STATE OF ILLINOIS AUG. 26, 1818

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

OF THE

ILLINOIS COURTS

1972 ANNUAL REPORT to the SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

OF THE

ILLINOIS COURTS

1972 ANNUAL REPORT to the SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS



The Supreme Court Building Springfield, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	ansmittal by Roy O. Gulley	4
	n	5 7
	e Administrative Director	8
Introdu	Retirements	8 8
	nois Constitution of 1970	9
The fill		10
d. b		11
b.	ion Affecting the Courts	
		16
		18
	es of The Judiciary	-
a.	Supreme Court	
и. b.	Chart on Judicial Salary Structure	23
с.	Appellate Court	24
0.	Chart on Cases Filed and Disposed of	
d.		27
ч.	Graph on Average Delay	
	Chart on Cases Begun and Terminated	
e.	Judicial Elections	
с. f.	Courts Commission	
g.	Judicial Conference	
b.	Conference of Chief Circuit Judges	36
	ministrative Office	
a.	Introduction	
а. b.	Fiscal	
υ.		40
		41
с.		42
d.		42
e.		44
с. f.		45
g.		46
b.		46
i.	0	46
i.	Impartial Medical Expert Rule	
· ·	Chart on 1972 Statistical Summary	
	Chart on Cumulative Statistical Summary	
k.	Representation By Supervised Senior Law Students	
I.	Judicial Economic Statements	
m.	Judicial Statistics	
n.		50
0.		51
Conclus		51
Caseload and		53
		55
a.		56
b.		57
с.		58
d.		59
The Ap		50
a.		51
b.		52
с.		53
d.		54
The Cire		55
a.	Number of Cases Begun and Terminated	78
b.	The Trend of Law Jury and all Civil Cases, the Number of Law Jury Verdicts,	
)4
с.	Ratio of Caseload per Judge 10	05
d.	Disposition of Defendants in Felony Cases 10	
Statistical R	eport on the Circuit Court of Cook County 11	12
Append	ix 12	26



Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

ROY O. GULLEY DIRECTOR SUPREME COURT BUILDING SPRINGFIELD 62706

30 North Michigan Avenue Chicago 60602

To The Honorable Chief Justice and Justices of the Supreme Court

I tender herewith the annual report of the Administrative Office for calendar year 1972.

It has been a year of great accomplishments for the entire State judicial system and for the Administrative Office. The Supreme Court, through the Chief Justice, continues to delegate its administrative authority to enable us to assist the Chief Justice in his administrative responsibilities.

Our completely unified court system has permitted us to be truly flexible in order to avert a crisis in the disposition of cases. The circuit courts continue to dispose of large numbers of cases because our judges have resolved to attain a fair degree of currency, and they are putting forth the necessary additional effort and sacrifice by working more diligently and by accepting assignments to high volume circuits.

I would be remiss if I failed to recognize the staff of the Administrative Office. It would be inappropriate to single out any one individual for recognition since each and every employee is a dedicated public servant who serves the Court and the Administrative Office with sincere devotion and fidelity.

This report is a factual representation of the operation of the Illinois judicial system during 1972, and it is an indicator of the future requirements of our judicial system.

Respectfully, Dulley

IN MEMORIAM

Circuit Court Judges

William H. Chamberlain, 7th Circuit	October 12, 1972
James K. Chelos (retired), Cook County	October 7, 1972
Trafton Dennis, 1st Circuit	April 9, 1972
Burl A. Edie (retired), 6th Circuit	December 26, 1972
John Guchnecht (retired), Cook County	June 1, 1972
John J. Lupe (retired), Cook County	December 4, 1972
Ross E. Millet (retired), 16th Circuit	September 20, 1972
Francis J. Moran, Cook County	August 22, 1972
Donald S. McKinley (retired), Cook County	January 19, 1972
Alexander J. Napoli (retired), Cook County	July 12, 1972
Herbert C. Paschen, Cook County	August 9, 1972
Bert E. Rathje, 18th Circuit	September 14, 1972
Howard T. Ruff, 5th Circuit	May 27, 1972
Edward J. Turnbaugh (retired), 15th Circuit	January 25, 1972

Associate Judges

Francis M. Blake, Cook County	December 16, 1972
George A. Blakey (retired), Cook County	August 15, 1972
Ezra L. D'Isa, 19th Circuit	January 31, 1972
Richard D. Gumbel, Cook County	April 10, 1972

~ 38

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR HON. ROY O. GULLEY

7

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

This is the fifth annual report of your Administrative Office which I have had the honor of presenting to you. The report is a narrative and statistical recordation of the significant historical and recent developments which affect the courts and judges of the State of Illinois. Particular emphasis has been placed on evolvements occurring in calendar year 1972.

In the 1972 report, we have retained the section on the Judicial Article of the 1970 Constitution, and we have devoted particular attention to the new Unified Code of Corrections. We have also augmented the narrative portion of the report with graphs which should increase the understanding of those readers who are not intimately familiar with the Illinois court system.

This report to you is a permanent record of the events which have transpired this year in the State courts and in the Administrative Office. Because the Illinois court structure is an acknowledged model system, distribution of the report extends beyond the boundaries of Illinois. Thousands of copies are requested and sent outside of this State: court administrators in all states; most law schools in the nation; constitutional conventions and citizens' groups studying court reform in other states; judges, lawyers and other court-related personnel in Illinois and elsewhere; and others, including students, legislators and researchers. The news media and libraries also maintain files of the reports for study and research projects.

The report for 1972 encompasses a description of the courts' activities, the roster of the State's judicial personnel and statistical data on all courts; and in addition, the report records the following significant developments:

Deaths and retirements of judges

Summary of the Judicial Article of the 1970 Constitution

Synopsis of legislation affecting the courts

Summary of the Unified Code of Corrections

Activities of the judiciary

The Administrative Office-Duties and Accomplishments

JUDICIAL RETIREMENTS

A total of thirty-one Illinois judges retired during 1972. Most of the Appellate Court and circuit court judges who retired did not seek retention in office; however, one circuit and one associate judge were retired by reason of the compulsory retirement statute. Several judges retired due to age and failing health, yet others left the bench to pursue other vocational and avocational endeavors, including returning to the more lucrative practice of law.

Appellate Court Judges

John J. Lyons, 1st District December 3, 1972

Circuit Court Judges

Edwin Becker, 9th Circuit December 3, 1972

- J. H. Benjamin, 11th Circuit August 7, 1972
- A. R. Cagle, 1st Circuit April 10, 1972
- L. Eric Carey, 19th Circuit December 31, 1972
- William M. Carroll, 19th Circuit December 31, 1972
- John Dixon, 15th Circuit December 3, 1972
- Joseph E. Fleming, 20th Circuit March 31, 1972
- L. Melvin Gundry, 15th Circuit December 3, 1972
- George O. Hebel, 14th Circuit December 31, 1972
- Elmer N. Holmgren, Cook County May 31, 1972
- James D. Hurley, Sr., 13th Circuit December 3, 1972
- Stewart C. Hutchison, 12th Circuit December 3, 1972
- William Webb Johnson, 2nd Circuit December 3, 1972
- Michael Kinney, 3rd Circuit December 3, 1972
- Fred J. Kullberg, 17th Circuit November 1, 1972
- L. A. Mehroff, 7th Circuit December 3, 1972
- Foss D. Meyer, 3rd Circuit December 3, 1972
- Harold C. Sewell, 17th Circuit December 3, 1972
- Herman W. Snow, 12th Circuit December 3, 1972
- Quinten Spivey, 20th Circuit June 30, 1972
- Joseph A. Troy, 20th Circuit September 5, 1972
- Lyle R. Wheeler, 8th Circuit December 3, 1972
- Julian P. Wilamoski, 14th Circuit July 1, 1972

Associate Judges

James M. Allen, 15th Circuit September 1, 1972 Robert W. Boeye, 14th Circuit December 3, 1972 Jack R. Cook, 17th Circuit April 30, 1972 Duane L. Martin, 8th Circuit May 31, 1972 Peter L. Melius, 19th Circuit February 15, 1972 Robert B. McKechan, 7th Circuit July 31, 1972 Ralph E. Stephenson, 14th Circuit

April 30, 1972

THE ILLINOIS CONSTITUTION OF 1970

The Illinois court system underwent extensive and revolutionary change on January 1, 1964 when the amended Judicial Article of the 1870 Constitution became effective. With the adoption of the 1970 Constitution, the judicial structure and court operation were refined, but the basic salutary changes brought about by the 1964 Judicial Article were retained virtually intact in Article VI of the new Constitution.

The traumatic and dynamic transformation from a complex judicial system of yesteryear to a simple, modern and efficient court organization of today, objectively viewed, was the most far-reaching and constructive reform in the history of state constitutional efforts to establish an up-to-date and productive system for the administration of justice. Illinois pioneered the unified trial court structure, and because of its highly successful implementation, the Illinois court system is a model which every state in the Union is attempting to emulate.

The 1964 Judicial Article and the 1970 Constitution turned the judicial system around, making it possible for the judicial branch of government to more efficiently and justly serve the people. Illinois innovated the unified trial court system; and the people, lawyers and judges made it work beyond their expectations. The State became a judicial laboratory, and the great experiment proved beyond a doubt that the concept of a unified trial court was workable. The outstanding reputation of the Illinois court system and its judges was reaffirmed by the electorate when the 1964 Judicial Article was almost totally retained in the 1970 Constitution. The minor refinements in the present Judicial Article will provide Illinois with an even more sound judicial system than in previous years.

In our reports of 1970 and 1971, the saga of the Illinois court system was told in detail. What is presented below will highlight the significant provisions of the present Judicial Article. The chart on channel of appeal and the Judicial Article of the 1970 Constitution, which immediately follow, will be helpful in understanding the Illinois court structure.

In summary form, the 1970 Judicial Article provides:

Section 1. The judicial power is vested in the Supreme Court, the Appellate Court and the circuit courts. This grant of power has its greatest impact in the simplicity of the constitutional judicial structure and the firm establishment of a three-level court structure.

Section 2. The State is divided in five judicial districts for the selection of Supreme and Appellate Court judges. Section 3. The Supreme Court consists of seven judges, four of whom are necessary for a decision, and one of whom is selected by his fellow judges as the Chief Justice.

Section 4. The Supreme Court's discretionary and mandatory original and appellate jurisdiction is set out. Section 5. The organization of the Appellate Court is explained.

Section 6. The Appellate Court's jurisdiction is established. All final judgments of the circuit court are appealable as a matter of right.

Section 7. The State is divided into judicial circuits. Each county must have at least one circuit judge unless changed by law. The circuit judges select one from their number to be chief judge who shall have general administrative authority over his court, subject to the authority of the Supreme Court.

Section 8. The circuit court judges appoint associate judges as provided by Supreme Court rule.

Section 9. The jurisdiction of the circuit court extends to all justiciable matters. All cases are filed in the circuit court, and every judge of that court possesses the full jurisdiction of the circuit court. This is the heart of the unified trial court system.

Section 10. The terms of office for all judges are stated. Section 11. Every judge must be a U.S. citizen, licensed attorney and a resident of the unit which selects him.

Section 12. Supreme, Appellate and circuit court judges are initially selected in partisan elections; thereafter, each judge is retained in office if he receives a 60% favorable vote in an uncontested retention election. The Supreme Court may appoint lawyers to fill judicial vacancies occurring between elections.

Section 13. The Supreme Court must adopt rules of conduct for judges. Supreme Court Rules 61 through 71 establish standards of judicial conduct.

Section 14. Judges are paid a salary by the State, and fee officers are not allowed in the judicial system.

Section 15. The General Assembly is empowered to provide for the retirement of judges at a prescribed age. Retired judges may be recalled to judicial service. The Judicial Inquiry Board is authorized to investigate and file complaints against judges. The Courts Commission adjudicates charges filed against judges by the Board.

Section 16. The Supreme Court is vested with general administrative and supervisory authority over all courts, and appoints the administrative director to assist the Chief Justice in his duties. The Supreme Court may assign judges temporarily to any court.

Section 17. An annual judicial conference is created to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice.

Section 18. The Supreme and Appellate Courts appoint the clerks of their respective courts. Circuit court clerks are selected as provided by law.

Section 19. The state's attorneys are elected in each county; however, one state's attorney may be elected to serve more than one county.



CHANNEL OF APPEALS PRIOR TO 1964



CHANNEL OF APPEAL TODAY

*

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

(a) 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 Appellate 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 onefourth 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 nominate 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 Judiciary 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 dispute, 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 Commission 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.

Res

LEGISLATION AFFECTING THE COURTS 1972

During the 1972 regular and special sessions of the 77th General Assembly, hundreds of bills were introduced which affected the practice of the law and the operation of the court system and its personnel. Those pieces of legislation which were enacted into law and significantly related to judges, the courts, and the practice of law are summarized below.

Set out in the following section of this report is a summary of the new Unified Code of Corrections, which was enacted into law in July of 1972 and made generally effective January 1, 1973. Because of the comprehensive nature of the Code and of its impact on the courts, a separate section is devoted to it.

Changes in Substantive and Procedural Law

SB 161 (PA 77-1884) and HB 4461 (PA 77-1881) amend the Implied Consent Act to redefine the effective date of the Act and to clarify certain ambiguities. Effective October 1, 1972, any operator of a motor vehicle who drives a vehicle anywhere within the State, impliedly consents to take and complete a test or chemical analysis of his breath to determine the alcoholic content of his blood when arrested for driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor (DWI). Two breath analyses on approved breath testing machines must be administered not less than 15 minutes apart, and a reading of .10% or more by weight of alcohol in the blood establishes a presumption of intoxication.

If the operator refuses to submit to the test, then the clerk of the circuit court notifies the operator that his operator's license will automatically be suspended unless he requests a court hearing. The hearing is of limited scope: Inquiry shall only relate to whether the operator was arrested on a charge of DWI; whether the police had reasonable belief that the operator was driving while intoxicated; whether the operator was advised of his rights; and whether the operator was advised that his driving privileges would be suspended if he refused to take the breath test.

The aforementioned hearing in and of itself does not bar prosecution on the DWI charge. Upon conviction on the DWI charge, the court may sentence the defendant to imprisonment for up to 1 year and/or fine him up to 1,000; or in lieu of imprisonment, the defendant may be sentenced to serve a term of not less than 2 days in a hospital, rehabilitation center, etc.

HB 518 (PA 77-2762) provides for the seizure of any vessel, vehicle or aircraft used in the commission of an offense prohibited by the Controlled Substances or Cannabis Control Acts.

HB 774 (PA 77-2017) and HB 775 (PA 77-2018) amend the Probate Act and the Limitations Act by reducing the time from 7 to 3 years on the lease, sale or mortgage of the decedent's real estate for the purpose of paying claims or expenses of administration, and on commencing actions against the estate under the Statute on Frauds and Perjuries.

HB 1318 (PA 77-2829) creates an act in relation to the revision and combination of multiple forms of laws passed by the 77th General Assembly.

HB 1467 (PA 77-2019), HB 1468 (PA 77-2020) and HB 1469 (PA 77-2021) reduce the time from 7 to 6 months to file claims against decedent's estate and to file an action against the executor or administrator; reduce the time from 8 to 7 months within which surviving spouse may renounce a will; and reduce the time from 7 to 3 years after death as to the time when claims are barred against unadministered estates.

HB 2198 (PA 77-1869) and HB 2199 (PA 77-1870) allow persons to inspect, after notice, fiscal records which the State and local governmental units are required to maintain.

HB 3665 and HB 3666 (PA 77-2625 and PA 77-2626) implement the 1970 Constitution by prescribing the procedure whereby two or more counties may provide for the joint election of a state's attorney.

HB 3802 (PA 77-2767) changes from 2 to 5 days during which an employee may give his employer notice of a defense to a wage assignment.

HB 4122 (PA 77-1861) repeals the Illinois Highway Trust Authority Act which was declared unconstitutional by the Illinois Supreme Court in *Rosemont Bldg. Supply Inc.* v. *Authority*, 45 Ill.2d 243.

HB 4220 (PA 77-1912) excludes murder, aggravated kidnapping and treason from bailable offenses.

HB 4681 (PA 77-2133) provides that the 1972 personal property tax paid by natural persons shall be held in escrow until final disposition of the case which held that abolition of the personal property tax on individuals but not on corporations was constitutionally impermissible. In *Lake Shore Auto Parts* v. *Korzen*, 49 III.2d 137, the Illinois Supreme Court held that a State constitutional amendment subjecting corporations, but not individuals, to the personal property tax was violative of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The U.S. Supreme Court has granted *certiorari*, 40 LW 3483.

Changes Affecting Courts and Judges

SB 889 (PA 77-2633) establishes a statewide appellate defender organization. This Act codifies to a great extent the Illinois Defender Project, which was a quasi-official body funded by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. The Act charges the State Appellate Defender with representing indigent persons on appeal in criminal cases when appointed to do so by the Supreme, Appellate or circuit courts.

The governing structure of the Appellate Defender is a commission which is composed of nine members who are appointed by the Governor, the Supreme Court and the Appellate Court. The commission acts as advisor to the Defender and may, subject to rules of the Supreme Court, recommend policies for the operation of the Defender's office. The Supreme Court is responsible for appointing the Appellate Defender; and in exercise of that duty, the Court has appointed Theodore A. Gottfried as Appellate Defender.

SB 915 (PA 77-1888) increases judicial salaries as follows: former associate judges, who became circuit judges by virtue of the 1970 Constitution, receive \$27,500 per year, except in Cook County where they receive \$35,000 per year; the new associate judges (former magistrates) receive \$23,500 per year (\$20,000 per year if the associate judge is not a lawyer), except in Cook County and DuPage County where associate judges receive \$28,000 per year.

SB 1351 (PA 77-1928) and HB 3030 (PA 77-1839) appropriate operating funds for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 to the Judicial Inquiry Board. The Board is constitutionally responsible for investigating complaints about judges.

SB 1563 (PA 77-2046) and SB 1564 (PA 77-1941) appropriate funds for payment of judicial salaries and for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Supreme Court.

HB 3623 (PA 77-1805) makes the primary provisions of the Election Code applicable to the nomination of judges to elective judgeships. This bill was vetoed by the Governor, but the General Assembly overrode the veto in January, 1972. However, since the bill was enacted into law after the deadline for filing in the 1972 primary election, no judicial elections were held in 1972. Accordingly, pursuant to the Constitution, the Supreme Court continues to fill judicial vacancies by appointment.

HB 3624 (PA 77-1814) makes applicable the provisions

for filling a vacancy in the former offices of associate judge to the resident circuit judges, who became circuit judges by virtue of the 1970 Constitution.

HB 3700 (PA 77-1806) requires in general that officers and employees of the State and local governmental units must annually file with the Secretary of State a verified written statement of economic interests. This legislation, known as the Governmental Ethics Act, substantially amends the prior statute which was effective January 1, 1968. The original and the amended Acts were applicable to judicial officers; however, there the similarity ends insofar as the Acts apply to judges.

The first Act was successfully challenged as to its application to judges. In *Cusack v. Howlett*, 44 III.2d 233 (1969), the Illinois Supreme Court held that the General Assembly had no constitutional authority to require judges to complete and file economic statements of interests and that the Act insofar as it related to judges was an infringement on the doctrine of the separation of powers. Then, in December 1970, the new Constitution was adopted. The 1970 Constitution, Article XIII, Section 2, specifically empowers the General Assembly to require the filing of economic interest statements of "holders of state offices."

Thus, the new Constitution, as implemented by the amended Governmental Ethics Act, mandates that judges file the economic interest statements. This requirement is in addition to the obligation that judges must file sealed and unsealed declarations of economic interest pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 68.

HB 4285 (PA 77-2817) increases the maximum salaries of certain county officers and clerks of the circuit courts.

UNIFIED CODE OF CORRECTIONS

In 1969, the 76th General Assembly re-established the Council on the Diagnosis and Evaluation of Criminal Defendants. At its first meeting, the Council was requested by the Governor to research and draft a correctional code. At the outset, the Council and its committees studied five major areas of concern in preparation for drafting the code: Sentencing, Community Supervision, Institutions, Organization of Probation Services, and Juveniles.

The Director of the Administrative Office, Roy O. Gulley, was appointed to the Council and served on the following advisory committees: Organization of Correctional Services, Juvenile, and Supervision in the Community. Deputy director William M. Madden of the Administrative Office served as a special consultant.

After a year of research, a draft of the proposed code was introduced into the General Assembly. From January 1971 until June 1972, the legislature scrutinized the code and made numerous and substantial changes. Then, in June 1972, the legislature passed HB 811 and more than 475 corollary bills. The Governor in July 1972 signed into law PA 77-2097, the Unified Code of Corrections; and it is generally effective January 1, 1973. The Code is a comprehensive compilation of laws, which has as its purposes to prescribe sanctions proportionate to the seriousness of the offenses and to permit the recognition of differences in rehabilitation possibilities among individual offenders; to forbid and prevent the commission of offenses; to prevent arbitrary or oppressive treatment of persons adjudicated offenders or delinquents; and to restore offenders to useful citizenship.

Much of the Code is devoted to the organization and procedures of the Illinois Department of Corrections; however, a significant portion of the Code establishes new sentencing procedures which are of great import to the judiciary. It is the sentencing provisions of the Code which are highlighted below. Section references are to Ill.Rev. Stat., 1972 Supp., ch. 38, unless otherwise specified.

Section 1005-2-1 provides the procedures to determine, after the issue has been raised, whether the defendant is unfit to stand trial or be sentenced because of a mental or physical condition which renders him incapable of understanding the nature and purpose of the proceedings or of assisting in his defense. The terms "unfit" and "fitness" are new matter and are used instead of "competence", as under the prior law, to broaden the concept to include the defendant's physical condition. Section 1005-3-1 makes mandatory that the court, prior to imposing sentence for conviction of a felony, consider a written presentence report of investigation. The defendant may waive the investigation and report. The court has discretion to order a presentence investigation in non-felony cases.

Section 1005-3-2 spells out the guidelines for matters to be contained in the presentence report. The guidelines are based on statutes of other states and the *A.B.A. Minimum Standards Relating to Probation.*

Section 1005-3-3 allows the court to temporarily commit a felon to a court clinic or the diagnostic depot of the Department of Corrections for up to 60 days to obtain additional information as a basis for determining the sentence.

Section 1005-3-4 permits presentence reports to be disclosed only to specified persons or agencies.

Section 1005-4-1 deals with the sentencing hearing and provides that the hearing is mandatory before sentence is imposed. The sentencing judge, state's attorney and defense counsel may file a statement as to the facts and circumstances of the offense and other matters which shall be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the appropriate agency or institution to which the defendant is committed.

Section 1005-5-1 and Section 1005-5-2 classify all offenses for sentencing purposes. Felonies are classified as: Murder; Class 1; Class 2; Class 3; and Class 4. Misdemeanors are classified as: Class A; Class B; and Class C. Petty and business offenses are not classified. If an offense is not classified in the specific law defining that offense, then this section of the Code classifies by reference the offense based on the penalty provided.

Section 1005-5-3 establishes the dispositions the court may impose on the defendant upon a finding of guilty.

- (1) Upon conviction of murder, the death penalty or imprisonment may be imposed.
- (2) Upon conviction of a felony or misdemeanor, the court may sentence the defendant to:
 - a. probation or conditional discharge, except in certain cases;
 - b. a term of periodic imprisonment;
 - c. a term of imprisonment;
 - d. a fine, except that a fine shall not be the sole disposition in felony cases.
- (3) Upon conviction of a business or petty offense, the court may sentence the defendant to:
 - a. a period of conditional discharge;
 - b. a fine.
- (4) Upon conviction of an offense, the court may sentence a corporation or an unincorporated association to:
 - a. a period of conditional discharge;
 - b. a fine.
- (5) A felon who, while on probation or conditional discharge for a felony, is convicted of a Class 1 felony, shall not be eligible for probation or conditional discharge.

Section 1005-6-1 sets out that the court shall impose a sentence of imprisonment if the court is of the opinion that imprisonment is necessary for the protection of the public, that the defendant is in need of correctional treatment that can be best provided by imprisonment, or that probation or conditional discharge would deprecate the seriousness of the defendant's conduct.

Section 1005-6-2 and Section 1005-6-3 provide for the mandatory and discretionary conditions of a sentence of probation or conditional discharge. The defendant must be given a certificate which sets forth the conditions of probation or conditional discharge. The periods of probation and conditional discharge are:

- (1) For a felony, up to 5 years;
- (2) For a misdemeanor, up to 2 years;
- (3) For a petty offense, up to 1 year.

Section 1005-7-1 defines a sentence of periodic imprisonment to be a sentence of imprisonment to be served on certain days. Periodic imprisonment may be imposed to permit the defendant to seek employment, to work, to attend school, to obtain medical or psychological treatment, etc. A sentence of periodic imprisonment cannot be imposed if the court imposes a sentence of imprisonment.

Section 1005-8-1 and Section 1005-8-3 establish the maximum and miminum terms of indeterminate sentences of imprisonment (see chart):

- (1) For murder, not less than 14 years;
- (2) For a Class 1 felony, not less than 4 years;
- (3) For a Class 2 felony, not less than 1 nor more than 20 years;
- (4) For a Class 3 felony, not less than 1 nor more than 10 years;
- (5) For a Class 4 felony, not less than 1 nor more than 3 years.

In Class 2 and Class 3 felonies, the minimum term of imprisonment shall not be more than one-third of the maximum term.

- (6) For a Class A misdemeanor, up to 1 year;
- (7) For a Class B misdemeanor, up to 6 months;
- (8) For a Class C misdemeanor, up to 30 days.

Section 1005-8-2 allows the court in certain limited circumstances to impose a term of imprisonment not to exceed twice the maximum sentence authorized for the specified class of felony; however, the minimum period of imprisonment may not be doubled.

Section 1005-8-4 spells out the conditions where the court may impose consecutive sentences.

Section 1005-9-1 specifies the fines the court may impose (see chart):

- (1) For a felony, up to \$10,000 or greater amount stated in the offense;
- (2) For a Class A misdemeanor, up to \$1,000;

- (3) For a Class B or Class C misdemeanor, up to \$500;
- (4) For a petty offense, up to \$500 or greater amount stated in the offense;
- (5) For a business offense, the amount specified in the statute.

Section 1008-2-4 provides that if the offense being prosecuted has not reached the sentencing stage or a final adjudication, then the sentencing provisions of the Code apply unless the sentence under the prior law is less.

HB 810 (PA 77-2096) amends the Juvenile Court Act. This bill is companion legislation to the new Code of Corrections. Section references are to III.Rev.Stat., 1972 Supp., ch. 37.

Section 702-2 defines delinquent as any minor who prior to his 17th birthday violates or attempts to violate any federal, state or municipal law.

Section 702-3 defines who is a minor in need of supervision, and provides that any minor who violates a court order shall be deemed in need of supervision, effective January 1, 1974.

Section 702-7 specifies that a minor 13 years of age or over must be adjudicated under the Juvenile Court Act unless the petition alleges an act which is a crime, in which case the state's attorney may petition the Juvenile Division judge to transfer the case to the Criminal Division for prosecution pursuant to the criminal laws of the State. The chief circuit judge designates the judge of the Juvenile Division who will rule on the state's attorney's motion to transfer.

Section 702-8 raises the age from 14 to 16 years that a minor may be confined to a jail or lock-up.

Section 705-1 provides that a minor adjudged to be delinquent cannot be committed to the Department of Corrections unless the court has received a written report of social investigation.

Section 705-2 permits the court to place a delinquent, *inter alia*, on probation or conditional discharge. After July 1, 1973 minors adjudged delinquent who are less than 13 years of age cannot be committed to the Department of Corrections unless the Department of Children and Family Services certifies that no other fitting and proper placement can be found for the minor.

Section 705-3 sets out the conditions of probation or conditional discharge for minors.

100

CHART ON CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES AND SENTENCES Under The UNIFIED CODE OF CORRECTIONS

~ @#	
Classification	Sentence
Murder	Death; or Imprisonment in penitentiary: Minimum: 14 years Maximum: No limit Parole term: 5 years
Class 1 Felony	Imprisonment in penitentiary: Minimum: 4 years Maximum: No limit Parole term: 5 years Fine: \$10,000 or greater amount stated in offense.
Class 2 Felony	 Imprisonment in penitentiary: Minimum: 1 year Maximum: 20 years Parole term: 3 years Fine: \$10,000 or greater amount stated in offense.
Class 3 Felony	Imprisonment in penitentiary: Minimum: 1 year Maximum: 10 years Parole term: 3 years Fine: \$10,000 or greater amount stated in offense.
Class 4 Felony	Imprisonment in penitentiary: Minimum: 1 year Maximum: 3 years Parole term: 2 years Fine: \$10,000 or greater amount stated in offense.
Class A Misdemeanor	Imprisonment in other than penitentiary: Up to 1 year Fine: Not to exceed \$1,000.
Class B Misdemeanor	Imprisonment in other than penitentiary: Up to 6 months Fine: Not to exceed \$500
Class C Misdemeanor	Imprisonment in other than penitentiary: Up to 30 days Fine: Not to exceed \$500
Petty Offense	Imprisonment: None Fine: Not to exceed \$500 (If \$100 or less—the amount is stated in the statute.)
Business Offense	Imprisonment: None Fine: Over \$500; Amount stated in offense.
Probation	Felony: Up to 5 years Misdemeanor: Up to 2 years Petty or Business Offense: Up to 1 year.

ACTIVITIES OF THE JUDICIARY



The Supreme Court

The Illinois Supreme Court is the pinnacle of the three-tier Illinois court structure, and it is, by its constitutional nature, the final arbiter in this State of litigation which it hears by mandatory or discretionary appeal or in original actions.

Pursuant to statute, the Court holds five terms each year during the months of January, March, May, September and November. During the 1972 terms, the Court sat a total of 70 days. When the Court is not in session, each justice is preparing his assigned opinions. At each term, the Court issues opinions, holds conferences on drafts of proposed opinions, hears oral arguments, rules on motions, considers modifications to the Supreme Court rules, and meets with the Administrative Director to discuss budgetary requirements and to consider other administrative matters.

When in session, the justices reside in the Supreme Court Building at 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 Urbana-Champaign campus of the University of Illinois College of Law. The sessions at the law school present an invaluable opportunity for law school students to observe the highest State court in action.

Besides deciding cases and administering and supervising the entire judicial system in accordance with its constitutional mandate, the Supreme Court has multifarious duties which are weighty, yet less prominent than its more publicized opinions. For example, the Court approves, after preparation by the Administrative Director, the annual budget for the State's courts; employs two law clerks for each justice who assist in researching the law and preparing legal memoranda; selects a marshall who attends each term of Court and performs such other duties, at the direction of the Court, which are usually performed by the sheriffs to the trial courts; and appoints the Supreme Court librarian who is charged with keeping the library in current condition and preserving all books and documents in the library. In addition, the Court appoints, pursuant to PA 77-2633, the Appellate Defender and two persons to the Appellate Defender Commission; the Court has appointed Theodore Gottfried as Defender and William M. Madden. deputy director of the Administrative Office, as a commissioner. Furthermore, the Court selects committees, as the need arises, to study and suggest amendments in substantive and procedural law.

The primary reason, of course, that the Supreme Court exists is to render decisions which require adjudication by the court of last resort. During 1972, the seven justices of the Court delivered 246 full opinions, a 15.4% increase over 1971, which affected every citizen of Illinois to some degree; filed 72 memorandum opinions; ruled on 70 petitions for rehearing; decided 447 petitions for leave to appeal, a 25% increase over last year; and disposed of 917 other motions. The Court additionally received 879 new filings as compared to 1274 filings in 1971. Many of the new filings included petitions for inmates at the State penitentiaries praying for modifications of sentences to conform to the new Code of Corrections.

By the very nature of the type of litigation which the Supreme Court hears, many of its opinions deal with issues which are particularly germane to Illinois; however, since Illinois is one of the major and leading jurisdictions in the United States, it is not uncommon that sister states and the federal courts cite the Illinois Supreme Court opinions as authority in their jurisdictions. Some of the Court's most significant opinions in 1972 follow.

• Interpretation of the Constitution. In People ex rel. Klinger v. Howlett, 50 III.2d 242, the Court was presented with several important constitutional questions: whether a legislative scheme to provide public funds for financial assistance to nonpublic school education was constitutionally permissible; what was the effective date of said legislation; and whether it was within the constitutional authority of the Governor to return said legislation to the General Assembly with extensive recommendations for change. The General Assembly passed three bills which would provide for "indirect" financial aid for nonpublic school education. While the bills were pending the Governor's approval or disapproval, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down laws, similar to the pending Illinois legislation, in Pennsylvania and Rhode Island. The Governor then returned the bills to the legislature with specific recommendations for change to overcome the objections of the U.S. Supreme Court. The General Assembly concurred in the recommendations, and the Governor signed the legislation into law. The Illinois Supreme Court never reached the question of the constitutionality of using public funds for nonpublic school education since the Court held that the legislation was not effective until July 1, 1972, and the Court therefore would not grant a writ of mandamus to compel disbursement of the funds prior to the effective date of the law. However, by way of dicta, the

Court ruled that it is not within the Governor's constitutional authority to return bills to the legislature with extensive, substantive specific recommendations for change.

Grace v. Howlett, 51 III.2d 478 (two justices dissenting), struck down legislation which would have created "no fault" automobile insurance in Illinois. The Court held that the legislation violated the 1970 Constitution in that it denied equal protection of law and was a special law in an area where a general law could have been applicable; it infringed on the right to a jury trial; it deprived the circuit court of its jurisdiction in all justiciable matters; and it permitted fee officers in the judicial system.

Brokaw Hospital v. Circuit Court, 52 III.2d 182, was the first instance where the Supreme Court entered a supervisory order directed at a lower court. The 1970 Constitution provides that the Supreme Court has "supervisory authority over all courts."

Stein v. Howlett, 52 III.2d 570, upheld the constitutionality of the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, which requires certain public officers and employees to file a statement of economic interests. The Court ruled the Act was not a violation of privacy, nor was it vague or an *ex post facto* law.

• Tax and Bonds. In *Austin Liquor Mart Inc.* v. *Department of Revenue*, 51 III.2d 1 (three justices dissenting), the Court ruled that payment and acceptance of a tax assessment under the Retailer's Occupation Tax Act did not bar subsequent investigation relating to the period covered by the assessment. The general rule is that "the State cannot be estopped in the exercise of its power of taxation or the collection of revenue unless necessary to prevent fraud and injustice."

People v. *Northwestern University*, 51 III.2d 131, decreed that where the university had been granted a property tax exemption, the income derived by the university from the lease of the property owned by it to a corporation which operated a garage thereon, was exempt from taxation.

Doran v. Cullerton, 51 III.2d 553 (two justices partially dissenting), upheld legislation which created a homestead tax exemption of \$1500 to persons 65 or older who occupy and own real property during 1972 and thereafter.

S. Bloom, Inc. v. Korshak, 52 III.2d 56, interpreting the "home rule" powers of local governmental units, held that the City of Chicago ordinance imposing a tax on all cigarettes possessed for sale, which tax was ultimately paid by the consumer, was not an occupation tax in violation of the Constitution.

Children's Development Center, Inc. v. Olson, 52 III.2d 332 (one justice dissenting), adjudged that real estate owned by a religious corporation and leased to a not-for-profit corporation to provide educational programs was exempt from taxation, regardless of whether the religious corporation made a profit from leasing.

Cecrle v. *Authority*, 52 III.2d 312, provided that a tax exemption of a religiously affiliated school is not constitutionally prohibited and that the issuance of bonds, pursuant to statute, to indirectly provide public

funds to private institutions of higher education is constitutionally permissible.

Kanellos v. County of Cook, 53 III.2d 161, decided that the "home rule" article of the Constitution, in absence of legislative disapproval, authorizes the issuance of general obligation bonds by the Cook County Board without referendum.

People v. *McMackin*, 53 III.2d 347 (one justice dissenting), resolved that a "non-home rule" unit could issue bonds, pursuant to the Industrial Project Revenue Bond Act, and use the revenue therefrom to finance industrial projects to be leased to private concerns. The Act does not violate the constitutional provision against the use of public funds for private enterprises.

City of Evanston v. County of Cook, 53 III.2d 312 (three justices dissenting), held that a "home rule" county could constitutionally impose a tax on the sales of new motor vehicles even though a "home rule" municipality within the county had imposed a similar tax. Said tax could be collected by the county for sales within the municipality, and the municipality could collect its tax within its boundaries.

- Landlord-Tenant. Jack Spring, Inc. v. Little, 50 III.2d 351 (three justices dissenting), is a landmark decision in Illinois and in the United States. The defendant, a tenant in plaintiff's apartment building, refused to continue to pay rent because the building contained many violations of the Building Code of the City of Chicago. Plaintiff brought an action to collect the past due rent and to oust the defendant from the premises. The Court, heavily relying on Javins v. First National Realty Corp., 138 U.S.App.Ct.D.C. 369, held that "included in the contracts, both oral and written, governing the tenancies of the defendants in the multiple unit dwellings occupied by them, is an implied warranty of habitability which is fulfilled by substantial compliance with the pertinent provisions of the Chicago building code."
- Criminal. In *People* v. *Woerly*, 50 III.2d 327, the Court ruled that a defendant, charged with the statutory offense of reckless driving, had a statutory right to a trial by jury.

People v. *Pier*, 51 III.2d 96, reasoned that a convicted defendant who violates the conditions of probation is entitled to due process of law at the probation revocation hearing. "Since the results of a probation revocation may be a deprivation of liberty . . . we agree . . . that due process of law requires that a defendant charged with having violated his probation be entitled to a conscientious judicial determination of the charge according to accepted and well recognized procedural methods . . . He is not, however, entitled to a jury trial . . . He is entitled to counsel."

People v. *Moore*, 51 III.2d 79, decided that a defendant is entitled to a transcript of the preliminary hearing whether or not he is able to pay for it.

People v. Flowers, 51 III.2d 25 (two justices dissenting), reversed and remanded the defendant's conviction because "the totality of the denial of the discovery and access to information to which the defendant was entitled constituted a denial of due process..."

People v. One 1965 Oldsmobile, 52 III.2d 37 (three justices dissenting), held that defendant's automobile,

which was used in the commission of a felony, could be ordered forfeited and sold pursuant to statute. The fact that the notice of the forfeiture was sent by the sheriff to the defendant's address where the automobile was registered, even though the sheriff had the defendant incarcerated and made it impossible for the defendant to receive said notice, did not violate due process since the proceeding was *in rem*.

People v. *Speck*, 52 III.2d 284, remanded for sentencing the defendant who was convicted of murdering eight women. The trial court had imposed the death sentence, and the Illinois Supreme Court, in accordance with the U. S. Supreme Court opinions, remanded the case for imposition of a sentence other than death.

People v. *Sterling*, 52 III.2d 287, adjudicated that the defendant did not have a First Amendment right to distribute leaflets in a privately owned shopping center, citing *Lloyd Corp.* v. *Tanner*, 407 U.S. 551.

People v. *Prim*, 53 III.2d 62, directed that, pursuant to the Supreme Court's supervisory authority, all Illinois trial courts "when faced with deadlocked juries comply with" the American Bar Association Standard 5.4, relating to trial by jury.

People v. *Kent*, 54 III.2d 161, held that where there is a finding for the defendant of no probable cause at the preliminary hearing, there is no constitutional bar prohibiting the State from directly seeking a true bill from the grand jury for the same alleged offense.

People v. Coleman, 52 III.2d 470, and People v. Morrissey, 52 III.2d 418, implement Argersinger v. Hamlin, 407 U.S. 25, wherein the U.S. Supreme Court held that a defendant cannot be imprisoned upon conviction unless counsel was appointed to represent him or the defendant waived his right to counsel.

• Juvenile and Adoption. In *People v. Bombacino*, 51 III.2d 17, the defendant, a minor, was brought before a judge in the juvenile division of the circuit court on a petition for delinquency. Pursuant to the Juvenile Court Act, the state's attorney petitioned the judge to transfer the case to the criminal division to try the defendant as an adult. The petition was granted without an evidentiary hearing. The Supreme Court held that a due process hearing under the Act is not required at this stage of the proceeding.

People ex rel. Slawek v. Covenant Children's Home, 52 III.2d 20, ruled that in compliance with Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645, a putative father must be accorded notice and an opportunity to assert his rights in proceedings to determine the custody and/or adoption of his illegitimate child.

- Injunction. In *People v. Sears, Roebuck and Co.,* 52 III.2d 301, the Court decided that Sears had a proprietary right to construct a 110 story building, notwithstanding interference with television reception caused by the building in the surrounding area and that such interference did not constitute an actionable nuisance warranting injunctive relief.
- Appeals. In *Hamilton Corp.* v. *Alexander*, 53 III.2d 175, the Supreme Court ruled that the legislature could not constitutionally impose the posting of an appeal bond upon the appellant as a condition precedent to appeal in forcible entry actions.

- Contempt. In *People* v. *Carradine*, 52 III.2d 231, the defendant, who was a prosecution witness in another case, refused to testify because she feared for the safety of her family. The trial court found her in contempt and sentenced her to six months imprisonment. The Supreme Court held that despite the extenuating circumstances, "the contemnor's refusal to testify ... clearly obstructed the court in its administration of justice."
- Other cases. During the year, the Supreme Court also rendered opinions relating to Industrial Commission (workman's compensation) orders, Commerce Commission orders, habeas corpus, criminal matters, anti-trust, contempt, civil cases including personal injury actions, and other litigation which required review by the State's highest court.

The Supreme Court's disposition of cases by full opinion was greater in 1972 than in the preceding year since the Court was not required to devote as much time to implementing the new Constitution as in 1971. However, the Court was quite involved with several cases, as noted above, which required interpretation of the 1970 Constitution, particularly in the "home rule" article. Substantial attention was also given to the administrative problems of the court system and to filling judicial vacancies. Considerable consideration was also directed to necessary amendments to the Supreme Court rules. Some of the most noteworthy rule changes are below.

Rule 23-Allows the Appellate Court to issue memorandum opinions in affirming a judgment when no error of law appears when an opinion would have no precedential value and when one or more of the following circumstances exists and is dispositive of the case: (a) That a judgment in a civil case is not against the manifest weight of the evidence; (b) That a judgment in a civil case entered upon allowance of a motion for a directed verdict should be affirmed because all of the evidence so overwhelmingly favors the appellee that no contrary verdict could ever stand; (c) That in a criminal case the evidence is not so unsatisfactory as to leave a reasonable doubt as to the defendant's guilt; (d) That the decision of an administrative body or agency reviewed under the Administrative Review Act and confirmed by the circuit court is not against the manifest weight of the evidence. Rule 315–Provides that the State may petition for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court from the Appellate Court in any case not appealable from the Appellate Court as a matter of right.

Rule 501—Makes Article V of the Supreme Court rules relating to trial court proceedings in traffic and conservation offenses applicable to offenses under the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act.

Rule 526—Amends the amount of bail that must be posted in certain truck offenses.

Rule 527-Amends the bail schedule to include offenses charged under the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act.

Rule 604—Permits the State to file for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court from the Appellate Court in criminal cases; and provides that during the pendency of the petition to appeal, the defendant shall not be detained or denied bail unless there are compelling reasons.

Rule 701—Changes the requirements for persons to be admitted to the practice of law to include a "general fitness to practice law."

Rules 704, 705, 708, and 709—Provide that an applicant to be admitted to the bar must be certified by the Board of Law Examiners to be of good moral character and "general fitness to practice law."

Briefly mentioned *infra* was another responsibility of the Supreme Court: The power of the Court to fill judicial vacancies in absence of a law enacted by the legislature. This grant of constitutional authority enables the Court to select and appoint lawyers and judges of the highest caliber and qualifications to the circuit and appellate benches where vacancies exist by reason of death or resignation; it allows the Court to maintain the judicial system at full strength to hear the torrent of litigation being filed in the Illinois courts.

The Court has wisely and prudently exercised its appointment power by selecting the following attorneys and sitting judges to fill vacancies.

Jack A. Alfeld-7th Judicial Circuit Raymond K. Berg-Cook County Circuit Court Patrick M. Burns-12th Judicial Circuit U. S. Collins-9th Judicial Circuit Joseph F. Cunningham-20th Judicial Circuit John L. DeLaurenti-3rd Judicial Circuit Eric S. DeMar-15th Judicial Circuit William P. Denny–13th Judicial Circuit Simon L. Friedman–7th Judicial Circuit Robert L. Gagen-20th Judicial Circuit John C. Hayes–1st District Appellate Court Thomas E. Hornsby-15th Judicial Circuit Wilbur S. Johnson-14th Judicial Circuit George Kaye-11th Judicial Circuit Carl A. Lund-5th Judicial Circuit Victor I. Mosele-3rd Judicial Circuit John P. Shonkwiler–6th Judicial Circuit John E. Sype-17th Judicial Circuit Thomas W. Vinson–12th Judicial Circuit Guy R. Williams-8th Judicial Circuit

It should be observed that of this score of appointments, five appointees were sitting judges who were elevated to higher judgeships. Thus, it can be stated that where the Supreme Court discerned outstanding performance by sitting judges, then these well qualified jurists were selected to fill vacant judgeships which carry greater responsibility in the judicial system.

What has been detailed here is representative of the manifold responsibilities and duties exercised by the Illinois Supreme Court in 1972. Some of the other business handled by the Court included hearing and adjudicating disciplinary proceedings against attorneys, admitting 1221 lawyers to the Illinois bar, appointing special committees to study particular legal problems and receiving reports there-on, maintaining close liaison with the executive committee of the Illinois Judicial Conference and Conference of Chief Circuit Judges and making appearances before the state and local bar associations.

The Illinois Supreme Court, and its individual justices,

has achieved national recognition for its scholarly and well-reasoned opinions, and the Court's faithful discharge of its duties, and in particular the execution of its general and supervisory authority over the Illinois courts, has earned the respect and admiration of the public, court administrators, lawyers and judges throughout the United States.

In its role as the head of the court system, the Supreme Court is vitally concerned with the financial and economic status of the judges of Illinois. The Court is cognizant that judges must be adequately compensated and have retirement benefits which are commensurate with their duties and responsibilities. Increasing judicial salaries and pensions has long had the active support of the Supreme Court, and recently the organized bar, through the presidents of the Illinois State and Chicago Bar Associations, has publicly joined the judges of the State in urging the legislature to augment salaries and pensions.

In a message to the 77th General Assembly, Chief Justice Robert C. Underwood recommended upgrading judicial salaries and pensions:

"With constantly increasing caseloads, the judges of this State are increasingly burdened. If the judiciary of Illinois is to continue to attract able lawyers, the compensation must be kept at a level which, when combined with retirement benefits, does not compel substantial financial sacrifice by one who is elected to a judgeship. It is, I believe, a fair statement to say that, under current conditions, the earnings of able judges would be substantially greater in the private practice of law. While monetary considerations are not to be viewed as a primary factor, judges, like other persons, have families to provide for, children to educate, and a normal desire for an adequate standard of living. We accordingly suggest . . . the desirability of upgrading all judicial salaries by at least an amount sufficient to offset cost-of-living increases."

Implicit in the Chief Justice's remarks are the stringent restrictions placed on judges' outside income. In Illinois, judges must devote full time to their judicial duties, and they cannot practice law. Supreme Court Rules 63 through 65 provide that a judge cannot assume an active role in the management of any business or serve as a director or officer of any for-profit corporation; that a judge cannot accept duties or obligations which would interfere with the proper performance of his official duties; and that a judge cannot accept compensation of any kind for services performed or to be performed, except his judicial salary and for lecturing, teaching or writing.

During 1972, some judicial salaries were increased; however, it is expected that legislation will again be introduced in 1973 to raise salaries. The salaries of the former associate judges who became circuit judges on July 1, 1971 by virtue of the new Constitution were increased and equalized with the circuit judges; i.e., \$2,500 increase to \$35,000 in Cook County and \$27,500 downstate, and the salaries of the associate judges were increased by \$5,000. The chart following illustrates the judicial salary structure as of December 31, 1972.

JUDICIAL SALARY STRUCTURE

December 31, 1972



*Lawyer and non-lawyer Associate Judges in DuPage County receive \$28,000 per year.

23

1200

The Appellate Court

The Illinois Appellate Court is the intermediate court of review of this State. Its foundation and organization are set forth in Section 5 of the Judicial Article which provides that judges of the Appellate Court are to be elected from the five Judicial Districts in such numbers as determined by the legislature, except that each division within the Appellate Court districts must have at least three judges. Presently, there are thirty elected judgeships in the Appellate Court: The First District (Cook County) has five divisions of three judges each, however, three additional judgeships created by statute are presently vacant; and the Second through the Fifth Districts each have one division of three judges.

Prior to the adoption of the 1964 Judicial Article and the 1970 Constitution, the creation of an Appellate Court was authorized by the 1870 Constitution; however, its establishment was left to the legislature. By law, the legislature provided that the Supreme Court appoint sitting circuit judges, and in the case of Cook County, Superior Court judges, to man the four appellate court districts and that the appointees could not receive compensation beyond their circuit judges' salaries. After 1964, the constitutional structure of the Appellate Court was substantially altered, and its origin and establishment were conferred with constitutional dignity.

The Constitution (there are only thirteen states which constitutionally provide for an intermediate appellate court) provides that the Appellate Court and its judges (a) be elected for ten-year terms; (b) be elected from the same five Judicial Districts as the justices of the Supreme Court; (c) each district have at least three judges; (d) a concurrence of a majority is necessary for a decision; and (e) mandates the Supreme Court to exercise its rule-making authority to structure the divisions of the Appellate Court.

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

- Divisions—The Appellate Court shall sit in divisions of three judges. The First District shall have five divisions and shall sit in Chicago; the Second through the Fifth Districts shall each have one division, and shall respectively sit in Elgin, Ottawa, Springfield and Mount Vernon. 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 shall constitute the executive committee of the Appellate Court.
- First District Executive Committee—The First District Executive Committee shall be composed of five members, one from each division, and shall have general administrative authority.

The heart of the Appellate Court is its jurisdiction; and the form, which has been described above, that the Appellate Court takes is secondary to its power to hear cases. Section 6 of Article VI of the 1970 Constitution spells out the jurisdiction of the Appellate Court: every final judgment (and in some cases, nonfinal judgments) of the circuit court is appealable as a matter of right to the Appellate Court, except those cases appealable directly to the Supreme Court and except in criminal cases where the accused has been acquitted after a trial on the merits.

It is interesting to observe that Illinois is only one of nine 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.

Generally, Article III and Article 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. Section 6 of Article VI of the Constitution states that the "Appellate Court shall have such powers of direct review of administrative action as provided by law." Effective July 1, 1970, the legislature enacted into law the Environmental Protection Act which provides that orders of the Pollution Control Board are directly appealable to the Appellate Court. In its essence, Rule 335 is not dissimilar to the procedures for reviewing administrative actions in the circuit court.

The independent observer will discern that the broad jurisdictional base of the Appellate Court is probable cause to project that it has a massive caseload (see chart). On December 31, 1964, a full year after the 1964 Judicial Article was adopted, the Appellate Court had 859 cases pending, and only 2 cases which were disposed of were more than two years old; three years later, 1967, the Court received 1402 new filings, disposed of 1310 cases of which 129 were more than two years old, and had 1462 cases pending; during 1970, the Appellate Court disposed of 1496 cases (1079 cases by full opinion) of which 351 were more than two years old, but 1856 appeals were filed, and 2261 cases were pending on December 31, 1970. In 1971, the Appellate Court disposed of 1944 cases (1410 cases by full opinion) of which 370 cases were more than two years old, received 2499 new cases, and had 2816 cases pending as of December 31, 1971. During 1972, the Court disposed of 2526 cases (1763 cases by full opinion) of which 340 cases were more than two years old, received 3020 new cases, and had 3310 cases pending at the close of 1972. Comparing the pertinent statistics for 1971 and 1972



reveals some interesting results: the judges of the Appellate Court disposed of nearly 30% more cases in 1972 than 1971, with a 25% increase in the number of cases disposed of by full opinion; yet, there was an increase of almost 21% in cases filed in 1972 as compared to 1971, and there was 17.5% more cases pending at the end of 1972 than in 1971. Every year since 1964, the Appellate Court as a whole has lost ground in currency; i.e., more cases pending on January 1 than on December 31 of each calendar year.

Yet, the Appellate Court judges are disposing of more and more cases each year. For example, one judge authored 69 full opinions (including two dissents) in 1972. However, the caseload continues to grow in striking proportions. In addition to the trend of increased filings, 143 cases were transferred to the Appellate Court from the Supreme Court, and many cases which would have been heard in the Supreme Court prior to July 1, 1971, are now filed in the Appellate Court because the 1970 Constitution has lessened the Supreme Court's mandatory appellate jurisdiction. As mentioned *supra*, the Appellate Court is also required to directly review orders of the Pollution Control Board.

It is highly problematical whether the Appellate Court can expeditiously dispose of cases so as to attain a reasonable degree of currency unless appropriate and innovative measures are taken. Using the years 1965 and 1972 as examples, the Appellate Court judges disposed of 180.7% more cases in 1972 than in 1965; however, there were 125.7% more appeals filed in 1972 than in 1965, and the percentage of cases pending at the end of 1972 was 15.5% greater than in 1965. Cognizant of the need to achieve currency in the Appellate Court, action has been and will be taken by the Appellate Court itself, by the Supreme Court and by the legislature. Some noteworthy measures employed thus far are as follows:

(1) Increase the number of Appellate Court judgeships. The 77th General Assembly authorized the selection of three additional judgeships in the First Appellate District. This will bring the total number of elected judgeships up to 18 in that district. The three new judges would have been elected in November of 1972 if a contested judicial election had been held; however, for reasons indicated in another section of this report, there were not any judicial elections in 1972.

Pursuant to Article VI, Section 12(b) of the Constitution, the Supreme Court is expected to appoint three judges to the First District Appellate Court.

(2) Curtail the number of full opinions where appropriate. Effective January 31, 1972, the Supreme Court adopted Rule 23 in accordance with a recommendation of the Appellate Court. The rule authorizes the Appellate Court to adopt memorandum opinions in affirming judgments when certain factors are present. Because of the apparent limitations of the rule, it remains to be seen whether it will be a significant tool in expediting cases in the Appellate Court. The rule is set out below.

"RULE 23. Signed memorandum opinions may be used in affirming a judgment when the Appellate Court determines that no error of law appears, that an opinion would have no precedential value, and that any one or more of the following circumstances exists and is dispositive of the case:

(a) That a judgment in a civil case is not against the manifest weight of the evidence;

(b) That a judgment in a civil case entered upon allowance of a motion for directed verdict or for judgment notwithstanding the verdict should be affirmed because all of the evidence, when viewed in the light most favorable to the appellant, so overwhelmingly favors the appellee that no contrary verdict based on that evidence could ever stand (*Pedrick v. Peoria & Eastern R.R. Co.* (1967), 37 III.2d 494);

(c) That in a criminal case the evidence is not so unsatisfactory as to leave a reasonable doubt as to defendant's guilt;

(d) That the decision of an administrative body or agency reviewed under the provisions of the Administrative Review Act and confirmed by the circuit court is not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

In the memorandum opinion the Appellate Court shall state at least the following: the court from which the appeal comes; the nature of the proceedings below, *i.e.*, bench trial, jury trial, administrative review, *etc.*; the nature of the case, *e.g.*, personal injury or contract suit; and such other matters as in the judgment of the court are necessary for an understanding of the case; and shall thereupon, with a minimum of discussion, affirm, indicating that the affirmance is in compliance with this rule."

(3) Assign judges to the Appellate Court. Pursuant to Section 16 of Article VI, the Supreme Court "may assign a judge temporarily to any court." During 1972, twenty-six circuit judges (not necessarily all different judges) were temporarily assigned to the Appellate Court and/or Appellate judges (not necessarily all different judges) to Appellate Court districts other than districts where they are permanently serving. Additionally, five circuit judges were relieved of their circuit court duties and fully assigned to the Appellate Court:

First District—Edward J. Egan Second District—Glenn K. Seidenfeld Third District—Albert Scott Fourth District—Leland Simkins Fifth District—Charles E. Jones

Appellate Court judges from the Fourth District delivered three opinions in 1972 in cases from the First District which were assigned to them during and prior to 1972; one judge in the Third District rendered one opinion in a Second District case and one opinion in a Fourth District case; judges in the Fourth District delivered three opinions in Third District cases and two opinions in Fifth District cases; and one judge in the Fifth District rendered one opinion in a Fourth District case.

Nine circuit judges temporarily assigned to the Appellate Court rendered a total of 19 opinions in cases assigned to them during and prior to 1972.

(4) Assign retired judges to the Appellate Court. Section 15 of Article VI provides that the Supreme Court may assign a retired judge, with his consent, to judicial service. In 1972, the Supreme Court assigned one retired Appellate Court judge, Ulysses S. Schwartz, and one retired circuit court judge, Caswell J. Crebs, to full judicial service in the First and Fifth Appellate Court districts.

(5) Fill Appellate Court vacancies by appointment. Article VI, Section 12 permits the Supreme Court, in absence of law, to fill vacancies. The Supreme Court by appointment in 1971 filled the vacancies in the Third District and in the Fifth District; and it is expected that the three vacancies in the First District will be filled in the near future.

(6) Propose solutions to Appellate Court problems. In late 1971, the Illinois Appellate Court, with the approval of the Supreme Court, established an Administrative Committee to propose solutions to expeditiously handle the increasing caseload of the Appellate Court.

The Committee, after a year of intensive research, produced a comprehensive report which suggested extensive amendments to the Supreme Court rules governing appeals. In summary, the report recommended: (a) The creation of a central research department composed of attorneys whose duties would include preparing a prehearing report for each case appealed to the Appellate Court, preparing and publishing a weekly cumulative digest of opinions for each case decided in the Supreme or Appellate Courts, and publishing a digest of issues for each issue presented to the courts of review but not yet decided; (b) The appointment of a director of research who would be a lawyer and responsible for the supervision and administration of the research department; and (c) The creation of the position of chief judge of the Appellate Court who would serve as the administrative coordinator of the Appellate Court.

The Supreme Court has taken the report of the Committee under advisement.

In 1972, the Supreme Court approved the creation of an experimental research staff in the First Appellate Court District. The experiment is funded by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, and the National Center for State Courts is assisting in the implementation of the project. The purpose of the project is to expedite the consideration and disposition of cases appealed to the First District Appellate Court by screening routine cases and composing memoranda which are suitable to assist the Appellate Court judges in arriving at *per curiam* opinions. The project has been in full operation since September, and the data thus far available is incomplete to determine whether the experiment will accelerate the disposition of cases on appeal.

In conclusion, it can be observed that the Illinois Appellate Court is a constitutionally based intermediate court of review which possesses expansive power of review from judgments of the circuit court and from orders of the Pollution Control Board. The constitutional right to appeal and the jurisdiction of the Appellate Court to hear most appeals enhances the importance of the Appellate Court and makes it the final arbiter in the vast majority of cases which it decides.

The mammoth caseload of the Appellate Court continues to increase; however, the flexibility permitted by the Constitution should ameliorate the pressing caseload of the Appellate Court. Retired judges and sitting judges on the circuit court level will continue to be assigned to the Appellate Court, and the Supreme and Appellate Courts will seek new means to alleviate caseload problems.

The Circuit Courts

The main nerve center of the Illinois court system is the circuit court which is the court of first impression, the trial court, for virtually all litigation. There are only three broad areas where the circuit court cannot or may not exercise its jurisdiction: (1) the Supreme Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction in cases involving legislative redistricting and the ability of the Governor to serve in office; (2) the Supreme Court has discretionary original jurisdiction to hear cases relating to revenue, mandamus, prohibition and habeas corpus; and (3) by statute, the Appellate Court directly reviews orders of the Pollution Control Board. The grant of jurisdiction to the circuit court by Section 9 of Article VI of the Constitution – "Circuit Courts shall have original jurisdiction of all justiciable matters \dots " - is a simple concept which, however, initially startles those who reside in multi-trial court jurisdictions in sister states. Once the concept of a single trial court with unlimited jurisdiction is developed, it is understandably accepted as a model to emulate.

Illinois, which pioneered the unified trial court (and while other states have tried, they have not succeeded in providing for such a court), had a galaxy of trial courts prior to 1964. There were hundreds and hundreds of courts with limited, special, parallel and overlapping jurisdictions. For example, Cook County had 208 courts in 1962: Circuit court, Superior court, Family court, Criminal court, Probate court, County court, Chicago Municipal court, 23 city, village, town and municipal courts, 75 justice of the peace courts, and 103 police magistrate courts. The Judicial Article of 1964, which was continued nearly in toto in the 1970 Constitution, completely and totally abolished all of the State's trial courts of first impression and in their stead created the circuit court which is the only trial court in Illinois. Virtually all causes of action are filed, litigated, and adjudicated in the circuit court, and an appeal from a judgment of the circuit court is filed in the Supreme Court or, as in most instances, in the Appellate Court. A judge of the circuit court has no power to review the decision of another circuit court judge.

The circuit courts are comprised of 597 judges who are designated as circuit judges and associate judges. The former are initially elected either on a circuit-wide basis or from the county where they reside; in the case of the Circuit Court of Cook County, circuit judges are elected in the entire county, in the city of Chicago, or outside of Chicago. The associate judges are appointed on a merit basis by the circuit judges of their respective circuits. Supreme Court Rule 39 establishes the procedures for nominating and appointing lawyers who have applied for the position of associate judge. It should be noted here that circuit judges and associate judges possess the full jurisdiction of the circuit court. Circuit judges are elected for six-year terms, and associate judges are appointed for four-year terms (Article VI, Section 10). The circuit judges pursuant to Section 7 of Article VI select by secret ballot from their

own number a chief judge in their respective circuits. Subject to the authority of the Supreme Court, the chief judge has general administrative authority over his court.

Geographically, there are 21 judicial circuits in Illinois which are composed of one or more counties. One circuit contains over 5,000,000 people while another circuit has less than 150,000 people. The Second Judicial Circuit contains twelve counties, 4796 square miles and 196,404 people in southern Illinois, while the Circuit Court of Cook County, for example, is within one county and has nearly 5,500,000 people in a 954 square-mile area. The diversity of Illinois' geography and its people are reflected in the composition of the judicial circuits; e.g., urban versus rural, industry versus agriculture, densely versus sparsely populated areas, etc. These differences are also mirrored in the quantity and types of litigation filed in the circuit courts.

It staggers the imagination when one is confronted with the fact that nearly 3 million cases were filed or reinstated in the circuit courts in 1972. That is a ratio of nearly one case filed for every three persons in Illinois. Yet, because of the elasticity and flexibility of the court system, 2,868,718 cases were terminated, which is more than 4,800 cases disposed of by each of the State's 597 judges. While the sole purpose of creating the unified trial court system was to expeditiously and justly protect the liberties and guarantee the rights of Illinois citizens, an ancillary financial benefit has accrued to the taxpayers by virtue of the organization of the circuit court and its efficient handling of litigation. It is estimated that the circuit courts of Illinois have generated in recent years about \$50,000,000 per year in fines, costs and other court related revenue.

The volume of litigation varies substantially from circuit to circuit due in part to the concentration of population, State institutions and industry. For example, the Eighth Judicial Circuit recorded less than 21,000 newly filed cases during 1972, but the Circuit Court of Cook County received nearly 2,000,000 new filings. Because Cook County has approximately one-half of the State's population, numerous highways and streets, and is one of the world's leading business centers, the Circuit Court of Cook County has a greater volume of cases than any other single court system in the country, and it has the largest number of judicial officers working under one head.

Not surprising is the difficulty of maintaining and, in some situations, achieving currency in high volume circuits, in particular Cook County. The chief judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County has employed many innovative ideas to prevent his court from becoming clogged in the morass of litigation. With the cooperation of the Supreme Court and its Administrative Director, Chief Judge John S. Boyle has reserved the tide in the delay of disposition of cases within certain divisions of the circuit court (see graph).

This accomplishment in significant part is due to the constitutional authority of the Supreme Court to assign sitting and retired judges from other circuits into those circuits which are in need of additional judicial manpower. Acting on behalf of the Supreme Court, the Administrative Director assigned 94 sitting circuit and associate judges (not necessarily all different judges) and 2 retired circuit judges from other circuits to the Circuit Court of Cook County for a total of 1249 days during 1972. Additionally, the

Director assigned 58 sitting circuit and associate judges (not necessarily all different judges) and 6 retired circuit and associate judges to the other 20 circuits for a total of 666 days.

The Illinois unified trial court system has proven itself to be the most efficient and modern court system yet devised by mankind. The circuit courts have demonstrated the ability and potential, as the need may arise, to effectively and justly dispose of a massive number of cases within a reasonable time after filing. The volume of cases which are filed or reinstated is immense; e.g., 2,250,233 cases were filed during 1964, but 2,912,958 cases were filed during 1972, a decrease of 4.1% over 1971 (see chart). It is anticipated that the circuit courts can and will meet the challenge and continue to deliver justice with fairness and dispatch to the citizens of Illinois.

A typical example of how the circuit courts seek to serve the people is illustrated by General Order 72-8(M), entered by Judge Eugene L. Wachowski, presiding judge of the First Municipal District (Chicago) of the Circuit Court of Cook County. (A similar order is in effect in the 17th Judicial Circuit, Winnebago County.) A study of small claims indicated that many individuals often cannot economically justify the employment of a lawyer to prosecute a small claim. Accordingly, Judge Wachowski entered the General Order to establish a *pro se* small claims section of the court to provide substantial justice between the parties in a forum where litigants can obtain a prompt and inexpensive hearing and adjudication of their claim.

Generally, the Order provides: (a) a small claim to be less than \$300.00; (b) formal pleadings are not necessary and the hearing is informal; (c) attorneys cannot represent plaintiffs; (d) claims of corporations, partnerships and associations are not permitted to be filed in the section; (d) in the court hearing, the rules of evidence are liberally construed for the purpose of obtaining substantial justice; and (f) hearings are set at such hours to allow the litigants to appear in court without unnecessary loss of income.

A recent survey indicates that the most common types of claims filed are to seek return of rent deposits and to obtain repair costs for damage caused in minor automobile collisions.

Judicial Elections

During 1972 there were not any partisan elections to fill judicial vacancies since no election law was in effect for judicial elections. Section 12 (a), Article VI of the Constitution provides that "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."

The General Assembly passed legislation in 1971 making the primary election law applicable to judicial elections; however, the Governor vetoed the bill. The legislature overrode the veto in January of 1972, but since the time had already passed for filing in the March primary, judicial candidates were foreclosed from seeking election. Thus, there will not be contested judicial elections in Illinois until 1974.

The Illinois Constitution provides that a Supreme, Appellate and circuit judge who has been elected to that office may upon expiration of his term of office file a



CASES BEGUN OR REINSTATED OR TERMINATED IN THE CIRCUIT COURTS



declaration of candidacy to succeed himself. A judge who so files "runs on his record" and without opposition. A 60% affirmative vote of the electors voting on the question is required for the judge to retain his office. In November of 1972, one hundred and forty-two judges stood for retention. All were retained in office. The results of the election are as follows.

Appellate Court

Judge	% of "yes" votes
Robert E. English (1st District)	85.5%
Francis S. Lorenz (1st District)	83.2%
John J. Stamos (1st District)	84.3%
Mel Abrahamson (2nd District)	84.3%
Jay J. Alloy (3rd District)	82.5%
Samuel O. Smith (4th District)	84.9%

First Judicial Circuit

Robert H. Chase	76.0%
Harry L. McCabe	75.0%
George Oros	73.7%
Robert B. Porter	60.8%
Paul D. Reese	61.8%
Dorothy W. Spomer	75.3%
R. Gerald Trampe	72.3%
Second Judicial Circuit	
Philip B. Benefiel	74.2%
John D. Daily	74.1%
Don A. Foster	73.1%
Charles W. Frailey	73.6%
A. Hanby Jones	75.2%
Henry Lewis	74.0%
Clarence E. Partee	72.0%
Bruce Saxe	74.2%
Alvin L. Williams	72.6%
Carrie L. Winter	62.5%
Harry L. Ziegler	75.0%
Third Judicial Circuit	
Fred P. Schuman	80.6%
Fourth Judicial Circuit	
William A. Ginos, Jr.	61.4%
Arthur G. Henken	67.0%
George W. Kasserman, Jr.	69.4%
George R. Kelly	70.4%

/0.4%
67.7%
69.9%
69.3%
69.9%
70.1%
68.6%
79.7%
78.8%
80.7%
79.7%
79.7%
81.2%

Sixth Judicial Circuit	
William C. Calvin	83.8%
Frank J. Gollings	83.4%
Roger J. Little	85.2%
Donald W. Morthland	84.0%
Joseph C. Munch	82.1%
James N. Sherrick	83.6%
Creed D. Tucker	83.6%
Seventh Judicial Circuit	
Seventh Judicial Circuit Francis J. Bergen	84.3%
William D. Conway	78.4%
George P. Coutrakon	83.9%
Byron E. Koch	83.3%
Howard L. White	83.4%
John B. Wright	84.1%
Eighth Judicial Circuit	
Cecil J. Burrows	81.6%
Paul R. Durr	80.3%
Lyle E. Lipe	81.5%
J. Ross Pool	82.5%
Fred W. Reither	82.1%
Edward D. Turner	81.9%
Ernest H. Utter	81.8%
Ninth Judicial Circuit	
Ezra J. Clark	82.4%
John W. Gorby	78.8%
Earle A. Kloster	79.4%
Scott I. Klukos	79.9%
Francis P. Murphy	80.1%
Daniel J. Roberts	83.1%
Tenth Judicial Circuit	
Richard E. Eagleton	87.1%
Edward E. Haugens	80.6%
James D. Heiple	83.1%
Charles W. Iben	82.8%
Albert Pucci	79.5%
C. M. Wilson	80.6%
Eleventh Judicial Circuit	
Eleventh Judicial Circuit Keith E. Campbell	86.9%
Wilton Erlenborn	85.0%
Samuel G. Harrod, III	82.6%
John T. McCullough	87.0%
Wendell E. Oliver	87.2%
Twelfth Judicial Circuit	
Wayne P. Dyer	80.2%
Robert J. Immel	80.5%
Angelo F. Pistilli	78.5%
-	, 010 ,0
Thirteenth Judicial Circuit	00 50/
Robert W. Malmquist	82.5%
John S. Massieon	85.9%
Fourteenth Judicial Circuit	05.001
Robert M. Bell	85.2%
Charles H. Carlstrom	82.2%
Robert J. Horberg	83.8%

John L. Poole	83.7%
Richard Stengel	85.7%
L. L. Winn	82.2%
Fifteenth Judicial Circuit	
Robert D. Law	88.1%
William B. Phillips	87.7%
John W. Rapp, Jr.	87.6%
Sixteenth Judicial Circuit Ernest W. Akemann James E. Boyle Robert J. Sears	75.2% 82.7% 80.7%
Seventeenth Judicial Circuit John S. Ghent, Jr. John C. Layng	89.6% 89.5%
Eighteenth Judicial Circuit Edwin L. Douglas Bruce R. Fawell	84.9% 83.5%
Nineteenth Judicial Circuit	
James H. Cooney	83.9%
Fred H. Geiger	84.2%
John J. Kaufman	84.5%
Charles S. Parker	84.6%
Twentieth Judicial Circuit	
Robert Bastien	73.9%
Carl H. Becker	76.7%
William P. Fleming	76.3%
James W. Gray	77.4%
Alvin H. Maeys, Jr.	75.2%
Francis E. Maxwell	76.1%
Circuit Court of Cook County	,-
James M. Bailey	81.1%
Norman C. Barry	75.0%
John S. Boyle	72.2%
David A. Canel	73.1%
David Cerda	82.0%
Wilbert F. Crowley	74.0%
William V. Daly	77.4%
Francis T. Delaney	80.3%
George E. Dolezal	80.5%
Raymond P. Drymalski	82.4%
Robert J. Dunne	84.4%
Edward J. Egan	83.8%
Herbert A. Ellis	80.0%
Samuel B. Epstein	79.3%
Richard J. Fitzgerald	84.4%
Louis B. Garippo	80.5%
James A. Geroulis	80.2%
Edward F. Healy	80.7%
Harry G. Hershenson	78.1%
Mark E. Jones	82.3%
Sidney A. Jones, Jr.	74.6%
Nathan J. Kaplan	81.3%
Walter J. Kowalski	83.0%
Franklin I. Kral	82.7%
Irving Landesman	78.2%
Robert L. Massey	80.5%

James J. Mejda	81.9%
Robert A. Meier, III	82.1%
Robert E. McAuliffe	74.9%
James E. Murphy	81.1%
Gordon B. Nash	79.9%
Albert S. Porter	82.8%
Philip Romiti	80.0%
Daniel J. Ryan	82.7%
Ben Schwartz	81.0%
Pasquale A. Sorrentino	80.2%
Harry S. Stark	80.1%
Sigmund J. Stefanowicz	81.4%
James E. Strunck	79.2%
Harold W. Sullivan	83.3%
Harold G. Ward	74.3%
William S. White	81.2%
Arthur V. Zelezinski	79.1%

The Courts Commission

Prior to the effective date of the 1970 Constitution, the sole method of redressing grievances against judges was to file a complaint with the courts commission. The commission would investigate, prosecute and adjudicate to determine whether a judge should be disciplined. The courts commission as established under the 1964 Judicial Article subsisted for 7-1/2 years, January 1, 1964 to July 1, 1971; and during that time, the commission received 922 complaints about the conduct or disability of judicial officers. Many of the complaints were from prisoners and disgruntled litigants; however, each complaint was thoroughly investigated. Those complaints having merit were brought to the attention of the commission by its secretary. The confidentiality requirement before the formal filing of the complaint with the commission was an effective fulcrum to induce judges, who were found to be physically or mentally disabled or guilty of serious judicial impropriety, to retire or resign from the bench. The courts commission was an effective but unobserved body that truly served the best interests of the public and its judges.

Now, Section 15 of Article VI of the 1970 Constitution, provides that the Judicial Inquiry 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 . . . All proceedings of the Board shall be confidential except the filing of a complaint with the Courts Commission." The Board is composed of nine members, seven of whom are appointed by the Governor, and two circuit judges appointed by the Supreme Court. The Court has appointed Judge Walter P. Dahl of Cook County and Judge John T. Reardon of Quincy to the Board.

During 1972, the Board filed one complaint with the Commission. The complaint filed in December, alleges that a certain judge in the Eight Judicial Circuit, Calhoun County, violated the Judicial Article and the Supreme Court rules of judicial standards in that he did not devote full time to his judicial duties, that he engaged in the practice of law, and that he operated a land title company in the county. The Commission has set the matter down for hearing in 1973.

The case is an important matter since it is the first complaint that has been filed by the Board under the Constitution. It is also significant in that the Courts Commission will set precedents by its rulings on preliminary motions, particularly motions to discover. Of course, it is the first case to come before the Commission strictly in its new adjudicatory posture.

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 powers of the Board and the application of that power has caused some concern. Chief Justice Robert C. Underwood commented on the concern in a recent 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 responsibilities. 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."

Under the Constitution, the Supreme Court appoints one of its justices as chairman of the Commission and two circuit court judges, and the Appellate Court selects two of its judges as commissioners. The present commissioners are Justice Daniel P. Ward, chairman, Judge Joseph Burke and Judge Edward C. Eberspacher (both from the Appellate Court), Judge Robert J. Dunne and Judge Seely P. Forbes (both from the circuit court.). Roy O. Gulley, the Administrative Director, is the Commission secretary.

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. It remains to be seen whether the Judicial Inquiry Board will perform, as the Chief Justice stated, "its duties in a responsible, impartial and nonsensational manner." However, the Illinois Courts Commission stands ready to perform its constitutional function with fidelity and impartiality.

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.

- 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 elected judicial officers in the State; i.e., 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 December 31, 1972, the executive committee consisted of Appellate Court Judges Jay J. Alloy (3rd District), Henry W. Dieringer (1st District), and Daniel J. McNamara (1st District); and circuit court Judges Nicholas J. Bua (Cook County), Harold R. Clark (3rd Circuit), George Fiedler (Cook County), Frederick S. Green (6th Circuit), Mel R. Jiganti (Cook County), Peyton H. Kunce (1st Circuit), Daniel J. Roberts (9th Circuit), Rodney A. Scott (6th Circuit), and Eugene L. Wachowski (Cook County). Supreme Court Justice Thomas E. Kluczynski is the liaison officer to the executive committee. The Supreme Court appointed Judge Scott as chairman and Judge McNamara as vice-chairman.

The executive committee meets regularly every month except during July and August and discusses, studies, and makes recommendations relating to the business of the courts. In recent years, the Judicial Conference has devoted considerable time to continuing judicial education in the form of planning seminars; however, a constant concern of the Conference and its executive committee is the improvement of the administration of justice through legislation, rule changes, and procedural modifications. Illinois has long been an innovative leader in continuing judicial education. Many years before judicial education was fashionable, the Illinois Judicial Conference and its predecessor conference were bringing judges together from every corner of the State to discuss and develop recent case law and legislation which affected the courts.

On June 17, 1972, the Judicial Conference convened its nineteenth annual meeting and seminar. The 350 judges from the Supreme, Appellate, and circuit courts, who had gathered together for the three day meeting, heard lectures and investigated current developments in the law. Chief Justice Robert C. Underwood opened the Conference with a cogent address which set the theme of the Conference and suggested strident action on the part of judges to unify the judiciary and resolve crucial problems. In his remarks, the Chief Justice emphasized three topics of concern to the judiciary: Recommendations to improve the administration of justice; Unifying the judiciary; and Reducing the time in disposition of cases.

Chief Justice Underwood reminded the conferees that judges have an obligation to communicate suggestions to improve the legal system:

"The judges of Illinois deal each day with interpretation of the laws which govern this State. Each of us has frequent occasion to reflect upon the need for statutory change in those areas where problems have arisen, and it seems clear to me that suggestions and recommendations from a group as knowledgeable in this area as are the members of this Conference would be quite helpful to the members of the General Assembly ... I suspect, however, that there are many individual judges who from time to time have useful ideas regarding legislative or other changes, but who do not communicate those ideas to the Conference. I suggest that you not hesitate to submit to the executive committee of the Conference, or to the Administrative Office, any recommendations, legislative or otherwise, which you believe may be beneficial in the operation of the system as a whole. Each of us is a member of this Conference, and each of us shares responsibility for the operation of the judicial system of this State."

Continuing, the Chief Justice stressed that Illinois has a unified court structure, which is the finest in the nation, and that the time is ripe to achieve a unified judiciary:

"We are now, to a substantially greater degree than ever before, each an integral part of a unified court system in which ultimate supervisory and administrative authority is vested in [the Supreme Court]. That system will function best if each judge in the State recognizes his individual responsibility to contribute his best efforts towards improvement of the system as a whole. Certainly improvement in the operation of the court in which you serve is important — but it is no longer the extent of your obligation which now includes devoting your best efforts towards cooperating in the operation and improvement of courts other than your own."

Commenting on how cooperation among the judiciary can solve complex problems which face the court system, the Chief Justice directed the conferees attention to the substantial reduction in delay between date of filing and date of verdict in cases in the Law Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County:

"During the 17-month period from January 1, 1971 through the end of May, 1972, the number of pending cases in the Law Jury Division has been reduced from 36,000 to 30,840... The average time elapsed from the date of filing to the date of verdict has been reduced from 61.7 months on January 1, 1971, to 50.9 months as of the end of May, 1972. In my estimation, these figures are an indication of substantial progress ... In short, it would appear that the goal of 24 months average time lapse from date of filing to date of verdict is a realistic possibility within a reasonable time in the Circuit Court of Cook County."

In closing, Justice Underwood reiterated that the circuit judges should select from among themselves a chief judge in their respective circuits who is a capable administrator:

"Chief judges should be judges who have the ability to recognize and understand the problems in the circuit and the system, the courage to do what has to be done to remedy them, and the tact to do it as diplomatically as possible."

Mr. Leon Jaworski, President of the American Bar Association, in the main address to the assembled judges, dwelled at length on the proposed National Institute of Justice, which would marshall private resources for a coordinated program of modernization and improvement of the legal and judicial systems. Mr. Jaworski outlined the purposes of the Institute:

"First, to provide direction and leadership to improve the functioning of the legal system, serving as consultant and advisor to all components of the administration of justice at both the Federal and State levels;

Secondly, the Institute would be a permanent body charged with the development of the overall view of the law and the courts in operation, identifying priorities for needed improvement, and having responsibility for the coordination of educational resources, research activities and projects of the organized bar;

Thirdly, the Institute would serve as a fiscal agent to receive and disburse public and private funds for research, evaluation and action. It's conceived that the Institute would be both a grantor as well as a grantee of funds. In its role as grantee, the Institute would be authorized to receive funds for its general administration under contract for specific projects and programs. As grantor, the Institute might serve as a funding agency to apply for public or private funds and specific research or action programs.

The operating functions of the Institute would include these:

- A. The providing of a central national source for the collection and dissemination of information.
- B. The operation of our law society, a function not now being provided by any national source.
- C. To identify and evaluate the principal bottlenecks in the flow of civil and criminal justice and the recognition of new problem areas as they arise. This, too, is a function that never has been assumed by any agency or organization on a continuing basis."

In conclusion, Mr. Jaworski reminded the conferees that judges and lawyers must work together to advance the cause of justice:

"Certainly, a central purpose of our professional associations must always be to discharge the social responsibility which [has been] described so well. I believe we are doing so in a partnership with the judiciary. And we cannot do so without that partnership. I truly believe that the record confirms that we are entering upon a new era of closer cooperation between the bar and the judiciary, which will lead to solid advances in the administration of justice in this decade and in the balance of this century."

The educational portion of the Conference offered six topics of which any three could be selected by the judges. Each topic was presented three times simultaneously with every other topic, except the panel discussion on video technology in the courts which was only presented once. Four topics were discussed by lecture while the remaining two topics were presented in seminar format. The executive committee established the following Conference committees to research and conduct the seminar:

- 1. Video Technology and the Courts. Demonstration of audio-video equipment and of its possible applications to courtroom use.
- Lecture on Individual Rights Under the 1970 Constitution. Exploration of the right to remedy and justice, to a healthy environment, to privacy and the various provisions prohibiting discrimination.
- III. Evidence Lecture. Competency of witnesses, qualifications of witnesses, limitations on direct and cross examination, and impeachment and rehabilitation.
- IV. Criminal Law Lecture. In depth analysis of recent developments in the law of search and seizure.
- V. Torts. *Pedrick* aftermath, special interrogatories, *voir dire*, jury size and quorum, and settlements.
- VI. Chancery Problems. Study of ecological actions, class actions, and temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions.

The second educational seminar for Illinois judges was held on February 2, 3 and 4, 1972 in Chicago for the appointed judiciary; i.e., the associate judges. The executive committee appointed a coordinating committee, chaired by Judge Glenn K. Seidenfeld and Judge Charles P. Horan, to organize and plan the seminar. A total of 241 judges were assembled for the three day seminar.

The Director of the Administrative Office, Roy O. Gulley, addressed the seminar on behalf of the Supreme Court, and he stressed the significance of the unified trial court system in Illinois:

"The National Conference on the judiciary made a consensus statement as to what a state court system should be. It sounds like the Illinois Constitution. [It stressed] that there should be a unified trial court and an intermediate appellate court, and statewide control over the operation of that court with statewide budgeting for the expenses of the judiciary . . [The statement provided] that there should be unquestioned administrative authority in the chief justice of the Supreme Court with a statewide court administrative staff to assist him in his administrative duties. Thirdly, it said [there] should be a professional judiciary composed of people who are adequately paid and who can devote fulltime [to judicial duties]. Illinois is the only state that fits the consensus statement of the National Conference."

The coordinating committee selected the following committees to research and present topics at the seminar. Each topic was presented twice, except the lectures on evidence and criminal law. These lectures were attended by all of the conferees, and following each lecture, the judges divided into small groups to discuss the content of the lectures.

- I. Procedures In Criminal and Ordinance Violation Cases. Comparison of procedures in misdemeanor and ordinance violation cases.
- II. Miscellaneous Actions. Discussion of mass arrest procedures, environmental actions, drug offenses, and obscenity offenses.
- III. Courtroom Decorum. Development of the law of contempt.
- IV. Recent Developments In the Law. Study of the implied consent act and "no fault" automobile legislation.
- V. Evidence Lecture. Discussion of the Illinois Deadman's Act and confidential communication privileges.
- VI. Criminal Law Lecture. In depth analysis of recent developments in the law of search and seizure.

The third educational program for judges was the New Judge Seminar, held in Chicago on December 14, 15 and 16, 1972, and attended by 28 recently appointed associate, circuit and Appellate Court judges. The seminar format offered a series of lectures, followed by question and answer periods. The new judges were addressed by Chief Justice Underwood, Justice Thomas E. Kluczynski, and Director Gulley. The lectures covered the topics:

- I. The Illinois Judicial System—Its Structure and Operation.
- II. The Trial and Judges' Authority.
- III. Search and Seizure.
- IV. Selected Topics of Evidence.
- V. Motions, Pleas of Guilty and Sentencing Under The New Code of Corrections.
The fourth educational program for judges was a series of regional seminars on criminal law. The executive committee appointed a committee on criminal law seminars for Illinois judges, chaired by Judge Richard Mills, to plan and obtain the necessary funds to conduct the seminars. The committee developed a program and requested the Supreme Court committee on criminal justice programs to apply for a grant of funds from the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. The grant was approved, and seminars were held in Mount Vernon and Chicago during 1971. A subsequent grant was approved and two seminars were held in Peoria, and one in Rockford with one planned for Mount Vernon in January 1973. Each seminar conducted discussion sessions on criminal motions, pleas of guilty and sentencing under the Unified Code of Corrections. The committee is also in the process of drafting a criminal law benchbook which will contain checklists, forms and readily available reference materials on the various stages of criminal court proceedings. Each seminar was limited to less than 40 judge participants, and from all indications, the seminars were very successful.

In addition to the considerable time devoted to judicial education, the executive committee spent long hours studying problems which face the judicial system. Some of the committee's decisions are highlighted here:

- (1) Urged the standing committees on probation and juvenile problems to seek employment of staff who would be paid from federal grant funds. The staff would be employees of the Supreme Court committee on criminal justice programs, but would be under the direction of the two named committees.
- (2) Studied the feasibility of upgrading court reporters' fees for transcripts.
- (3) Recommended continuation of regional criminal law seminars and requested the Supreme Court to authorize regional civil law seminars.
- (4) Recommended to the Supreme Court employment of a professional academic to staff the Conference.
- (5) Suggested that the Supreme Court reactivate the committee on judicial ethics.
- (6) Appointed a committee, chaired by Judge Marvin E. Aspen, to study the recommendations of the committee on procedures in criminal and ordinance violation cases. The recommendations would make the prosecution of ordinance violation cases subject to the Code of Criminal Procedure.
- (7) Appointed a committee, chaired by Judge Caswell Crebs to study the proper role of the judge when he is confronted with lawyers' conduct which is unethical or unprofessional in derogation of correct courtroom decorum.
- (8) Recommended to the Supreme Court that a committee be selected to study the law of evidence in Illinois in light of the proposed federal rules of evidence.
- (9) Recommended legislation to exempt every trial judge from receiving a copy of the Illinois Session Laws.

- (10) Studied the desirability of reorganizing the Conference with a view toward being able to offer the Supreme Court greater assistance in the area of planning seminars and making recommendations.
- (11) Heard a report on the videotape deposition studio in the courthouse in the city of Bloomington.

It is anticipated that the Illinois Judicial Conference, with the guidance of the Supreme Court, will continue to grow in stature and provide the judiciary of this State with continued leadership in judicial education and in suggesting recommendations to improve the administration of justice.

The Conference of Chief Circuit Judges

The Constitution of 1970, as well as the 1964 Judicial Article, created the office of chief judge. Subject to the Supreme Court, the chief judge of each circuit has a very responsible role in the administration of his circuit's business. As the day to day manager of the circuit court, the chief judge is immediately responsible for operating his circuit court in such a manner that the ends of justice on the trial court level are fully satisfied.

As an organized body, the State's 21 chief judges are something of an anamoly. In late 1963, shortly before the effective date of the 1964 Judicial Article, the Supreme Court convened the chief judges so that the transition from multiple trial courts to a unified circuit court would be a *fait accompli* prior to January 1, 1964. As an outgrowth of these first early meetings, the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges resulted. The Conference is a voluntary organization without a constitutional or statutory base, albeit the Juvenile Court Act provides that the Conference shall promulgate minimum standards of qualifications for juvenile probation officers, and Supreme Court Rule 552 provides that uniform traffic tickets shall be in forms approved by the Conference.

The Administrative Office acts as secretary to the Conference, and the Supreme Court has appointed Justice Thomas E. Kluczynski as its liaison officer to the Conference.

The regular meetings of the Conference present invaluable opportunities for the chief judges to discuss problems, to propose solutions thereto, and to compare notes on how each chief judge is managing his circuit court. In 1972, the Conference held six meetings. A principal concern of the Conference during its early meetings in 1972 was clarification of the chief judge's responsibility in certifying the qualifications of juvenile probation personnel so that counties could recover reimbursement from the State for part of their salaries under the Juvenile Court Act.

A committee of the Conference reviewed the qualifications set out in the standards promulgated by the Conference on June 17, 1966, and the committee proposed a procedure so that new chief judges would be aware of their responsibilities in certifying to recover State payments to counties for juvenile probation personnel. Several chief judges remarked that it was nearly impossible in smaller counties to obtain the services of fully qualified juvenile probation personnel and that their inability to obtain the services of fully qualified people made it impossible for them to obtain the reimbursement available from the State. Many chief judges urged that the standards be reduced somewhat so that personnel available to them could meet the standards. Nevertheless, the Conference voted not to lower or otherwise change the previously adopted standards and qualifications for juvenile probation personnel.

The chief judges adopted the following interpretations and definitions to supplement Section 6-7 of the Juvenile Court Act. The following is Section 6-7 (1) of the Juvenile Court Act and the interpretations of said Section approved by the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges in Chicago on October 27, 1972:

"JUVENILE COURT ACT, Section 6-7 (1). Before the 15th day of each month, beginning with August 1966, there shall be filed with the Auditor of Public Accounts an itemized statement of the amounts paid, by the county, probation district or counties cooperating informally under Section 6-2, as compensation for services rendered under this Act during the last preceding month to all full-time probation and other social service personnel including the Director and assistant directors of the Probation or Court Services Department, who were appointed or reappointed in accordance with minimum qualifications or criteria established by the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges under Section 6-5 and devoted at least one-half of their time during the month to services rendered under this Act." (Emphasis supplied.)

"Probation or other social service personnel means any person specifically appointed as probation officer or any appointed counselor or person actually engaged in rehabilitative work with juveniles in Children's Homes or Detention Homes, who are appointed and/or supervised by the Chief Probation Officer of the County or Circuit and specifically excludes any such person not so appointed and/or supervised. This would also specifically exclude persons working in Children's Homes and Detention Homes as cooks, housemothers, custodians, guards, directors, administrators, teachers, etc.

"Full time should be a minimum of 30 hours per week of actual working and/or ready availability at a specific place designated by the chief judge or assigned judge. This would mean 4-1/3 weeks x 30 hours which would equal 130 hours per month minimum.

"Devote at least one-half of their time during the month to services rendered under this Act, would then mean at least one-half of their time, or 65 hours per month, would have to be at work or readily available at a specific place designated by the chief judge or assigned judge for services rendered under the Juvenile Court Act.

"In order for a county to be reimbursed for any personnel under this Juvenile Court Act, the personnel must first meet the following minimum standards adopted on June 17, 1966, by the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges under Section 6-5 of the Juvenile Court Act, since these are re-adopted without change."

Minimum Standards for Juvenile Probation and Court Services Department Personnel

As provided in Paragraph 3 of Sec. 6-5 of the Illinois Juvenile Court Act – PERSONNEL OF PROBATION AND COURT SERVICES DEPARTMENTS – the following state-wide minimum qualifications are adopted for Directors and Assistant Directors of Probation or Court Services Departments and for Probation Officers and other social service personnel employed for purposes of this Act:

a. Experience, Education and Alternatives

1. *Past Experiences:* Persons who on January 1, 1966 previously have been employed for a period of two consecutive years immediately preceding January 1, 1966 in the Juvenile Court or Court Services Department for a county or an entire circuit are automatically qualified for re-appointment, provided they had devoted at least one-half of their working time during each month of this period to the services provided by their respective departments.

2. *Past and Future Experience:* Persons presently employed when they complete two years of service after January 1, 1966 shall be considered as meeting minimum qualifications.

3. Education and Alternatives: Any person employed by the Probation or Court Services Department of any county or circuit after January 1, 1966 shall have completed four full years of formal college training or obtained a degree. However, the following alternatives shall be considered equivalent to four years or a degree:

aa. Four years or more of supervised full-time experience in personal work with juveniles or social work with families, and some evidence of formal training during this period.

bb. Two years of college with social work, education, psychology, or other related subjects, and two or more years employed in social work with juveniles.

b. *General Requirements:* All appointees shall be required to demonstrate:

1. Devotion to principles of Public Service.

2. Capacity to learn by experience.

3. Fundamental capacity for and interest in the welfare of human beings.

4. Good character and balanced personality with ability to work with others.

5. Possession of or ability to obtain a valid Illinois Driver's License.

The method of selecting new personnel for vacancies should be set forth by the chief judge in each circuit, as long as the appointment meets the requisite qualifications. This could be done by an oral and/or written examination and other testing methods; or the applicant may be appointed without examination as long as he has the required qualifications. Further requirements such as physical, citizenship and residences may further be established by the chief circuit judge of his circuit.

A copy of this and any other amendments and changes concerning the minimum qualifications shall be forwarded to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and also to the Office of the Auditor of Public Accounts [now the Office of the Comptroller], Springfield, Illinois, as they are adopted by the Conference of the Chief Circuit Judges. Adopted June 17, 1966.

Other 1972 highlights of the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges include:

(1) Appointment of a subcommittee to study and report on the question of whether a uniform rule should be promulgated to require or not require the automatic preparation of verbatim transcripts of prove ups in default divorce cases and proofs of heirship in probate matters. It was unanimously agreed that even if a court reporter is entitled to a fee for automatic preparation of a transcript in any case, no money should pass from an attorney or a litigant to a court reporter while they were in the courtroom.

(2) A report from the subcommittee on automatic preparation of transcripts. The subcommittee recommended that "each circuit should have discretion as to whether transcripts should be automatically prepared in default divorce cases, and that each county within a circuit be given the discretion as to whether transcripts should be automatically prepared in the probate of wills and proof of heirship cases."

(3) Appointment of a subcommittee, chaired by Judge Richard T. Carter, to study the powers and duties of the office of chief judge and to develop a manual which might be used by new chief judges as a guide to their functions in that office.

(4) A presentation by the executive director of the John Howard Association on proposed changes in the organization of probation services in the State of Illinois.

(5) A discussion on a new system by which a computer in the Office of the Secretary of State makes immediately available in the courtroom (over closed circuit video communication) the record of a traffic offender for the use of the sentencing judge after an offender has been found guilty.

(6) A report on the results of a detailed survey on the method used for jury selection in the 102 counties of Illinois. The survey, conducted by Judge James O. Monroe of the Third Circuit, sought to determine the degree of uniformity, if any, used in the jury selection process throughout the State.

(7) A review of the operation of the First Municipal District's *pro se* small claims section. A copy of the order creating the section was distributed to each chief judge.

The Conference has selected Richard T. Carter, Chief Judge of the 20th Circuit, as its chairman for a term ending in 1973.

Introduction

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 verbiage 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 fourteen 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 the judges of all the courts in the State and court-related personnel. In addition to the Director, the office employs six persons (three of whom are lawyers) on a managerial or supervisory level, with the balance of employees serving in various supporting capacities.

The many duties performed by this office are not all easily reducible to writing; however, some of the more prominent functions of this office are summarized below. Generally, the Constitution provides for the obligations of the Administrative Office as directed by the Chief Justice; yet by Supreme Court order or rule or by legislative enactments, the office has been delegated specific functions. Additionally, the office has assumed other duties relating to the courts by necessity or by default or for the simplistic reason that this office is the "logical place" to execute a given responsibility.

Fiscal

An integral part of the structure of the Administrative Office is the accounting division which administers monies appropriated by the legislature to the judicial system. Monthly reports are submitted to the Supreme Court reflecting the expenditures of funds for salaries, travel for judges and court reporters, transcript fees, and general operational costs. The division is supervised by Jeanne Meeks of the Springfield office.

Annual budgets with written justifications are prepared and submitted to both the House of Representatives and to the Senate for approval. Illinois is the only state in the Union where the legislative body appropriates funds for the operational costs of the judicial system directly to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court administers funds allocated for the operational costs of the Supreme and Appellate Courts, Administrative Office, Judicial Conference, travel for judges and court reporters, transcription fees, and other appropriations relative to the functions of the judiciary.

The unique appropriation of funds directly to the Supreme Court is administered by the accounting division which prepares payrolls, maintains payroll controls, registers and ledgers, enters monthly activities to each employee posting sheet, and completes detailed insurance reports on a semi-monthly and monthly basis.

The voucher section of the accounting division audits all vouchers submitted for payment which are encumbered by the Supreme and Appellate Courts, Administrative Office, Judicial Conference, travel and transcription fees, as well as for expenses of other allied accounts which are the responsibility of the Supreme Court. All records of the carefully designed accounting system are referred to and maintained on a daily basis. Exclusive of the payrolls, the accounting division processed approximately 13,000 vouchers during fiscal year 1972.

Every year since 1964, the monies appropriated by the General Assembly to the judicial branch have increased (see chart on cost analysis). Part of the increase is attributed to higher salaries to the judges; however, by statute and court decision or rule, the judiciary has assumed expanded responsibilities. Some of the significant causes of larger appropriations to the judiciary include:

(1) Prior to the Judicial Article, elected circuit court judges were assigned by the Supreme Court to serve as judges of the Appellate Court. In November of 1964, judges were elected to the Appellate Court, and their salaries and office expenses are reflected in the expenditures commencing July, 1965.

(2) On January 1, 1966, all formerly county paid court reporters became a part of the State judicial system and were paid at the existing salary rate which had been certified by the county treasurers.

CHART ON COST ANALYSIS OF THE ILLINOIS JUDICIAL SYSTEM 1964 – 1972



125

Appropriated funds for Fiscal Year 1972 - in millions of dollars \$5,987.3



* The cost of administering the Judicial System is .4 of 1 percent of the total State Budget for fiscal year 1972.

(3) New legislation amending the Court Reporters Act mandated that proficiency examinations be administered and that salaries be determined by classification according to proficiency rank. During February, 1966, the first proficiency examinations for court reporters were given and salary adjustments were made in March, 1966.

(4) The former police magistrates and justices of the peace were phased out of the system by 1967. Consequently, salaries for newly appointed magistrates are reflected in the increase.

(5) The history of the appropriation for transcription fees in the State of Illinois is one of gargantuan growth over the past eight years. The increase in the number of free transcripts furnished to indigent defendants has been brought about by decisions of the United States Supreme Court, which continues to expand those areas in which free transcripts must be ordered. In addition to felony cases, transcripts are now ordered in both juvenile and misdemeanor cases.

(6) Supreme Court assignments of judges to districts and circuits other than their own, in addition to routine assignments which necessitate travel, have increased travel costs.

Salaries for judicial and related personnel for the period ending September 30, 1972, were an aggregate of \$20,360,796.31. Operational costs of the Supreme and Appellate Courts, Administrative Office, Judicial Conference, and allied appropriations amounted to \$2,905,851.84. The total State funds expended for this period amounted to \$23,266,648.15. This figure represents .4% of the total State expenditure for fiscal year 1972 (see chart).

The accounting division is audited each fiscal year by independent accountants who scrutinize the accounting procedures, internal controls, and all ledgers. To date, no recommendations for procedural changes have been made by the auditors. The formulation of the accounting procedures of the office has been accomplished through hard work, tight controls, and constant vigilance. The accounting division's accounting system has been praised by certified public accountants, who have made annual audits, as the model fiscal system in the State. Credit for the success of this system is due to the division's diligent and faithful employees who continue to contribute to the efficient operation of the carefully designed system. The function and procedures of the accounting division will continue to be reviewed, evaluated and revised as dictated by the expanding responsibilities of the judicial system.

Secretariat

The dictionary defines secretariat as an "office entrusted with administrative duties, maintaining records, and overseeing or performing secretarial duties." That definition is inadequate and incomplete insofar as it applies to the Administrative Office acting as secretary to a host of committees and conferences. For in addition to arranging meetings, recording minutes and keeping records, the office acts as a fact finding body, does research, conducts surveys and apprises judges of recent developments in procedural and substantive law. Some of the committees served by the Administrative Office are: (1) Illinois Judicial Conference. Rule 41 designates the Administrative Office as secretary to the Conference. The office handles all details for the regular 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 to conduct the Judge Seminar and the Associate Judge Seminar and validates expense accounts. Also, the office services the coordinating committee and the subcommittees which research topics for the seminars.

(2) Conference of Chief Circuit Judges. The office prepares agendas, arranges meetings, assists in drafting proposed traffic rule amendments, 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) Committee on Probation in Illinois and Committee on Juvenile Problems. The office arranges meetings and provides limited research assistance to these two standing committees of the Judicial Conference. The Juvenile Problems Committee is currently revising motion, order, presentence report, etc. forms to comply with the provisions of the Unified Code of Corrections. It is anticipated that both of the committees will receive additional staff assistance in 1973.

Recordkeeping

Prior to the adoption of the 1964 Judicial Article, little effort had been made to modernize or simplify the archaic and antiquated method of making and preserving records in the trial court. The basic recordkeeping system prior to 1964 was provided for by statutes enacted in 1874.

In 1963, the Illinois State Bar Association formed a committee to develop a modern and efficient approach to recordkeeping. The committee was formed from all segments of the court system: lawyers, judges, clerks, court administrators, certified public accountants and land title experts. The bar association committee subsequently gained the full support of the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office.

After a thorough study of the old recordkeeping system, the committee concluded that (a) each of the 102 counties in the State maintained its own individually stylized recordkeeping methods, and (b) recordkeeping should be uniform throughout the State. Subsequently, the General Assembly was asked to amend the recordkeeping statute. In 1965 enabling legislation passed which provided that the statutory recordkeeping system could be changed by Supreme Court rule or administrative order.

A manual on recordkeeping was proposed; and after extensive study and revision, the Supreme Court approved the manual in 1968. The manual, which contains specimen

UNIFORM RECORDKEEPING IN THE CIRCUIT COURTS



forms to be used for all records and detailed instructions to implement the required procedures, was revised during 1972 by the staff of the Administrative Office to incorporate changes which were based upon the experiences gained in working with the system in the clerks' offices. In cooperation with the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, the Administrative Office, through the Supreme Court committee on criminal justice programs, was awarded a grant of funds to publish the recordkeeping manual. Copies of the manual are now readily available and have been distributed to all of the circuit court clerks, the chief circuit judges and out of state judicial personnel.

Prior to 1972, the Administrative Office assisted the clerks in 33 counties in installing the recordkeeping system. During 1972, six additional counties were brought under the system. Assistant director Jerry Gott of the Administrative Office, a former circuit court clerk, personally supervised the installation in the following counties: In the Ninth Judicial Circuit – Hancock, Henderson, Knox and McDonough (with the exception of Fulton County, the Ninth Circuit is now totally operating under the new recordkeeping system). In the Fourth Judicial Circuit and in the Tenth Judicial Circuit, Jasper County and Stark County became the first counties in their respective circuits to implement the recordkeeping system.

With the addition of the above named six counties, the recordkeeping system is now in operation in 39 of the State's 102 counties. The other downstate counties continue to maintain their records in accordance with statutory provisions until such time as the recordkeeping system provided by the Supreme Court's order becomes effective in each of these counties by administrative directive.

The development of the uniform recordkeeping system as it relates to maintaining the case files, indexes and other records has been recited in prior reports. Equally, and perhaps even more important to the Supreme Court's program and effort directed toward improving the recordkeeping operation of the circuit courts and the clerks' offices, has been the development of a financial recordkeeping system.

The circuit courts, through the respective clerk's office in each county, have been maintaining in some acceptable form the case files and records of the proceedings which have transpired in court. Experience has shown, however, that in many counties the clerk's office has not maintained adequate financial records. The Supreme Court's order requiring a uniform financial recordkeeping system, the prescribed forms and procedures developed by the Administrative Office with the assistance of David H. Veach, C.P.A., and the detailed written instructions contained in the manual on recordkeeping have provided for the first time a sound and systematic bookkeeping operation for all circuit clerks' offices. Now, records and procedures readily conform to generally accepted accounting principles, and the records contain the accounting information required to comply with the statutes relating to financial reports and audits.

The importance and success of the uniform financial recordkeeping system can perhaps best be measured by its acceptance by the clerks as well as by the auditing personnel in those counties in which the procedures have been implemented. In many of these counties the auditor is finding for the first time a system of records that meets all auditing requirements. The recordkeeping system, which has attracted nationwide interest, is a sound, practical, efficient and economical approach to managing the courts; and the system will be further improved and refined as its use becomes more commonplace.

Official Court Reporters

Since January 1, 1966, all official court reporters in the State have been supervised and paid by the Administrative Office. By statute, court reporters are qualified by testing their proficiency in taking the spoken word and reducing it to writing. The tests and standards are devised by the Administrative Office in accordance with accepted criteria promulgated by the court reporting profession. The tests are administered by the Administrative Office at least twice every year. To date, 1,432 reporters have attempted to qualify either for appointment as official court reporters or for advancement to a higher official pay level.

Tests are composed of three parts. The "A" test requires the greatest proficiency, while the other two tests are less demanding. Each test consists of "Q & A" and a legal opinion (the former being given on a two-voice basis) which are dictated by professional instructors. No official court reporter may remain in the system unless he has eventually passed a test. Those who have performed satisfactorily in the test may be appointed by the circuit court as official court reporters.

The Supreme Court determines the number of court reporters in each circuit, and the Court may allocate additional court reporters upon a showing of need. The statute sets out the criteria for the number of court reporters in the circuits, and the Administrative Director can recommend to the Supreme Court employment of additional court reporters. As of December 31, 1972, there were 355 official court reporters in Illinois, of whom 16 were on a part-time basis.

During 1972, a total of five court reporter proficiency examinations were administered – three in Chicago and two at Illinois State University in Normal. Of the 128 test applicants, 29 passed the "A" test and 20 passed the "B" test. The paucity of successful applicants in 1972 and in previous years has caused great concern. Despite the fact that the number of court reporters allocated to and hired by the circuit courts throughout the State has increased substantially over the last eight years, the shortage of qualified official court reporters is still a critical problem in Illinois. It is apparent that unless more qualified court reporters are employed, appropriate measures will have to be taken to record the proceedings in a trial by some substitute method.

In an effort to alleviate this problem, the Supreme Court during 1972 considered a proposal which will allow the Administrative Office to apply for a grant of federal monies to conduct an experimental project using computers to translate court reporters' stenograph machine notes and automatically produce a typewritten English transcript. The theory behind this project is as follows: When a court reporter strikes the keys of a stenograph machine, he makes an electronic tape in addition to the symbols printed on paper. The electronic tape when fed into a computer will translate the stenographic symbols into English words. It is anticipated that this project will get underway some time during 1973.

If the experiment is a success, it might eventually be possible to dramatically reduce the delay in preparing trial transcripts and make more efficient use of court reporters' time. For example, time presently spent typing or dictating transcript could be used for taking testimony in court.

The Supreme Court also authorized a grant funded project to survey the court reporting profession to determine the most efficient means available to recruit and train qualified official court reporters. The survey will examine the motivation and the physical and mental qualifications of the best qualified official court reporters in the State and as a result attempt to determine, in advance, whether young people, who show interest in becoming court reporters, have the basic qualifications which might insure that they will become fully qualified with proper training. When the survey is complete, it is anticipated that the Administrative Office will be authorized to seek additional grant funds to implement the findings of the survey and to stimulate interest in the court reporting profession among qualified young people in the State of Illinois.

Depending on demonstrated proficiency, experience and the population of the area served, official court reporters are paid up to \$13,000 per annum, exclusive of fees for preparing transcripts. On September 29, 1972, the Supreme Court revised the fee schedule for transcripts, and adopted the following uniform schedule of charges:

"In accordance with Section 5 of the Court Reporter Act, as amended (III. Rev. Stat. 1971, ch. 37, para. 655), the Supreme Court adopts the following Uniform Schedule of Charges for Official Court Reporters' Transcripts of evidence and proceedings.

- 1. Charges shall be computed on a 'per page' basis.
- 2. Each page for which a charge is to be made shall meet the following minimum standards:

A page shall be 81/2 inches by 11 inches in size. The left-hand margin shall be not more than 11/4 inches from the left-hand edge of the paper and the right-hand margin shall not be more than ³/₄ inch from the right-hand edge of the paper. Each page shall be prenumbered on the left-hand margin and shall contain a minimum of 24 lines of type. The first line of any question or any answer may be indented not more than five spaces from the left-hand margin; the first line of any paragraph or other material may be indented not more than ten spaces from the left-hand margin. There shall not be more than one space between each word nor more than two spaces between each sentence. Type pitch shall be not less than 9 characters per inch.

3. *Charges for Regular Copy Delivery:* (Delivery during the period allowed by law or rule or any extensions thereof).

(a) Original	\$.85 per page
(b)Copies	\$.35 per page

4. *Daily Copy Delivery:* (Delivery within 24 hours after the close of proceedings or, during proceedings, before noon on the day following proceedings to be transcribed and delivered).

(a) Original	\$1.25 per page
(b)Copies	\$.60 per page

5. Orders for daily copy must be approved by the Judge to whom the case is assigned. If the Judge to whom the case is assigned is unavailable, a Judge of the circuit to which the case is assigned may enter an order allowing the official court reporter to prepare daily copy."

During 1972, the Supreme Court, through the Chief Justice, also entered an administrative order, effective September 1, 1972, which affected official court reporters as well as other salaried employees of the Illinois judiciary. The order requires that all "salaried employees of the Illinois judiciary, including official court reporters must be bona fide residents of the State of Illinois."

Teller of Elections

The Director acts as a teller of judicial elections in two areas. By agreement of the circuit judges, several circuits have the Administrative Office mail out ballots and tabulate the votes in elections to select the chief judge of the circuit.

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. 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 1972, the Director certified that the following persons had been selected as associate judges:

- Third Circuit Thomas R. Gibbons and Arthur Greenwood
- Fifth Circuit Richard E. Scott
- Tenth Circuit William H. Young
- Thirteenth Circuit John D. Zwanzig

- Fourteenth Circuit Joseph G. Carpentier and Henry W. McNeal
- Fifteenth Circuit Alan W. Cargerman and Martin D. Hill
- Seventeenth Circuit Michael R. Morrison
- Eighteenth Circuit Helen C. Kinney and Charles R. Norgle, Sr.
- Nineteenth Circuit Thomas F. Baker, Warren G. Fox and Robert K. McQueen
- Cook County Anthony Bosco, John Breen, Martin Brodkin, Irwin Cohen, James Condon, Myron Gomberg, John Hogan, John Murphy, William Peterson, Joseph Schwaba and Thomas Walsh.

Public Information and Publications

One of the time consuming duties of the Administrative Office is its contact with the public, organizations interested in the Illinois court system and the news media. People constantly telephone, write or appear at the office to inquire about specific litigation or about the general organization of the judicial system. It is the policy of the Administrative Office to supply each inquirer with a complete answer to questions which he may ask about the Illinois courts. The office is of the firm belief that it must be oriented to serve the public. This philosophy has enhanced the reputation of the Administrative Office in Illinois and in sister states.

Because the Illinois courts are a model among judicial systems, citizens, judges, lawyers and court administrators from the other states and from foreign nations are constantly visiting the office and the courts throughout the State. An important function of the office is to discuss the court system with the visitors and arrange visits to courthouses and interviews with judges. The Director, or his assistants, is asked to address civic groups, bar associations, legislative commissions, and court reform organizations to tell the Illinois story regarding the operation of the unified trial court. Some of the organizations which were addressed in 1972 were: Southeastern Illinois Bar Association; Iowa Institute on Judicial Nominating Commissions; Third National Conference on Judicial Disability and Removal; Edgar County Bar Association and civic groups; Rend Lake Dedication; Utah Nominating Commissioners Institute; National Conference of Court Administrative Officers; Citizens Conference of South Dakota; and the Lawyers Shrine Club of Chicago.

The Administrative Office 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.

Legislation

In addition to appearing before the appropriation committees of the legislature regarding the judicial budget of the State, the Director regularly appears before the Judicial Advisory Council of the legislature. The Director's advice is sought on proposed legislation which may affect the courts or its personnel. The Director also frequently appears before the judiciary committees of the House and Senate to testify on bills affecting court procedure and the number of judicial officers required to maintain currency in the disposition of litigation.

The Administrative Office has developed a sound working relationship with the legislature and the Governor's office, and the office operates as a clearing house for information between the judicial branch of government and the legislative and executive branches. This flow of information and data is constantly maintained and updated, and the Director is in close communication with the Supreme Court, apprising the justices of the status of legislation.

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.

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 1971, two programs were conducted. This year two additional visits were arranged at the Industrial School for Boys at Sheridan and the Illinois State Penitentiary at Menard. In conjunction with the latter institution, the judges visited the Illinois Security Hospital in Chester. The programs were held on April 7, 1972 and October 28, 1972 respectively. A total of 50 judges attended the programs.

Each program ran for a full day, and the judges were given access to institutional buildings, including vocational workshops, cell-houses and isolation units. The judges freely mixed and conversed with inmates and wards. Both visits ended with a question and answer period in which the Director of Corrections, the Chairman of the Parole and Pardon Board, and institutional administrators participated.

Of particular interest to the judges was the psychiatric

division of the Menard Penitentiary. Here, Dr. Brelje, the head of the division, discussed current programs to treat sexually dangerous persons and those inmates who are certified in need of mental treatment. He emphasized that few convicted defendants are committed under the Illinois sexually dangerous persons act, but that many defendants convicted of other crimes are in fact sexually dangerous. Also noted was the fact that the division conducts therapeutic programs for inmates in need of mental treatment and for those who are mentally retarded and exhibit continuing criminal propensities.

Impartial Medical Expert Rule

The Administrative Office is charged with administering Supreme Court Rule 215(d). The accompanying statistical summaries illustrate that the rule continues to be utilized on a selective basis and that the trial courts are ordering impartial examinations where in the opinion of the judge such an examination will materially aid in a just determination of the case.

The 1972 Statistical Summary reveals some rather dramatic results in utilization of the rule as compared to previous years. For the first time in its twelve year history, more 215(d) orders were entered in divorce cases than in any other type of litigation. All of the 63 orders invoked in divorce matters during 1972 were entered by the Divorce Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County; and most of these orders were entered by two judges in the post-decree section of the Division. A typical order entered by Judges Robert Buckley or David Linn (these two judges accounted for 53 orders in divorce cases), provided that the parents and children be psychiatrically examined to determine whether the parents were mentally and/or emotionally competent to have custody of or visitation rights with their children.

Of the 133 impartial examinations performed in 1972, nearly 83% were psychiatric examinations, and most of these involved divorce related cases. Since there is a limited number of psychiatrists on the impartial expert panel, the State Medical Society requested those psychiatrists to perform many more examinations than would have been required if the panel contained a larger number of qualified specialists in psychiatry. The trend, and therefore the need for psychiatrists, is expected to continue, and the State Medical Society is increasing its efforts to place additional qualified psychiatrists on the panel.

During 1972, a case involving Rule 215(d) was appealed to the Illinois Appellate Court for the Fourth District. The opinion in *Estell* v. *Barringer*, 3 Ill.App.3d 455, 278 N.E. 2d 424, is interesting in that it is illustrative of the highly qualified physicians who are appointed pursuant to the rule. Dr. Ruge was appointed as the impartial neuro-surgical expert; and as Judge Richard Mills, writing for the majority, noted, "No question whatever was raised as to the neurosurgical expertise of Dr. Ruge..." (at page 427).

The Cumulative Statistical Summary set out in this report is self-explanatory; but it should be noted that the number of Impartial Medical Expert (IME) examinations scheduled exceeds the number of IME orders since some orders provided for more than one party to be examined.

The 1972 Statistical Summary is similar to the Cumula-

tive Summary, but contains additional information, and several items should be explained: The fact that the number of IME examinations exceeds the number of IME orders entered during 1972, is explained by considering that some orders provided for examinations of more than one party in the case and that two 1971 orders resulted in examinations in 1972, although seventeen 1972 orders provided for 1973 examinations.

Further, the IME panelists' average fee per examination includes costs ancillary to the examination, e.g., pathology, radiology, psychology, etc. However, where an IME physician used the services of another medical specialist, no recordation was made for the second physician's specialty unless his services were more than incidental to completing the examination.

Representation By Supervised Senior Law Students

Supreme Court Rule 711, which the Administrative Office administers, has been in effect 43 months. Law school deans continue to regard the Rule 711 program as a very important part of the student's total education and preparation to practice law as well as a positive contribution to persons who might otherwise receive no legal assistance.

During 1972, an additional 453 temporary licenses were issued to senior law students as compared to 339 licenses in 1971 - a 30% increase. The number of licensed law students and their law schools for 1972 follows.

IIT — Chicago-Kent College of Law	104
University of Illinois	98
DePaul University	87
Northwestern University	40
University of Chicago	37
Loyola University — Chicago	34
John Marshall Law School	24
St. Louis University	11
Washington University – St. Louis	4
Notre Dame University	3
Indiana University	2
Valparaiso University	1
Rutgers	1
University of Michigan	1
Drake University	1
University of San Diego	1
Yale Law School	1
University of Santa Clara	1
University of Iowa	1
Georgetown University	1

Rule 711 provides that the services authorized therein may only be carried on in the course of the student's work with one or more of the following organizations or programs:

"(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."

Agencies with which 711 students were associated during 1972 are as follows:

Subject											
Orders Entered During 1972	Downstate (10)				Circuit Co	ourt of Cook C (89)	99				
Action	Adoption (1) Juvenile (2) Probate (1)	Crimir (7)	Civil- Criminal Personal Injury (7) (25)			Divorce-Custody (63)					
Frequency of Use by Judges	10 different jud in 20 different cas	-	10 judges in 10 cases	3 judge in 9 case	in	ir	-	1 judge in 32 cases	99	ŝ	
IME Exams Scheduled	Cases Settled Prior to Trial (2)	Ex					nations Actually Perf (133)	ormed		149	
Type of Medical Specialist	Ophthalmolog Otolaryngolog Urology (1)		Orthopedics Internal (3) Medicine (4)					hiatry 10)	133		
Frequency of Use of Panelists	10 different each used			3 panelists 1 panelis used twice used 3 tin			anelist 4 times	1 panelist used 5 times	1 panelist used 12 times 1 panelist used 19 times 1 panelist used 25 times 1 panelist used 49 times	133	
Panelist's Testimony Required at Trial and Average Fee	Cases (13) Average Fee (\$173.00)	13	13					1			
Panelist's Average Fee (Including Ancillary Costs)		Downstate	ownstate—\$82.00 per exam				ounty—\$	68.00 per exam			
Orders Entered During 1971	Downstate (9)		Circuit Court of Cook Count (25)				34		-		

1972 STATISTICAL SUMMARY

CUMULATIVE STATISTICAL SUMMARY

(January 1970 – December 1972)

Total Orders Entered	Downstate Circuit Court of Coo (35) (144)			k County	1	179 🔹				
Action	Adoption Juvenile (Probate (2)	Criminal (18)		Divorce-Custody (70)		Civil-Personal Injury (87)		179	÷
IME Exams Scheduled	Cases Sett Prior to Trial (5	C		incelled Exams (21)			Ex	aminations Actually Performed (214)		
Panelist's Testimony Required at Trial	Cases (16)	16								
Panelist's Average Fee (Including Ancillary Costs and Testimony)		atewide O per exa	m				Ĩ			
Type of Medical Specialist	Ophthalm Otolaryng Urology (ology (3)	Me	ternal edicine (5)	Neurology (23)		opedics 41)	Psychi (13		214

Public Agencies

County Public Defender Offices and the	
Illinois Defender Project	106
County State's Attorneys' Offices	48
Attorney General's Office	26
Municipal Legal Departments	23
1st Municipal District of Cook County	
Circuit Court	2
Cook County Public Aid	1
Manteno State Hospital Legal Aid	1
Equal Opportunity Employment Commission	1
Private Agencies	
Mandel Legal Aid Clinic	30
Northwestern University Law Clinic	34
Cook County Legal Assistance Foundation	21
DePaul University Law Clinic	20
Land of Lincoln Legal Aid Bureau	11
Legal Aid Society of Chicago	7
University of Illinois Clinic	6
Legal Aid Societies (unspecified)	6
United Charities-Legal Aid Bureau	6
Chicago Volunteer Legal Services Foundation	6 5 5 4
Community Legal Counsel Office	5
Illinois Migrant Legal Assistance Project	4
Champaign County Legal Services	4
Illinois Migrant Council	2 2
Cook County Special Bail Project	2
Legal Assistance Foundation of Champaign	
County	2
Civil Legal Aid Clinic of the Foundation	
for the New Business Ethic	2
Lawndale Legal Services Bureau	1
Legal Aid of St. Clair County	1
Madison County Legal Services	1
The Ark	1

Judicial Economic Statements

The Administrative Director is directed in Supreme Court Rule 68 to be custodian of certain statements which every judge is required to file.

The rule provides that "a judge shall 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 names of the corporations and other businesses in which he or members of his immediate family have a financial interest." The sealed statements cannot be disclosed except on order of the Supreme Court or Courts Commission. The unsealed statements may be revealed to any party in a case where specific information is requested as to whether the presiding judge or members of his immediate family had a financial interest in the outcome of the case or in the corporation or business which was a party to the case.

Judicial Statistics

Nearly 75 years ago, Oliver Wendell Holmes remarked, "For the rational study of the law the black-letter man may be the man of the present, but the man of the future is the man of statistics and the master of economics." As far as the judicial system is concerned, Justice Holmes' prophetic statement is a reality today. There is, perhaps, no more accurate method of determining the progression and disposition of caseloads than by compiling numbers and analyzing them.

The Administrative Office receives from every division and department in the Circuit Court of Cook County monthly reports which, in general, show the number, kind, and disposition of cases handled by the judges. The judges of the other twenty circuits also file monthly reports which additionally indicate the amount of time spent on their cases. Detailed reports are also received from the clerks of the circuit courts and Appellate Court. The reports are analyzed for correctness and tabulated by Mr. Clarence Hellwig in Chicago and assistant director Jerry Gott of Springfield. Monthly reports showing the trend of cases in Cook County are issued and a periodic report is published for the downstate circuits. In addition, the office receives regular reports from the Appellate Court.

The reports are valuable for many obvious reasons; however, one truly significant advantage to the reports is that they enable the Supreme Court, through the Director, to assign on a temporary or permanent basis judges to Appellate Court districts and to judicial circuits where the caseloads are so heavy as to delay timely disposition. Thus, as Justice Holmes prophesied, statistics have permitted the Illinois Supreme Court and its Administrative Director to master the economy of judicial manpower.

Other Duties of the Administrative Office

Some of the other duties of the office which the Director and his assistants perform are summarized below:

(A) Suggest amendments to Supreme Court rules and recommend legislation where appropriate.

(B) Keep the judiciary informed of current legislation, rule changes and decisions emanating from the federal and State courts of review.

(C) Advise the Secretary of State and Governor's office of judicial vacancies created by death, retirement, or resignation.

(D) Reply to correspondence from inmates at the State penitentiaries.

(E) Act as a repository of rules adopted by the Appellate and the circuit courts, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 21.

(F) Meet formally with the Supreme Court during each of its five terms and more frequently if necessary. These administrative sessions are guided by an agenda prepared by the Director, and they serve to keep the Court informed of recent developments in the court system and provide guidance to the Director as to the action he should take regarding administrative problems.

(G) Arrange for judges to attend judicial education programs outside of Illinois; e.g., National College of the State Judiciary.

(H) Arrange for the State Attorney General to represent judges who are named as defendants in law suits. Many of these cases are filed in the federal and State courts by inmates of the State penitentiary system and by other disgruntled litigants.

Membership in Organizations

The Administrative Office, Director and/or his assistants maintain membership or are participants in the following organizations:

(1) The Director is a member of the Council On The Diagnosis And Evaluation Of Criminal Defendants. The Council is a creature of the legislature, and one of its purposes is to draft a correctional code for Illinois. A major portion of the Council's work was completed with the enactment into law of the Unified Code of Corrections. The Council is now engaged in preparing legislation which would create a statewide probation system to be administered by the Administrative Office.

(2) The Director by appointment of the Governor is a commissioner of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. This is the State agency which oversees the allocation of federal funds granted by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

(3) The Governor's Traffic Safety Coordinating Committee. By statute, the Director is a member of this committee.

(4) The Conference of State Court Administrators. The Director additionally serves as chairman of the Conference's committee on federal-state relations. (5) The Director serves on the Board of Directors of the American Judicature Society.

(6) Council of State Governments.

(7) By order of the Supreme Court, the Director is an ex officio member of the Supreme Court Committee on Criminal Justice Programs. This committee has an executive secretary and staff and is funded by the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. It is charged with studying and proposing recommendations in the area of criminal and juvenile justice.

(8) The Institute of Judicial Administration.

(9) National Conference of Trial Court Administrators.

(10) American, Illinois State and Chicago Bar Associations.

(11) Uniform Circuit Court Rules Committee of the State Bar Association.

(12) Judicial Administration Section of the State Bar Association.

(13) National advisory committee on video tape in the courts.

(14) The Illinois Parole, Probation and Correctional Association.

(15) Probation Services Council of Illinois.

CONCLUSION

As this report clearly illustrates, 1972 was a busy and fruitful year, particularly for the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office. Much was accomplished in the form of administering the court system, shepherding legislation through the General Assembly, and executing new and old duties in the Administrative Office. We anticipate that the Court will continue to be occupied in the coming years with questions arising under the 1970 Constitution which require adjudication by the State's highest court. Because the Court's mandatory appellate jurisdiction is not as burdensome under the new Constitution as it was under the 1964 Judicial Article, we believe the Court will be able to devote substantially more of its time to administration of the entire judicial system. Therefore, we foresee substantial demands being made upon the Administrative Office to assist the Chief Justice in his administrative duties.

Illinois has what we firmly believe to be the soundest court structure in the nation. We have the basic implements to permit the judiciary and the Administrative Office to make great progress in the efficient administration of justice. Our praises have been sung many times by judges, lawyers and court administrators throughout this nation. In such an environment, it is not uncommon for human nature to relax, to bask in the glory, and to rest on its laurels. We are determined that Illinois will continue to push ahead.

We are resolute in our determination that the Supreme Court, with the assistance of its Administrative Office, will be in the forefront of resolving administrative problems as they arise as well as planning for the future needs of the Illinois judiciary and its citizenry. Solutions must be found to eliminate the official court reporter shortage, to accelerate the disposition of cases on appeal, to amplify the statistical process especially in criminal and juvenile cases, to construct new court facilities and refurbish antiquated courthouses, to provide for a more effective utilization of probation officers, and to adequately fund the judicial system to meet its present and future needs.

It is a highly valued tradition and obligation for the judges of Illinois to look to the Supreme Court for leadership and guidance. Custom dictates that opinions of the Supreme Court are the law, and the precepts enuciated in those opinions are to be implemented by the courts. This type of leadership, of course, is extremely important, but by its limited nature, it is probably not the most acceptable manner to resolve administrative problems which do not lend themselves to the formal judicial process. Sound management necessarily infers decision-making within a reasonable time frame. Problems must be identified and solved before they become a crisis. The alternative to aggressive judicial administration is passivity and a shrinking of the public's confidence in the court system.

With the help of the legislative and executive branches of government, we believe the judicial branch can and will provide Illinois with a court system which will more efficiently and justly serve the requirements and best interests of its citizens.

Respectfully submitted,

Roy O. Gulley DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE ILLINOIS COURTS à. -

CASE LOADS AND STATISTICAL RECORDS 1972

. 196



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

-524

FIRST DISTRICT

Walter V. Schaefer Chicago, Illinois

Thomas E. Kluczynski Chicago, Illinois

> Daniel P. Ward Chicago, Illinois

SECOND DISTRICT

Charles H. Davis Rockford, Illinois

THIRD DISTRICT

Howard C. Ryan Tonica, Illinois

FOURTH DISTRICT

Robert C. Underwood Bloomington, Illinois

FIFTH DISTRICT

Joseph H. Goldenhersh East St. Louis, Illinois



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS NUMBER OF CASES DECIDED WITH FULL OPINIONS 1950–1972

*Not included is a total of 72 Memorandum Opinions filed.

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS NUMBER OF PETITIONS FOR REHEARING 1950–1972







APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS

(June 30, 1972)

FIRST DISTRICT

First Division Joseph Burke Mayer Goldberg John J. Lyons

Second Division

George N. Leighton Ulysses S. Schwartz (retiredserving by assignment) John J. Stamos

Third Division

John T. Dempsey Thomas A. McGloon Daniel J. McNamara

Fourth Division

Thaddeus V. Adesko Henry L. Burman Henry W. Dieringer

Fifth Division

Joseph J. Drucker Robert E. English Francis S. Lorenz

SECOND DISTRICT

Mel Abrahamson William L. Guild Thomas J. Moran Glenn K. Seidenfeld (assigned from the 19th Judicial Circuit)

THIRD DISTRICT

Jay J. Alloy Walter Dixon Albert Scott (assigned from the 9th Judicial Circuit) Allan L. Stouder

FOURTH DISTRICT

James C. Craven Leland Simkins (assigned from the 11th Judicial Circuit) Samuel O. Smith Harold Trapp

FIFTH DISTRICT

1

Caswell J. Crebs Edward C. Eberspacher Charles E. Jones (assigned from the 2nd Judicial Circuit) George J. Moran

THE TREND OF CASES IN THE APPELLATE COURT DURING 1972

Appellate District		No. of Cases	No. of Cases	No. of Cases	No. of Cases Disposed of During 1972	No. of Cases	Gain or Loss in Currency	
		Pending 1-1-72	Filed During 1972*	Disposed of During 1972	With Full Opinions	Pending 12-31-72	Gain	Loss
First	Civil	880	710	703	423	887	-	7
T list	Criminal	769	847	535	442	1081	_	312
	Civil	180	182	171	114	191	-	11
Second	Criminal	161	213	189	156	185	-	24
Third	Civil	83	139	138	105	84	-	1
	Criminal	99	193	129	110	163	-	64
Fourth	Civil	1 <mark>3</mark> 7	130	141	94	126	11	_
Fourth	Criminal	172	240	158	122	254	_	82
Eifth	Civil	160	143	157	92	146	14	_
Fifth	Criminal	175	223	205	105	193	_	18
Total	Civil	1440	1304	1310	828	1434	6	
Total	Criminal	1376	1716	1216	935	1876	_	500

* Includes a total of 143 cases transferred from the Supreme Court to the five Appellate Court Districts.

Appellate D	istrict	Affirmed	Reversed	Affirmed in Part	Modified	Dismissed without Opinion	Dismissed with Opinion	Total
Г: <i>t</i>	Civil	212	174	25	4	280	8	703
First	Criminal	322	71	23	24	93	2	535
1	Civil	60	34	14	1	58	4	171
Second	Criminal	108	31	4	8	32	6	189
Third Civil Criminal	67	28	8	0	35	0	138	
	Criminal	75	27	3	0	24	0	129
	Civil	48	32	10	0	47	4	141
Fourth	Criminal	87	27	5	0	36	3	158
	Civil	53	17	10	1	72	4	157
FifthC	Criminal	59	31	5	20	90	0	205
Total	Civil	440	285	67	6	492	20	1310
	Criminal	651	187	40	52	275	11	1216

CASES DISPOSED OF IN THE APPELLATE COURT IN 1972

TIME LAPSE BETWEEN DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF DISPOSITION OF CASES DECIDED IN THE APPELLATE COURT DURING 1972

	*			Time	Elapsed		
Appellate District		Under 6 Mos.	6-12 Mos.	1-1½ Years	1½-2 Years	2-3 Years	Over 3 Years
	Civil	56	70	106	232	211	28
First	Criminal	48	81	128	198	69	11
	Civil	37	93	40	1	_	_
Second	Criminal	26	137	25	1		
	Civil	47	67	21	2	1	_
Third	Criminal	62	35	23	6	2	1
F	Civil	27	31	58	22	3	_
Fourth	Criminal	35	51	49	22	1	
	Civil	49	34	40	26	7	1
Fifth	Criminal	97	51	40	12	4	1
Total	Civil	216	295	265	283	222	29
	Criminal	268	355	265	239	76	13

-

TIME LAPSE BETWEEN DATE BRIEFS WERE FILED AND DISPOSITION OF CASES DECIDED IN THE APPELLATE COURT DURING 1972

	>	Time Elapsed						
Appellate District		Under 6 Mos.	6-12 Mos.	1-1½ Years	1½-2 Years	2-3 Years	Over 3 Years	
	Civil	127	268	176	113	14	5	
First	Criminal	149	284	91	10	1	_	
	Civil	101	62	7	1			
Second	Criminal	120	65	4				
	Civil	125	12	1				
Third	Criminal	121	6	2			_	
E	Civil	48	63	28	1	1		
Fourth	Criminal	71	79	6	2	_		
	Civil	63	57	32	4	1	_	
Fifth	Criminal	145	49	8	3	_		
Total	Civil	464	462	244	119	16	5	
	Criminal	606	483	111	15	1	_	

-



JUDGES OF THE CIRCUIT COURTS OF THE STATE (June 30, 1972)

COOK COUNTY

-324

Circuit Judges John S. Boyle, Chief Judge

Earl Arkiss Marvin E. Aspen lames M. Bailey Charles R. Barrett Thomas W. Barrett Norman C. Barry William M. Barth Raymond K. Berg L. Sheldon Brown Abraham W. Brussell Nicholas J. Bua Felix M. Buoscio |oseph |. Butler David A. Canel Archibald J. Carey, Jr. David Cerda Nathan M. Cohen Robert J. Collins Harry G. Comerford Daniel A. Covelli lames D. Crosson Wilbert F. Crowley Walter P. Dahl William V. Daly Russell R. DeBow Francis T. Delaney George E. Dolezal Thomas C. Donovan Robert J. Downing Raymond P. Drymalski Arthur L. Dunne Robert I. Dunne Edward J. Egan 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 lames A. Geocaris lames A. Geroulis Louis J. Giliberto Albert E. Hallett Richard A. Harewood Edward F. Healy John F. Hechinger Jacques F. Heilingoetter Joseph B. Hermes Harry G. Hershenson George A. Higgins Reginald J. Holzer Charles P. Horan Robert L. Hunter Harry A. Iseberg Mel R. Jiganti Glenn Ť. Johnson Mark E. Jones Sidney A. Jones, Jr. William B. Kane Nathan J. Kaplan Anthony J. Kogut Norman A. Korfist Walter J. Kowalski Franklin I. Kral Alvin J. Kvistad Irving Landesman David Lefkovits Frank B. Machala Robert L. Massev Nicholas J. Matkovic Robert E. McAuliffe

Francis T. McCurrie Helen F. McGillicuddy John P. McGury Robert A. Meier, III James J. Mejda Francis T. Moran F. Emmett Morrissey lames E. Murphy James C. Murray Gordon B. Nash Benjamin Nelson Irving R. Norman Donald J. O'Brien Wayne W. Olson Margaret G. O'Malley Herbert C. Paschen William F. Patterson John E. Pavlik Edward E. Plusdrak Maurice D. Pompey Albert S. Porter loseph A. Power Daniel A. Roberts Philip Romiti Thomas Rosenberg Daniel J. Ryan Edith S. Sampson

Raymond S. Sarnow George J. Schaller Ben Schwartz Anton A. Smigiel Joseph A. Solan Pasquale A. Sorrentino Harry S. Stark Sigmund J. Stefanowicz Earl E. Strayhorn James E. Strunck Chester J. Strzalka Harold W. Sullivan Robert J. Sulski Fred G. Suria, Ir. Vincent W. Tondryk Raymond E. Trafelet Eugene L. Wachowski Harold G. Ward Alfonse F. Wells Kenneth R. Wendt Louis A. Wexler William Sylvester White Frank J. Wilson Kenneth E. Wilson Minor K. Wilson Joseph M. Wosik Arthur V. Zelezinski

Associate Judges

Charles A. Alfano Peter Bakakos Frank W. Barbaro Lionel J. Berc Francis M. Blake Nicholas J. Bohling Anthony J. Bosco John M. Breen, Jr. Martin F. Brodkin Robert C. Buckley Thomas R. Casey, Jr. Thomas P. Cawley Paul G. Ceaser Irwin Cohen Cornelius J. Collins James A. Condon Francis X. Connell Richard K. Cooper Ronald James Crane John J. Crowley Robert J. Dempsey Russell J. Dolce John T. Duffy George B. Duggan

Charles J. Durham Ben Edelstein Nathan B. Engelstein Carl F. Faust William F. Fitzpatrick John M. Flaherty John Gannon Lawrence Genesen Paul F. Gerritv Ioseph R. Gill Francis W. Glowacki Meyer G. Goldstein Myron I. Gomberg Ben Gorenstein lames L. Griffin Jacob S. Guthman Arthur N. Hamilton Edwin C. Hatfield John J. Hogan Louis J. Hyde Thomas J. Janczy Rudolph L. Janega Lester Jankowski Robert F. Jerrick, Sr.

Eddie C. Johnson Richard H. Jorzak Benjamin J. Kanter Wallace I. Kargman Helen J. Kelleher John J. Kelly, Jr. Irving Kipnis Marilyn R. Komosa Edwin Kretske Albert H. LaPlante Maurice W. Lee Richard F. LeFevour Reuben J. Liffshin John J. Limperis David Linn Frank S. Loverde Martin J. Luken James Maher, Jr. Harry H. Malkin Erwin L. Martay John H. McCollom John J. McDonnell William J. McGah, Jr. Dwight McKay Anthony J. Mentone Joseph W. Mioduski Anthony S. Montelione Joseph C. Mooney John Joseph Moran John M. Murphy John William Navin Earl J. Neal James L. Oakey, Jr. Paul A. O'Mallev John A. Ouska Burton H. Palmer Marvin J. Peters William E. Peterson

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 George M. Schatz Joseph Schneider Harry A. Schrier Joseph R. Schwaba Anthony J. Scotillo Samuel Shamberg David J. Shields Harold A. Siegan Frank M. Siracusa Jerome C. Slad Raymond C. Sodini Joseph A. Solan Milton H. Solomon Robert C. Springsguth Adam N. Stillo James N. Sullivan Robert A. Sweeney John F. Thornton Alvin A. Turner Thomas M. Walsh lames M. Walton Jack Arnold Welfeld Daniel John White Willie Mae Whiting lames A. Zafirato George J. Zimmerman

FIRST CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

John H. Clayton, Chief Judge

Robert H. Chase Stewart Cluster Peyton H. Kunce William A. Lewis Harry L. McCabe Jack C. Morris George Oros Robert B. Porter Everett Prosser Paul D. Reese Richard E. Richman Dorothy W. Spomer R. Gerald Trampe

Associate Judges

Michael P. O'Shea

Robert W. Schwartz

SECOND CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

William G. Eovaldi, Chief Judge

Philip B. Benefiel John D. Daily Don Al Foster Charles Woodrow Frailey F. P. Hanagan William Webb Johnson A. Hanby Jones Charles E. Jones (assigned to Appellate Court) Henry Lewis Clarence E. Partee Randall S. Quindry Wilburn Bruce Saxe Alvin Lacy Williams Carrie LaRoe Winter Harry L. Ziegler

Associate Judges

Roland J. DeMarco Charles Deneen Matthews Charles L. Quindry

THIRD CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Michael Kinney, Chief Judge

Joseph J. Barr William L. Beatty Harold R. Clark John Gitchoff Foss D. Meyer James O. Monroe, Jr. Fred P. Schuman

Associate Judges

Thomas R. Gibbons Arthur L. Greenwood Merlin Gerald Hiscott William E. Johnson

A. Andreas Matoesian Harry R. Mondhink Roy W. Strawn Doane Kent Trone

FOURTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

George W. Kasserman, Jr., Chief Judge

Daniel H. Dailey William A. Ginos Arthur G. Henken Paul M. Hickman Raymond O. Horn George R. Kelly James E. McMackin, Jr. Gail E. McWard Jack M. Michaelree Robert J. Sanders Bill J. Slater E. Harold Wineland

Associate Judge Robert M. Washburn

FIFTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Jacob Berkowitz, Chief Judge

Caslon K. Bennett Harry I. Hannah Frank J. Meyer Ralph S. Pearman James Kent Robinson William J. Sunderman James R. Watson Paul M. Wright

Associate Judges

Lawrence T. Allen, Jr. Thomas Michael Burke Matthew Andrew Jurczak Richard E. Scott John F. Twomey

SIXTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Birch E. Morgan, Chief Judge

William C. Calvin Burl A. Edie Frederick S. Green Frank J. Gollings Roger H. Little Donald W. Morthland Joseph C. Munch Rodney A. Scott James M. Sherrick Creed D. Tucker Albert G. Webber, III

Associate Judges

Henry Lester Brinkoetter John L. Davis Wilbur A. Flessner Sarah McAllister Lumpp James R. Palmer John Payson Shonkwiler George Richard Skillman Andrew Stecyk

SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

William Henry Chamberlain, Chief Judge

J. Waldo Ackerman Harvey Beam Francis J. Bergen William D. Conway George P. Coutrakon Byron E. Koch L. A. Mehrhoff Paul C. Verticchio Howard Lee White John B. Wright

Associate Judges

Richard J. Cadagin Eugene O. Duban Imy J. Feuer Robert B. McKechan Jerry S. Rhodes Charles J. Ryan Gordon D. Seator

EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

John T. Reardon, Chief Judge

Cecil J. Burrows Paul R. Durr Lyle E. Lipe Richard Mills J. Ross Pool Fred W. Reither Richard F. Scholz Edward D. Turner Ernest H. Utter Lyle R. Wheeler

Associate Judges

Leo J. Altmix Owen D. Lierman Alfred L. Pezman Virgil W. Timpe Guy R. Williams

-
NINTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Daniel J. Roberts, Chief Judge

Edwin Becker Ezra J. Clark John W. Gorby Earle A. Kloster Scott I. Klukos Gale A. Mathers Francis P. Murphy Albert Scott (assigned to Appellate Court) Keith F. Scott

Associate Judges

Jack R. Kirkpatrick Lewis D. Murphy Russell A. Myers G. Durbin Ranney William K. Richardson Keith Sanderson

TENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Ivan L. Yontz, Chief Judge

Richard E. Eagleton Edward E. Haugens James D. Heiple Robert E. Hunt Charles W. Iben Albert Pucci John E. Richards Calvin R. Stone Charles M. Wilson

Associate Judges

Robert A. Coney Carl O. Davies Arthur H. Gross John A. Holtzman David C. McCarthy William John Reardon John D. Sullivan John A. Whitney Espey C. Williamson William H. Young

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Wendell E. Oliver, Chief Judge

Stephen Adsit J. H. Benjamin Keith E. Campbell Wilton Erlenborn Samuel Glenn Harrod, III John T. McCullough Leland Simkins (assigned to Appellate Court) Wayne C. Townley, Jr.

Associate Judges

William T. Caisley Luther H. Dearborn Ivan Dean Johnson Darrell H. Reno Robert Leo Thornton

TWELFTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

David E. Oram, Chief Judge

Victor N. Cardosi Wayne P. Dyer Robert E. Higgins Stewart C. Hutchison Robert J. Immel Michael A. Orenic Angelo F. Pistilli Herman W. Snow

Associate Judges

Roger A. Benson Patrick M. Burns Robert W. Boyd Robert R. Buchar Charles P. Connor Emil DiLorenzo Thomas P. Faulkner Louis K. Fontenot John F. Gnadinger John C. Lang John Verklan

THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Thomas R. Clydesdale, Chief Judge

William P. Denny Leonard Hoffman James D. Hurley, Sr. Robert W. Malmquist John S. Massieon W. J. Wimbiscus

Associate Judges

John J. Clinch, Jr. Herman Ritter Wendell LeRoy Thompson C. Howard Wampler Robert G. Wren

FOURTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

George O. Hebel, Chief Judge

Robert M. Bell[®] Charles H. Carlstrom Robert J. Horberg Dan H. McNeal John Louis Poole Paul E. Rink Charles J. Smith Conway L. Spanton Richard Stengel Julian P. Wilamoski L. L. Winn

Associate Judges

Robert W. Boeye Walter E. Clark John B. Cunningham John R.Erhart Jay M. Hanson Ivan Lovaas Edwin Clare Malone Henry W. McNeal

FIFTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

James E. Bales, Chief Judge

John Dixon Wesley A. Eberle L. Melvin Gundry Robert D. Law John L. Moore William B. Phillips John W. Rapp, Jr.

Associate Judges

James M. Allen Alan W. Cargerman James R. Hansgen Dexter A. Knowlton James M. Thorp

SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

John S. Page, Chief Judge

Ernest W. Akemann James E. Boyle John A. Krause Neil E. Mahoney Rex F. Meilinger John S. Petersen Paul W. Schnake Robert J. Sears Charles G. Seidel Carl A. Swanson, Jr.

100

Associate Judges

Donald T. Anderson Thomas J. Burke James W. Cadwell Thomas S. Cliffe William H. Ellsworth Joseph T. Suhler Carlyle Whipple

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Albert S. O'Sullivan, Chief Judge

Seely P. Forbes John S. Ghent, Jr. Fred J. Kullberg 128

John C. Layng William R. Nash Harold C. Sewell

Associate Judges

John T. Beynon Robert A. Blodgett Edwin John Kotche Robert Elwood Leake Michael R. Morrison John W. Nielsen Alford R. Penniman

EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Bert E. Rathje, Chief Judge

Edwin L. Douglas Bruce R. Fawell Philip F. Locke LeRoy L. Rechenmacher George W. Unverzagt Alfred E. Woodward

Associate Judges

William E. Black George Borovic, Jr. George Herbert Bunge Richard L. Calkins James E. Fitzgerald Marvin E. Johnson Gordon Moffett Robert A. Nolan Jack T. Parish Lester P. Reiff George B. VanVleck Blair Varnes

NINETEENTH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

LaVerne A. Dixon, Chief Judge

L. Eric Carey William M. Carroll James H. Cooney Fred H. Geiger John J. Kaufman

Charles S. Parker Glenn K. Seidenfeld (assigned to Appellate Court) Harry D. Strouse Lloyd VanDeusen

Associate Judges

Thomas F. Baker Leonard Brody Eugene T. Daly Thomas R. Doran Warren Fox William Joseph Gleason John L. Hughes Bernard J. Juron Paul J. Kilkelly Robert K. McQueen Alvin I. Singer Robert J. Smart

TWENTIETH CIRCUIT

Circuit Judges

Richard T. Carter, Chief Judge

Robert Bastien Carl H. Becker Joseph F. Cunningham Harold O. Farmer William P. Flemming James Wendell Gray Alvin H. Maeys, Jr. Francis E. Maxwell Quinten Spivey Joseph A. Troy

Associate Judges

Anthony A. Bloemer David W. Costello John T. Fiedler Barney E. Johnston Billy Jones Ora Polk Robert Blackburn Rutledge, Jr. George H. Sansom Robert J. Saunders James F. Wheatley

* -

NUMBER OF CASES BEGUN AND TERMINATED

			Law \$15	0ver ,000		15,000 Jnder		ieous ies	E		al ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
1st	Alexander	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	6 6 17	6 6 4	1 1 1	15 15 24	5 5 5	15 15 12	1 - 1 1	11 11 5		10 10 6	78 78 86	32 9 - 41 32
	Jackson	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	47 	18 - - 18 13	7 7 6	145 — 145 145 105	33 33 44	7 7	26	64 	1 - - 1	- - - 1	241 241 262	60 - - 60 57
	Johnson	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	2	3 - - 3 3	- - - 7	17 17 9	7 7 4	11 - 11 6	 4	2 2 1	-	-	39 - - 39 37	9 9 3
	Massac	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	5 — 5 14	3 - - 3 3	2 +1 3 5	10 9 16	1 1 5	6 6 10	 5	14 14 11	- - 1	1 - 1 1	86 1 87 86	34 34 24
	Роре	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	2 +1 3 	2 1 1 -	1 - 1 -	5 5 4	2 2 3	1 - 1 -	-	2 2 2		-	13 13 16	2 2 1
	Pulaski	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	3 3 3	1 1 	1 +1 2 -	16 1 -1 16 17	4 4 5	3 3 4		7 7 5		-	48 _48 43	12 - 12 13
	Saline	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	21 - 21 21 26	2 2 4	2 2 5	92 92 95	22 22 12	6 6 6	4 4 1	35 — 35 45	2 2 3	32 32 32	141 _141 134	37 37 38
	Union	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	19 — 19 16	7 - - 7 16	1 1 1	33 33 31	13 13 2	3 3 1	2 _ 2 	6 6 15		807 807 804	74 74 85	11 11 36
	Williamson	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	57 2 - 59 68	13 1 - 14 16	23 +10 33 19	100 2 9 93 114	37 2 39 47	21 - 21 23	- - - 1	25 — 25 29	1 1 1	9 9 13	287 10 297 313	61 2 63 75
1st	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	162 2 +1 165 207	55 1 1 55 59	38 +12 50 44	433 3 11 425 415	124 2 126 127	73 73 67	33 33 31	166 166 197	5 5 5	859 859 857	1,007 11 1,018 1,062	258 11 269 279

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT-1972

										r		1
		Misde	meanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
32	88	22 1	256	40	35	456	1,946	122	3,177 10	Begun	Alexander	1st
— 32 15	-3 85 42	+1 24 13	+2 258 246	 40 33		 456 430	 1,946 2,112		3,187 3,240	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
35	150	82	437	1,429	119 —	1,848	5,871	58	10,678	Begun	Jackson	
 35 73		82 73	437 473	 1,429 1,412		 1,848 1,857	5,871 5,800	 58 61	10,678 10,691	Transferred Net Added 		
	36 	-	112	112	10 _	-	794 	7	1,161	Begun	Johnson	
		-		 112 84	10 18			- 7 7		Transferred Net Added Terminated		
33	43	31	235 	84	46 	110 —	1,230	14 _	1,989 1	Begun	Massac	
	-12 31 20	—1 30 14	+13 248 208	 84 97	- 46 81	 110 104	_ 1,230 1,233	 14 12	 1,990 1,972	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
2	4	_	74 	9	12 _	2	171	14 —	318 —	Begun	Pope	
2 2	- 4 3		 74 59	 9 8	- 12 12	2 2		 14 12	 318 294	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
15	28	6	185	36	25	92	1,466	16	1,964 1	Begun	Pulaski	
 15 8	-4 24 28	-2 4 1	+6 191 199	- 36 41	 25 31	_ 92 71		- 16 18	1,965 2,062	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
55 —	89 —	11	453 	691	67	118	1,677 _	3	3,560 —	Begun	Saline	
 55 48	 89 87		453 445	691 753	- 67 70			3 3		Transferred Net Added 		
8	37	2	105 _	642 —	51 _	179 	1,755 —	17	3,772 —	Begun	Union	
- 8 48	-3 34 26	2 	+3 108 93	 642 454	 51 36		 1,755 1,588	 17 15				
53 1	133 7	48 1	362 2	469 5	117 3	195 —	4,289	62 _	6,362 38	Begun	Williamson	
54 67	 140 118	49 67	 364 306	—1 473 527		_ 195 210	4,289 4,310	- 63 83	6,400 6,548	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
233 1	C08 7	202 2	2,219 2	3,512 5	482 3	3,000 —	19,199 —	313	32,981 50	Begun	Circuit Totals	1st
 234 283	-22 593 506	-2 202 184	+24 2,245 2,139	—1 3,516 3,409	485 547	 3,000 2,908				Transferred Net Added Terminated		

				0ver ,000		15,000 Jnder		leous ies	E		al ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
2nd	Crawford	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	6 +1 7 7	7 1 6 4	6 +2 8 4	57 2 55 49	15 15 6	3 - 3 3		31 31 25		11 - 11 11	113 113 78	38 38 31
	Edwards	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated		1 1 2		10 - 10 8	2 2 4	1 - 1 1	2 2 1	10 10 8		2 2 2	30 - 30 30	9 9 7
	Franklin	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	31 — 31 58	12 12 10	7 7 14	82 82 95	20 20 30	6 6 2		39 39 21	1 1 1	20 - - 20 4	223 223 212	59 — 59 60
,	Gallatin	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	8 8 8	9 9 2	- - - 1	25 - 25 17	3 3 5	9 9 6	-	16 16 25		1 1 	46 2 48 40	15 15
	Hamilton	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	2 2 2	2 2 	1 +1 2 1	13 -1 12 17	11 11 9	3 3 4	3 3 2	8 8 9	- - - 1		36 36 34	9 9 7
	Hardin	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	2 2 4		- - - 1	8 8 6	2 2 			1 1 1	3 3 3	2 2 2	31 31 30	10 10
	Jefferson	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	12 2 14 31	8 1 9 4	3 1 +3 7 9	128 2 3 127 112	15 15 10	9 1 10 8	6 6 8	19 19 42	4 4 1	59 59 30	211 12 223 190	34
	Lawrence	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	4 4 3	3 1 - 4 2	1 1 -	20 20 17	8 4 12 8	1 1 1		37 37 26		1 1 8	66 5 71 59	21 21 19
	Richland	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	12 12 10	7 7 13	7 7 4	29 29 50	8 8 36	1 1 2	1 1 1	21 21 5	4 4 	9 9 7	68 68 64	35 35 20
	Wabash	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	1 1 	9 9 4	 	41 41 23	10 10 7	8 8 1	- - - 3	10 10 	2 2 3	7 - 7 7 7	72 1 73 64	18 18 9

				1							r T	
		Misder	neanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	[©] Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total			
12	28	1	239	153	98 —	125	1,053	20 —	2,016	Begun	Crawford	2nd
 12 10	 28 25	- 1 1	 239 216	 153 122	 98 85	 125 115	 1,053 1,027	 20 18	 2,016 1,837	Transferred		
4	8	1	40	77	41	1	704	22	965 —		Edwards	
 4 4		- 1 -	 40 29	77 69	- 41 29	_ 1 _	 704 698	22 22 22	 965 921	Transferred		
33 —	90 —	25 —	289 —	310 —	140 —	365 —	2,911 —	35 —	4,698 —	Begun	Franklin	
 33 16	 90 79	25 29	 289 479	 310 293	140 130		 2,911 2,602	 35 43	4,698 4,440	Transferred		
12	38 —	14	129 	137 —	25 —	194 —	534 —	20 —	1,235 2	Begun	Gallatin	
 12 10	38 30	 14 11		137 116	 25 16	 194 189	534 533	20 20	1,237 1,170	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
2	14 1	9 1	59 —	85 —	46 	1 -	486 —	8 	798 2	Begun	Hamilton	
- 2 1	 15 12	- 10 13	 59 58	- 85 102	 46 47	 1 	 486 478	 8 9	 800 806	Transferred		
5	13	-	32	104	16	10	238		477	Begun	Hardin	
5 1	-2 11 3	- - -	+2 34 15	 104 24	16 10	 10 10	 238 209	- - -		· Transferred Net Added 		
67	114 3	26 	297	361 3	102 1	43	1,996 —	17 _	3,531 26	Begun	Jefferson	
 67 29	-7 110 59	+2 28 13	+5 302 215	 364 515	 103 78	 43 37	 1,996 2,025	 17 20		Transferred Net Added Terminated		
14 	27	6 _	133	175	67 	140 —	1,174 _	46 —	1,944 10	Begun	Lawrence	
	27 21	 6 2	- 133 71		 67 54	 140 125	 1,174 1,030	- 46 46	 1,954 1,724	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
27	24 		268	354 	49	4	1,084 —	16 —	2,028 —	Begun	Richland	
 27 29	1 23 12	+1 1 -	 268 295	 354 414	 49 29	 4 1	 1,084 858	 16 15	 2,028 1,865	Transferred Net Added 		
13	48 —	8	51	163	63 —	107 	594 —	19 —	1,244 1	Begun	Wabash	
- 13 4	1 47 19	 8 3	+1 52 24		 63 17	 107 74	 594 587	 19 24	 1,245 984	Transferred Net Added 		

				0ver ,000	Law \$ and l	15,000 Jnder		eous ies	-		l ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	Wayne	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	7 7 5	4 4 1	1 - 1 -	37 - 37 31	13 13 	3 3 2	- - - 3	30 30 36	-	14 — 14 5	94 94 94	27 27 31
	White	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	6 6 8	3 - 3 2	 1	32 - 32 22	17 17 14	8 8 10	2 2 3	15 15 12	2 2 2	1 - 1 1	103 1 	27 27 27
2nd	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	91 2 +1 94 136	65 2 1 66 44	26 1 +6 33 35	482 2 6 478 447	124 4 128 137	52 1 53 40	14 14 21	237 237 214	16 16 8	127 127 77	1,093 21 1,114 981	302 302 259
3rd	Bond	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	9 9 6	3 - 3 3	5 5 4	44 44 38	2 2 6	-		4 4 8		-	43 43 61	11 11 11
	Madison	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	471 8 +45 524 437	270 2 43 229 181	248 4 +75 327 314	482 1 75 408 341	238 238 246	207 1 208 223	17 - 17 7	373 373 53	5 5 5	425 425 435	1,560 — 1,560 1,692	619 619 690
3rd	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	480 8 +45 533 543	273 2 -43 232 184	253 4 +75 332 318	526 1 75 452 379	240 240 252	207 1 208 223	17 17 7	377 	5 - 5 5	425 425 435	1,603 — 1,603 1,753	630 630 701
4th	Christian	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	12 4 +1 17 31	9 1 10 9	4 2 6 16	155 8 -1 162 231	20 9 29 95	2 2 5	_ _ _ 3	236 236 216	4 4 	2 47 - 49 4	178 2 180 201	38 38 62
	Clay	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	7 7 5	3 3 1	2 2 	28 28 36	15 15 14	8 8 10		9 9 14	 5	- - - 8	61 61 57	33 33 58
	Clinton	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	17 17 32		1 1	2 2 	9 9 2	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	-	61 61 38	5 5 3
	Effingham	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	11 11 8	5 5 3	2 2 3	113 113 	10 10 15	1 1 3		24 24 30		6 6 5	90 — 90 75	41 41 41

		Misder	neanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
18 18 8	40 4 36 27	18 18 18	96 +4 100 87	490 490 394	63 63 42	19 19 14	835 — 835 746	5 5 6	1,814 — 1,814 1,558	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated		
32 5 37 18	33 _4 29 32	9 9 13	148 +4 152 106	246 246 267	74 74 89	88 88 74	1,344 — 1,344 1,356	36 36 44	2,226 6 2,232 2,187	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated		
239 5 244 145	477 4 18 463 326	117 1 +3 121 103	1,781 +15 1,796 1,728	2,655 3 2,658 2,640	784 1 785 626	1,097 1,097 901	12,953 12,953 12,149	244 244 267	22,976 47 23,023 21,284	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated		2n
18 - - 18 18	7 2 5 5	4 4 4	96 +2 98 88	200 200 395	37 37 37	1 1 1	824 824 725	6 6 6	1,314 1,314 1,416			3ri
328 328 222	268 268 271		8,533 — — 8,533 8,354	7,498 7,496 4,743	666 666 525	8,651 — 8,651 8,221	10,390 10,390 9,817	15 15 1	41,264 16 41,280 36,878		Madison	
346 346 240	275 2 273 276	4 4 4	8,629 +2 8,631 8,442	7,698 7,696 5,138	703 703 562	8,652 8,652 8,222	11,214 11,214 10,542	21 - 21 7	42,578 16 42,594 38,294		Circuit Totals	3ri
62 62 66	98 _14 _84 _66	11 -2 9 12	251 2 +16 269 357	714 92 806 713	473 473 97	7 7 6	3,036 3,036 2,970	62 62 71	5,370 171 5,541 5,231	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Christian	4tl
14 14 10	34 2 32 9	1 1 	146 - +3 149 172	185 185 158	75 — 75 76	55 55 41	948 948 901	22 - 22 21	1,646 1,646 1,596	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Clay	
16 16 6	28 — 28 21		130 130 105	178 178 188	119 — — 119 94	66 66 57	1,096 1,096 1,013	151 — 151 153	1,879 1,879 1,712		Clinton	
27 27 22	20 20 16	- - - 2	325 325 309	315 315 244	106 106 92	35 — 35 35	3,578 	16 — 16 16	4,725 4,725 4,872		Effingham	

				Over ,000		15,000 Jnder		es Suo			ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	Fayette	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	6 6 11	7 7 2	1 1 2	56 — 56 63	14 - 14 17	23 23 22	-	22 22 19	2 - 2 1	3 - - 3 1	76 76 79	34 —
	Jasper	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	- - - 3	2 2 2	1 1 1	20 20 20	11 11 3	1 - 1 1		14 14 18	-	-	27 - 27 26	7 7 7 7
	Marion	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	28 +1 29 31	7 -1 6 3	2 2 3	111 - 111 107	10 10 15	5 5 1	6 6 	59 59 71		37 37 41	227 227 208	114 114 94
	Montgomery	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	14 14 17	10 - - 10 1	1 1 3	65 65 79	10 10 10	-	2 2 11	24 24 33		4 1 - 5 1	120 - 120 110	46 46 44
	Shelby	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	7 7 6	1 - - 1 3	1 1 1	39 39 21	7 7 9	10 10 10	-	21 21 12		-	68 68 57	27 27 20
4th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	102 4 +2 108 144	44 1 1 44 24	15 _2 17 29	589 8 1 596 578	106 9 115 180	50 50 52	8 8 14	409 409 413	2 4 6 6	52 1 53 60	908 47 955 851	345 2
5th	Clark	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	11 11 15	3 - - 3 1		15 - 15 14	11 11 8	9 9 9	3 - - 3 3	19 19 30	-		65 65 60	42 1 43 54
	Coles	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	31 31 28	22 - - 22 13	6 6 13	145 145 129	29 — 29 31	18 18 15	2 - - 2 1	6 6 3	3 - 3 -	1 1 3	267 267 247	116 116 108
	Cumberland	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	3 - - 3 4	5 5 3	1 - - 1 -	8 8 5	4 4 1		-		-	-	34 - - 34 30	12 12 4
. 	Edgar	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	8 8 7	3 3 4		36 36 53	10 10 5	8 - 8 6	1 - - 1 -	53 53 32		1 1 6	112 - 112 118	33 33 24

									neanors	Misder		
Circu	County		Total	Conservation Violations	Traffic	Ordinance Víolations	Probate	Small Claims	Jail or Fine	Penitentiary	Felony	Juvenile
	Fayette	Begun	2,984	45 	2,167 —	4 _	149	130 -	118	1	80	46
		Transferred Net Added Terminated	2,984 3,016	 45 45	2,167 2,177	4 4	149 166	 130 146	118 113	1 2	 80 79	46 31
	Jasper	Begun	623 —	1	360 —	5	46	82	30 -	-	11	5
			 623 597	1 4	 360 360	 5 1	46 32	82 76		 5	 11 5	5 7
	Marion	Begun Reinstated	5,757 —	23 —	3,357 —	580 —	205	572	276 —	12 -	73 —	53 —
		Transferred Net Added Terminated	5,757 5,845	23 19	 3,357 3,497		205 149	572 646	 276 261	 12 7	 73 61	53 46
	Montgomery	Begun Reinstated Transferred	4,077 3	-	2,594 	273	161 2	433	230 —	25 —	48	17
		Net Added	4,080 3,667	- - -	2,594 2,385	273 210	163 148	433 407	230 151	25 14	48 26	 17 17
	Shelby	Begun	2,495	157 _	1,633 —	63 —	130	166	106	5	31	23
		Transferred Net Added Terminated	 2,495 2,119	 157 178	 1,633 1,389	 63 44	130 108	166 114	+1 107 94		-1 30 29	23 22
4		Begun	29,556 174	477	18,769 —	1,088	1,464 2	2,775 92	1,612 2	55 —	423	263
		Transferred	 29,730 28,655		 18,769 18,624	 1,088 983	1,466 962	 2,867 2,692	+20 1,634 1,588	-3 52 44	-17 406 312	263 227
5		Begun	2,978 1	22	2,297	30 —	75 —	218	153 —	-	5	_
			2,979 3,026	22 16	 2,297 2,272			218 264	+3 156 175	-	-3 2 8	-
		Begun	5,640	8	3,077	508 —		726	451		139	85
			 5,640 5,510		 3,077 3,077	508 508		726 668	451 441	-		85 75
	Cumberland	Begun	1,062 —	2	839 —	2 _	42	28	65 —		10	7
		Transferred Net Added 	 1,062 948	2 2	 839 782	2 2	42 35		65 53	-		 7 6
	Edgar	Begun	2,145 _	15 -	1,095	75 —	130	193	286	3	50 —	33
		Transferred Net Added Terminated	2,145 2,148	 15 17	 1,095 1,098	 75 67			+11 297 282	32	-11 39 30	 33 22

				Over ,000	Law \$ and l	15,000 Jnder	×	eous ies	_		l ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	Vermilion	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	60 2 +1 63 58	12 -1 11 7	10 10 9	323 323 300	59 59 20	60 60 41	15 - 15 15	115 115 		35 — 35 31	565 — 565 646	150 150 159
5th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	113 2 +1 116 112	45 	17 17 22	527 527 501	113 — 113 65	95 95 71	21 21 19	193 193 133	3 - 3 -	37 37 40	1,043 1,043 1,101	353 1 354 349
6th	Champaign	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	133 133 107	55 1 56 23	34 34 17	431 431 359	104 104 54	76 76 30	1 - 1 3	27 27 36		71 71 46	845 1 846 749	270 270 301
	DeWitt	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	8 8 19	3 - - 3 -	1 - 1 -	103 103 61	7 7 11	1 1 1	-	113 113 102	-	-	103 103 95	30 30 29
	Douglas	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	12 12 14	5 5 2	3 3 4	41 41 37	14 — 14 9	3 3 5	- - - 1	22 22 25	-	2 2 2	74 74 69	27 27 27
	Macon	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	71 71 73	22 - - 22 33	39 39 23	552 — 552 629	70 — 70 53	37 37 32	2 - 2 10	36 36 45	17 17 10	39 — 39 26	779 779 722	181 181 78
	Moultrie	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	6 +1 7 13	3 1 -1 3 6	4 +1 5 7	19 -1 18 44	2 _2 14	2 2 1	1 1 3	16 16 9		1 1 1	37 1 38 42	28 28 28
	Piatt	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	4 1 5 3	3 3 3	5 	25 25 31	6 6 7	1 1 7	- - - 1	12 12 7	1 - 1 -	_ _ _ 1	72 72 68	19 19 24
6th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	234 1 +1 236 229	91 2 1 92 67	86 +1 87 54	1,171 — —1 1,170 1,161	203 203 148	120 120 76	4 4 18	226 	18 - - 18 10	113 113 76	1,910 2 1,912 1,745	555 555 487
7th	Greene	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	2 2 1		1 1 	41 1 42 89	4 4 	2 2 		3 3 4		 4	67 6 73 54	16 1 17 18

											······	
		Misder	neanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	* Probate	» Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
164 9 - 173 71	238 37 201 136	 +8 8 6	961 4 +29 994 936	984 984 882	330 2 332 384	1,980 — — 1,980 1,989	10,064 10,064 10,093	192 192 294	16,317 17 		Vermilion	
289 9 298 174	442 391 323	3 +8 11 8	1,916 4 +43 1,963 1,887	2,149 2,149 2,079	577 2 579 608	2,595 — 2,595 2,598	17,372 17,372 17,322	239 239 337	28,142 18 28,160 27,777	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Circuit Totals	5th
234 234 284	642 1 95 548 555	1 +60 61 128	1,420 1 +35 1,456 1,781	2,401 2,401 1,611	624 624 474	2,018 2,018 1,430	13,995 13,995 13,793	- - - 18	23,382 4 23,386 21,799		Champaign	6th
36 36 38	47 47 28	10 10 8	188 188 187	305 4 309 300	120 120 115	35 — 35 29	1,509 — 1,509 1,328	1 1 1	2,620 4 2,624 2,352	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	DeWitt	
23 23 14	29 2 27 18		159 +2 161 125	563 563 436	100 - 100 103	4 4 1	1,494 1,494 1,504	35 35 35	2,610 2,610 2,431		Douglas	
430 430 431	305 305 275	134 134 101	1,788 1,788 1,867	3,512 	426 426 483	1,350 — 1,350 1,098	13,723 13,723 12,211	57 57 41	23,570 23,570 21,475	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Macon	
14 14 15	19 8 11 17	4 4 5	131 +8 139 153	257 257 501	84 1 85 118	2 2 2	1,020 1,020 1,048	284 284 281	1,934 3 1,937 2,308	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Moultrie	
12 - 12 12 12	38 1 1 38 35		206 +1 207 275	257 1 258 234	77 - 77 104	28 28 33	1,452 1,452 1,459	51 - 51 54	2,269 3 - 2,272 2,361	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Piatt	
749 749 794	1,080 2 106 976 928	149 +60 209 242	3,892 1 +46 3,939 4,388	7,295 5 7,300 6,316	1,431 1 1,432 1,397	3,437 	33,193 — 33,193 31,343	428 428 430	56,385 14 56,399 52,726	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Circuit Totals	6th
23 - - 23 8	12 -2 10 1	8 8 5	215 	113 - 113 51	114 114 98	2 2 3	586 586 487	10 10 8	1,219 8 1,227 1,079	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Greene	7th

of Illinois, the following amendment is made.

On pages 88 and 89 of the chart entitled, "Number of Cases Begun and Terminated In The Circuit Court --1972," the numbers of cases Terminated in Scott County, 7th Circuit, should be:

36

	Law \$15,			15,000 Under		sous sei			t ations						È	reanors E			suo		retion tions	
	Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Aiscellan Remed	Emineint Domair	Ĩ	Municipal Corpore	Mentel Health	Divorce	Family	Juvenile	Felony	Penitenti	Jail or Fi	Small Cleims	Probate	Ordinane Violati	Traffic	Conserva Violati	Total
Terminated	2	5	1	27	3	1,-		3			16	7		5	1	18	218	34		289	4	635

ERRATA

				0ver ,000		15,000 Jnder		eous ies			l ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
•	Jersey	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added	5	7 - - 7	5 5	42 42 51	8 8 12	1 1 1		7 7 2		1 - 1 4	89 89 81	29 29 27
	Macoupin	Terminated Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	11 34 34 44	10 6 6 2	6 5 5 5	86 - 86 63	9 9 14	6 6 4	4 4	60 60 33		+	193 — 193 187	31 - 31 31 30
	Morgan	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	18 18 5	7 7 3	13 13 1	78 — — 78 54	19 — 19 19 12	4 4 4	19 - 19 3	19 19 10	- - 1	328 — 328 303	156 — 156 165	32 — 32 25
	Sangamon	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	152 152 109	41 41 35	2 2 2	912 912 513	115 — 115 81	150 — 150 101	-	100 100 72	-	105 — 105 89	1,069 — — 1,069 947	348 348 263
	Scott	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	1 - 1 172	2 2 55	1 1 15	23 23 797	5 5 122	- - - 111	- - - 57	9 9 124		 400	20 20 1,450	4 4 370
7th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	212 212 172	63 — — 63 55	27 27 15	1,182 1 1,183 797	160 160 122	163 — 163 111	_	198 198 124	- - 1	434 434 400	1,594 6 1,600 1,450	460 1 461 370
8th	Adams	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	42 +3 45 55	17 -2 15 14	17 +5 22 21	182 176 194	32 — 32 36	39 39 47	- - - 2	65 65 77		9 9 8	354 354 382	88 88 81
	Brown	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	3 - 3 7	2 2 3		6 6 10	4 4 5	8 8 11	-	12 12 16	-	- - - 1	19 19 28	6 6 6
	Calhoun	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	1 1 - 2 2		 2	10 10 6	3 3 3	7 7 1		2			16 1 17 14	5 5 2
	Cass	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	3 3 3	2 2 1	4 4 4	15 15 21	11 11 8	7 7 6		29 29 19		1 1 1	51 51 57	29 29 25

		Misde	meanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
55	38	-	250 —	1,118	79	1	988	47	2,770	Begun	Jersey	
 55 55		-	250 231		_ 79 55	 1 		47 34	2,770 2,091	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
77	55 —	87 —	553 —	478 —	243 —	256 	2,302 —	9	4,494	Begun	Macoupin	
	—3 52 57	—3 84 45	+6 559 535	478 477	 243 207	256 184	 2,302 2,305	9 9	4,494 4,265	Transferred		
30 —	58	-	377	288 67	187 	25 —	2,578 —	13 —	4,250 67	Begun	Morgan	
	4 54 25		+4 381 256		187 134	25 14	 2,578 2,596		 4,317 4,109	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
268 —	593 		776	3,356 —	625 —	134	18,491 —	8 —	27,334 	Begun	Sangamon	
	-1 592 337		+1 777 298		 625 550	134 61		8 8	 27,334 24,655	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
-	5	1	19 —	252 —	43 —		308 	5 _	698 —	Begun	Scott	
- 509	5 456	1 51			 43 1,078	 262		 5 72	 698 36,834			
453	761	96	2,190	5,605 67	1,291	418	25,253	92 	40,765 75	Begun	Circuit Totals	7th
 453 509	-10 751 456	-3 93 51	+13 2,203 1,586	5,672 5,118	 1,291 1,078	418 262	 25,253 24,029	- 92 72	40,840 36,834	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
145	137	58 	357	972 5	329 2	1,208	5,729 	40	9,820 7	Reinstated	Adams	8th
 145 156	-6 131 90	-7 51 46	+13 370 329	977 843		 1,208 1,227	5,729 5,734	- 40 41		Transferred Net Added 		
6	9	_	56 —	30	43	10	421	9	644	Begun	Brown	
 6 2	-3 6 4	 	+3 59 65	 30 49	43 31		421 432	- 9 10	 644 693	Transferred Net Added 		
7	6 2	2	128	18 1	26 _	1	599	43 _	875 5	Begun	Calhoun	
7 2	 8 8	_ 2 _	 128 125	– 19 15	 26 24	1 1	 599 544	 43 45	 880 797	Transferred Net Added 		
12	22	7	158	133	56	6	1,174	11	1,732	Begun	Cass	
 12 8	4 18 30	+1 8 8	+3 161 159	_ 133 103	 56 66	 6 5			_ 1,732 1,722	Transferred Net Added Terminated		

				0ver ,000		15,000 Jnder	~	reous lies	E		unicipal Corporations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporat	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	Mason	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	11 +2 13 11	5 2 3 3	3 3 4	46 46 39	12 12 3	10 — 10 15	- - - 1	22 22 20	1 - - 1 -	1 1 1	74 74 63	31 31 27
	Menard	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	9 9 7		- - - 1	18 - - 18 18	5 5 5	2 2 3		16 16 8		1 - 1 1	38 38 40	9 9 13
	Pike	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	6 6 11	- - - 1	4 +4 8 7	63 -4 59 75	14 14 16	20 20 19	1 - 1 -	22 22 11	4 4 3	1 - 1 -	81 81 81	20 20 21
	Schuyler	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	6 - 6 4	-	1 1 1	10 10 7	1 1 8	3 3 4		3 3 4	-	-	31 31 30	5 5 7
8th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	81 1 +5 87 100	26 4 22 22	29 +9 38 43	350 	82 82 84	96 96 106	2 2 4	171 171 155	6 6 6	13 - 13 12	664 1 665 695	193 193 182
9th	Fulton	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	35 35 35	2 2 10	5 +2 7 13	95 93 98	17 17 17	14 - 14 11	1 - - 1 1	57 57 61	1 - - 1 3		218 218 220	49 49 44
	Hancock	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	8 +1 9 17	6 -1 5 5	4 +4 8 13	39 -4 35 38	12 12 8	3 3 3		23 23 20	-	3 3 4	79 79 79 79	20 1 21 23
	Henderson	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	9	3 3 1	2 2 3	19 19 14	4 4 4	2 2 2		125 125 137	-		38 38 52	11 11 15
	Knox	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	+3 44	3 2 1 3	20 1 +5 26 17	160 6 6 160 150	33 33 27	44 44 45	- - 2	9 9 	-	154 — 154 174	410 11 421 398	107 2 109 96
	McDonough	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	- 11	9 9 27	7 7 9	78 78 110	12 12 19	27 27 32	2 _ 2 4	21 21 30		1 1 	140 140 172	32 32 22

				T		1		1			1	
		Misder	neanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jait or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
14	59 —	2	193	134	99	107	1,120	23	1,967 3	Begun	Mason	
	-12 47 53	+6 8 11	+6 199 171	 134 120	99 209	 107 82	 1,120 1,083	 23 18	 1,970 1,944	Transferred		
12 1	12 _	7	123 —	362 —	65 1	_	683 —	15 —	1,377 2	Begun	Menard	
	 12 15	 7 6	123 130	362 338	 66 56	 		 15 15		Transferred Net Added Terminated		
24 —	37 —	2	166 —	296 —	97 —	74 —	2,017 —	54 —	3,003 —	Begun	Pike	
24 15		2 3	 166 127		97 57		2,017 1,973	 54 52		Transferred Net Added Terminated		
5 —	10 —	2	29 —	49 —	44 —	24 —	1,149 —	31 —	1,403 	Begun	Schuyler	
5 4	 10 2	_ 2 2	29 36	 49 40	- 44 39	24 25		 31 33		Transferred Net Added Terminated		
225 4	292 2	80 —	1,210 _	1,994 6	759 3	1,430 -	12,892 —	226 	20,821 17	Begun	Circuit Totals	8th
 229 207	-25 269 228	 80 76	+25 1,235 1,142	 2,000 1,869	762 792	_ 1,430 1,430	 12,892 12,772	226 224	 20,838 20,519	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
51 —	44	1	389 1	555 	210	264 	1,976 —	148	4,132 1	Begun	Fulton	9th
	4 40 42	 1 1	+4 394 335	 555 540	210 162	 264 228	 1,976 2,054	 148 140	_ 4,133 4,084	Transferred		
31 _	29	22	245 —	356 —	130 3	70 	1,486 —	32 —	2,598 4	Begun	Hancock	
- 31 18	—3 26 21	22 13	+3 248 236	356 314	 133 198	70 60	 1,486 1,500	 32 32	2,602 2,602 2,602			
5	19		116	155 —	55 —	126 —	711	141 —	1,541 —	Begun	Henderson	
- 5 2	-2 17 11	- - 7	+2 118 128		55 54	 126 210	 711 634	141 90	– 1,541 1,559	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
129	140 1	34	628 —	578 —	323 1	900 —	7,395 —	51 —	11,158 25	Begun	Knox	
129 57	34 107 187	-1 33 23	+35 663 666	578 609		 900 871	 7,395 7,488	 51 52	 11,183 11,283			
12	57	13 _	277	262 —	157 —	699 —	3,793 —	102 —	5,712	Begun	McDonough	
 12 1	57 76	- 13 2	 277 356	 262 199		699 573	3,793 3,429	 102 66	5,712 5,275	Transferred Net Added Terminated		

				Over ,000		15,000 Jnder		eous ies	_	- 1	l ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	Warren	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	9 9 6	2 2 2	3 3 	51 51 44	10 10 10	5 5 3		5 5 5	1 1 		125 — 125 108	23 23 23
9th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	110 3 +4 117 129	25 	41 1 +11 53 55	442 6 –12 436 454	88 88 85	95 95 96	5 5 8	240 240 253	2 2 3	158 — 158 178	1,010 11 1,021 1,029	242 3 245 223
10th	Marshall	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	12 - - 12 5	2 2 15		20 2 - 22 11	22 22 22 22	6 6 4	-	20 20 13			34 1 35 45	22 - 22 13
	Peoria	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	431 431 447	60 60 70	80 80 155	601 601 600	130 130 153	150 150 111	1 1 4	195 195 562		325 325 353	1,433 7 1,440 1,346	370 370 518
	Putnum	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	7 7 11			5 5 2	4 4 4		- - - 1	4 4 4		-	21 5 26 15	5 5 2
	Stark	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	4 4 6	2 2 2	1 1 2	7 7 11	1 1 1	1 - 1 1		10 10 9	2 2 1	1 1 1	15 - 15 13	5 5 6
	Tazewell	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	187 1 +1 189 172	13 	32 +12 44 56	249 	50 50 60	50 50 61	2 2 2	46 46 46			546 — 546 505	177 177 164
10th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	641 1 +1 643 641	77 1 76 96	113 +12 125 213	882 2 12 872 858	207 207 240	207 207 177	3 - 3 7	275 275 630		326 326 354	2,049 13 2,062 1,924	579 579 703
11th	Ford	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	7 7 13	3 1 - 4 10	7 +3 10 9	31 3 28 50	11 11 22	1 1 4	 5	4	- - 1	1 - 1 1	56 — 56 90	15 — 15 17
	Livingston	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	26 1 27 51	11 - 11 12	3 3 	60 — 60 105	23 23 20	56 56 56	29 29 9	52 52 79	-	22 - - 22 11	153 — 153 155	60 60 89

		Misder	neanors					_				
e	~	Penitentiary	Fine	sm	fe	rdinance Violations	U	Conservation Violations				
Juvenile	Felony	Penite	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	* Probate	Ordinance Violation	Traffic	Conse Viol	Total		County	Circuit
32	67	_	326	242	135	68 _	2,528	28	3,660 —	Begun	Warren	
	-4 63 26	-	+4 330 315	 242 256	 135 126	 68 86	 2,528 2,268		3,660 3,338	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
260	356 1	70	1,981 1	2,148	1,010 4	2,127	17,889	502	28,801 30	Begun	Circuit Totals	9th
 260 179	-47 310 363	1 69 46	+48 2,030 2,036	 2,148 2,109	1,014 1,038	 2,127 2,028			28,831 28,141	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
_	5		74	195	80	-	675	39	1,206 3	Begun	Marshall	10th
 _	5 10	-	 74 83	195 156			 675 673	 39 39	1,209 1,153	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
492	622 8	389	2,289	3,825	665	1,176	20,055 	53	33,342 15	Begun	Peoria	
 492 495	-9 621 705	16 373 270	+25 2,314 2,505	3,825 3,857	 665 753	 1,176 1,259	 20,055 20,210	 53 42	33,357 34,415	Transferred Net Added 		
_	6	_	12	50 2	22	2	227	64	429 7	Begun	Putnum	
 _	 6 2		 12 8	- 52 53	 22 25	2 2	 227 192		436 378	Transferred Net Added 		
1	5	4	44	57	68	4	177	20	429	Begun	Stark	
- - 1	5	- 4	 44	57	- 68	- 4	_ 177	 20	429	Transferred		
-		-	56	54	34	3	173	15	388	Terminated		
107 —	113 2	11	685 —	1,251 —	388 —	997 —	11,234 —	176 —	16,314 3	Begun	Tazewell	
107 68	115 125		685 690		388 324			176 190	16,317 16,458	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
600 —	751 10	404 —	3,104 —	5,378 2	1,223 —	2,179 —	32,368 —	352 —	51,720 28	Begun	Circuit Totals	10th
600 563	—9 752 842	-16 388 282	+25 3,129 3,342	5,380 5,382	 1,223 1,200	_ 2,179 2,292	 32,368 32,698	352 347	51,748 52,792	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
16	37	5	95 —	72	93 —	56 —	1,385 —	38 —	1,934 1	Begun	Ford	11th
_ 16	—9 28	 5	+9 104	 72	93	 56	 1,385		1,935	Transferred		
16	20	1	146	48	109	52	1,405	41	2,068	Terminated		
94 	125 		231 	555 — —	313 	41 	5,509 	32	7,395	Begun Reinstated Transferred	Livingston	
94 68	125 114	-	231 193	555 499	313 142	41 39	5,509 5,263	32 32	7,396 6,937	Net Added		

			Law \$15,	0ver ,000	Law \$ and l	15,000 Jnder		eous ies	ſ		l ations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Тах	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	Logan	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	20 20 38	1 1 2	3 3 1	182 182 190	14 — 14 18	4 4 4	39 — 39 24	46 46 50		2 2 	137 137 149	43 43 58
	McLean	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	124 19 +5 148 181	26 3 -5 24 30	33 2 +14 49 66	252 25 14 263 263	48 1 49 55	41 41 38	59 4 63 41	147 147 148	2 1 - 3 2	1 - 1 1	597 30 - 627 636	134 2 136 134
	Woodford	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	14 - 14 8	18 — — 18 15	6 6 5	88 — 	11 11 8		_ _ _ 2	6 6 3			78 78 79	30 30 41
11th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	191 20 +5 216 291	59 4 —5 58 69	52 2 +17 71 81	613 25 17 621 704	107 1 108 123	102 102 102	127 4 131 81	255 255 288	3 1 - 4 3	26 - 26 13	1,021 30 1,051 1,109	282 2 284 339
12th	Iroquois	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	33 - - 33 27	2 2 6	14 — 14 12	69 — 69 68	22 22 6	5 5 7		4 4 11	- - - 2	3 3 	85 — 85 83	32 32 25
	Kankakee	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	57 1 +9 67 65	44 1 _9 36 45	4 1 +23 28 24	463 31 -23 471 411	47 2 49 61	39 — 39 30	1 2 - 3 6	145 145 152		165 165 171	558 45 603 572	210 20 230 186
	Will	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	210 15 +111 336 380	234 2 -104 132 46	35 11 +57 103 132	886 36 58 864 799	260 2 262 258	109 — 109 95	47 47 58	285 3 288 171	-	124 124 120	1,164 4 1,168 1,122	260 1 261 643
12th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	300 16 +120 436 472	280 3 113 170 97	53 12 +80 145 168	1,418 67 81 1,404 1,278	329 4 333 325	153 — 	48 2 50 64	434 3 437 334	4	292 292 291	1,807 49 1,856 1,777	502 21 523 854
13th	Bureau	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	28 +2 30 33	7 2 -2 7 11	4 +2 6 9	100 2 98 98	21 21 24	19 — — 19 17	2 2 2	18 — 18 13			151 1 152 148	36 — 36 39
	Grundy	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	26 +5 31 27	16 1 -5 12 7	3 +3 6 10	56 -3 53 85	11 - 11 8	9 9 6	6 6 2	31 31 26			172 172 156	42 42 36

1												
				L S		s			neanors			
Circui	County		Total	Conservation Violations	Traffic	Ordinance Víolations	* Probate	Small Claims	Jail or Fine	Penitentiary	Felony	Juvenile
			6,024	13	4,224	47	177	608	344	_	59	61
		Transferred Net Added Terminated	 6,024 6,228	 13 10	4,224 4,252	47 45		 608 700		-	59 83	
	McLean	Begun	23,389 344	29 4	16,474 68	891 6	557 —	2,016 71	1,673 94	54 1	141 13	90
		Transferred Net Added Terminated	 23,733 24,459	 33 18		 897 899	557 523	2,087 2,106	 1,767 2,121	55 55	154 198	90 89
		Begun	4,131 9	17	2,977	5	185 3	405 5	203	_	79	9 1
		Transferred Net Added 		 17 18	 2,977 2,886	 5 5		_ 410 397	 203 212	-	79 81	10 13
11t	Circuit Totals	Begun	42,873 355	129 4	30,569 68	1,040 6	1,325 3	3,656 76	2,546 94	59 1	441	270 1
		Transferred Net Added 	 43,228 43,747		 30,637 30,661	 1,046 1,040	 1,328 1,134		+9 2,649 3,042	 60 56	—9 445 496	 271 246
12tl	Iroquois	Begun	6,562 —	80	5,180 —	5	220	317	365	-	93	33
		Transferred Net Added 		 80 104	5,180 5,232	- 5 5	 220 184	317 291	365 413		93 57	 33 32
	Kankakee	Begun	16,207 147	318 _	11,336 	381	282	1,302	489 2	120 —	123 11	123 31
		Transferred		 318 319		381 430		1,302 1,311	491 539	120 124	134 159	154 156
	Will	Begun	39,605 386	398 —	27,324 152	2,295 4	501 1	3,286 151	1,488 4	100 —	303	292
		Transferred Net Added Terminated			 27,476 26,915	 2,299 2,235	502 359	—6 3,431 3,430	+69 1,561 1,419		69 234 240	292 139
12tl	Circuit Totals	Begun	62,374 533	796 —	43,840 152	2,681 4	1,003 1	4,905 151	2,342 6	220 _	519 11	448 31
		Transferred Net Added Terminated		796 816	43,992 43,203	2,685 2,670	 1,004 823	—6 5,050 5,032	+69 2,417 2,371	220 205	-69 461 456	479 327
13tl	Bureau	Begun	7,185 3	25 —	5,555 —	70 —	191	364	471	4	75	44
		Transferred Net Added 	7,188 7,351	 25 24	5,555 5,499	- 70 63	191 343	364 418	+1 472 486	4 4	-1 74 73	44 47
	Grundy	Begun	4,280 2	104 —	2,889 1	83	86 —	309	367	_	32	38
		Transferred Net Added Terminated	4,282 4,097		2,890 2,865	 83 76	 86 87		+2 369 300	_ _ _	-2 30 23	 38 38

			Law \$15	Over ,000		15,000 Jnder	_	eous ies	_		l ations			
Circuit	County		ൢ Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	La Salle	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	157 14 +14 185 294	47 5 –14 38 38	8 5 +8 21 112	270 9 8 271 284	79 1 80 55	45 45 31	19 2 21 21	36 36 7	- - 2	21 21 22	491 3 494 465	220 220 192
13th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	211 14 +21 246 354	70 8 21 57 56	15 5 +13 33 131	426 9 13 422 467	111 1 112 87	73 73 54	27 2 29 25	85 — 85 46	- - 2	21 - 21 22	814 4 818 769	298 298 267
14th	Henry	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	28 — 28 30	12 12 6	11 +1 12 14	66 65 58	23 23 26	9 9 7	1 - 1 -	13 13 5	-	10 - 10 10	184 — 184 185	77 11 88 96
	Mercer	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	11 - - 11 7	7 - 7 5	2 2 3	44 44 38	8 	6 6 3		13 13 11	-	10 10 10	63 63 50	25 25 24
	Rock Island	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	155 12 +9 176 192	39 2 9 32 26	65 3 +26 94 64	405 2 26 381 135	165 4 169 184	104 1 	15 8 23 23	164 164 140		292 10 302 302	1,074 9 1,083 1,095	335 335 570
	Whiteside	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	32 - 32 20	19 19 10	3 3 3	169 - 169 168	26 26 25	22 22 19	29 29 17	51 51 44		10 - 10 9	323 323 335	120 120 68
14th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	+9 247	77 2 9 70 47	81 3 +27 111 84	684 2 27 659 699	222 4 226 240	141 1 142 108	45 8 53 40	241 241 200		322 10 332 331	1,644 9 1,653 1,665	557 11 568 758
15th	Carroll	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	- 11	8 1 9 6	1 1 1	35 1 36 27	8 8 10	6 6 8		11 11 10		7 7 7 7	90 90 70	26 2 28 17
	Jo Daviess	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	+1 10	6 1 1 6 3	3 +1 4 4	37 1 1 37 36	7 7 9	2 2 3		40 	1 1 1	3 3 3	43 1 44 56	12 - 12 16
	Lee	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	-	22 -5 17 15	1 - +2 3 11	76 2 3 75 77	25 3 28 18	12 12 12	4 4 3	43 43 51		9 9 3	159 2 161 177	77 77 74

116 110 3 1,423 3,292 470 610 8,024 64 15,507										,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			Misder	neanors									
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	 Ordinance Víolations 	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		110	3	1,423	3,292	470	610	8,024	64	15,507			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	116	89	2	1,445						 15,546	Transferred		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		217	7	2,261	3,965	747	763	16,468				Circuit Totals	13 th
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	198	193	6	2,286					 193	 27,016			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		60 		245	455 	265	230	8,214		10,056 68			14th
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	 135	58	-	247					 75				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	30	1	129	300		7	773		1,610		Mercer	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30	24	1	135		 75			 76				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	190					603	1			36,053 75		Rock Island	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	190	-1 414	-	+1 3,107	 2,920		 690	 25,191	149		Transferred		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	156	286		1,124	531	251	32	4,887	162	8,233			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				-	- - 521					- - 0 222	Transferred		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			1					4,623					
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					4,193 13	1,194	1						14th
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	511	782		4,613	 4,206		959	39,065	462		Net Added		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $													
39 19 - 317 172 68 162 1,929 106 3,019 Net Added 32 33 - 341 145 84 93 1,953 107 2,951 Net Added 11 7 - 263 258 142 495 2,429 288 4,056 Jo Daviess - 1 - - - - 4 Terminated Jo Daviess - 1 - - - - - 4	-		-	_	172	1	-	1,929	-	5	Reinstated		15th
11 7 - 263 258 142 495 2,429 288 4,056 Begun Jo Daviess - 1 - - - - - 4 Begun Jo Daviess - - - - - - - - - Begun Jo Daviess 11 8 - 263 258 142 495 2,429 288 4,060 Net Added 11 8 - 263 258 142 495 2,429 288 4,060 Net Added 14 5 - 294 223 115 532 2,554 295 4,217 Terminated 75 87 45 642 349 149 72 4,033 60 5,960 Begun Lee	39	19		317			162		106	3,019	Net Added		
- 1 - - - - 4 Reinstated - - - - - - - - - 11 8 - 263 258 142 495 2,429 288 4,060 Net Added 14 5 - 294 223 115 532 2,554 295 4,217 Terminated 75 87 45 642 349 149 72 4,033 60 5,960													-
14 5 294 223 115 532 2,554 295 4,217 Terminated 75 87 45 642 349 149 72 4,033 60 5,960 Begun Lee	-	1		-		-	-	-	-	4	Reinstated		
				642	1			4,033					1
5 -1 +6Transferred 75 84 45 648 351 152 73 4,033 60 5,976Net Added		-5 84	-1 45	648		 152			-	 5,976	Transferred		
66 134 77 653 376 170 67 3,948 59 6,013 Terminated	66	134	77	653	376	170	67	3,948	59	6,013	Terminated		

			Law \$15,		Law \$ and L		~	ies	E		unicipal Corporations			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Тах	Municipal Corporat	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
	Ogle	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	15 15 20	24 24 10	2 - 2 6	111 - - 111 127	25 — 25 28	5 5 5	1 - 1 4	16 — 16 16		2 2 2	209 — 209 221	84 84 83
	Stephenson	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	31 - +2 33 32	15 _1 14 14	12 - 12 7	101 100 98	34 34 47	4 4 3		26 26 23		4 1 5 1	243 243 219	186 186 96
15th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	86 +9 95 100	75 2 7 70 48	19 +3 22 29	360 4 	99 3 5 97 112	29 29 31	5 5 7	136 136 135	1 1 1	25 1 26 16	744 3 747 743	385 2 387 286
16th	De Kalb	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	39 4 +7 50 47	24 1 5 20 20	7 3 +17 27 30	150 9 18 141 131	33 1 34 33	31 - 31 30	15 - 15 7	92 92 104	31 - 31 -	4 4 5	305 38 343 345	110 4 114 113
	Kane	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	277 16 293 328	148 5 153 172	62 4 66 80	796 17 813 795	208 3 211 204	90 6 96 97	3 1 - 4 23	284 1 285 233	5 5 59	643 643 572	1,706 12 1,718 1,613	462 6 468 483
	Kendall	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	12 +2 14 18	9 2 7 3	2 +7 9 30	66 _7 59 63	16 16 18	4 4 2		7 7 11	1 - 1 -	3 3 4	131 131 120	51 51 47
16th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	328 20 +9 357 393	181 6 7 180 195	71 7 +24 102 140	1,012 26 -25 1,013 989	257 4 261 255	125 6 	18 1 19 30	383 1 	37 37 59	650 — 650 581	2,142 50 2,192 2,078	623 10 - 633 643
17th	Boone	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	11 11 19	5 5 5	5 5 4	57 57 52	28 — 28 29	11 - 11 11		1 - 1 2		-	168 168 144	69 — 69 69
	Winnebago	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	251 5 +1 257 255	64 2 1 65 68	61 1 +2 64 80	963 4 2 965 1,276	310 2 	197 197 147	12 1 13 14	62 		776 776 833	1,605 13 - 1,618 1,961	662 52 714 669
17th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	262 5 +1 268 274	69 2 1 70 73	66 1 +2 69 84	1,020 4 2 1,022 1,328	338 2 	208 — 208 158	12 1 13 14	63 63 41		776 	1,773 13 - 1,786 2,105	731 52 783 738

											İ	
		Misder	neanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
62 1	112	235	1,169	464	181	1	3,431	114	6,263 1	Begun	Ogle	
 63 42		235 220	+1 1,170 1,084	 464 476	181 199	- 1 -	3,431 3,252	 114 111	6,264 6,001	Transferred Net Added 		
56	122		669 1	570 —	272	652 —	5,095	34 —	8,126 2	Begun	Stephenson	
	_7 115 100		+7 677 640	570 613	 272 238		 5,095 4,787	 34 25	8,128 7,599	Transferred Net Added ierminated		
243 1	360 3	280 1	3,047 1	1,813 2	811 4	1,382 1	16,917 —	602 —	27,419 28	Begun	Circuit Totals	15th
244 204	-26 337 367	-1 280 297	+27 3,075 3,012	 1,815 1,833	815 806	 1,383 1,298		.602 597	27,447 26,781	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
68 30	168 	62 -	1,352	1,366 3	185 —	317 —	6,243 —	29 —	10,631 93	Begun	De Kalb	16th
98 85	-6 162 150	-1 61 48	+7 1,359 1,371	—1 1,368 1,368	185 156		 6,243 6,023		10,724 10,338	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
493 —	742 3	376 —	3,586 —	7,699 129	767 	1,742 —	37,689 —	80 	57,858 203	Begun	Kane	
493 486	745 539	376 364		 7,828 7,831	 767 718			 80 84	58,061 58,761	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
48	49	12	172	167	76	78	2,466	56	3,426	Begun	Kendall	
	—9 40 41	-2 10 7	+11 183 230	167 141	76 69	 78 81	 2,466 2,449	 56 58	3,426 3,417	Transferred		
609 30	959 3	450 —	5,110	9,232 132	1,028 	2,137	46,398 —	165 —	71,915 296	Begun	Circuit Totals	16th
639 596	—15 947 730	-3 447 419	+18 5,128 5,310	-1 9,363 9,340	 1,028 943	 2,137 2,022	 46,398 47,141	 165 175	 72,211 72,516	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
16 —	13 —	-	545 —	561 —	105 —	972 —	3,253 —	12 —	5,832	Begun	Boone	17th
	-1 12 21		+1 546 557	561 654		972 865	3,253 3,240		5,832 5,841	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
811 248	810 4	265 1	2,959 13	6,915 14	852	2,775	48,982 —	76 —	69,408 360	Begun	Winnebago	
1,059 1,318	-184 630 395	-70 196 109	+254 3,226 3,113		852 564	 2,775 2,775	48,982 48,047	76 76	69,768 70,314	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
827 248	823 4	265 1	3,504 13	7,476 14	957	3,747	52,235	88	75,240 360	Begun	Circuit Totals	17th
1,075 1,357	-185 642 416	-70 196 109	+255 3,772 3,670	 7,490 8,902	957 686			 88 84				

			Law \$15,		Law \$ and L	15,000 Jnder		ss			tions			
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
18th	Du Page	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	464 11 +150 625 558	327 3 150 180 125	.73 6 +79 158 142	1,424 5 79 1,350 1,097	300 7 307 222	308 — 308 204	24 - 24 15	11,867 11,867 11,313	-	18 — 18 2	1,950 22 1,972 1,980	564 564 708
18th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	464 11 +150 625 558	327 3 -150 180 125	73 6 +79 158 142	1,424 5 79 1,350 1,097	300 7 307 222	308 — 308 204	24 24 15	11,867 11,867 11,313		18 18 2	1,950 22 1,972 1,980	564
19th	Lake	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	315 9 +8 332 467	221 3 7 217 274	64 3 +6 73 94	1,475 8 6 1,477 1,770	348 2 	166 — 166 143	15 - 15 17	109 109 119	7 7 9	143 — 143 146	2,049 2 2,051 2,073	670 — 670 708
	McHenry	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	124 124 84	9 9 7	17 17 11	367 	133 133 79	43 43 27	5 5 5	41 41 28	13 - 13 5	2 2 3	580 580 461	239 239 149
19th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	439 9 +8 456 551	230 3 7 226 281	81 3 +6 90 105	1,842 8 6 1,844 2,132	481 2 483 568	209 209 170	20 - 20 22	150 150 147	20 20 14	145 145 149	2,629 2 2,631 2,534	909 — 909 857
20th	Monroe	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	14 +1 15 11	2 2 - 4 4	1 1 7	18 3 21 30	8 8 12	14 14 15	6 6 1	9 9 3	- - - 17	1 1 1	44 44 48	17 17 22
	Perry	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	10 10 7	4 4 	6 6 5	33 2 35 30	7 7 3	3 3 3	-	17 1 18 25			65 12 77 76	12 6 18 29
	Randolph	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	13 13 14	4 4 3	4 4 4	13 - 13 15	- - - 1	92 92 81		25 25 22		119 119 121	106 — 106 100	39 — 39 38
	St. Clair	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	475 19 +11 505 751	99 4 2 101 55	236 7 +38 281 396	771 18 47 742 821	241 2 243 199	275 4 279 324	16 20	4,520 4,520 3,844	- - 1	-	1,640 1,640 1,195	602 602 416
	Washington	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	7 +1 8 5	1 _1 	1 - - 1 1	12 - 12 13	5 5 6	2 2 2	 2	23 23 29	- - 2	5 5 5	22 22 27	8 — 8 19

(4)		Misden	neanors									
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
559	1,371 95	_	4,329	3,258	671	8,397 _	58,737	_	94,641 149	Begun	Du Page	18th
559 454		- - -		 3,258 3,241		_ 8,397 6,890	58,737 54,192			Transferred Net Added Terminated		
559	1,371 95	-	4,329	3,258	671	8,397	58,737	_	94,641 149	Begun	Circuit Totals	18th
559 454		- - -	4,329 3,729		671 553			-	 94,790 86,761	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
579	347	159 —	3,168 —	8,683	1,310 _	5,602 —	48,852	256	74,538 27	Reinstated	Lake	19th
579 523	—3 344 323	—2 157 189	+5 3,173 3,558	-1 8,682 8,072		 5,602 4,958	— 48,852 48,961	 256 268		Transferred Net Added Terminated		
.143	173		1,575	3,345 _	419	983 —	13,747	13	21,971	Begun	McHenry	
143 79	173 110	- - -	 1,575 1,487	 3,345 2,960	419 448			 13 17	 21,971 19,879	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
722	520	159 —	4,743	12,028	1,729	6,585 _	62,599	269	96,509 27	Begun	Circuit Totals	19th
	—3 517 433	—2 157 189	+5 4,748 5,045	-1 12,027 11,032	 1,729 1,682		 62,599 61,755	 269 285		Transferred Net Added Terminated		
6	13 1	_	140	269 2	125	-	1,354	10	2,051 8	Begun	Monroe	20th
				 271 277	125 69				2,059 2,161	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
4 1	28 9	-	83 9	540 —	138 10	91 _	1,101	4	2,146 50	Begun	Perry	
5 9	-1 36 35		+1 93 97	540 552	148 95	91 80	1,101 943	4 4	2,196 1,993	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
15	24	5	115	260 2	133 1	1	1,921 —	39 —	2,928 3	Begun	Randolph	
	-5 19 29	+5 10 5		 262 258		1 1		 39 43	2,931 2,843	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
546 27	332 2	132	2,759 19	2,800	771	2,513	23,199 _	_	41,916 118	Begun	St. Clair	
573 570		 132 56	2,778 2,357	 2,800 2,882		 2,513 2,162	 23,199 22,179		42,034 39,298	Transferred Net Added Terminated		
3	19	-	20	122	71	-	611	22	956	Begun	Washington	
37			20 20		- 71 70	-	611 587	22 23	956 978	Transferred Net Added Terminated		

<u></u>				0ver ,000	Law \$ and l	15,000 Jnder		ss ss tions						
Circuit	County		Jury	Non- Jury	Jury	Non- Jury	Chancery	Miscellaneous Remedies	Eminent Domain	Tax	Municipal Corporations	Mental Health	Divorce	Family
20th	Circuit Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	519 19 +13 551 788	110 6 -3 113 62	248 7 +37 292 413	847 23 47 823 909	261 2 263 221	386 4 390 425	16 26	4,594 1 4,595 3,923	- - 3	125 — 125 127	1,877 12 1,889 1,446	678 6 684 524
	Cook Co. Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	2,715 2,411 +9,784 14,910 19,005	13,875 1,798 9,784 5,889 4,597	6,592 2,331 +2,206 11,129 13,074	78,609 1,632 2,194 78,047 78,999	14,258 0 14,258 12,073		161 0 0 161 153	85,541 3,273 0 88,814 84,942	65 1 0 66 33	0 0 3,414	0 0 27,106	47,164 0 0 47,164 46,741
	Downstate Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	5,252 150 +406 5,808 6,443	2,242 47 379 1,910 1,680	1,404 54 +414 1,872 2,205	16,230 196 430 15,996 15,928	3,952 45 3,997 3,949	13 2,905	34 589	20,700 5 20,705 19,179	5 135		306 29,588	9,446 122 9,568 9,892
	State Totals	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	7,967 2,561 +10,190 20,718 25,448	16,117 1,845 10,163 7,799 6,277	7,996 2,385 +2,620 13,001 15,279	94,839 1,828 2,624 94,043 94,927	18,210 45 0 18,255 16,022	17 0 3,906	34 0 750	106,241 3,278 0 109,519 104,121	6 0 201	8,358 12 0 8,370 8,265	306 0 56,694	122 0 56,732

		Misdemeanors										
Juvenile	Felony	Penitentiary	Jail or Fine	Small Claims	Probate	Ordinance Víolations	Traffic	Conservation Violations	Total		County	Circuit
574 28 602 602	416 12 6 422 403	137 +5 142 61	3,117 28 +1 3,146 2,840	3,991 4 3,995 4,110		2,605 2,605 2,243	28,186 28,186 26,970	75 — 75 80	4,997 179 50,176 47,273	Begun Reinstated Transferred Net Added Terminated	Circuit Totals	20th
21,859 125 0 21,984 23,710	0 0 5,076		1,795 0 1,795 1,213	76,618 574 12 77,180 76,389	0 0 10,652	0 0 263,235	1,279,877 0 0 1,279,877 1,282,295		1,939,609 12,149 0 1,951,758 1,937,949	BegunBegun	Cook Co. Totals	
8,561 415 8,976 8,532	11,879 170 653 11,396 10,099	2,758 6 26 2,738 2,385	155 +679 64,968	95,726 572 –11 96,287 92,274	35 20,462	56,319 11 56,330 51,415	596,111 226 596,337 581,362	4	958,617 2,583 961,200 930,769	BegunBegun	. Downstate Totals	
30,420 540 0 30,960 32,242	16,955 170 653 16,472 14,585	2,758 6 26 2,738 2,385	155 +679 66,763	1,146 —23 173,467	35 0 31,114	11 0		4 0 5,677	14,732 0 2,912,958		State Totals	

THE TREND OF ALL CASES, THE NUMBER OF CIVIL VERDICTS* AND THE AVERAGE DELAY** IN REACHING VERDICT DURING 1972

¢.	Total Cases Begun or	Total Cases	Curr	ency	Total No. of Civil Cases* Terminated	Average
Circuit	Reinstated	Terminated	Gain	Loss	by Verdict	Time Elapsed**
Cook	1,951,758	1,937,949	_	13,809	1,036	42.0
1st	33,031	32,835	-	196	14	25.2
2nd	23,023	21,284	_	1,739	15	24.1
3rd	42,594	38,294	-	4,300	55	27.2
4th	29,730	28,655	-	1,075	14	17.3
5th	28,160	27,777	_	383	11	17.3
6th	56,399	52,726	-	3,673	22	18.8
7th	40,840	36,834	-	4,006	16	15.9
8th	20,838	20,519	-	319	12	21.3
9th	28,831	28,141	-	690	8	19.9
10th	51,748	52,792	1,044	-	57	20.3
11th	43,228	43,747	519	_	35	22.3
12th	62,907	61,699	-	1,208	39	35.1
13th	27,016	26,689	_	327	38	23.6
14th	56,095	55,017	-	1,078	35	24.4
15th	27,447	26,781	-	666	16	18.7
16th	72,211	72,516	305	-	46	17.8
17th	75,600	76,155	555	-	35	23.6
18th	94,790	86,761	_	8,029	48	18.2
19th	96,536	94,274	-	2,262	60	26.5
20th	50,176	47,273	-	2,903	50	24.9
Downstate Total	961,200	930,769	-	30,431	626	23.3
State Total	2,912,958	2,868,718	_	44,240	1,662	35.0

-

* Includes verdicts in Law–Jury cases only. ** Average time elapsed (in months) between date of filing and date of verdict.

RATIO OF CASELOAD PER JUDGE IN THE CIRCUIT COURTS OF ILLINOIS DURING 1972

s Circuit	Number of Counties	Population (1970 Federal Census)	Area (Square Miles)	Total Number of Cases Filed During 1972	Number of Circuit Judges, Associate Judges	Average No. of Cases per Judge
Cook	1	5,427,237	954	1,939,609	258	7,517
1st	9	187,915	3,242	32,981	16	2,061
2nd	12	196,404	4,796	22,976	18	1,276
3rd	2	259,947	1,114	42,578	16	2,661
4th	9	223,553	5,425	29,556	14	2,111
5th	5	190,966	2,885	28,142	14	2,010
6th	6	350,317	3,178	56,385	20	2,819
7th	6	280,344	3,485	40,765	18	2,265
8th	8	147,767	3,918	20,821	16	1,301
9th	6	188,261	3,904	28,801	16	1,800
10th	5	338,168	2,129	51,720	20	2,586
11th	5	220,380	3,853	42,873	13	3,298
12th	3	374,840	2,647	62,374	20	3,119
13th	3	174,521	2,453	26,972	12	2,248
14th	4	296,604	2,492	55,952	20	2,798
15th	5	169,769	3,136	27,419	13	2,109
16th	3	348,972	1,472	71,915	18	3,995
17th	2	269,829	803	75,240	14	5,374
18th	1	484,301	331	94,641	19	4,981
19th	2	485,564	1,068	96,509	21	4,596
20th	5	362,249	2,652	49,997	21	2,381
Downstate Total	101	5,550,671	54,983	958,617	339	2,828
State Total	102	10,977,908	55,937	2,898,226	597	4,855

DISPOSITION OF DEFENDANTS CHARGED WITH FELONIES OR MISDEMEANORS PUNISHABLE BY IMPRISONMENT IN THE PENITENTIARY AND PENALTIES IMPOSED DURING THE YEAR 1972

					NOT CONVICTED																	CONV	CTED	ED			
								Re	duced o	r Dismiss	ed				Trie	d But No	ot Convi	cted									
Circuit	County	Total Number Of Defendants Disposed Of		N	Total Not Convicted		ged At inary ring	Dism On Mo Defer	tion Of	Dism On Mo Sta	tion Of	Reduc Jail/ Misden	Fine	Acqu B ¹ Coi	V	Acqu B Ju	y I	Convic Jail/ Misden	Fine	To <u>Conv</u>		-	ea)f ilty	Conv B' Cor	y	В	victed Sy Iry
		CF	CM	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ
1st	Alexander Jackson Johnson Massac Pope Pulaski Saline Union Williamson . TOTALS	55 181 27 32 3 30 87 29 111 555	15 80 14 3 16 42 170	44 105 18 23 2 22 74 20 58 366	8 36 3 8 21 81	- 1 - 1 23 - 25	1 2 1 4	- 2 - - 7 1 10	- - - 1 1	41 103 9 10 2 16 51 9 55 296	6 36 - 3 - 1 6 - 18 70	2 7 12 - 5 - 3 1 30				- - - - - 1 2		1 - - - 1 - 3	1 1	11 76 9 1 8 13 9 53 189	7 44 9 8 21 89	11 75 9 1 8 9 51 182	7 44 9 8 20 88	 1 1	- - - - * - 1	- - - - 4 - 1 6	
2nd	Crawford Edwards Franklin Gallatin Hamilton Jefferson Lawrence Richland Wabash Wayne White TOTALS	23 7 79 29 21 6 6 61 28 12 20 31 48 365	1 29 11 16 - 13 3 - 3 18 14 108	7 2 74 21 10 4 42 14 2 10 22 35 243	1 29 2 12 - 7 2 - 11 12 76	2 - 1 - 4 - - 7			- - - 1 - - - - 1	4 2 74 17 9 31 12 2 9 18 24 202	1 29 2 12 - 4 2 - 9 12 71	1 1 - 4 3 1 - 1 4 4 4 19	- - - 1 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		- - - 1 - - - - 1	 3	 2 2			16 5 8 11 2 18 14 10 10 9 13 121	- - 9 4 - 6 1 - 3 7 2 32	16 5 8 9 2 15 14 10 9 13 116				- - 2 - 3 - - - 5	
3rd	Bond Madison TOTALS	7 385 392	2 - 2	2 225 227	-			2 2	-	200 200	-	2 8 10			-	3 3		 4 4	-	5 150 155	2	5 136 141	2 - 2	5 5			- - -
4th	Christian Clay Clinton Effingham . Fayette Jasper Marion Montgomery Shelby TOTALS	66 10 21 16 79 5 78 46 30 351	10 1 3 2 5 7 15 2 45	33 7 6 49 3 51 36 15 200	6 1 3 1 5 4 8 2 30	2 - 2 2 4			 4 4	19 3 6 42 3 39 34 10 156	4 3 - 5 4 3 1 20	14 2 2 1 1 1 21	2 1 - - - - 3	- - - - 1 - 1		 2	- - 1 - 1 - 1 - 2		- - - - - 1 1	31 3 21 10 30 2 27 10 15 149	4 1 3 7 15	29 3 21 10 29 2 27 9 15 145	4 - 1 - 3 7 - 15	1 1		1 - 1 - 1 - 3	
5th	Clark Coles Cumberland Edgar Vermilion TOTALS	11 136 5 32 194 378	 2 5 7	9 48 2 26 114 199	- - 1 - 1		-	- - 14 14		6 32 2 15 49 104		3 2 11 27 43	- - 1 - 1	 5 5	-	- - - 5 6		- - 1 1		2 88 3 6 80 179	- - 1 5 6	2 88 3 6 59 158	- - 1 5 6	- - 9 9		- - - 12 12	
													PENA	LTIES													
---------	--	----	-------------	--	---	---	------------------------------	--	-------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------	--	---	--	--	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	--	----------------------------	-----------------------------
				_				SENTE	INCES									•		PROB	ATION					Commi	ittad a
Circuit	County	De	ath		onment entiary	Impriso ar Fi		Ja	ail	J. ai Fi	nd	Fi	1e	To Sente		With Or Or E	Jail	With Re Or C Or E	osts	With Spe Cond	cial	With Spe Condi	cial	To Proba		Incom Before	petent Trial C xually
oncur	County	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	CM	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ
1st	Alexander Jackson Johnson Massac Pope Pulaski Saline Union Williamson . TOTALS	-		5 18 4 2 - 5 2 16 52	2 2 - - 3 7	- - - - - - 2 2		1 6 - 2 9		2 - 2 - 4	1 1 2	- 19 1 - 1 2 - 1 24	 2 4 22	8 43 5 2 1 2 7 2 21 91	3 18 - - 2 - 8 31	2 22 1 5 1 6 7 16 60	1 17 - 9 - - 6 4 37		- 3 - - - - 8 11	- 1 1 - 3 - - 2 8	- - - - - 1	1 5 - - - - 6	3 5 - - - 1 9	3 33 4 7 6 7 32 98	4 26 - 9 - 6 * 13 58		
2nd	Crawford Edwards Franklin Gallatin Hamilton Jefferson Lawrence Richland Wabash Wayne White TOTALS			5 3 1 4 1 9 11 6 5 4 2 51	- - 1 2 - - 1 - 1 - 5	- - - - - - - - - - - - 2	 2 2	3 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -					- 6 - 1 - 4 - 11	8 2 4 3 4 1 10 13 6 6 4 3 64	- 7 2 - 1 1 1 - 3 4 - 18	7 2 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 3 9 32	- - - - - - - - - 3 1 6	1 1 - 1 - 7 - 2 3 1 1 1 7	- - - 3 - - - 1 4		- - 1 - - - - - - - - - 2	 2	- - 1 - - 1 - - - - - 2	8 3 1 5 7 1 8 1 4 4 5 10 57	- 2 2 5 - 3 2 14		
3rd	Bond Madison TOTALS	-	- - -	1 64 65	2 - 2		 						-	1 70 71	2 - 2	1 10 11		1 10 11	- - -	2 18 20		- 42 42		4 80 84		 10 10	
4th	Christian Clay Clinton Effingham Fayette Jasper Marion Montgomery Shelby TOTALS			21 1 12 2 14 2 7 3 7 69	- - - 1 - - - 1		3 - 1 4	 1 3 4			- - - - - 3 - 3	 1 4 5	1 1 1 3	21 2 18 2 15 2 8 7 7 82	4 1 - 2 4 11	2 1 3 1 6 - 11 3 4 31	- - - - 1 - 1	8 3 4 5 4 24	- - - 1 1 2	 4 4		- - 4 1 - 3 - - 8	 1 1	10 1 3 8 15 - 19 3 8 67	- - - 1 3 - 4	2 2	
5th	Clark Coles Cumberland Edgar Vermilion TOTALS				- - - 2 2			 11 - 1 13		- 3 - 1 4	 	- 17 - - 17		- 45 1 38 87	 2 2	1 12 6 19	- - 1 - 1	 16 2 3 18 39	 2 2	1 - - 17 18	- - 1 1	- 15 - 1 16		2 43 2 3 42 92	- - 1 3 4		

108					NOT CONVICTED Reduced or Dismissed Tried But Not Convicted															CONVI	CTED						
								Re	duced o	r Dismiss	ed	r			Trie	d But No	ot Convi	cted									
Circuit	County	Total N Of Defe Dispos	ndants	To No Convi	ot	Dischar Prelim Hea	inary	Dism On Mo Defer	tion Of	Dism On Mot Sta	tion Of	Reduc Jail/I Misden	Fine	Acqu B [:] Coi	Y	Acqu B Ju	у	Convic Jail/ Misden	Fine	Tot Convi		Ple O Gui	f	Convi By Cou	/	Convi B Jui	Ý
		CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ
6th	Champaign . DeWitt Douglas Macon Moultrie Piatt TOTALS	564 28 20 352 25 36 1,025	154 9 116 5 284	445 13 12 138 19 30 657	45 3 40 4 - 92	71 - - - 71	3 3	18 3 17 - - 38	- - 10 - 10	333 9 9 111 11 29 502	5 3 	9 2 2 8 1 22	36 2 38	5 1 - 4 - 10	-	9 1 4 14	- - 2 - 2		1 1 2	116 15 8 214 6 5 364	108 6 76 1 191	96 14 8 208 4 4 334	105 6 75 1 187	14 1 - - 1 16	1 1	6 6 2 14	2 1 3
7th	Greene Jersey Macoupin Morgan Sangamon . Scott TOTALS	3 32 60 28 132 4 259	5 15 1 76 3 100	3 30 22 20 47 2 124	3 10 1 76 3 93	 1 5 6				1 29 19 13 21 2 85	3 4 1 29 3 40	2 	- 4 - 14 - 18	- - 1 - 1		- 1 13 - 15	Ţ, Ţ Ţ Ţ Ţ Ţ Ţ	- - 3 - 3	- 1 - 19 - 20	- 2 38 8 84 2 134	2 5 - 7	- 2 34 4 52 2 94	2 - 7	- 2 3 13 - 18	*	 2 1 19 22	
8th	Adams Brown Calhoun Cass Mason Menard Pike Schuyler TOTALS	99 7 8 37 59 17 24 2 253	51 7 11 6 3 2 80	65 6 5 21 32 6 8 2 145	34 2 4 1 41	6 - 1 - 7	3 3	2 - 2 4	1 1	50 5 15 26 3 7 2 108	22 2 4 1 29	6 6 - 5 6 - - - 23	8 8			1 1 - 1 - 3				34 1 3 16 27 11 16 - 108	16 5 7 6 3 1 38	31 1 3 15 27 11 16 - 104	15 4 7 6 3 1 36		- - 1 - - - 1	3 1 4	1 1
9th	Fulton Hancock Henderson . Knox McDonough Warren TOTALS	46 24 14 236 78 30 428	1 13 29 2 45	31 17 10 172 45 12 287	- 11 - 20 2 - 33	- - 3 - 3	- 1 - 1 - 2	- 1 - 2 2 - 5	- 1 - - 1	26 13 7 141 41 8 236	- 9 - 17 2 - 28	4 3 26 1 4	- - 2 - 2 - 2			- - - 1 - 1		1 - - - 1		15 7 4 64 33 18 141	1 2 - 9 - 12	14 7 4 64 32 13 134	1 2 - 9 - 12	1 - 1		- - - 1 5 6	
10th	Marshall Peoria Putnam Stark Tazewell TOTALS	10 737 3 125 875	291 - 12 303	8 470 3 63 544	 184 11 195	6 5 - - 11	- 3 - - 3	99 - - 99	 30 - 30	2 320 2 62 386	- 126 - 7 133	19 1 - 20	- 20 - - 20	-	 4 5	- 3 - 1 4		 24	- 4 - - 4	2 267 62 331		2 256 57 315	107 - 1 108	- 1 - - 1		 10 5 15	
11th	Ford Livingston . Logan McLean Woodford TOTALS	29 107 83 221 81 521	3 55 58	26 57 61 109 49 302	2 40 42	- 5 7 - 12		- 6 4 10 13 33	- - 2 - 2	17 42 50 89 35 233	2 34 36	9 9		2 3 5	- - 1 - 1	2 - 7 - 9	- - 3 - 3	- - 1 1		3 50 22 112 32 219	1 15 16	2 46 20 101 32 201	1 14 15	 2 2 2 6	- - 1 - 1	1 2 - 9 - 12	
12th	Iroquois Kankakee Will TOTALS	54 172 380 606	134 95 229	47 86 296 429	49 70 119	3 10 7 20	- 1 - 1	 6 1 7		31 57 214 302		9 1 68 78	 9 9	1 3 1 5	9 1 10	1 9 5 15		2 - - 2		7 83 83 173		7 68 62 137	 78 20 98		- 7 5 12	 5 17 22	

-													PENA	TIES													
		1000000000				4		SENTE	NCES			_								PROBA	ATION	4				Commi	ittad as
Circuit	County	De	ath	Impriso Penite		Impriso an Fi		Ja	il F	ar	ail 1d ne	Fir	10	To: Sente		With Or. Or B	Jail	With Res Or C Or E	osts	With Spe Condi	cial	With Spe Cond	cial	Tot Proba		Incom Before As Se:	itted as opetent Trial Or xually perous
	obunty	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	CM	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	CM	CF	СМ	CF	CM	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	CM	CF	CM
6th	Champaign . DeWitt Douglas Macon Moultrie Piatt TOTALS			41 104 3 148	2 10 12			12 1 - 4 - 1 18	22 2 12 1 37	1 1 - 2 - - 4	7 	16 - - - 17	42 4 10 56	70 5 1 110 3 1 190	73 6 37 1 117	11 5 - - 2 23	8 8	32 3 	26 39 65	2 2 2 1 1 8	1 - 1	1 - - - - 3		46 10 7 104 3 4 174	35 39 74	3 - - 1 4	1 - - - - 1
7th	Greene Jersey Macoupin Morgan Sangamon . Scott TOTALS			- 2 15 4 84 1 106					2 2			- 1 - - 1		- 22 8 84 1 117	2 5 7	- 10 - 1 1		- 5 - - 5				- 1 - - 1		- - - - - - - 1 17		- - - 1 - 1	
8th	Adams Brown Calhoun Cass Mason Pike Schuyler TOTALS			17 4 14 5 2 42	4 1 1 6	1 1 1 - 1 - 4		2 1 2 - 5	 1 2 1 4			- - 2 - - 2	- - 2 1 - 3	20 6 19 5 3 53	4 2 4 2 1 13	5 1 - 2 2 4 8 - 22	3 1 2 2 1 1 10	6 4 4 1 5 20	8 - 1 1 - - 10	3 3 4 10	1 1 - 2	- - 2 1 - 3	- - 1 - 1 1 - 3	14 1 3 10 8 6 13 	12 3 3 4 2 1 25		1 - - 1
9th	Fulton Hancock Henderson . Knox McDonough Warren TOTALS			6 2 	1 - 1 - 3	1 - - 1		1 - 1 2		- - - 1 1		5 2 2 9	- - 1 - 1	13 2 21 8 4 50	1 1 2 - 4	- 1 17 1 14 33	- - 2 - 2	2 1 21 2 - 27	- - 3 - 3		 2 - 2	- 1 - - - 1	- 1 - - - 1	2 5 2 43 25 14 91	- 1 - 7 - 8		
10th	Marshall Peoria Putnum Stark Tazewell TOTALS			2 58 15 75	 5 5	- 1 - - 1		 10 - 10	- 1 - - 1			- - - 7	31 - - 31	2 76 - 15 93	37 - - 37 37	 78 35 113	27 - - 27 27	 82 11 93	- 20 - 1 21	 15 1 16	- 16 - - 16	- 16 - - 16	- 7 - - 7	- 191 - 47 238	- 70 - 1 71		-
11th	Ford Livingston . Logan McLean Woodford TOTALS			1 17 2 31 5 56		- 1 - 1		 1 6 4 4 15	- - 2 - 2	- - 1 - 1		- 2 1 - 1 4	1 - - - 1	1 20 10 36 10 77	1 2 3		- - 10 - 10	2 4 6 28 8 48	- - 3 - 3	- 4 - 1 5 10		- 3 - - 3		2 30 12 76 22 142	- - 13 - 13		
12th 109	Iroquois Kankakee Will TOTALS	-		- 31 45 76	- 3 - 3	- 4 - 4		1 3 3 7	- 5 6 11			- 12 2 14	 57 8 65	1 50 50 101	67 14 81	3 21 24	 5 6 11	2 15 6 23	9 4 13	1 10 - 11	- 2 - 2	 8 6 14	- 2 1 3	6 33 33 72	- 18 11 29	- 3 1 4	

										N	IOT CON	IVICTE	D										CONVI	CTED			
								Re	duced o	r Dismiss	ed				Trie	d But No	ot Convi	cted									
Circuit	County	Total N Of Def Dispo	endants	To N Conv	ot	Dischar Prelim Hea	ninary	Dism On Mot Defer	tion Of	Dism On Mo Sta	tion Of	Reduc Jail/ Misder		Acqu B Cor	y	Acqu B Ju	у	Convic Jail/ Misden	Fine	To Conv		PI C Gu)f	Conv B ⁱ Cor	y	Convi B ¹ Jui	y
		CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF•	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	CN
13th	Bureau Grundy LaSalle TOTALS	93 24 96 213	1 6	55 5 68 128	4 1 5 10			- - 1 1	4 4	47 4 47 98	- - 5 5	5 1 18 24	- 1 - 1		-	3 2 5			- - -	38 19 27 84	- - 1 1	38 19 26 83	- - 1 1			- - 1 1	-
14th	Henry Mercer Rock Island Whiteside TOTALS	69 26 318 279 692	1 - -	46 17 130 200 393	- 1 - 1	1 1 2	 	- - 23 23		23 9 106 176 314	- 1 - 1	22 8 6 36				- 13 - 13		- 		23 9 188 79 299	-	23 9 164 78 274		- 14 1 15	-	- 10 - 10	-
15th	Carroll Jo Daviess . Lee Ogle Stephenson TOTALS	41 5 138 96 110 390	 78 221 	34 94 50 68 246	67 121 	1 1 2 4	 9 1 10	3 - 1 1 - 5	- - 1 - 1	19 84 46 48 197	- 57 116 - 173	11 4 1 13 29	- 1 - 1	- - - 1 1	 3 3	- - 4 - 6 10				7 5 44 46 42 144	- 11 100 - 111	7 5 40 45 37 134	- 10 95 - 105	- 2 - 1 3	- - 4 - 4	 2 1 4 7	
6th	De Kalb Kane Kendall TOTALS	155 490 50 695	161 9	108 258 46 412	40 129 7 176	6 45 1 52	5 5	 18 2 20		85 178 33 296	20 124 5 149	6 12 9 27	3 2 5	5 4 - 9	5 5 10	2 1 3	6 6	4 1 - 5	1 - 1	47 231 4 282	9 32 2 43	44 55 3 102	9 21 2 32	1 173 174	- 11 - 11	2 3 1 6	
7th	Boone Winnebago . TOTALS	22 598 620	181	8 429 437		 30 30	-	 10 10		5 199 204	 53 53	2 188 190	- 72 72	1 1	_ 2 2	1 1 2	_ 1 1		- 2 2	14 168 182	- 51 51	11 144 155	 44 44	3 4 7	- 3 3	 20 20	
Bth	Du Page TOTALS	443 443		218 218	_	-	-	40 40	_	178 178	-		-	-	_	-	-	-		225 225	_	194 194	-	12 12	-	19 19	
9th	Lake McHenry TOTALS	380 109 489	-	197 57 254	136 136	43 	36 	6 - 6	4 - 4	84 54 138	54 54	39 39	31 	3 1 4	5 5	14 2 16	2 - 2	8 8	4 4	181 52 233	56 	152 51 203	43 43	6 6	9 9	23 1 24	
0th	Monroe Perry Randolph St. Clair Washington TOTALS	27 42 37 341 20 467	5 85	6 14 20 138 9 187	- 3 29 - 32	-		- - 1 - 1		6 13 20 122 9 170	- 3 26 - 29	- - - 1	- - 3 - 3	- - 4 - 4		- - 8 - 8		- - 3 - 3		21 28 17 203 11 280	- 2 56 - 58	19 28 17 183 10 257	- 2 53 - 55	- - 3 - 3	- - 2 - 2	2 17 1 20	
	te Totals unty Totals . Total State .	10,017 <u>3,948</u> 13,965	2,424 2,424	5,998 2,069 8,067	1,476 	323 	72 72	342 	78 78	4,405 1,613 6,018	1,012 	672 	218 218	59 351 410	43 	134 105 239	18 	63 63	35 - 35	3,992 2,417 6,409	946 	3,463 1,610 5,073	885 	292 593 885	45 	237 214 451	

													PENA	LTIES													
				1		·····		SENTE	INCES			r				r				PROB	ATION					Commi	itted as
Circuit	County	De	ath		onment entiary	Impriso ar Fi	d	Ja	ail	a	ail nd ne	Fi	ne	To Senti		With Or. Or E	Jail	With Re Or C Or E		With Spe Cond	cial	With Spe Cond		To Proba		Incom Before As Se	ipetent Trial Or
Circuit	County	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	CM	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ	CF	СМ
13th	Bureau Grundy LaSalle TOTALS			19 5 16 40				- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 		 2 2 4	-			19 7 21 47		9 4 2 15		9 5 4 18	- - 1 1	1 2 - 3		- 1 - 1		19 12 6 37	- 1 1	- - 1 1	
14th	Henry Mercer Rock Island Whiteside TOTALS			5 5 45 14 69		- - 4 4	-	 18 7 25		 2 5 7		1 16 15 32	-	6 5 81 45 137		4 25 29 58		13 4 22 2 41		- 10 - 10		 50 3 53		17 4 107 34 162		-	
15th	Carroll Jo Daviess . Lee Ogle Stephenson TOTALS			1 16 2 3 22	- 1 2 - 3	- - 1 - 1		1 - 2 2 - 5	- 1 9 - 10	- - 1 - 1	- - 2 - 2	1 2 3	- 3 40 - 43	3 20 6 3 32	 5 53 58	3 2 13 17 33 68	- - 1 8 - 9		- 1 24 - 25	1 - 2 - 3	- 4 3 - 7	- - 13 1 14	- - 12 - 12	4 ** 5 24 40 39 112	 6 47 53		
16th	De Kalb Kane Kendall TOTALS	-		2 77 1 80	- - 1 1	 6 6		2 1 - 3	- 3 - 3	- 1 - 1		2 7 9	4 23 1 28	6 92 1 99	4 26 2 32	9 4 1 14	- - - -	29 100 2 131	5 - 5		- 3 - 3	3 17 - 20		41 139 3 183	5 6 11	- 1 - 1	
17th	Boone Winnebago . TOTALS	-		 56 56	- 7 7		 1 1	2 1 3		1 - 1	— 1 1	-	- 3 3	3 57 60	23 23	8 8 16	- 4 4	3 94 97	 20 20	- 7 7	 3 3	- 2 2	- 1 1	11 111 122	 28 28	- 1 1	-
18th	Du Page TOTALS	_		64 64	-		-	16 16			-	19 19		99 99	-	45 45	_	81 81	-	_	_	-	-	126 126	-	-	-
19th	Lake McHenry TOTALS	1 		53 16 69	3 - 3			1 - 1	8 8	- - -		2 2 4	2 - 2	57 18 75	13 13	67 67	15 	50 	27 27	7 24 31	-	- 10 10	1 1	124 34 158	43 43	2 - 2	
20th	Monroe Perry Randolph St. Clair Washington TOTALS			15 11 7 71 7 111	 1 8 9	- - - 2 2	- - 1 - 1	- 1 10 - 11	- - 8 - 8			- - 5 - 5	- 1 3 - 4	15 11 8 86 9 129	- 2 20 - 22	6 2 13 2 25	- - 5 - 5	 15 7 36 58	 6 6	- - 4 - 4	- - 1 - 1	- - 64 - 64	 24 24	6 17 9 117 2 151	- - 36 - 36		
	te Totals unty Totals . Total State .	1 1	-	1,341 2,029* 3,370	74 74	40 40	8 8	160 160	97 97	28 	22 22	184 15 199	273 273	1,754 1,754	474 	768 768	146 146	974 974	218 218	217 368 585	41 	279 5 284	67 67	2,238 373 2,611	472 472	27 27	2 2

* Includes 368 probationers serving some jail time.

REPORT ON THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1972

		Denting			T	Tatal		Dendi	Inven	tory
		Pending at Start	Begun	Reinstated	Trans- ferred	Total Added	Terminated	Pending at End	Decrease	Increase
Law Over	Jury	32,875	2,715	2,411	+9784	14,910	19,005	28,780	4,095	
\$15,000	Non-Jury	3,653	13,875	1,798	-9784	5,889	4,597	4,945		1,292
Tax		14,233	34,002	1,074	0	35,076	30,097	19,212		4,979
Condemnatior	۱	499	161	0	0	161	153	507		8
Mental Health		12	3,414	0	0	3,414	3,411	15		3
Municipal Cor	p	33	65	1	0	66	33	66		33
Misc. Remedy		1,502	997	4	0	1,001	626	1877		375
Chancery		3,564	7,849	0	0	7,849	8,192	4,951*		1,387
Housing		5,898	6,409	0	0	6,409	3,881	8,426		2,528
Juvenile		5,024	21,859	125	0	21,984	23,710	3,298	1,726	
Divorce		11,448	27,106	0	0	27,106	27,097	11,457		9
Probate			10,652	0	0	10,652	9,830			
Felony		1,491	5,076	0	0	5,076	4,486	2,081		590
Misdemeanor .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2,597	1,795	0	0	1,795	1,213	3,179		582
TOTALS		82,829	135,975	5,413	0	141,388	136,331	88,794		5,965

100

TREND OF CASES IN THE COUNTY DEPARTMENT CALENDAR YEAR 1972

*Adjusted By +1730 Cases After Physical Inventory

			1964 and Earlier	During 1965	During 1966	During 1967	During 1968	During 1969	During 1970	During 1971	During 1972	Totals
Law	J	Total Filed or Transferred In			14,463	13,316	13,195	13,444	12,984	12,641	9,924**	
Cases	U R	Pending	11	14	43	124	518	2,351	6,846	9,378	9,495	28,780
Over	Y	% Terminated			99.7%	99.1%	96.1%	82.5%	47.3%	25.8%	4.3%	
\$15,000		Total Filed			16,131	14,881	14,857	15,012	14,146	13,502	13,875	
	Non-	Pending	0	0	0	0	0	157	275	1,470	3,043	4,945
	Jury	% Terminated or Transferred out			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.9%	98.1%	89.1%	78.1%	

AGE OF LAW CASES PENDING IN THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT*

* Also See Appendix at page 126. ** Includes only 1972 cases which were begun and transferred in.

AVERAGE TIME INTERVAL BETWEEN DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF TERMINATION OF LAW JURY CASES IN THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT

	Ø. t.		
	Cases Termina	ated by Verdict	
Total Number of	Months Elapsed E	Between Date of Filing a	and Date of Verdict
Verdicts Reached During the Period	Maximum	Minimum	Average
637	70.3	12.8	49.8

C	ases Terminated by Any	Means, Including Verdi	t
Total Number of	Months Elapsed Betw	ween Date of Filing and	Date of Termination
Cases Terminated During the Period	Maximum	Minimum	Average
19,005	Figures to Co	mplete This Analysis are	unavailable.

113

-

ANALYSIS OF LAW JURY CASES PROCESSED BY THE TRIAL JUDGES OF THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT
COMPARISONS WITH PRECEDING YEARS

	N	umber of Law Ju	ıry Cases	Number	r of Verdicts	Ratio of Contested	Law Jury T	rial Judges 🍃
	Total Added	Total Terminated	Total Assigned For Trial	Total	Contested	Verdicts to Total Cases Terminated	Substantially Full-Time	Substantially Part-Time
Number For December, 1972	1,081	981	399	44	44	4.5	24	10
Average Per Month, 1972	1,187	1,585	518	53	52	3.3	24	6
Average Per Month, 1971	1,228	1,521	429	65	60	3.9	26	7
Average Per Month, 1970	1,200	1,393	302	62	53	3.8	28	13
Average Per Month, 1969	1,345	1,474	398	62	50	3.5	33	8
Average Per Month, 1968	1,164	1,417	393	63	50	3.5	31	12

di s

IN THE LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ANALYSIS OF LAW JURY TERMINATIONS **DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1972**

134 (1) Age of Law Jury Cases Disposed of During Calendar Year 1972

		1964 and Earlier	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
	No	15	18	190	2,377	5,548	4,399	3,375	2,618	465
posed of During 1972	%age	0.1%	0.1%	1.0%	12.5%	29.2%	23.1%	17.8%	13.8%	2.4%

(2) Law Jury Cases Terminated During Calendar Year 1972

Terminations Credited by Clerk To:	Number of Terminations			
Assignment Judge	5,050			
Pre-Trial Judges*	5,909			
Motion Judges	1,100			
Full-Time Trial Judges**	4,412			
Part-Time Trial Judges***	632			
No Progress Call	1,902			
T0TAL	19,005			

* Includes trial judges hearing summer pre-trials. ** 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.

(3) Maximum, minimum and average productivity of full-time trial judges and stages at which full-time trial judges terminated law jury cases during Calendar Year 1972

		V	erdicts		Cases Settled	
	Total Law Jury Cases Terminated	Contested	Uncontested	Without Use of Jury	During Selection of Jury	After Selection of Jury
Maximum*	727	34	3	679	16	28
Minimum*	76	1	0	50	0	0
Average	175.5	20.5	0.5	142.8	3.8	11.2

* Maximum and Minimum reported by any judge in each category not necessarily the same judge in each category.

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 1972

During calendar year 1972, the Law Division of the County Department of the Circuit Court of Cook County terminated 19,005 law jury cases which were credited by the clerk as follows:

١.	To f	the Assignment Judge (Judge Butler)	5,050*
11.	To 1	the Motion Judges (Judges Brussell, Bua, Hallett and Schwartz)	1,100
ш.	To t	the Pre-Trial Judges (Judges Harewood, Iseberg, Jones, Landesman, Matkovic, Morrissey, Nash, Nelson and Stefanowicz)	3,631
IV.	Cro	the 21 Judges who participated in the Summer Pre-Trial Program as follows: Judges Barry, Barth, Berg, Canel, Crosson, wley, Ellis, T. H. Fitzgerald, Geroulis, Heilingoetter, Hershenson, Holzer, Jiganti, Lefkovits, Murray, Norman, Roberts, aller, Stark, Wells and Wosik	2,278
v.	To t	the Law Jury Trial Judges as follows:	
	A)	To the 30 Judges (Judges Barry, Canel, Carey, Crosson, Crowley, Daly, DeBow, Ellis, Felt, Fiedler, J. C. Fitzgerald, T. H. Fitzgerald, Geroulis, Heilingoetter, Hershenson, Holzer, Jiganti, Kipnis, Kowalski, Lefkovits, McAuliffe, Murray, Norman, Roberts, Schaller, Sorrentino, Stark, Wells, M. K. Wilson and Wosik) whose service in the Law Jury Division was not substantially interrupted by other judicial duties or illness during the entire period	5,207
	B)	To the 15 Judges (Judges Barth, Berg, Breen, Brown, Downing, Elward, Epton, Holmgren, Iseberg, Massey, Mejda, Nash, P. O'Malley, Palmer and Schrier) whose service in the Law Jury Division was limited by other judicial duties, assignments and illness during the entire period	612
	C)	To the 16 Judges (Judges Hebel, Henken, Kasserman, Koch, Lipe, Mehrhoff, McNeal, Porter, Quindry, Reese, Slater, Sunderman, Trampe, C. M. Wilson, Wineland and Yoder) on assignment from circuits outside of Cook County	132
	D)	To the Status Call/No Progress Call Judges (Judges Elward and Palmer)	995
		Total Terminations	19,005

-

*Includes terminations by Judges C. P. Horan and P. A. Sorrentino

SUMMARY OF THE JUDICIAL PROCEEDING OF THE 6160 LAW JURY CASES REPORTED THROUGH THE MONTHLY REPORTS OF THE LAW JURY TRIAL JUDGES (COUNTY DEPARTMENT, CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY) DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1972

Method of Disposition	No. of Cases	No. of Jury ½ Days	No. of Judge ½ Days in Excess of Jury ½ Days
1. With Use of Jury:			
A. Dismissed By Agreement During Selection Of Jury	142	312	170
B. Dismissed By Agreement After Selection of Jury	370	1,309	477
C. Contested Verdicts For Plaintiff	325	2,099	513
D. Contested Verdicts For Defendant	285	1,670	456
E. Uncontested Verdicts For Plaintiff	16	88	43
F. Uncontested Verdicts For Defendant	5	53	28
G. Other Terminations	0	0	21
2. Mistrials For Error	28	134	42
3. Mistrials For Disagreement	12	202	36
4. Without Use of Jury			
A. Court Finding For Plaintiff	856	X	1,169
B. Court Finding For Defendant	94	X	92
C. Uncontested Prove-Ups	524	X	556
D. Dismissed Or Terminated By Agreement	3,164	X	3,084
E. Dismissed For Want Of Prosecution	136	X	164
F. Other Terminations	34	Х	98
5. Returned To Assignment Judge	169	29	178
TOTALS	6,160*	5,896	7,127

* Includes Law Jury Cases Processed By The 16 Judges On Assignment From Circuits Outside Of Cook County During Calendar Year 1972

-

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 1972–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 6160 cases processed and 5951 cases terminated.

Subsections A, B and 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.

ſ	Settled	Settled	Settled	Verdicts		Returned					Total Judge	Calendar ½
	Without	During	After			to		Total Law	Total Law	Total	½ Days in	Days Avail-
	Use of	Selection	Selection			Assignment		Jury Cases	Jury Cases	Jury	Excess of	able for
	Jury	of Jury	of Jury	Contested	Uncontested	Judge	Mistrials	Terminated	Processed	½ Days	Jury ½ Days	Assignment

A. The Law Jury record of the 30 Law Jury Judges whose service in the Law Jury Trial Division was not substantially interrupted by other judicial duties, assignment or illness during Calendar Year 1972

TOTALS	4,202	121	343	525	16	123	38	5,207	5,368	5,454	6,032	11,486
Maximum	679	16	28	34	3	20	7	727	728	327	326	414
Minimum	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	81	55	111	324
Average	140.0	4.0	11.4	17.5	0.5	4.1	1.3	173.5	178.9	181.8	201.1	382.9

B. The Law Jury record of the 12 Law Jury Judges whose service in the Law Jury Trial Division was substantially limited by other judicial duties, assignments or illness during Calendar Year 1972

	-, -				s er miness u							
TOTALS	514	6	17	65	5	38	2	607	647	519	901	1,420
Maximum	171	2	0	13	1	13	1	186	187	99	178	232
Minimum	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	13	28
Average	42.8	0.2	0.6	2.2	0.2	1.3	0.1	20.2	21.6	17.3	30.0	47.3
₿. ^a	C. The Law Jury record of the 19 Judges on assignment to the Circuit Court of Cook County, Law Jury Division from circuits outside of Cook County during Calendar Year 1972											
TOTALS	92	15	10	20	0	8	0	137	145	123	194	360
Maximum	10	4	1	3	0	1	0	15	15	14	16	20
Minimum	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	10
Average	4.8	0.8	0.5	1.1	0	0.4	0	7.2	7.6	6.5	10.2	18.9

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY TREND OF CASES IN THE COUNTY DEPARTMENT, COUNTY DIVISION DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1972

4. Be	Pending at Beginning of Year	Cases Filed or Reinstated	Trans- ferred	Cases Terminated During Year	Total Cases Pending at End of Year
Tax CasesSpecial Assessments—ChicagoSpecial Assessments—SuburbanTax DeedsScavenger Tax DeedsInheritance Tax PetitionsInheritance Tax AssessmentsPetitions For Tax RefundsTax ObjectionsCondemnationsOther Tax Cases	1	101 87 1,323 51 8,335 54 39 4,995 9 290	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	149 10 1,341 172 6,821 11 2 2,330 1 252	402 386 1,541 26 4,932 62 118 3,378 27 39
Adoption Cases Related Agency Private Placement	221 163 291	1,333 1,042 601	0 0 0	1,303 1,075 567	251 130 325
Mental Health Procedures Petitions for Commitment Adults . Minors . Petitions for Restoration Adults . Minors . Petitions for Discharge . Support .	0 0	3,372 37 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	3,369 37 0 0 0 0	15 0 0 0
Municipal Corporations Petition to Organize Annexn's, Discn's, Dissol's Local Options and Propositions Election Contests Fraud	1 24 0 8 0	3 33 18 11 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 23 1 7 0	3 34 17 12 0
Reciprocal Non Support Originating in Cook County Originating Outside Cook County Served in Cook County Marriages Of Minors		1,552 	0 0	971 252	3,164 15

119

. Ref

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Nature of Termination of Criminal Cases in the County Department, Criminal Division During Calendar Year 1972 Actual number of defendants in cases disposed of = 3948

Not Convicted	2,069	Convicted and Sentenced	2,417	Type of Sentence	
Dismissed	1,613*	Pleas of Guilty	1,610	Imprisonment	2,029**
Acquitted by Court	351	Convicted by Court	593	Probation	373
Acquitted by Jury	105	Convicted by Jury	214	Fine Only	15

땋

* Includes: Stricken Off with leave to reinstate	
Nolle Prossed	253
Discharged and others	193

** Includes: 368 Probationers Serving Some Jail Time

Report on Probate Proceedings in the County Department, Probate Division During Calendar Year 1972

	Decedent Estates	Guardianships	Conservatorships	Total
Number of cases begun during year	7,895	1,843	914	10,652
Number of cases terminated during year	7,610	1,435	785	9,830

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY CHILDREN REFERRED TO THE COUNTY DEPARTMENT, JUVENILE DIVISION DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1972

Delinquents	Dependents	Truants	Victim of Delinquent or Criminal Offense	Victim of Neglect	Other	Reactivated Cases	Total
16,632	293	3,839	0	2,284	689	0	23,737

Initial action taken on cases referred to the County Department, Juvenile Division during Calendar Year 1972

Adjusted	Social Investigation Ordered	Petition Recommended	Total		
158	72	23,507	23,737		

Cases adjusted in the County Department, Juvenile Division during Calendar Year 1972

	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	146	0	4	0	0	150
TOTAL	146	0	4	0	0	150

Nature of petitions disposed of in the County Department, Juvenile Division during Calendar Year 1972

Petitions Dismissed	Continued Generally	Cases Closed	Guardian Appointed with Right to Consent to Adoption	Guardian Appointed with Right to Place	Probation	Institutional Commitments	Total
23,710	47,938	10,452	552	1,730	2,721	2,783	89,886

Ĩeń

DISPOSITION OF DIVORCE CASES DURING THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1972 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1972 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

TOTAL DIVORCE CASES TERMINATED	
27,097	
ΡΔΩΤΙΙ	

FARTI	
DECREES	
TOTAL DECREES	21,494
1. Divorce	
2. Separate Maintenance	
3. Annulment	
	1

	PART III		
	CASES DISMISSED		
OTA	AL DISMISSALS		5,60
1.	Divorce	5,603	L
2.	Separate Maintenance	0	
3.	Annulment	0	

TREND OF ALL CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, CIRCUIT COURT, COOK COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 1972

		Pending						Pending	Inve	ntory
		at Start	* Begun	Rein- stated	Trans- ferred	Total Added	Termi- nated	at End	Decrease	Increase
Law	Dist. 1	15,537	6,379	2,221	+893	9,493	11,135	13,895	1,642	-
Jury	Dist. 2	327	0	0	+342	342	461	208	119	
Cases	Dist. 3	309	130	0	+235	365	350	324	-	15
\$15,000	Dist. 4	388	38	28	+317	383	474	297	91	
and	Dist. 5	280	20	82	+126	228	291	217	63	_
Less	Dist. 6	231	25	0	+293	318	363	186	45	
Law	Dist. 1	23,303	74,953	1,566	-893	75,626	76,420	22,509	794	_
Non-Jury	Dist. 2	70	691	0	-342	349	348	71	_	1
Cases	Dist. 3	260	682	0	-234	448	470	238	22	_
\$15,000	Dist. 4	194	927	53	-311	669	719	144	50	-
and	Dist. 5	288	627	13	-125	515	617	186	102	
Less	Dist. 6	209	729	0	-289	440	425	224		15
0	Dist. 1	3,692	72,255	541	0	72,796	71,997	4,491	_	799
Small Claims	Dist. 2-6	1,046	4,363	33	-12	4,384	4,392	1,038	8	_
Ordinance Violations and	Dist. 1		237,505	0	0	237,505	220,696	_	_	
Misdemeanors	Dist. 2-6	-	25,730	0	0	25,730	28,579	_	-	_
Traffic	Dist. 1		881,766	0	0	881,766	866,449	-	-	
TRATING	Dist. 2-6	-	398,111	0	0	398,111	415,846		_	_
Taxes	Dist. 1	6,077	51,539	2,199	0	53,738	54,845	4,970	1,107	
Family and Youth	Dist. 1	-	47,164	0	0	47,164	46,741	_	-	
TOTALS		52,211	1,803,634	6,736	0	1,810,370	1,801,618	48,998	3,213	

AVERAGE TIME INTERVAL BETWEEN DATE OF FILING AND DATE OF VERDICT OF LAW JURY CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, CIRCUIT COURT, 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	254	21	31	39	27	27				
Months elapsed between date of filing and	Average	37.9	12.7	15.2	16.7	20.5	9.5			
date of verdict	Maximum	79.4	40.7	30.1	57.5	43.7	22.6			
	Minimum	1.8	0.6	7.3	8.7	5.2	4.9			

		1966		1967	1968		1969		1970		1971		1972	
	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury	Jury	Non-Jury
First District	2	0	3	11	121	80	375	284	2,671	1,569	5,779	2,541	4,944	18,024
Second District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	4	73	14	107	53
Third District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	109	38	213	194
Fourth District	0	2	1	0	4	1	3	0	10	1	53	9	226	131
Fifth District	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	1	33	5	85	26	90	153
Sixth District	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	1	5	2	27	8	148	212
Totals	2	2	4	12	129	82	389	286	2,749	1,587	6,126	2,636	5,728	18,767

AGE OF PENDING LAW CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, CIRCUIT COURT, COOK COUNTY*

* Also See Appendix at page 127.

Ø. - .

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, DISTRICTS 1-6 NATURE OF TERMINATION OF CRIMINAL, ORDINANCE AND TRAFFIC CASES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1972

*	Prelimina	ry Hearings		eanors and e Violations	Tr	affic
Method of Termination or Disposition	District 1	District 2-6	District 1	Districts 2-6	District 1	Districts 2-6
1. Fine	ххх	xxx	18,327	4,629	348,287	256,475
2. Fine and Jail Sentence or Probation	XXX	XXX	XXX	ХХХ	14,655	4,567
3. House of Correction	XXX	XXX	5,368	217	XXX	ХХХ
4. County Jail	XXX	ХХХ	1,342	736	XXX	ХХХ
5. Probation	ХХХ	ХХХ	6,671	1,747	ХХХ	ХХХ
6. State Institutions	ХХХ	ХХХ	244	141	ХХХ	XXX
7. Transferred to Criminal Division	2,119	861	0	6	ХХХ	ХХХ
8. Ordered to Pay	ххх	ХХХ	300	144	ххх	ххх
9. Dismissed on Payment of Court Costs	ххх	ХХХ	ХХХ	ХХХ	0	0
10. Ex Parte, Satisfied	ххх	XXX	ХХХ	ХХХ	0	0
11. Ex Parte, Execution to Issue	ххх	ХХХ	ххх	ХХХ	0	0
12. Fine and Costs Suspended	ххх	ХХХ	ххх	ХХХ	12,833	70
13. Discharged	0	80	30,937	7,244	314,175	77,728
14. D.W.P	0	98	39,414	3,167	118,029	27,354
15. Leave to File Denied	0	2	92,894	244	418	843
16. Leave to File Denied–No Number	0	2	0	10	ХХХ	ХХХ
17. Non-Suit	0	7	23,821	346	26,041	9,737
18. Nolle Prosequi	210	657	10,220	1,467	21,634	15,973
19. Stricken Off-Leave to Reinstate	390	661	34,698	4,636	10,377	23,099
20. Other	0	159	482	1,318	0	0
T0TAL	2,719	2,527	264,718	26,052	866,449	415,846

APPENDIX

CHARTS COMPARING AGE OF PENDING CASES

LAW DIVISION, COUNTY DEPARTMENT CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

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
1000	11,464	12,211	11,400	8,276	4,487	1,421	49,259
1966	23.3%	24.8%	23.1%	16.8%	9.1%	2.9%	100.0%
1007	11,108	10,996	9,137	7,675	6,467	208	45,592
1967	24.4%	24.1%	20.0%	16.8%	14.2%	.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%
1000	10,691	10,414	8,205	6,257	4,822	1,538	41,931
1969	25.5%	24.8%	19.6%	14.9%	11.5%	3.7%	100.0%
	9,539	9,228	6,911	5,831	3,842	845	36,196
1970	26.4%	25.5%	19.1%	16.1%	10.6%	2.3%	100.0%
	9,472	9,690	6,436	5,109	2,061	107	32,875
1971	28.8%	29.5%	19.6%	15.5%	6.3%	0.3%	100.0%
	9,495	9,378	6,846	2,351	518	192	28,780
1972	33.0%	32.6%	23.8%	8.2%	1.8%	0.6%	100.0%

1

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS: YEAR-END AGE OF PENDING LAW JURY CASES

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

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
4000	10,524	7,289	3,435	2,166	1,757	383	25,654
1966	41.4%	28.4%	13.4%	8.4%	6.9%	1.5%	100.0%
1007	6,277	5,134	2,543	1,693	1,530	645	17,822
1967	35.2%	28.8%	14.3%	9.5%	8.6%	3.6%	100.0%
1000	5,910	5,227	3,392	2,207	147	0	16,883
1968	35.0%	31.0%	20.1%	13.1%	.8%	.0%	100.0%
1000	6,310	5,086	2,730	880	70	0	15,076
1969	41.9%	33.7%	18.1%	5.8%	.5%	.0%	100.0%
4070	6,966	5,580	3,123	855	550	408	17,482
1970	39.9%	31.9%	17.9%	4.9%	3.1%	2.3%	100.0%
	6,669	5,762	3,306	854	409	72	17,072
1971	39.1%	33.7%	19.4%	5.0%	2.4%	0.4%	100.0%
1070	5,728	6,126	2,749	389	129	6	15,127
1972	37.9%	40.5%	18.2%	2.5%	0.8%	0.1%	100.0%

CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS: YEAR-END AGE OF PENDING LAW JURY CASES