,924	—	790	75	75	—	11	19	15	15	5	2	2	26.0
3rd	Circuit Total	56,678	55,300	—	1,378	75	—	6	11	19	15	15	5	2	2	26.0
4th	Christian	5,893	5,829	—	64	6	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	2	36.9
	Clay	2,106	1,992	—	114	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Clinton	3,536	3,372	—	164	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Effingham	6,610	6,404	—	206	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	44.6
	Fayette	4,023	3,528	—	495	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.0
	Jasper	2,150	2,028	—	122	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	70.9
	Marion	6,479	6,043	—	436	2	2	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	34.0
	Montgomery	5,575	5,365	—	210	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.3
	Shelby	3,096	2,719	—	377	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	40.1
4th	Circuit Total	39,468	37,280	—	2,188	16	8	2	1	5	1	1	1	1	4	10.0
	Clark	6,071	5,377	—	694	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.8
	Coles	8,648	8,809	161	—	5	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.3
	Cumberland	1,293	1,043	—	250	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.8
	Edgar	3,065	3,136	71	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.2
	Vermilion	16,501	15,893	—	608	10	10	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5th	Circuit Total	35,578	34,258	—	1,320	18	13	5	4	4	3	—	1	1	1	26.5
	Champaign	33,996	30,561	—	3,435	13	4	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.8
	DeWitt	2,662	2,391	—	271	5	3	—	3	—	2	1	2	—	2	30.5
	Douglas	3,619	3,571	—	48	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.1
	Macon	25,689	25,396	—	293	9	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.0
	Moultrie	2,300	2,252	—	48	2	—	—	4	1	2	—	1	—	—	20.4
	Piatt	2,686	2,823	137	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.5
6th	Circuit Total	70,952	66,994	—	3,958	30	11	8	7	3	4	2	3	—	2	24.7

**THE TREND OF ALL CASES, THE NUMBER OF LAW-JURY CASE VERDICTS, TIME LAPSE BETWEEN
DATE OF FILING AND VERDICT AND THE AVERAGE DELAY (IN MONTHS) IN REACHING
VERDICT IN LAW-JURY CASES TRIED DURING 1976**

Circuit	County	Total Cases Begun or Reinstated	Total Cases Terminated	Currency		Number of Cases Law-Jury Cases Terminated by Verdict	Number of Cases Terminated by Verdict Which Involve A Death or Personal Injury	Time Lapse						Average Time Elapsed (Months)		
				Gain	Loss			Under 1 Year	1 Year to 1 1/2 Years	1 1/2 Years to 2 Years	2 Years to 2 1/2 Years	2 1/2 Years to 3 Years	3 Years to 3 1/2 Years		3 1/2 Years to 4 Years	Over 4 Years
7th	Greene	2,479	2,404	—	75	3	2	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	37.0
	Jersey	2,974	3,083	109	—	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.0
	Macoupin	5,904	5,634	—	270	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.9
	Morgan	7,497	7,226	—	271	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.1
	Sangamon	33,333	31,067	—	2,266	14	12	—	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	28.1
	Scott	625	610	—	15	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	23.2
7th	Circuit Total	52,812	50,024	—	2,788	23	19	—	5	5	2	1	1	1	3	25.0
8th	Adams	11,701	11,579	—	122	3	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	22.2
	Brown	1,166	1,080	—	86	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Calhoun	1,181	1,222	41	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.7
	Cass	2,486	2,285	—	201	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.6
	Mason	4,017	4,179	162	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.4
	Menard	1,865	1,785	—	80	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8th	Pike	3,856	3,995	139	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	58.5
	Schuyler	1,435	1,460	25	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Circuit Total	27,707	27,585	—	122	8	2	—	1	1	2	—	—	—	1	23.2
	Fulton	6,699	6,451	—	248	6	3	—	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	25.2
	Hancock	2,955	2,749	—	206	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Henderson	1,826	1,776	—	50	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	45.5
9th	Knox	11,665	11,749	84	—	6	5	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	17.5
	McDonough	6,620	6,688	68	—	3	2	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	22.5
	Warren	5,395	5,203	—	192	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Circuit Total	35,160	34,616	—	544	16	11	—	3	5	1	1	2	1	—	23.1
	Marshall	1,637	1,659	22	—	2	1	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	29.1
	Peoria	44,625	42,689	—	1,936	44	34	—	7	12	4	1	1	—	2	18.8
10th	Putnam	819	704	—	115	2	2	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	23.6
	Stark	688	659	—	29	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Tazewell	28,696	28,338	—	358	18	15	—	8	4	1	—	—	—	2	20.3
	Circuit Total	76,465	74,049	—	2,416	66	52	—	15	17	8	1	1	1	4	19.7
	Ford	2,488	2,420	—	68	4	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	19.3
	Livingston	10,355	10,624	269	—	9	9	—	4	—	1	—	—	—	—	17.0
11th	Logan	6,284	5,973	—	311	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	27.4
	McLean	23,690	23,119	—	571	21	14	—	7	6	1	1	1	1	1	22.3
	Woodford	5,324	5,137	—	187	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	18.3
	Circuit Total	48,141	47,273	—	868	37	26	—	11	6	4	2	1	1	1	20.6
	Iroquois	8,447	8,536	89	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Kankakee	22,406	21,684	—	722	6	4	—	—	1	1	—	1	1	1	32.7
12th	Will	72,613	72,459	—	154	25	11	—	—	1	—	5	4	2	11	45.1
	Circuit Total	103,466	102,679	—	787	31	15	—	—	2	1	5	5	3	12	42.7
13th	Bureau	7,186	7,099	—	87	10	7	—	3	2	2	—	2	—	—	22.9
	Grundy	4,821	4,764	—	57	4	3	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	1	26.0
13th	LaSalle	20,485	18,361	—	2,124	12	10	—	2	5	1	1	1	1	—	20.6
	Circuit Total	32,492	30,224	—	2,268	26	20	—	7	7	4	1	3	—	1	22.3
14th	Henry	9,472	9,366	—	106	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.4
	Mercer	2,015	2,024	9	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	59.9
14th	Rock Island	45,951	44,760	—	1,191	34	24	—	7	6	1	2	—	1	2	18.0
	Whiteside	10,071	9,890	—	181	5	4	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	1	22.6
	Circuit Total	67,509	66,040	—	1,469	41	29	—	10	7	1	—	2	—	3	19.4

**THE TREND OF ALL CASES, THE NUMBER OF LAW-JURY CASE VERDICTS, TIME LAPSE BETWEEN
DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF VERDICT AND THE AVERAGE DELAY (IN MONTHS) IN REACHING
VERDICT IN LAW-JURY CASES TRIED DURING 1976**

Circuit	County	Total Cases Begun or Reinstated	Total Cases Terminated	Currency		Number of Law-Jury Cases Terminated by Verdict	Number of Cases Terminated by Verdict Which Involve A Death or Personal Injury	Time Lapse							Average Time Elapsed (Months)	
				Gain	Loss			Under 1 Year	1 Year to 1 1/2 Years	1 1/2 Years to 2 Years	2 Years to 2 1/2 Years	2 1/2 Years to 3 Years	3 Years to 3 1/2 Years	3 1/2 Years to 4 Years		Over 4 Years
15th	Carroll	3,074	3,029	—	45	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Jo Daviess	4,711	4,956	245	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Lee	12,198	11,820	—	378	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.2
	Ogle	8,444	8,239	—	205	4	3	1	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	19.3
	Stephenson	8,872	8,778	—	94	4	—	2	2	1	—	—	1	—	—	23.0
15th	Circuit Total	37,299	36,822	—	477	12	3	5	4	1	—	—	2	—	—	16.5
16th	DeKalb	19,858	18,999	—	859	3	3	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.4
	Kane	71,059	71,243	184	—	39	27	10	11	9	6	2	—	1	—	18.3
	Kendall	5,038	4,787	—	251	3	3	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	13.8
	Circuit Total	95,955	95,029	—	926	45	33	13	13	10	6	2	—	1	—	17.5
17th	Boone	7,262	7,042	—	220	2	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.7
	Winnebago	74,307	72,582	—	1,725	27	16	8	7	3	5	1	2	—	1	20.1
17th	Circuit Total	81,569	79,624	—	1,945	29	17	9	8	3	5	1	2	—	1	19.5
18th	DuPage	100,249	97,981	—	2,268	50	—	1	12	19	8	3	3	3	1	24.1
	Circuit Total	100,249	97,981	—	2,268	50	—	1	12	19	8	3	3	3	1	24.1
19th	Lake	94,842	88,156	—	6,686	51	35	12	19	7	11	2	—	—	—	17.8
	McHenry	27,923	27,235	—	688	14	10	13	3	—	3	2	2	2	1	29.5
19th	Circuit Total	122,765	115,391	—	7,374	65	45	13	22	7	14	4	2	2	1	20.3
20th	Monroe	2,145	2,190	45	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.1
	Perry	2,247	2,134	—	113	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	31.2
	Randolph	4,189	4,282	93	—	2	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.2
	St. Clair	51,959	46,500	—	5,459	62	41	1	7	15	12	10	2	6	9	32.8
	Washington	2,213	2,159	—	54	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	33.6
20th	Circuit Total	62,753	57,265	—	5,488	67	46	2	9	15	12	12	2	6	9	31.9
	Downstate Totals	2,269,085	2,092,699	—	176,386	753	N/A	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	36.95
	Cook	1,215,487	1,176,139	—	39,348	695	449	137	151	143	96	55	38	27	48	23.9
	State Totals	3,484,572	3,268,838	—	215,734	1,448	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.7

PRINTER'S ERRATA

The heading "Downstate Totals"
and the heading "Cook" on page 142
should be reversed, i.e.,

Cook
Downstate Totals

DISPOSITIONS IN 1976 OF DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH A FELONY AND

Circuit	County	Total Number of Defendants Disposed of	NOT CONVICTED								
			Reduced or Dismissed					Tried But Not Convicted			
			Total Not Convicted	Discharged at Preliminary Hearing	Dismissed On Motion of Defendant	Dismissed On Motion of State	Reduced To Misdemeanor	Acquitted By Court	Acquitted By Jury	Convicted of Misdemeanor	Total Convicted
1st	Alexander	185	143	1	1	103	37	—	1	—	42
	Jackson	311	215	11	6	122	60	4	12	—	96
	Johnson	41	22	—	—	16	5	1	—	—	19
	Massac	95	61	1	2	41	16	—	1	—	34
	Pope	27	22	—	1	14	7	—	—	—	5
	Pulaski	59	47	—	—	32	15	—	—	—	12
	Saline	190	110	—	2	108	—	—	—	—	80
	Union	68	61	—	15	22	24	—	—	—	7
	Williamson	284	142	10	11	109	3	6	3	—	142
1st	Circuit Totals	1,260	823	23	38	567	167	11	17	—	437
2nd	Crawford	58	49	1	—	33	14	1	—	—	9
	Edwards	23	16	—	—	10	4	—	2	—	7
	Franklin	142	91	—	—	69	22	—	—	—	51
	Gallatin	46	44	—	—	26	18	—	—	—	2
	Hamilton	16	10	—	—	6	4	—	—	—	6
	Hardin	8	5	1	—	3	1	—	—	—	3
	Jefferson	68	31	9	5	12	—	1	4	—	37
	Lawrence	105	88	—	—	62	26	—	—	—	17
	Richland	31	14	—	—	9	5	—	—	—	17
	Wabash	138	81	2	4	75	—	—	—	—	56
	Wayne	29	20	—	1	14	5	—	—	—	9
	White	80	48	—	—	26	22	—	—	—	32
2nd	Circuit Totals	744	497	13	10	345	121	2	6	—	246
3rd	Bond	34	10	—	1	4	2	—	1	2	24
	Madison	1,299	903	60	9	497	333	1	3	—	396
3rd	Circuit Totals	1,333	913	60	10	501	335	1	4	2	420
4th	Christian	101	41	3	—	25	13	—	—	—	60
	Clay	68	43	1	1	31	10	—	—	—	25
	Clinton	48	25	3	2	13	2	—	3	2	23
	Effingham	87	54	—	—	42	12	—	—	—	33
	Fayette	93	67	—	—	43	24	—	—	—	26
	Jasper	34	25	1	—	17	3	—	4	—	9
	Marion	244	191	6	—	128	57	—	—	—	53
	Montgomery	122	58	2	—	33	20	1	2	—	64
	Shelby	21	14	—	—	6	8	—	—	—	7
4th	Circuit Totals	818	518	16	3	338	149	1	9	2	300
5th	Clark	25	16	—	—	16	—	—	—	—	9
	Coles	236	78	6	2	29	37	—	4	—	158
	Cumberland	20	15	—	—	15	—	—	—	—	5
	Edgar	50	33	—	—	14	19	—	—	—	17
	Vermillion	289	133	8	5	87	10	6	10	7	156
5th	Circuit Totals	620	275	14	7	161	66	6	14	7	345
6th	Champaign	715	519	6	3	305	196	2	7	—	194
	DeWitt	55	44	—	—	43	—	—	1	—	11
	Douglas	38	22	—	—	22	—	—	—	—	16
	Macon	481	192	—	66	112	—	3	11	—	288
	Moultrie	50	20	1	—	10	7	2	—	—	30
	Piatt	51	36	—	4	20	12	—	—	—	15
6th	Circuit Totals	1,390	833	7	73	512	215	7	19	—	554
7th	Greene	55	43	6	—	10	26	—	1	—	12
	Jersey	98	83	—	—	69	14	—	—	—	15
	Macoupin	89	37	2	1	31	—	1	2	—	52
	Morgan	96	69	5	14	23	21	4	2	—	27
	Sangamon	748	419	47	64	254	38	3	9	4	329
	Scott	19	19	—	—	11	5	—	2	1	—
7th	Circuit Totals	1,105	670	60	79	398	104	8	16	5	435
8th	Adams	222	157	9	18	110	15	—	4	1	65
	Brown	12	8	—	1	4	3	—	—	—	4
	Calhoun	34	27	5	1	19	2	—	—	—	7
	Cass	56	34	—	1	20	10	—	3	—	22
	Mason	94	60	—	—	28	29	1	2	—	34
	Menard	20	11	—	—	6	3	—	2	—	9
	Pike	91	56	—	1	33	22	—	—	—	35
	Schuyler	16	12	—	1	9	2	—	—	—	4
8th	Circuit Totals	545	365	14	23	229	86	1	11	1	180
9th	Fulton	244	110	—	—	82	28	—	—	—	134
	Hancock	55	44	1	2	28	10	2	1	—	11
	Henderson	33	18	2	—	9	7	—	—	—	15
	Knox	244	138	1	2	126	2	—	5	2	106
	McDonough	130	104	—	—	90	13	—	—	1	26
	Warren	123	74	6	—	56	8	1	3	—	49
9th	Circuit Totals	829	488	10	4	391	68	3	9	3	341

SENTENCES IMPOSED DURING 1976 ON DEFENDANTS CONVICTED OF A FELONY

CONVICTED															Found Unfit To Stand Trial Or To Be Sexually Dangerous	County	Circuit
Plea Of Guilty					Convicted By Court					Convicted By Jury							
Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4			
—	4	26	10	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Alexander	1st
—	2	12	65	2	—	—	—	3	1	—	1	3	7	—	—	Jackson	
—	—	9	8	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Johnson	
—	—	14	13	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	2	—	—	Massac	
—	—	—	2	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Pope	
—	—	6	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Pulaski	
—	4	15	43	13	—	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	Saline	
—	—	3	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Union	
1	2	27	79	15	—	—	2	5	1	—	4	1	4	1	—	Williamson	
1	12	112	227	39	—	—	3	11	2	—	8	6	15	1	—	Circuit Totals	1st
—	—	1	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Crawford	2nd
—	—	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Edwards	
—	3	20	22	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	—	Franklin	
—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Gallatin	
—	—	—	5	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Hamilton	
—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Hardin	
—	2	19	5	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	4	4	—	—	Jefferson	
—	1	7	8	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Lawrence	
—	—	10	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Richland	
—	—	3	37	6	—	—	—	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	Wabash	
—	1	5	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Wayne	
—	1	7	19	4	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	White	
—	8	80	114	18	—	1	2	10	—	—	1	7	5	—	1	Circuit Totals	2nd
—	—	3	16	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	Bond	3rd
4	35	191	125	21	—	1	3	—	1	2	7	4	2	—	—	Madison	
4	35	194	141	23	—	1	3	—	1	2	7	4	4	1	—	Circuit Totals	3rd
—	1	21	25	9	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	1	—	Christian	4th
—	1	14	6	3	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Clay	
—	—	2	10	8	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Clinton	
—	—	8	16	4	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	2	—	—	—	Effingham	
—	2	12	8	2	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	Fayette	
—	—	1	4	2	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Jasper	
—	—	17	24	8	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	Marion	
—	—	29	26	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	2	—	Montgomery	
—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Shelby	
—	4	111	119	39	—	1	3	4	2	4	1	6	3	3	—	Circuit Totals	4th
—	—	5	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Clark	5th
—	7	69	60	20	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Coles	
—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	Cumberland	
—	—	4	10	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Edgar	
—	5	49	58	18	—	—	—	2	—	4	4	7	8	1	—	Vermillion	
—	12	129	132	41	—	—	2	4	—	4	5	7	8	1	—	Circuit Totals	5th
2	18	68	64	15	—	1	2	—	—	3	5	5	10	1	2	Champaign	6th
—	—	7	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	DeWitt	
—	—	8	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	Douglas	
—	11	123	98	22	2	—	2	—	1	1	5	16	6	1	1	Macon	
—	—	3	23	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Moultrie	
—	—	7	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	Piatt	
2	29	216	200	44	2	1	4	—	1	4	10	22	17	2	3	Circuit Totals	6th
—	1	3	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	Greene	7th
—	—	5	7	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Jersey	
—	—	4	39	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	Macoupin	
—	—	14	7	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	Morgan	
2	19	125	149	13	—	—	—	—	—	1	4	8	8	—	—	Sangamon	
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Scott	
2	20	151	209	27	—	—	—	—	—	1	5	8	10	2	—	Circuit Totals	7th
—	4	16	30	7	—	1	—	—	—	—	3	2	2	—	—	Adams	8th
—	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	Brown	
—	—	4	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Calhoun	
—	—	16	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	Cass	
—	1	1	19	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	2	—	Mason	
—	—	2	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	Menard	
1	—	9	19	4	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	Pike	
—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	Schuyler	
1	5	50	80	23	—	1	1	—	1	2	4	5	5	2	—	Circuit Totals	8th
—	2	18	94	9	—	1	3	1	1	—	—	3	2	—	—	Fulton	9th
—	—	3	3	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	2	1	—	—	Hancock	
—	—	5	4	4	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Henderson	
1	4	36	58	5	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	Knox	
—	—	4	7	1	—	—	3	3	—	—	—	1	6	—	—	McDonough	
—	3	6	33	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Warren	
1	9	72	199	26	—	1	7	7	2	—	1	6	10	—	—	Circuit Totals	9th

DISPOSITIONS IN 1976 OF DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH A FELONY AND SENTENCE

Circuit	County	Total Number of Defendants Disposed of	NOT CONVICTED								Total Convicted
			Reduced or Dismissed					Tried But Not Convicted			
			Total Not Convicted	Discharged at Preliminary Hearing	Dismissed On Motion of Defendant	Dismissed On Motion of State	Reduced To Misdemeanor	Acquitted By Court	Acquitted By Jury	Convicted of Misdemeanor	
10th	Marshall	67	54	—	—	30	22	1	—	1	13
	Peoria	863	305	20	1	205	67	3	9	—	557
	Putnam	6	5	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	1
	Stark	9	4	—	—	1	3	—	—	—	5
	Tazewell	267	128	2	4	97	7	1	7	10	138
10th	Circuit Totals	1,212	496	22	5	338	99	5	16	11	714
11th	Ford	63	58	5	7	18	26	—	1	1	5
	Livingston	215	86	8	—	63	11	—	4	—	127
	Logan	150	98	—	—	58	37	1	2	—	52
	McLean	482	277	38	18	168	1	11	15	26	204
	Woodford	113	58	—	—	58	—	—	—	—	55
11th	Circuit Totals	1,023	577	51	25	365	75	12	22	27	443
12th	Iroquois	77	52	3	—	26	21	—	2	—	25
	Kankakee	251	113	32	11	47	2	3	10	8	131
	Will	539	395	—	13	363	6	4	9	—	144
12th	Circuit Totals	867	560	35	24	436	29	7	21	8	300
13th	Bureau	74	58	—	—	28	30	—	—	—	15
	Grundy	85	62	—	—	23	39	—	—	—	23
	LaSalle	196	107	—	—	62	42	—	3	—	89
13th	Circuit Totals	355	227	—	—	113	111	—	3	—	127
14th	Henry	117	77	2	—	26	47	—	2	—	40
	Mercer	42	24	—	1	15	6	—	2	—	18
	Rock Island	615	367	44	17	251	45	2	8	—	248
	Whiteside	312	220	12	—	172	36	—	—	—	92
14th	Circuit Totals	1,086	688	58	18	464	134	2	12	—	398
15th	Carroll	85	48	3	1	40	1	3	—	—	37
	Jo Daviess	134	105	6	—	70	29	—	—	—	29
	Lee	233	153	3	—	99	49	—	2	—	80
	Ogle	171	98	8	2	71	16	1	—	—	73
	Stephenson	232	165	10	1	115	38	—	1	—	66
15th	Circuit Totals	855	569	30	4	395	133	4	3	—	285
16th	DeKalb	302	253	42	1	200	4	—	—	6	49
	Kane	1,369	853	51	6	511	261	18	5	1	514
	Kendall	89	74	4	3	59	5	—	3	—	15
16th	Circuit Totals	1,760	1,180	97	10	770	270	18	8	7	578
17th	Boone	98	56	—	3	31	21	—	1	—	42
	Winnebago	1,041	578	34	6	316	205	7	8	2	454
17th	Circuit Totals	1,139	634	34	9	347	226	7	9	2	496
18th	DuPage	2,514	2,046	128	19	213	1,670	8	8	—	467
18th	Circuit Totals	2,514	2,046	128	19	213	1,670	8	8	—	467
19th	Lake	420	143	—	1	94	—	1	8	39	273
	McHenry	512	267	—	—	171	81	8	6	1	245
19th	Circuit Totals	932	410	—	1	265	81	9	14	40	518
20th	Monroe	37	27	—	1	20	5	—	—	1	10
	Perry	72	39	1	—	31	7	—	—	—	33
	Randolph	112	82	5	—	43	34	—	—	—	30
	St. Clair	1,126	641	7	4	505	116	3	5	1	481
	Washington	36	20	—	—	13	5	—	—	2	16
20th	Circuit Totals	1,383	809	13	5	612	167	3	5	4	570
	Down State Totals	21,770	13,578	685	367	7,760	4,306	115	226	119	8,154
	Cook*	16,638	5,833	—	—	5,184	—	538	111	—	10,455
	State Totals	38,408	19,411	685	367	12,944	4,306	653	337	119	18,609

* See pages 165 and 166 for tables on method of disposition and sentence imposed on defendants charged by indictment and information in the Criminal Division and in the Municipal Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County.

IMPOSED DURING 1976 ON DEFENDANTS CONVICTED OF A FELONY—Continued

Murder	CONVICTED														Found Unfit, To Stand Trial Or To Be Sexually Dangerous	County	Circuit
	Plea Of Guilty				Convicted By Court					Convicted By Jury							
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4			
— — — 3 3	— 8 — 5 13	6 274 — 1 52 333	3 237 — 2 52 294	3 15 — 1 7 26	— — — — —	— — — — —	— — — 4 4	1 — 1 2 5	— — — 1 1	— 1 — — 1	— 9 — 2 11	— 7 — 1 8	— 5 — 8 13	— 1 — 1 2	— 1 — 1 2	Marshall Peoria Putnam Stark Tazewell Circuit Totals	10th
— — — 1 — 1	2 1 1 16 1 21	— 43 14 82 33 172	1 65 22 57 14 159	2 9 2 11 5 29	— — — — — —	— — 4 — — 4	— — — 5 — 5	— 1 1 6 — 8	— — — 1 — 1	— — — — — —	— — 4 2 — 6	— — 2 9 — 11	— 7 2 12 2 23	— 1 — 2 2 3	— 2 — 1 — 3	Ford Livingston Logan McLean Woodford Circuit Totals	11th
— 2 — 2	2 12 14 28	3 47 59 109	14 18 20 52	6 39 2 47	— 1 2 3	— 1 3 4	— 6 1 7	— 1 5 6	— — — —	— — 4 4	— 2 8 10	— 1 16 17	— 1 7 8	— — 3 3	— 7 — 7	Iroquois Kankakee Will Circuit Totals	12th
— — — —	— 2 4 6	1 9 40 50	13 6 35 54	— 2 10 12	— — — —	— — — —	— — — —	— — — —	— — — —	— — — —	— — — —	— — — —	1 4 — 5	— — — —	1 — — 1	Bureau Grundy LaSalle Circuit Totals	13th
— — — —	1 — 13 4 18	11 7 102 48 168	19 4 103 34 160	6 1 14 6 27	— — — — —	1 — 1 — 2	1 1 — — 2	— 3 1 — 4	— — — — —	1 — — — 1	— — 4 — 4	— — 1 — 2	— 1 9 — 10	— — — — —	— — — — —	Henry Mercer Rock Island Whiteside Circuit Totals	14th
— — — — —	— — 1 6 2 9	30 10 22 29 37 128	5 16 39 20 20 100	1 1 12 4 2 20	— — — — — —	— — — 2 — 2	— 1 — 4 — 5	1 — 1 2 — 4	— — — — — —	— — — — — —	— — 1 — — 2	— — 3 — 3 6	— 1 — 5 1 7	— — 1 — 1 2	— — — 1 — 1	Carroll Jo Daviess Lee Ogle Stephenson Circuit Totals	15th
— 2 — 2	2 15 — 17	16 173 6 195	21 228 5 254	8 54 2 64	— — 1 1	— 3 — 3	1 5 — 6	— 4 — 4	— 1 — 1	— 1 — 1	— 14 — 14	— 11 1 12	1 3 — 4	— — — —	— 2 — 2	DeKalb Kane Kendall Circuit Totals	16th
— 2 2	1 33 34	23 155 178	13 161 174	4 18 22	— 1 1	1 8 9	— 11 11	— 20 20	— 1 1	— 2 2	— 13 13	— 11 11	— 18 18	— — —	— 9 9	Boone Winnebago Circuit Totals	17th
1 1	15 15	138 138	227 227	53 53	— —	1 1	7 7	2 2	2 2	— —	10 10	5 5	4 4	2 2	1 1	DuPage Circuit Totals	18th
2 — 2	14 7 21	127 57 184	80 116 196	23 53 76	— — —	4 — 4	6 1 7	2 1 3	— 1 1	1 — 1	6 2 8	4 6 10	4 1 5	— — —	4 — 4	Lake McHenry Circuit Totals	19th
— — — 2 — 2	— 2 1 25 — 28	5 2 13 186 7 213	2 21 13 205 6 247	3 3 2 26 2 36	— — — 1 — 1	— — — — — —	— — — — — —	— — — 1 — 1	— — — — — —	— — — 18 1 19	— — — 10 — 10	— 2 — 4 — 6	— 3 1 3 — 7	— — — — — —	— — 4 — — 4	Monroe Perry Randolph St. Clair Washington Circuit Totals	20th
26	344	2,983	3,338	692	8	35	79	93	16	46	130	159	181	24	38	Downstate Totals	
(Cook County Total—9,649)					(Cook County Total—536)					(Cook County Total—270)					350	Cook*	
(State Total—17,032)					(State Total—767)					(State Total—810)					388	State Totals	

**Includes defendants committed as unfit to stand trial, unfit to be sentenced and as sexually dangerous.

SENTENCES IMPOSED ON DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH FELONIES DURING THE YEAR 1976

SENTENCES

Circuit	County	Death	Murder	Imprisonment			Imprisonment and Fine						Periodic Imprisonment (Dept. of Corrections)				Periodic Imprisonment and Fine (Dept. of Corrections)				Periodic Imprisonment (Local Correctional Institution)			
				Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
1st	Alexander Jackson Johnson Massac Pope Pulaski Saline Union Williamson Circuit Total	—	—	4 2 — 2 — — 5 — 1 1	6 9 8 1 — — 5 1 15 18	2 13 2 6 1 — 15 1 25 65	2 — — — — — 2 4 8	—	— 1 — 6 — — — 2 9	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	
2nd	Crawford Edwards Franklin Gallatin Hamilton Hardin Jefferson Lawrence Richland Wabash Wayne White Circuit Total	—	—	— 4 — — — — 3 — — — — — 7	— — 7 — — — 9 7 1 2 — 3 31	4 — 2 — — — 3 2 — 13 — 2 — 27	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — — — — —		
3rd	Bond Madison Circuit Total	—	—	— 6 40	2 101 103	5 36 41	— 8 8	—	1 — 1	—	— — —	—	— — —	—	— — —	—	— — —	—	— — —	—	— — —	—	— — —	
4th	Christian Clay Clinton Effingham Fayette Jasper Marion Montgomery Shelby Circuit Total	—	—	1 — 2 1 — — — — — 4	16 — — 6 2 9 4 23 3 63	13 — — 7 3 1 5 14 3 43	3 — — — — — — — — 3	—	— — — — — — 6 — 6	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —	—	— — — — — — — — — —			
5th	Clark Coles Cumberland Edgar Vernilion Circuit Total	—	—	— — — — 4	4 5 1 3 7 13	2 17 8 3 19 68	— 7 1 8 1 9	—	— — — — — —	—	— — — — — —	—	— — — — — —	—	— — — — — —	—	— — — — — —	—	— — — — — —	—	— — — — — —			
6th	Champaign DeWitt Douglas Macon Moultrie Piatt	—	—	5 — — 3 —	15 — — 7 —	13 5 1 47 3 1	3 2 — 10 12 —	—	1 1 — 12 —	—	— — — — —	—	— — — — —	—	— — — — —	—	— — — — —	—	— — — — —	—	— — — — —			

SENTENCES IMPOSED ON DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH FELONIES DURING THE YEAR 1976—Continued

SENTENCES

Circuit	County	Death	Imprisonment							Imprisonment and Fine							Periodic Imprisonment (Dept. of Corrections)							Periodic Imprisonment and Fine (Dept. of Corrections)							Periodic Imprisonment (Local Correctional Institution)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
			Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
6th	Circuit Total.	—	8	22	104	74	13	—	1	14	4	2	—	—	5	12	11	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

150

SENTENCES IMPOSED ON DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH FELONIES DURING THE YEAR 1976

SENTENCES

Circuit	County	Periodic Imprisonment and Fine (Local Correctional Institution)				Probation or Conditional Discharge With Periodic Imprisonment				Probation or Conditional Discharge With Other Discretionary Conditions				Probation or Conditional Discharge With No Discretionary Conditions				Found Unfit To Be Sentences or Executed				Total Sentences		
		Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4						
1st	Alexander	—	—	—	—	—	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42	
	Jackson	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	51	2	—	—	—	7	1	—	—	—	—	96	
	Johnson	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4	2	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	18**	
	Massac	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	8	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	34	
	Pope	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	
1st	Pulaski	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	12	
	Saline	—	2	4	7	—	1	3	—	—	7	24	3	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	80	
	Union	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	
	Williamson	—	—	—	1	—	2	3	—	1	11	59	10	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	142	
	Circuit Total	—	2	8	8	—	10	9	—	1	29	154	21	—	17	11	4	—	—	—	—	—	436	
2nd	Crawford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	
	Edwards	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	4	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	
	Franklin	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	13	19	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	51	
	Gallatin	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	
	Hamilton	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	
2nd	Hardin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	
	Jefferson	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	11	3	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	37	
	Lawrence	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17	
	Richland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	4	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17	
	Wabash	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	10	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	56	
2nd	Wayne	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	
	White	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	14	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32	
	Circuit Total	—	8	1	1	—	7	15	2	3	35	65	8	—	3	3	4	—	—	—	—	—	246	
	3rd	Bond	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	24
		Madison	—	—	—	—	—	30	16	6	3	52	64	8	—	15	11	396	—	—	—	—	—	420
4th	Circuit Total	—	—	—	—	—	30	17	6	3	52	65	8	—	15	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Christian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	7	12	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	60
	Clay	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	8	5	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	25
	Clinton	—	—	5	3	—	1	1	—	—	2	5	5	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23
	Efingham	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	4	8	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	33
4th	Fayette	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	26
	Jasper	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9
	Marion	—	—	—	—	—	6	5	2	—	4	12	6	—	3	3	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	53
	Montgomery	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	2	6	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	64
	Shelby	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
4th	Circuit Total	—	—	5	3	1	8	13	6	—	31	53	25	—	4	7	3	—	—	—	—	—	300	
5th	Clark	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9
	Coles	—	—	1	—	—	13	15	1	—	—	26	—	—	1	2	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	158
	Cumberland	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	
	Edgar	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	17	
	Vermillion	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	2	1	23	44	13	—	4	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	156
5th	Circuit Total	—	4	1	—	2	18	18	3	2	37	71	21	—	10	6	7	—	—	—	—	—	345	
6th	Champaign	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	1	8	28	32	7	—	16	25	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	194
	DeWitt	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	
	Douglas	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	4	—	1	—	2	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	
	Macon	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	24	21	6	3	17	18	1	—	—	1	—	—	288	
	Moultrie	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	4	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	
6th	Platt	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	
	Circuit Total	—	6	3	—	—	3	5	2	8	63	67	19	3	35	51	6	—	—	1	—	—	554	

SENTENCES IMPOSED ON DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH FELONIES DURING THE YEAR 1976—Continued

SENTENCES

Circuit	County	Periodic Imprisonment and Fine (Local Correctional Institution)				Probation or Conditional Discharge With Periodic Imprisonment				Probation or Conditional Discharge With Other Discretionary Conditions				Probation or Conditional Discharge With No Discretionary Conditions				Found Unfit To Be Sentenced or Executed					Total Sentences
		Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	
7th	Greene	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
	Jersey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
	Macoupin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	52
	Morgan	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27
	Sangamon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	329
7th	Scott	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Circuit Total	—	4	—	8	—	21	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	435
8th	Adams	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	64**
	Brown	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
	Calhoun	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
	Cass	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	22
	Mason	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34
8th	Menard	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9
	Pike	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	35
	Schuyler	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
	Circuit Total	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	179
9th	Fulton	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	134
	Hancock	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11
	Henderson	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
	Knox	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	106
	McDonough	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26
9th	Warren	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	49
	Circuit Total	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	341
10th	Marshall	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13
	Peoria	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	557
	Pulnam	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Stark	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
	Tazewell	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	138
10th	Circuit Total	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	714
11th	Ford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
	Livingston	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	127
	Logan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	52
	McLean	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	204
	Woodford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	55
11th	Circuit Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	443
12th	Iroquois	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	25
	Kankakee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	131
	Will	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	144
	Circuit Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	300
13th	Bureau	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
	Grundy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23
	LaSalle	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	89
	Circuit Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	127
14th	Henry	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	40
	Mercer	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18
	Rock Island	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	248
	Whiteside	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	92
	Circuit Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	398

SENTENCES IMPOSED ON DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH FELONIES DURING THE YEAR 1976—Continued

SENTENCES

Circuit	County	Periodic Imprisonment and Fine (Local Correctional Institution)				Probation or Conditional Discharge With Periodic Imprisonment				Probation or Conditional Discharge With Other Discretionary Conditions				Probation or Conditional Discharge With No Discretionary Conditions				Found Unfit To Be Sentenced or Executed				Total Sentences		
		Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Murder	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4						
15th	Carroll	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	37	
	Jo Daviess	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	
	Lee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	80	
	Ogle	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	73	
	Stephenson	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	66	
15th	Circuit Total	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	285	
16th	DeKalb	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	49	
16th	Kane	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	514	
	Kendall	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	
16th	Circuit Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	578	
17th	Boone	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42	
17th	Winnebago	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	453	
	Circuit Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	495	
18th	DuPage	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	467	
18th	Circuit Total	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	467	
19th	Lake	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	273	
19th	McHenry	—	—	7	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	245	
	Circuit Total	—	—	7	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	518	
20th	Monroe	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	
20th	Perry	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	33	
	Randolph	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	
	St. Clair	—	2	4	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	481	
	Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	
20th	Circuit Total	—	2	4	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	570	
	Downstate Total	—	31	51	23	13	481	453	98	61	863	1,507	294	21	401	559	159	—	—	2	—	—	8,151**	
	Cook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10,455***	
	State Total	—	31	51	23	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	18,606	
(Cook County Total—80)										(Cook County Total—1,557)										(See Note*)				
(State Total—1,125)										(State Total—4,282)										(State Total—5,316)				

* See footnote on page 165 regarding defendants found unfit to be tried.

** Does not include 1 disposition of Class 3 conviction and defendant ordered only to make restitution (Johnson County); 1 disposition of Class 3 conviction and defendant ordered only to pay fine (Adams County), and 1 disposition of Class 1 conviction and defendant not-sentenced, having been sentenced on other convictions (Winnebago County).

*** Included are 159 sentences described as "other."

REPORT ON THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1976

TREND OF CASES IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Division	County Department									
	Type of Case		Pending At Start	Begun	Reinstated	Transferred	Total Added	Terminated	Pending At End	Inventory Increase (+) Decrease (-)
L	Ad damnum \$15,000 & over	Jury	35,700 ^a	3,858	567	+12,587	17,012	12,615	40,156 ^b	+4,456
		Non-Jury	8,316	17,934	545	-12,587	5,892	4,726	9,491 ^b	+1,175
A	Tax		5,472	15,367	2,299	0	17,666	18,948	4,194 ^c	-1,278
W	Condemnation	263	160	10	0	0	170	195	238	-25
	Miscellaneous Remedy	1,964 ^d	1,737	152	0	0	1,889	1,683	2,133 ^e	+169
	Subtotals	(51,715)	(39,056)	(3,573)	(0)	(0)	(42,629)	(38,167)	(56,212)	(+4,497)
CHANCERY	Chancery	6,799	7,802	604	0	0	8,406	8,160	7,045	+246
	Housing	16,216	7,281	0	0	0	7,281	4,300	19,197	+2,981
	Subtotals	(23,015)	(15,083)	(604)	(0)	(0)	(15,687)	(12,460)	(26,242)	(+3,227)
DIVORCE	Divorce	15,823	29,465	2,997	0	0	32,462	29,518	18,767	+2,944
	Tax	15,932	36,085	0	0	0	36,085	24,165	27,852	+11,920
C	Mental Health	43	4,479	0	0	0	4,479	4,468	54	+11
O	Adoption, Marriage of Minors and Reciprocal Non-Support	5,492	5,957	0	0	0	5,957	4,967	6,482	+990
U	Municipal Corporations	196	58	0	0	0	58	17	237	+41
N	Subtotals	(21,663)	(46,579)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(46,579)	(33,617)	(34,625)	(+12,962)
PROBATE	Estates, Guardianships & Conservatorships		10,426	0	0	0	10,426	8,494		
JUVENILE	Delinquency, Dependency, Neglect & Supervision	8,683 ^f	15,486	156	0	0	15,642	17,644	6,681	-2,002
CRIMINAL	Felony (Indictment & Information)	6,700	7,132	2,275	0	0	9,407	9,065	7,458 ^g	+758
	County Department Subtotal	(127,599)	(163,227)	(9,605)	(0)	(0)	(172,832)	(148,965)	(149,985)	(+22,386)
	Municipal Department									
	Type of Case									
D	Law Ad damnum under \$15,000	Jury	13,918	7,352	985	+2,287	10,624	8,074	16,479 ^h	+2,561
		Non-Jury	28,122	87,409	1,950	-2,217	87,142	84,709	30,561 ^h	+2,439
I	Small Claims	9,540	102,403	1,529	-70	0	103,862	103,326	10,076	+536
S	Tax	68,941	66,955	2,941	0	0	69,896	56,035	82,802	+13,861
T	Felony (Information)	56 ⁱ	4,442	4	0	0	4,446	3,974	528	+472
R	Misdemeanors, Ordinance Violations & Preliminary Hearings (Felony)		276,903 ⁱ	23	0	0	276,926	218,819		
C	Traffic		1,478,279	0	0	0	1,478,279	1,420,163		
I	Family & Youth		65,078	0	0	0	65,078	48,634		
C	Subtotals	(120,577)	(2,088,821)	(7,432)	(0)	(0)	(2,096,253)	(1,943,734)	(140,446)	(+19,869)
T	Grand Total	248,176	2,252,048	17,037	0	0	2,269,085	2,092,699	290,431	+42,255
S										
ONE THRU SIX										

FOOTNOTES: (a) Computer adjustment of +8 cases; (b) Computer adjustments of net +59 cases in law jury and of net +9 cases in law nonjury; does not include 100 law jury and 42 law nonjury cases on Special Calendars (military, appeal, bankruptcy and insurance liquidation); (c) Computer adjustments of net +4 cases; (d) Computer adjustment of +1 case; (e) Computer adjustments of net -37 cases; (f) Adjusted by +5687 cases due to, per clerk, duplicate adjudications which occurred during 1975 and which could not be detected until the beginning of 1976; (g) Computer adjustment of +416 cases to correct for nonrecording of reinstatements; (h) Adjusted in District 5 after physical inventory by +11 cases in law jury and +6 cases in law nonjury; (i) Adjusted by +39 cases after physical inventory in some suburban districts; (j) Due to destruction of records by flooding in District 5, data unavailable for month of June.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT

AGE OF LAW CASES PENDING IN THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT

	J U R Y	1971 & Earlier	During 1972	During 1973	During 1974	During 1975	During 1976	Totals
		54	676	4,207	9,215	13,041	12,963	41,156*
LAW CASES OVER \$15,000								
	NUMBER PENDING							
	% OF TOTAL PENDING INVENTORY	0.1%	1.7%	10.5%	22.9%	32.5%	32.3%	100.0%
	NUMBER PENDING	11	195	274	528	2,036	6,447	9,491*
	% OF TOTAL PENDING INVENTORY	0.1%	2.1%	2.9%	5.6%	21.4%	67.9%	100.0%

*Does not include 100 law jury and 42 law nonjury cases on Special Calendars; also see Appendix at page 172.

AVERAGE TIME INTERVAL BETWEEN DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF TERMINATION OF LAW JURY CASES
IN THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT

Calendar	Number of Verdicts Reached During Period	Cases Terminated by Verdict		
		Months Elapsed Between Date of Filing and Date of Verdict		
		Maximum	Minimum	Average
STANDARD	524	81.0	1.0	40.81
SPECIAL	4	90.0	38.0	55.00
TOTAL	528	90.0	1.0	40.91

Cases Terminated by Any Means Including Verdict			
Total Number of Cases Terminated* During the Period	Months Elapsed Between Date of Filing and Date of Termination		
	Maximum	Minimum	Average
12,450	106.0	1.0	27.4

* Does not reflect multiple dispositions of cases during the month in which reported.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT**
ANALYSIS OF LAW JURY CASES PROCESSED BY THE TRIAL JUDGES OF THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT
COMPARISONS WITH PRECEDING YEARS

	Number of Law Jury Cases			Number of Verdicts		Ratio of Contested Verdicts to Total Cases Terminated	Law Jury Trial Judges*	
	Total Added	Total Terminated	Total Assigned For Trial	Total	Contested		Substantially Full-Time	Part-Time
Number for Dec. 1976	1,395	756	353	33	32	4.2	23	9
1976 Monthly Average	1,417	1,051	489	43	43	4.1	27	8
1975 Monthly Average	1,480	1,097	522	42	42	3.9	24	8
1974 Monthly Average	1,343	1,018	471	48	48	4.6	25	7
1973 Monthly Average	1,279	1,313	467	47	47	3.6	25	6
1972 Monthly Average	1,187	1,585	518	53	52	3.3	24	7

*Includes Law Jury Trial Judges Assigned to Summer Pre-Trial Program During 1976.

**IN THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
ANALYSIS OF LAW JURY TERMINATIONS
DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

(1) Age of Law Jury Cases Disposed of During the Period

		1971 and Earlier	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	TOTAL
Law-Jury Cases Disposed of During the Period	No.	107	2,020	4,086	2,503	2,941	922	12,579*
	%age	0.9%	16.0%	32.5%	19.9%	23.4%	7.3%	100.0%

*Includes 91 cases transferred out of Division and 2 cases assigned to Special Calendars.

(2) Law Jury Cases Terminated During the Period

Terminations Credited by Clerk To	Number of Terminations
Assignment Judge	3,340
Pre-Trial Judges	1,911
Motion Judges	1,309
Full-Time Trial Judges (*) & (**)	5,056
Part-Time Trial Judges***	662
No Progress Call	208
TOTAL	12,486****

* Includes both regular pretrial and trial judges who heard summer pretrials.

** Includes only Cook County judges who spent 75% or more of their time in the Law Division.

*** Includes Cook County judges who spent less than 75% of their time in the Law Division and downstate judges who served in the Law Division on assignment.

**** Not included are 129 cases transferred out of Division and assigned to Special Calendars.

(3) Maximum, minimum and average productivity of full-time trial judges and stages at which full-time trial judges terminated law jury cases during the period

	Verdicts			Cases Settled		
	Total Law Jury Cases Terminated	Contested	Uncontested	Without Use of Jury	During Selection of Jury	After Selection of Jury
Maximum*	1,066	38	3	1,060	14	20
Minimum*	65	2	0	35	0	0
Average	211.8	17.0	0.6	183.3	3.3	7.6

* Maximum and Minimum reported by any judge in each category not necessarily the same judge in each category, and includes cases disposed of by Law Jury Trial Judges who participated in the summer pretrial program.

**STATEMENT OF TOTAL LAW JURY CASES TERMINATED AS
REPORTED BY THE CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK
COUNTY, COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION DURING
CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

During calendar year 1976, the Law Division of the County Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County terminated 12,486 Law Jury cases which were credited by the clerk as follows:

I. To the Assignment Judges (Judges Landesman and Sorrentino)	3,340
II. To the Motion Judges (Judges Bua, Coman, Elward, Hartman, Jiganti and Giliberto)	1,309
III. To the Pre-Trial Judges (Judges Garnett, Harewood, N. Kaplan, Matkovic, Murphy, Murray, Nash, Nelson and Sarnow)	1,911
IV. To the Law Jury Trial Judges as follows:	
A) To the 27 Judges (Judges Barry, Canel, Carey, Cherry, Crosson, Daly, DeBow, Ellis, Felt, Fiedler, J. Fitzgerald, Fleischman, Geroulis, Heilingoetter, Hershenson, Holzer, S. Jones, Kane, Kowalski, McAuliffe, Murray, Norman, Patterson, Power, Schaller, Stark and M. Wilson) whose service in the Law Jury Trial Section was not substantially interrupted by other judicial duties or illness during the entire period	5,056
B) To the 26 Judges (Judges Arkiss, Aspen, Berg, Buckley, J. Butler, Cerda, A. Dunne, Durham, Elward, Epton, T. Fitzgerald, Giliberto, Healy, Higgins, Horan, Janczy, Landesman, Machala, Montelione, Olson, Price, Schwaba, Solomon, Sorrentino, Tondryk and Wosik) whose service in the Law Jury Trial Section was limited by other judicial duties or illness during the period	462
C) To the 32 Judges (Judges Barr, Benefiel, Berkowitz, T. Burke, Burrows, Calvin, Dearborn, Ginos, Heiple, W. S. Johnson, A. Jones, Kasserman, Leach, Lenz, Lipe, Little, Lund, Mathers, Michaelree, Mills, O'Shea, Partee, J. R. Pool, Reither, D. Roberts, W. Roberts, Sunderman, Utter, Verticchio, Watson, H. White and C. Wilson) on assignment from circuits outside of Cook County	200
D) To the No Progress Call/Status Call Judge (Judge Iseberg)	208
Total Terminations*	12,486

* Includes terminations by both regular pretrial and Law Jury Trial Judges who participated in the summer pretrial program; does not include cases transferred out of the Law Division and cases assigned to Special Calendars.

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE LAW JURY PRODUCT OF THE LAW JURY TRIAL JUDGES OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
OF COOK COUNTY, COUNTY DEPARTMENT, FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1976 - AS REPORTED THROUGH THE
MONTHLY REPORTS OF LAW JURY TRIAL JUDGES***

The Monthly Reports Of The Law Jury Trial Judges Of The County Department Of The Circuit Court Of Cook County, Indicate A Total Of 7,793 Cases Processed And 6,514 Cases Terminated. Subsections A, B & C Below Describe The Processing Of These Cases, Classified According To The Amount Of Time A Judge Was Assigned To The County Department, Law Division, Jury Section.

Settled Without Use Of Jury	Settled During Selection Of Jury	Settled After Selection Of Jury	Verdicts		Returned To Assignment Judge	Mistrials	Total Law Jury Cases Terminated	Total Law Jury Cases Processed	Calendar 1/2 Days Available for Assignment
			Contested	Uncontested					

A. The Law Jury Record Of The 27 Law Jury Judges Whose Service In The Law Jury Trial Section Was Not Substantially Interrupted By Other Judicial Duties, Assignment Or Illness During The Period

TOTALS	4,951	89	205	15	1,071	32	5,720	6,823	11,646
Maximum	1,066	14	20	3	144	5	1,066	1,088	474
Minimum	65	0	0	0	0	0	65	68	356
Average	211.8	3.3	7.6	0.6	39.7	1.2	211.8	252.7	431.3

B. The Law Jury Record Of The 13 Law Jury Judges Whose Service In The Law Jury Trial Section Was Substantially Limited By Other Judicial Duties, Assignments Or Illness During The Period

TOTALS	545	6	5	2	161	1	592	754	1,266
Maximum	248	5	2	2	83	1	254	254	312
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
Average	41.9	0.5	0.4	0.2	12.4	0.1	45.5	58.0	97.4

C. The Law Jury Record Of The 31 Judges On Assignment To The Circuit Court Of Cook County, Law Jury Section From Circuits Outside Of Cook County During The Period

TOTALS	130	17	9	0	14	0	202	216	N/A
Maximum	22	3	2	0	3	0	26	26	N/A
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Average	4.2	0.5	0.3	0	0.5	0	6.5	7.0	N/A

* Includes cases processed and terminated by the Law Jury Trial Judges who participated in the summer pretrial program.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
DIVORCE DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT
DISPOSITION OF DIVORCE CASES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

PART I		
TOTAL DIVORCE CASES TERMINATED		
<div>29,518</div>		
PART II		
JUDGMENTS		
TOTAL JUDGMENTS		22,809
1. Divorce	22,440	
2. Separate Maintenance	99	
3. Annulment	270	
PART III		
CASES DISMISSED		
TOTAL DISMISSALS		6,709
1. Divorce	6,709	
2. Separate Maintenance	0	
3. Annulment	0	

**THE TREND OF CASES IN THE COUNTY DIVISION
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

Type of Case	Pending at Start	Filed	Trans- ferred	Term- inated	Pending at End
(A) TAX					
(1) Special Assessments					
a. Chicago	376	86		77	385
b. Suburban	527	33		25	535
(2) Tax Deeds	1,594	1,030		1,206	1,418
(3) Scavenger Tax Deeds	36	0		11	25
(4) Inheritance Tax Petitions	6,063	9,194		8,392	6,865
(5) Inheritance Tax Reassessments	194	46		0	240
(6) Tax Refund Petitions	213	37		56	194
(7) Tax Objections	6,758	24,659		13,447	17,970
(8) Condemnations (in conjunction with special assessments)	53	7		1	59
(9) Other	118	993		950	161
(Subtotal)	(15,932)	(36,085)	(0)	(24,165)	(27,852)
(B) ADOPTIONS					
(1) Related	164	1,293		1,115	342
(2) Agency	47	934		818	163
(3) Private Placement	387	315		379	323
(Subtotal)	(598)	(2,542)	(0)	(2,312)	(828)
(C) MENTAL HEALTH					
(1) Commitment Petitions					
a. Adults	39	4,366		4,353	52
b. Minors	2	45		47	0
(2) Restoration Petitions					
a. Adults	0	64		64	0
b. Minors	0	0		0	0
(3) Discharge Petitions					
a. Adults	2	4		4	2
b. Minors	0	0		0	0
(Subtotal)	(43)	(4,479)	(0)	(4,468)	(54)
(D) MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS					
(1) Petitions to Organize	18	0		0	18
(2) Petitions to Annex, Disconnect and Dissolve	76	21		9	88
(3) Local Options and Propositions	11	0		0	11
(4) Election Matters	91	37		8	120
(Subtotal)	(196)	(58)	(0)	(17)	(237)
(E) RECIPROCAL NON SUPPORT	4,863	3,348	0	2,597	5,614
(F) MARRIAGE OF MINORS	31	67	0	58	40
GRAND TOTAL	21,663	46,579	0	33,617	34,625

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
PROBATE DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT
STATISTICAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATED IN THE PROBATE DIVISION

	Decedent Estates	Guardianships	Conservatorships	Total
Number of Cases Begun	7,469*	1,729	1,228	10,426
Number of Cases Terminated	6,809*	933	752	8,494

* Includes Supplemental Proceedings Petitions: 90 filed and 82 terminated. Supplemental Proceedings Petitions are proceedings concerning contracts to make a will, construction of wills and the appointment of testamentary trustees during the period of administration.

**INVENTORIES FILED, FEES COLLECTED AND WILLS FILED
IN THE PROBATE DIVISION IN 1976**

**PART I
INVENTORIES FILED AND VALUE THEREOF**

Kind of Property	Inventories	
	Number	Value
Personal	6,486	\$588,797,563.00
Real Estate	2,060	\$91,126,478.00
TOTALS	8,546	\$679,924,041.00

**PART II
FEES COLLECTED (NET) BY THE CLERK**

\$710,042.28

**PART III
WILLS FILED AND PROBATED**

Filed	Probated	%Probated
13,053	4,746	36.36%

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
JUVENILE DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT
STATISTICAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

Children referred to the County Department, Juvenile Division

Delinquents	Dependents	Minors in Need of Supervision	Victim of Delinquent or Criminal Offense	Victim of Neglect	Other	Reactivated Cases	Total
10,400	150	1,828	0	2,682	426	0	15,486

Initial action taken on cases referred to the County Department, Juvenile Division

Adjusted	Social Investigation Ordered	Petition Recommended	Total
3,644	0	15,486	19,130

Cases adjusted in the County Department, Juvenile Division

	Dependents	Delinquents	Minors in Need of Supervision	Mental Deficients	Others	Total
By the Probation Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0
By the Complaint Unit Staff	55	2,724	865	0	0	3,644
TOTAL	55	2,724	865	0	0	3,644

Nature of petitions disposed of in the County Department, Juvenile Division

Petitions Disposed of	Continued Generally	Cases Closed	Guardian Appointed with Right to Consent to Adoption	Guardian Appointed with Right to Place	Probation	Institutional Commitments	Total
17,644	43,017	5,458	177	1,719	1,716	1,090	70,821

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
CRIMINAL DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT**

Table of Criminal Offenses Commenced by Indictment and Information
In The Criminal Division During 1976

CHARGED OFFENSES		Number of			
		Indict-ments	Defen-dants	Infor-mations	Defen-dants
Attempt-	Armed Robbery	26	38	68	86
	Arson	4	6	5	5
	Attempt (various offenses)	3	5	3	3
	Burglary	18	21	71	86
	Murder	114	156	150	176
	Rape	16	16	17	17
	Robbery	10	18	59	68
	Theft	23	27	28	32
Commission of-	Aggravated Assault (including assault)	2	3	2	2
	Aggravated Battery (including conspiracy)	126	161	286	319
	Aggravated Incest (including incest)	2	2	3	3
	Aggravated Kidnapping (including kidnapping)	1	1	4	5
	Armed Robbery (including conspiracy)	304	444	683	867
	Arson	8	10	25	33
	Bail Jumping (including violation of bail bond)	614	614	2	2
	Bribery (including offering bribe)	17	19	18	18
	Burglary (including conspiracy)	400	548	903	1,171
	Communicating with Jurors	4	4	0	0
	Conspiracy (various offenses)	8	24	3	4
	Criminal Damage to Property	2	2	7	7
	Deviate Sexual Conduct	17	20	12	12
	Escape (including aiding)	13	15	5	5
	Forgery	25	30	7	8
	Gambling (including syndicated gambling)	2	3	5	5
	Indecent Liberties	19	19	26	26
	Intimidation	15	25	17	20
	Involuntary Manslaughter	4	4	4	4
	Motor Vehicle Act Violations	7	7	5	6
	Murder	272	346	329	378
	Narcotic, Cannabis & Controlled Substances Violations (including delivery & possession)	371	435	604	655
	Obstructing Justice	4	4	1	1
	Official Misconduct	7	8	0	0
	Pandering	4	4	5	6
	Perjury	5	5	1	1
	Possession of Burglary Tools	1	1	3	7
	Possession of Stolen Auto	3	3	5	5
	Rape (including conspiracy)	105	126	146	160
	Reckless Homicide	9	9	6	6
	Robbery	97	144	367	458
	Theft (including conspiracy)	221	288	296	354
	Unlawful Restraint	2	3	3	3
	Unlawful Use of Credit Card	5	6	2	2
	Unlawful Use of Weapons	53	62	151	165
	Voluntary Manslaughter	5	5	7	7
	Miscellaneous Offenses	13	16	8	8
TOTALS		2,981*	3,707	4,352*	5,206

*These totals here are at a variance with the category "Cases Filed . . ." in the chart "Trend of Cases . . ." on page 154 due to monthly computer adjustments, as reflected in the year-end computer print-out.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
CRIMINAL DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT**

Trend of Cases Charging Defendants With Offenses
In the Criminal Division During 1976

Cases Commenced By	Cases Pending at Start of Period	Cases Filed During Period	Cases Reinstated During Period	Cases Disposed of During Period	Cases Pending at End of Period
Indictment	6,267	3,054	1,765	7,119	4,077*
Information	433	4,078	510	1,946	3,381*
TOTAL	6,700	7,132	2,275	9,065	7,458*

* Computer adjustments of +110 indictments and +306 informations to correct for nonrecording of reinstatements.

Method of Disposition of Defendants
Charged By Indictment and Information
In the Criminal Division During 1976

Disposed of By		Disposition of Defendants	
		Not Convicted	Convicted
Guilty Plea	Indictment		4,318
	Information		1,503
Bench Trial	Indictment	454	436
	Information	76	90
Jury Trial	Indictment	86	235
	Information	19	22
Stricken Off With Leave to Reinstatement	Indictment	1,997	
	Information	430	
Nolle Prosequi	Indictment	582	
	Information	108	
Other Discharge	Indictment	1,777*	
	Information	512*	
TOTALS		6,041	6,604

* Includes 333 defendants (233 charged by indictment and 100 charged by information) who were committed to the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities as unfit to be tried or sentenced or as sexually dangerous.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
CRIMINAL DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT**

Disposition of Defendants
Sentenced In the Criminal Division During 1976

Sentence Imposed	Number of Defendants	
	Indictment	Information
(1) Imprisonment (Ill. Dept. Corrections)	3,124	842
(2) Probation only—No Discretionary Conditions	1,299	553
(3) Probation & Jail	425	163
(4) Probation & Other Discretionary Conditions	3	1
(5) Conditional Discharge Only—No Discretionary Conditions	26	9
(6) Conditional Discharge with Discretionary Conditions	5	9
(7) Other	107	38
TOTALS	4,989	1,615

Number of Writs and Petitions Filed & Disposed Of
In the Criminal Division During 1976

	Number of Writs & Petitions	
	Filed	Disposed of
Habeas Corpus	361	117
Post-Conviction	106	97
Modify/Revoke Probation, Conditional Discharge, or Periodic Imprisonment	N/A	671

**TREND OF ALL CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

		Pending at Start	Begun	Rein- Stated	Trans- ferred	Total Added	Termi- nated	Pending at End	Inventory Increase (+) Decrease (-)
Law Jury Cases Under \$15,000	Dist. 1	12,929	7,245	947	+1,055	9,247	6,788	15,388	+2,459
	Dist. 2	115	0	1	+208	209	213	111	-4
	Dist. 3	202	14	0	+267	281	224	259	+57
	Dist. 4	301	42	20	+275	337	335	303	+2
	Dist. 5	192	13	2	+170	185	177	211 ^a	+19
	Dist. 6	179	38	15	+312	365	337	207	+28
Law Non-Jury Cases Under \$15,000	Dist. 1	27,036	83,330	1,733	-1,055	84,008	81,617	29,427	+2,391
	Dist. 2	93	545	29	-174	400	329	164	+71
	Dist. 3	226	713	51	-267	497	550	173	-53
	Dist. 4	271	1,261	69	-261	1,069	1,028	312	+41
	Dist. 5	176	443	13	-170	286	332	136 ^a	-40
	Dist. 6	320	1,117	55	-290	882	853	349	+29
Small Claims	Dist. 1	5,409	88,580	1,382	0	89,962	88,916	6,455	+1,046
	Dist. 1 Pro Se . . .	2,340	6,247	0	0	6,247	6,782	1,805	-535
	Dist. 2-6 . .	1,791	7,576	147	-70	7,653	7,628	1,816	+25
Taxes	Dist. 1	50,025	49,145	2,941	0	52,086	39,857	62,254	+12,229
	Dist. 2-6 . .	18,916	17,810	0	0	17,810	16,178	20,548	+1,632
Felony (Information)	Dist. 1	0	2,436	0	0	2,436	2,436	0	-
	Dist. 2-6 . .	56 ^b	2006	4	0	2,010	1,538	528	+472
Misdemeanors, Ordinance Viola- tions & Preliminary Hearings (Felony)	Dist. 1** . .		229,548	0	0	229,548	171,843		
	Dist. 2-6 . .		47,355 ^c	23	0	47,378	46,976 ^c		
Traffic	Dist. 1		906,230	0	0	906,230	895,240		
	Dist. 2-6 . .		572,049	0	0	572,049	524,923		
Family & Youth	Dist. 1		65,078	0	0	65,078	48,634		
TOTALS		120,577	2,088,821	7,432	0	2,096,253	1,943,734	140,446	+19,869

(a) Adjusted after physical inventory by +11 cases in law jury and +6 cases in law nonjury; (b) Adjusted by +39 cases after physical inventory in some districts; (c) Due to destruction of records by flooding in District 5, data unavailable for month of June.

**AVERAGE TIME INTERVAL BETWEEN DATE OF FILING AND
DATE OF VERDICT OF LAW JURY CASES IN THE
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY**

Cases Terminated by Verdict, Municipal Department, Circuit Court of Cook County						
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5*	District 6
Total number of verdicts reached during period	143	15	17	17	11	22
Months elapsed between date of filing and date of verdict	Average	16.2	13.1	16.6	21.5	14.5
	Maximum	38.9	22.5	63.1	36.7	41.4
	Minimum	0.9	6.3	6.1	9.3	5.7

* See note (C) on page 167.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, DISTRICTS 1-6
AGE OF PENDING LAW CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY***

	1970 & Before		1971		1972		1973		1974		1975		1976	
	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury
First District	10	0	34	0	100	7	1,327	80	3,317	1,561	5,290	11,940	5,310	15,839
Second District	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	26	11	13	82	124
Third District	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	5	72	3	173	163
Fourth District	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	2	79	31	207	275
Fifth District	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	10	4	63	23	137	108
Sixth District	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	40	12	162	337
Totals	11	0	34	0	102	7	1,332	88	3,374	1,598	5,555	12,022	6,071	16,846

* Also see Appendix at page 173.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, DISTRICTS 1-6**

Trend of Cases Charging Defendants with Felonies by Information During 1976

Commenced By	Cases Pending at Start	Cases Filed	Cases Reinstated	Cases Disposed Of	Cases Pending at End
Information	56	4,442	4	3,974	528

Method of Disposition of Defendants
Charged With Felonies By Information
In The Municipal Department During 1976

Disposed of By		Disposition of Defendants	
		Not Convicted	Convicted
Guilty Plea	District 1		2,435
	Districts 2-6.		1,393
Bench Trial	District 1	0	0
	Districts 2-6.	8	10
Jury Trial.	District 1	0	0
	Districts 2-6.	6	13
Stricken Off With Leave to Reinstate	District 1	0	
	Districts 2-6.	71	
Nolle Prosequi.	District 1	0	
	Districts 2-6.	16	
Other Discharge	District 1	1	
	Districts 2-6.	40*	
TOTALS		142	3,851

* Includes 17 defendants who were committed to the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities as unfit to be tried or sentenced or as sexually dangerous.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, DISTRICTS 1-6**

Disposition of Defendants Sentenced Where Charged With Felonies
By Information In The Municipal Department During 1976

Sentence Imposed	Number of Defendants	
	District 1	Districts 2-6
(1) Imprisonment (Ill. Dept. Corrections)	233	275
(2) Imprisonment (Ill. Dept. Corrections) & Fine	0	7
(3) Periodic Imprisonment (Ill. Dept. Corrections) & Fine	0	1
(4) Periodic Imprisonment (Cook Co. Dept. of Corrections)	0	1
(5) Probation only—No Discretionary Conditions	1,656	599
(6) Probation & Periodic Imprisonment	33	19
(7) Probation & Jail	508	172
(8) Probation & Fine	0	146
(9) Probation, Periodic Imprisonment & Fine	0	19
(10) Probation, Jail & Fine	0	20
(11) Probation & Other Discretionary Conditions	0	103
(12) Conditional Discharge—No Discretionary Conditions	2	32
(13) Conditional Discharge & Periodic Imprisonment	0	9
(14) Conditional Discharge & Fine	0	1
(15) Conditional Discharge & Other Discretionary Conditions	1	0
(16) Other	2	12
TOTALS	2,435	1,416

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, DISTRICTS 1-6
NATURE OF TERMINATION OF CRIMINAL, ORDINANCE AND TRAFFIC CASES DURING
CALENDAR YEAR 1976**

Method of Termination or Disposition	Preliminary Hearings		Misdemeanors & Ordinance Violations		Traffic	
	District 1	Districts 2-6 ***	District 1	Districts 2-6 ***	District 1	Districts 2-6
1. Fine	—	—	24,323	7,272	293,299	306,880
2. Fine and Jail Sentence or Probation	—	—	—	—	10,778	2,906
3. Local Correctional Institution	—	—	0	443	—	—
4. Cook County Dept. of Corrections . .	—	—	9,265	1,280	—	—
5. Probation*	—	—	5,908	5,021	—	—
6. State Institutions	—	—	158	200	—	—
7. Transferred to Criminal Division** . .	195	2,334	—	—	—	—
8. Ordered to Pay	—	—	2,093	1,114	—	—
9. Ex Parte, Satisfied.	—	—	—	—	0	0
10. Ex Parte, Execution to Issue	—	—	—	—	0	0
11. Fine and Costs Suspended	—	—	—	—	21,550	8,527
12. Discharged	—	162	20,679	8,356	432,906	92,067
13. D.W.P.	—	27	18,662	1,847	109,402	20,328
14. Leave to File Denied	—	2	64,934	510	864	2,162
15. Leave to File Denied—No Number. .	—	0	0	45	—	—
16. Non-Suit	—	9	32,367	759	8,362	32,247
17. Nolle Prosequi.	—	202	6,996	706	12,743	8,088
18. Stricken Off—Leave to Reinstate . . .	—	1,506	32,656	13,756	5,336	51,718
19. Off Call & Other	—	379	2,241	1,046	0	0
Total	195	4,621	220,282	42,355	895,240	524,923

* includes conditional discharge and supervision.

** or superseded by information.

*** Due to destruction of records by flooding in District 5, data unavailable for month of June.

APPENDIX

CHARTS COMPARING AGE OF PENDING CASES

LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS: YEAR-END AGE OF PENDING LAW JURY CASES

Year Ending Dec. 31	Up to One Year Old	Between One and Two Years Old	Between Two and Three Years Old	Between Three and Four Years Old	Between Four and Five Years Old	Five Years Old and Older	Total
1966	11,464	12,211	11,400	8,276	4,487	1,421	49,259
	23.3%	24.8%	23.1%	16.8%	9.1%	2.9%	100.0%
1967	11,108	10,996	9,137	7,676	6,467	208	45,592
	24.4%	24.1%	20.0%	16.8%	14.2%	0.5%	100.0%
1968	10,478	11,226	8,309	6,875	5,152	721	42,761
	24.5%	26.3%	19.4%	16.1%	12.0%	1.7%	100.0%
1969	10,691	10,414	8,205	6,257	4,822	1,542	41,931
	25.5%	24.8%	19.6%	14.9%	11.5%	3.7%	100.0%
1970	9,539	9,228	6,911	5,831	3,842	845	36,196
	26.4%	25.5%	19.1%	16.1%	10.6%	2.3%	100.0%
1971	9,472	9,690	6,436	5,109	2,061	107	32,875
	28.8%	29.5%	19.6%	15.5%	6.3%	0.3%	100.0%
1972	9,495	9,378	6,846	2,351	518	192	28,780
	33.0%	32.6%	23.8%	8.2%	1.8%	0.6%	100.0%
1973	10,838	9,869	5,428	2,036	0	0	28,171
	38.5%	35.0%	19.3%	7.2%	0%	0%	100.0%
1974	11,761	11,049	6,683	1,793	56	0	31,342
	37.5%	35.3%	21.3%	5.7%	0.2%	0%	100.0%
1975	13,412	11,460	8,128	2,580	110	2	35,692
	37.6%	32.0%	22.8%	7.2%	0.3%	0.1%	100.0%
1976	12,963	13,041	9,215	4,207	676	54	40,156*
	32.3%	32.5%	22.9%	10.5%	1.7%	0.1%	100.0%

* Does Not Include 100 Law Jury Cases Pending On Special Calendars (Military, Appeal, Insurance Liquidation, And Bankruptcy).

APPENDIX (Continued)
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS: YEAR-END AGE OF PENDING LAW JURY CASES

Year Ending Dec. 31	Up to One Year Old	Between One and Two Years Old	Between Two and Three Years Old	Between Three and Four Years Old	Between Four and Five Years Old	Five Years Old and Older	Total
1966	10,624	7,289	3,435	2,166	1,757	383	25,654
	41.4%	28.4%	13.4%	8.4%	6.9%	1.5%	100.0%
1967	6,277	5,134	2,543	1,693	1,530	645	17,822
	35.2%	28.8%	14.3%	9.5%	8.6%	3.6%	100.0%
1968	5,910	5,227	3,392	2,207	147	0	16,883
	35.0%	31.0%	20.1%	13.1%	0.8%	0.0%	100.0%
1969	6,310	5,086	2,730	880	70	0	15,076
	41.9%	33.7%	18.1%	5.8%	0.5%	0.0%	100.0%
1970	6,966	5,580	3,123	855	550	408	17,482
	39.9%	31.9%	17.9%	4.9%	3.1%	2.3%	100.0%
1971	6,669	5,762	3,306	854	409	72	17,072
	39.1%	33.7%	19.4%	5.0%	2.4%	0.4%	100.0%
1972	5,728	6,126	2,749	389	129	6	15,127
	37.9%	40.5%	18.2%	2.5%	0.8%	0.1%	100.0%
1973	6,233	4,962	2,873	626	129	46	14,869
	41.9%	33.4%	19.3%	4.2%	0.9%	0.3%	100.0%
1974	4,285	4,028	1,978	451	89	39	10,870
	39.4%	37.1%	18.2%	4.1%	0.8%	0.4%	100.0%
1975	6,148	4,486	2,715	470	72	27	13,918
	44.2%	32.2%	19.5%	3.4%	0.5%	0.2%	100.0%
1976	6,071	5,555	3,374	1,332	102	45	16,479
	36.8%	33.7%	20.5%	8.1%	0.6%	0.3%	100.0%

APPENDIX A

CONSTITUTION OF 1970

ARTICLE VI—THE JUDICIARY

Section 1. Courts

The judicial power is vested in a Supreme Court, an Appellate Court and Circuit Courts.

Section 2. Judicial Districts

The State is divided into five Judicial Districts for the selection of Supreme and Appellate Court Judges. The First Judicial District consists of Cook County. The remainder of the State shall be divided by law into four Judicial Districts of substantially equal population, each of which shall be compact and composed of contiguous counties.

Section 3. Supreme Court— Organization

The Supreme Court shall consist of seven judges. Three shall be selected from the First Judicial District and one from each of the other Judicial Districts. Four Judges constitute a quorum and the concurrence of four is necessary for a decision. Supreme Court Judges shall select a Chief Justice from their number to serve for a term of three years.

Section 4. Supreme Court— Jurisdiction

(2) The Supreme Court may exercise original jurisdiction in cases relating to revenue, mandamus, prohibition or habeas corpus and as may be necessary to the complete determination of any case on review.

(b) Appeals from judgments of Circuit Courts imposing a sentence of death shall be directly to the Supreme Court as a matter of right. The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for direct appeal in other cases.

(c) Appeals from the Appellate Court to the Supreme Court are a matter of right if a question under the Constitution of the United States or of this State arises for the first time in and as a result of the action of the Appellate Court, or if a division of the Appellate Court certifies that a case decided by it involves a question of such importance that the case should be decided by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court may provide by rule for appeals from the Appellate Court in other cases.

Section 5. Appellate Court— Organization

The number of Appellate Judges to be selected from each Judicial District shall be provided by law. The Supreme Court shall prescribe by rule the number of Appellate divisions in each Judicial District. Each Ap-

pellate division shall have at least three judges. Assignments to divisions shall be made by the Supreme Court. A majority of a division constitutes a quorum and the concurrence of a majority of the division is necessary for a decision. There shall be at least one division in each Judicial District and each division shall sit at times and places prescribed by rules of the Supreme Court.

Section 6. Appellate Court— Jurisdiction

Appeals from final judgments of a Circuit Court are a matter of right to the Appellate Court in the Judicial District in which the Circuit Court is located except in cases appealable directly to the Supreme Court and except that after a trial on the merits in a criminal case, there shall be no appeal from a judgment of acquittal. The Supreme Court may provide by rule for appeals to the Appellate Court from other than final judgments of Circuit Courts. The Appellate Court may exercise original jurisdiction when necessary to the complete determination of any case on review. The Appellate Court shall have such powers of direct review of administrative action as provided by law.

Section 7. Judicial Circuits

(a) The State shall be divided into Judicial Circuits consisting of one or more counties. The First Judicial District shall constitute a Judicial Circuit. The Judicial Circuits within the other Judicial Districts shall be as provided by law. Circuits composed of more than one county shall be compact and of contiguous counties. The General Assembly by law may provide for the division of a circuit for the purpose of selection of Circuit Judges and for the selection of Circuit Judges from the circuit at large.

(b) Each Judicial Circuit shall have one Circuit Court with such number of Circuit Judges as provided by law. Unless otherwise provided by law, there shall be at least one Circuit Judge from each county. In the First Judicial District, unless otherwise provided by law, Cook County, Chicago, and the area outside Chicago shall be separate units for the selection of Circuit Judges, with at least twelve chosen at large from the area outside Chicago and at least thirty-six chosen at large from Chicago.

(c) Circuit Judges in each circuit shall select by secret ballot a Chief Judge from their number to serve at their pleasure. Subject to the authority of the Supreme Court, the Chief Judge shall have general administrative authority over his court, including authority to provide for divisions, general or specialized, and for appropriate times and places of holding court.

Section 8. Associate Judges

Each Circuit Court shall have such number of Associate Judges as provided by law. Associate Judges shall be appointed by the Circuit Judges in each circuit as the Supreme Court shall provide by rule. In the First Judicial District, unless otherwise provided by law, at least one-fourth of the Associate Judges shall be appointed from, and reside, outside Chicago. The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for matters to be assigned to Associate Judges.

Section 9. Circuit Courts—Jurisdiction

Circuit Courts shall have original jurisdiction of all justiciable matters except when the Supreme Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction relating to redistricting of the General Assembly and to the ability of the Governor to serve or resume office. Circuit Courts shall have such power to review administrative action as provided by law.

Section 10. Terms Of Office

The terms of office of Supreme and Appellate Court Judges shall be ten years; of Circuit Judges, six years; and of Associate Judges, four years.

Section 11. Eligibility For Office

No person shall be eligible to be a Judge or Associate Judge unless he is a United States citizen; a licensed attorney-at-law of this State, and a resident of the unit which selects him. No change in the boundaries of a unit shall affect the tenure in office of a Judge or Associate Judge incumbent at the time of such change.

Section 12. Election And Retention

(a) Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Judges shall be nominated at primary elections or by petition. Judges shall be elected at general or judicial elections as the General Assembly shall provide by law. A person eligible for the office of Judge may cause his name to appear on the ballot as a candidate for Judge at the primary and at the general or judicial elections by submitting petitions. The General Assembly shall prescribe by law the requirements for petitions.

(b) The office of a Judge shall be vacant upon his death, resignation, retirement, removal, or upon the conclusion of his term without retention in office. Whenever an additional Appellate or Circuit Judge is authorized by law, the office shall be filled in the manner provided for filling a vacancy in that office.

(c) A vacancy occurring in the office of Supreme, Appellate or Circuit Judge shall be filled as the General Assembly may provide by law. In the absence of a law, vacancies may be filled by appointment by the Supreme Court. A person appointed to fill a vacancy 60 or more days prior to the next primary election to nomi-

nate Judges shall serve until the vacancy is filled for a term at the next general or judicial election. A person appointed to fill a vacancy less than 60 days prior to the next primary election to nominate Judges shall serve until the vacancy is filled at the second general or judicial election following such appointment.

(d) Not less than six months before the general election preceding the expiration of his term of office, a Supreme, Appellate or Circuit Judge who has been elected to that office may file in the office of the Secretary of State a declaration of candidacy to succeed himself. The Secretary of State, not less than 63 days before the election, shall certify the Judge's candidacy to the proper election officials. The names of Judges seeking retention shall be submitted to the electors, separately and without party designation, on the sole question whether each Judge shall be retained in office for another term. The retention elections shall be conducted at general elections in the appropriate Judicial District, for Supreme and Appellate Judges, and in the circuit for Circuit Judges. The affirmative vote of three-fifths of the electors voting on the question shall elect the Judge to the office for a term commencing on the first Monday in December following his election.

(e) A law reducing the number of Appellate or Circuit Judges shall be without prejudice to the right of the Judges affected to seek retention in office. A reduction shall become effective when a vacancy occurs in the affected unit.

Section 13. Prohibited Activities

(a) The Supreme Court shall adopt rules of conduct for Judges and Associate Judges.

(b) Judges and Associate Judges shall devote full time to judicial duties. They shall not practice law, hold a position of profit, hold office under the United States or this State or unit of local government or school district or in a political party. Service in the State militia or armed forces of the United States for periods of time permitted by rule of the Supreme Court shall not disqualify a person from serving as a Judge or Associate Judge.

Section 14. Judicial Salaries And Expenses—Fee Officers Eliminated

Judges shall receive salaries provided by law which shall not be diminished to take effect during their terms of office. All salaries and such expenses as may be provided by law shall be paid by the State, except that Appellate, Circuit and Associate Judges shall receive such additional compensation from counties within their district or circuit as may be provided by law. There shall be no fee officers in the judicial system.

Section 15. Retirement—Discipline

(a) The General Assembly may provide by law for the retirement of Judges and Associate Judges at a prescribed age. Any retired Judge or Associate Judge,

with his consent, may be assigned by the Supreme Court to judicial service for which he shall receive the applicable compensation in lieu of retirement benefits. A retired Associate Judge may be assigned only as an Associate Judge.

(b) A Judicial Inquiry Board is created. The Supreme Court shall select two Circuit Judges as members and the Governor shall appoint four persons who are not lawyers and three lawyers as members of the Board. No more than two of the lawyers and two of the non-lawyers appointed by the Governor shall be members of the same political party. The terms of Board members shall be four years. A vacancy on the Board shall be filled for a full term in the manner the original appointment was made. No member may serve on the Board more than eight years.

(c) The Board shall be convened permanently, with authority to conduct investigations, receive or initiate complaints concerning a Judge or Associate Judge, and file complaints with the Courts Commission. The Board shall not file a complaint unless five members believe that a reasonable basis exists (1) to charge the Judge or Associate Judge with willful misconduct in office, persistent failure to perform his duties, or other conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice or that brings the judicial office into disrepute, or (2) to charge that the Judge or Associate Judge is physically or mentally unable to perform his duties. All proceedings of the Board shall be confidential except the filing of a complaint with the Courts Commission. The Board shall prosecute the complaint.

(d) The Board shall adopt rules governing its procedures. It shall have subpoena power and authority to appoint and direct its staff. Members of the Board who are not Judges shall receive per diem compensation and necessary expenses; members who are Judges shall receive necessary expenses only. The General Assembly by law shall appropriate funds for the operation of the Board.

(e) A Courts Commission is created consisting of one Supreme Court Judge selected by that Court, who shall be its chairman, two Appellate Court Judges selected by that Court, and two Circuit Judges selected by the Supreme Court. The Commission shall be convened permanently to hear complaints filed by the Judicial Inquiry Board. The Commission shall have authority after notice and public hearing (1) to remove from office, suspend without pay, censure or reprimand a Judge or Associate Judge for willful misconduct in office, persistent failure to perform his duties, or other conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice or that brings the judicial office into disrepute, or (2) to suspend, with or without pay, or retire a Judge or Associate Judge who is physically or mentally unable to perform his duties.

(f) The concurrence of three members of the Com-

mission shall be necessary for a decision. The decision of the Commission shall be final.

(g) The Commission shall adopt rules governing its procedures and shall have power to issue subpoenas. The General Assembly shall provide by law for the expenses of the Commission.

Section 16. Administration

General administrative and supervisory authority over all courts is vested in the Supreme Court and shall be exercised by the Chief Justice in accordance with its rules. The Supreme Court shall appoint an administrative director and staff, who shall serve at its pleasure, to assist the Chief Justice in his duties. The Supreme Court may assign a Judge temporarily to any court and an Associate Judge to serve temporarily as an Associate Judge on any Circuit Court. The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for expeditious and inexpensive appeals.

Section 17. Judicial Conference

The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for an annual judicial conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice and shall report thereon annually in writing to the General Assembly not later than January 31.

Section 18. Clerks Of Courts

(a) The Supreme Court and the Appellate Court Judges of each Judicial District, respectively, shall appoint a clerk and other non-judicial officers for their Court or District.

(b) The General Assembly shall provide by law for the election, or for the appointment by Circuit Judges, of clerks and other non-judicial officers of the Circuit Courts and for their terms of office and removal for cause.

(c) The salaries of clerks and other non-judicial officers shall be as provided by law.

Section 19. State's Attorneys— Selection, Salary

A State's Attorney shall be elected in each county in 1972 and every fourth year thereafter for a four year term. One State's Attorney may be elected to serve two or more counties if the governing boards of such counties so provide and a majority of the electors of each county voting on the issue approve. A person shall not be eligible for the office of State's Attorney unless he is a United States citizen and a licensed attorney-at-law of this State. His salary shall be provided by law.

APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE ILLINOIS COURTS

Historical Development

The predecessor to the present Administrative Office of the Illinois courts was a statutory creature into which the General Assembly breathed life in 1959. The entity was known as the Court Administrator's Office, and it so existed until 1964. The office in those past years was chiefly concerned with studying caseloads to determine the needs of particular courts for assistance and to provide a statistical background for further studies.

The 1964 Judicial Article directed that the "Supreme Court shall appoint an administrative director and staff, who shall serve at its pleasure, to assist the Chief Justice in his administrative duties." That provision was retained, virtually intact, by Section 16, Article VI of the 1970 Constitution. Thus, the fledgling administrator's office of 1959 was continued and conferred with constitutional dignity in 1964 and in 1970. Two Illinois constitutional commentators, Messrs. Braden and Cohn, in analyzing this section have stated that "only five (states) have a constitutional office similar to the administrative director provided by Illinois . . .", and the authors noted that the constitutional grant of administrative power to the Supreme Court as exercised by the Chief Justice through the Administrative Director is an excellent "mechanism for a coordinated and efficient administration of the judicial system." Braden

and Cohn, *The Illinois Constitution: An Annotated and Comparative Analysis*, at page 335.

During the fifteen years that it has been in existence, the Administrative Office has matured from infancy to adulthood, and correspondingly it has taken on and has been assigned by the Supreme Court greater duties and responsibilities. The growth of the office has been carefully nurtured by a succession of highly qualified and distinguished lawyers: Henry P. Chandler, former administrator of the federal court system; Albert J. Harno, former dean of the University of Illinois College of Law; Hon. John C. Fitzgerald, now a Circuit Judge, former dean of the School of Law of Loyola University, Chicago; John W. Freels, now a special assistant Attorney General, former general counsel of the Illinois Central Railroad. The present Director is Roy O. Gulley, former Chief Judge of the Second Judicial Circuit.

Today, the Administrative Office has more than a score of employees who serve the Supreme Court and supervise the activities of all the courts in the State and court-related personnel. In addition to the Director, the office employs six persons (four of whom are lawyers) on a managerial or supervisory level, with the balance of employees serving in various supporting capacities.

APPENDIX C

JUDICIAL SALARY STRUCTURE

Supreme Court Judges—\$50,000
Appellate Court Judges—\$45,000
Circuit Court Judges—\$42,500
Associate Judges—\$37,000

GENEALOGY
OF
JUDGES OF THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT

