

**S U P R E M E C O U R T O F L O U I S I A N A**

**REPORT OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL**

*To The*

**LOUISIANA STATE LEGISLATURE**

*In Response To*

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 91  
OF THE 2007 REGULAR LEGISLATIVE SESSION**



**MAY 3, 2011**

# CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Work of the Committee to Review the Need for Judgeships, 2010-2011</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>A. Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>B. Evaluation of Case Filings and Judges Needed</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>C. Ongoing Efforts</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Judicial Council Recommendations Regarding Requests for         New Judgeships</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>A. 7<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>B. 12<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>C. 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Attachment 1</b>	
• <b>Analysis of District Court Case Filings and         Judges Needed, 2010</b>	<b>8</b>
• <b>Analysis of City and Parish Court Case Filings and         Judges Needed, 2010</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Attachment 2</b>	
• <b>Justice of the Peace Data Collection Form</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Attachment 3</b>	
• <b>32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Site Visit Report</b>	<b>20</b>

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 91 (hereinafter “SCR 91”) of the 2007 Regular Session requested the Louisiana Supreme Court in conjunction with the Judicial Council to study case filing and other data used to determine the need for judgeships and to report its findings to the Legislature each year.

The Legislature has historically relied on the Supreme Court through the Judicial Council to make recommendations with regard to legislation seeking to create new judgeships. By Act 163 of 2003 (R.S.13:61) the role of the Judicial Council was formalized through the passage of legislation requiring the Council to adopt standards and guidelines for use in making determinations regarding the need for judgeships. Guidelines governing the manner in which requests for new judgeships would be analyzed were established by the Judicial Council shortly thereafter.

During the First Extraordinary Session of 2006—in the wake of hurricanes Katrina and Rita—the Legislature passed Act 16. This Act requested a review by the Judicial Council as to the appropriate numbers of district court judgeships in the state on the basis of caseloads, population and other factors. The report was submitted by the Supreme Court to the Legislature in 2007. Act 16 was a precursor to SCR 91.

Pursuant to SCR 91 a report on judgeship issues was submitted to the Legislature in 2008, 2009 and 2010.<sup>1</sup> These reports contain historical information regarding the role of the Judicial Council in assessing the need for new judgeships; an analysis of the distribution of judges in district, city and parish courts throughout Louisiana by applying work point values approved by the Judicial Council to case filings received from each parish’s clerk of court; and other information. This report is submitted in response to SCR 91 for 2011.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2008 report contains an analysis of judges needed based on filings for 2004 through 2007, the 2009 report contains an analysis of judges needed based on case filings for 2008, and the 2010 report contains an analysis of judges needed based on case filings for 2009. This report includes an analysis of filings for 2010. These and related reports and documents are available at the Judicial Council link of the Supreme Court’s website: [www.lasc.org](http://www.lasc.org).

## **II. WORK OF THE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE NEED FOR JUDGESHIPS, 2010-2011**

### **A. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The criteria used to evaluate the need for judgeships was developed in the early 1980's by Dr. Hugh Collins, former Judicial Administrator of the Louisiana Supreme Court. This approach is based on several factors, including the number of hours of judicial activities during a year a judge should be expected to work, the number of filings in a jurisdiction, and the results of an analysis of the application of specific work point values to the different types of case filings. The outcome of an analysis based on such an approach is one of several important indicators that should be used when evaluating the need for judgeships. The evaluation process also involves on-site interviews by representatives of the Judicial Council's New Judgeship Committee and staff from the Supreme Court Judicial Administrator's Office with local judges, administrators, clerks of court, the district attorney and public defender, parish council or police jury representatives and others. The information obtained in these interviews is an essential complement to the filing data, and it and other information obtained during the evaluation process are critical to the assessment of any new judgeship request.

This formula became a model which was later emulated by a number of other states' courts in their attempts to assess their own courts' need for judges. The formula remained basically unchanged from 1980 until the Supreme Court's and Judicial Council's response to Act 16 of 2006. At that time, an evaluation of the new judgeship evaluation process was conducted by a revamped New Judgeship Committee – the membership of the committee having been expanded to include clerks of court, district attorneys, legislators, and others. As a result of these efforts, work point values for the different case types were reviewed and revisions were made to them.

At present, this work is largely complete, though the work point values are subject to the need to be regularly reviewed by the New Judgeship Committee, and in turn the

Judicial Council. Ongoing efforts of the New Judgeship Committee and the Judicial Council in this context are summarized below.

## **B. EVALUATION OF CASE FILINGS AND JUDGES NEEDED**

An analysis of judges needed in the district, city and parish courts based upon filing data submitted by clerks of court for calendar year 2010 is attached to this document as Attachment 1.

## **C. ONGOING EFFORTS**

The Judicial Council and the New Judgeship Committee recognize that the environment in which judges and other justice system participants work is not static, and that the processes used to make determinations about the number of judges should be reviewed—and possibly revised—on an ongoing basis. For example, a Subcommittee dealing with juvenile issues has requested that further study be undertaken of juvenile delinquency proceedings for the purpose of determining whether the current work point values adequately reflect the time spent on such cases. The New Judgeship Committee also continues to consider how factors such as a high incidence of civil or criminal jury trials, the presence of a drug court, and other factors impact the work of the courts.

It is obviously vital to any evaluation of caseloads and the establishment of work point values that the case filing information on which it relies is valid. Accordingly, work has been undertaken by the New Judgeship Committee to improve the quality of the data being received from the clerks of court, and discussions have been ongoing with the district attorneys to promote uniformity in the reporting of criminal caseloads.<sup>2</sup> A preliminary agreement to implement uniform criminal billing systems among all district attorneys in the State has been reached, which will help refine the analysis and promote comparisons, as appropriate, among jurisdictions.

---

<sup>2</sup> Problems in this context arise as a result of the charging practices of the district attorneys. E.g., in a matter involving multiple counts of a crime, some district attorneys file one bill of information for each count, whereas others file one bill of information containing all counts.

A Long Term Issues Subcommittee has considered a variety of issues confronting the judicial branch. That Subcommittee's report has been included in prior SCR 91 reports. Most recently, Subcommittee efforts have been dedicated to developing a protocol for collecting information from justices of the peace throughout the State. A data collection form has been developed in consultation with representatives from Louisiana Justice of the Peace and Constables Association. This form is attached to this document as Attachment 2.

### **III. JUDICIAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING REQUESTS FOR NEW JUDGESHIPS**

As indicated above, one of the functions of the Judicial Council is to consider applications for new judgeships and to make recommendations to the Legislature with respect thereto. The Judicial Council received three requests for new judgeships in 2010. The Judicial Council's recommendation regarding each request follows.

#### **A. 7<sup>TH</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

A request was received from the judges in the 7<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court for consideration of an additional judgeship. The Judicial Council's criteria were provided to the judges, and it was noted that based on a preliminary analysis of filing data there did not appear to be a need for an additional judgeship. Hearing nothing further from the judges in the 7<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court following this exchange of information, this file was closed.

A report on this matter was made by the Co-Chair of the New Judgeship Committee at the March 14, 2011 meeting of the Judicial Council and the following action was taken: *The Judicial Council recommends that this request for an additional judgeship not be approved.*

## **B. 12<sup>TH</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

A request was received from the judges in the 12<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Court for consideration of an additional judgeship. The Judicial Council's criteria were provided to the judges, following which the judges withdrew their request.

A report on this matter was made by the Co-Chair of the New Judgeship Committee and staff at the March 14, 2011 meeting of the Judicial Council and the following action was taken: *The Judicial Council recommends that this request for an additional judgeship not be approved.*

## **C. 32<sup>ND</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

A request was received from Representative Joe Harrison for "consideration of a new minority judgeship for the 32<sup>nd</sup> JDC." In response to this request a letter was sent to the judges of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court indicating that the Judicial Council does not make recommendations as to electoral subdistricts, but only as to the basic need for judgeships. Nonetheless, a packet containing the Judicial Council's new judgeship evaluation criteria was included in this response to Representative Harrison's letter. The letter also indicated that additional information was needed from the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court in order for work on the request to proceed.

No response was received to this letter. The New Judgeship Committee therefore considered the request to have lapsed or been withdrawn, and a recommendation was made by the Committee's Co-Chair to the Judicial Council at its March 14, 2011 meeting that the request not be approved.

After some discussion the Judicial Council directed the committee to conduct an evaluation and site visit. A site visit was conducted on March 30, 2011, after which a Site Visit Report and several attachments were distributed to New Judgeship Committee members, who voted to recommend to the Judicial Council that the judgeship not be

approved. The report and all of its attachments<sup>3</sup> were then distributed to Judicial Council members who voted on the matter. *It is the recommendation of the Judicial Council that this request for an additional judgeship not be approved.*

The Site Visit Report is attached to this document as Attachment 3.

---

<sup>3</sup> Site Visit team members received a large file of historical information relating to the need for an additional judgeship in the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court generally, and about the need for a minority judgeship specifically. This information was shared in its entirety with members of the New Judgeship Committee and the Judicial Council in connection with the votes they were requested to cast regarding the new judgeship request. This information is referenced as Exhibit 2 in the Site Visit Report. Because of the quantity of information contained in this file, it has not been made a part of this report. All of this material is on file in the Supreme Court Judicial Administrator's Office and can be obtained by calling (504) 310-2550.



## **Attachment 1**

### **Analysis of Case Filings and Judges Needed**

2010 District Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold\*

JDC	Parish	NON-DOMESTIC (1,51)			DOMESTIC (2,44)			FELONY (3,9)			MISDEMEANOR (4)			TRAFFIC (0,2)		
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
1	Caddo	6,176	9,326	2,94	2,497	6,093	1,92	8,233	32,109	10,14	1,469	588	0,19	113,10	226	0,07
2	Bienville	523	790	0,25	72	176	0,06	201	784	0,25	451	180	0,06	4048	81	0,03
2	Clabornne	261	394	0,12	73	178	0,06	244	952	0,30	553	221	0,07	3614	72	0,02
2	Jackson	516	779	0,25	119	290	0,09	166	647	0,20	428	171	0,05	628	13	0,00
	Subtotal	261	1,963	0,62	264	644	0,20	611	2,383	0,75	1,432	573	0,18	8,290	166	0,05
3	Lincoln	710	1,072	0,34	195	476	0,15	384	1,498	0,47	1,133	453	0,14	2923	58	0,02
3	Union	606	915	0,29	150	366	0,12	311	1,213	0,38	830	332	0,10	1,164	23	0,01
	Subtotal	1,316	1,987	0,63	345	842	0,27	695	2,711	0,86	1,963	785	0,25	4,087	82	0,03
4	Morehouse	665	1,004	0,32	96	234	0,07	472	1,841	0,58	939	376	0,12	6,189	124	0,04
4	Ouachita	3,244	4,898	1,55	1,216	2,967	0,94	3,216	12,542	3,96	4,423	1,769	0,56	25,415	508	0,16
	Subtotal	3,909	5,903	1,86	1,312	3,201	1,01	3,688	14,383	4,54	5,362	2,145	0,68	31,604	632	0,20
5	Franklin	603	911	0,29	124	303	0,10	174	679	0,21	640	256	0,08	571	11	0,00
5	Richland	539	814	0,26	166	405	0,13	139	542	0,17	1,163	465	0,15	2,911	58	0,02
5	West Carroll	252	381	0,12	94	229	0,07	149	581	0,18	388	155	0,05	725	15	0,00
	Subtotal	1,394	2,105	0,66	384	937	0,30	462	1,802	0,57	2,191	876	0,28	4,207	84	0,03
6	East Carroll	160	242	0,08	28	68	0,02	199	776	0,25	261	104	0,03	4492	90	0,03
6	Madison	344	519	0,16	25	61	0,02	286	1,115	0,35	504	202	0,06	3,176	64	0,02
6	Tensas	211	319	0,10	4	10	0,00	174	679	0,21	534	214	0,07	1,227	25	0,01
	Subtotal	715	1,080	0,34	57	139	0,04	659	2,570	0,81	1,299	520	0,16	8,895	178	0,06
7	Catahoula	273	412	0,13	143	349	0,11	146	569	0,18	220	88	0,03	791	16	0,00
7	Concordia	474	716	0,23	274	669	0,21	644	2,512	0,79	773	309	0,10	657	13	0,00
	Subtotal	747	1,128	0,36	417	1,017	0,32	790	3,081	0,97	993	397	0,13	1,448	29	0,01
8	Winn	349	527	0,17	232	566	0,18	224	874	0,28	414	166	0,05	1,593	32	0,01
9	Rapides	2,741	4,139	1,31	967	2,359	0,75	1,838	7,168	2,26	2,548	1,019	0,32	12,860	257	0,08
10	Natchitoches	961	1,451	0,46	312	761	0,24	644	2,512	0,79	869	348	0,11	6,281	126	0,04
11	Sabine	652	985	0,31	143	349	0,11	345	1,346	0,42	1,248	499	0,16	3,024	60	0,02
12	Avoyelles	1,578	2,383	0,75	354	864	0,27	1,047	4,083	1,29	1,711	684	0,22	4,061	81	0,03
13	Evangeline	1,085	1,638	0,52	64	156	0,05	544	2,122	0,67	405	162	0,05	5,233	105	0,03
14	Calcasieu	4,617	6,972	2,20	1,955	4,770	1,51	4,938	19,258	6,08	5,040	2,016	0,64	9,982	200	0,06
15	Acadia	1,542	2,328	0,74	271	661	0,21	834	3,253	1,03	560	224	0,07	5,250	105	0,03
15	Lafayette	6,750	10,193	3,22	1,669	4,072	1,29	2,758	10,756	3,40	2,856	1,142	0,36	10,192	204	0,06
15	Vermilion	1,414	2,135	0,67	423	1,032	0,33	1,116	4,352	1,37	1,236	494	0,16	3,296	66	0,02

\*Determinations regarding the need for judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.

2010 District Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold\*

2010

Attachment 1

JDC	Parish	NON-DOMESTIC (1,51)			DOMESTIC (2,44)			FELONY (3,9)			MISDEMEANOR (4)			TRAFFIC (02)		
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
	Subtotal	9,706	14,656	4.63	2,363	5,766	1.82	4,708	18,361	5.80	4,652	1,861	0.59	18,738	375	0.12
16	Iberia	1,946	2,938	0.93	239	583	0.18	714	2,785	0.88	1,348	539	0.17	11,244	225	0.07
16	St. Martin	1,433	2,164	0.68	99	242	0.08	962	3,752	1.18	1,066	426	0.13	8,752	175	0.06
16	St. Mary	1,363	2,058	0.65	488	1,191	0.38	950	3,705	1.17	1,732	693	0.22	4,020	80	0.03
	Subtotal	4,742	7,160	2.26	826	2,015	0.64	2,626	10,241	3.23	4,146	1,658	0.52	24,016	480	0.15
17	Lafourche	1,943	2,934	0.93	727	1,774	0.56	1,298	5,062	1.60	3,506	1,402	0.44	12,819	256	0.08
18	Iberville	1,288	1,945	0.61	330	805	0.25	428	1,669	0.53	849	340	0.11	9,863	197	0.06
18	Pt. Coupee	802	1,211	0.38	150	366	0.12	213	831	0.26	902	361	0.11	4,524	90	0.03
18	W. Baton Rouge	685	1,034	0.33	221	539	0.17	407	1,587	0.50	989	396	0.12	2,399	48	0.02
	Subtotal	2,775	4,190	1.32	701	1,710	0.54	1,048	4,087	1.29	2,740	1,096	0.35	16,786	336	0.11
19	E. Baton Rouge	14,065	21,238	6.71	0	0	0.00	4,364	17,020	5.37	5,267	2,107	0.67	31,943	639	0.20
20	E. Feliciana	739	1,116	0.35	311	759	0.24	141	550	0.17	732	293	0.09	2,159	43	0.01
20	W. Feliciana	221	334	0.11	109	266	0.08	109	425	0.13	303	121	0.04	544	11	0.00
	Subtotal	960	1,450	0.46	420	1,025	0.32	250	975	0.31	1,035	414	0.13	2,703	54	0.02
21	Livingston	3,259	4,971	1.55	1,251	3,052	0.96	1,336	5,210	1.65	2,540	1,016	0.32	11,398	228	0.07
21	St. Helena	338	510	0.16	21	51	0.02	277	1,080	0.34	604	242	0.08	1,998	40	0.01
21	Tangipahoa	3,635	5,489	1.73	925	2,257	0.71	2,340	9,126	2.88	5,526	2,210	0.70	23,667	473	0.15
	Subtotal	7,232	10,920	3.45	2,197	5,361	1.69	3,953	15,417	4.87	8,670	3,468	1.10	37,063	741	0.23
22	St. Tammany	7,512	11,343	3.58	1,422	3,470	1.10	2,567	10,011	3.16	5,167	2,067	0.65	35,889	718	0.23
22	Washington	1,276	1,927	0.61	295	720	0.23	645	2,516	0.79	746	298	0.09	3,384	68	0.02
	Subtotal	8,788	13,270	4.19	1,717	4,189	1.32	3,212	12,527	3.96	5,913	2,365	0.75	39,273	785	0.25
23	Ascension	3,279	4,951	1.56	879	2,145	0.68	1,731	6,751	2.13	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
23	Assumption	548	827	0.26	250	610	0.19	200	780	0.25	676	270	0.09	3,185	64	0.02
23	St. James	755	1,140	0.36	97	237	0.07	293	1,143	0.36	780	312	0.10	3,828	77	0.02
	Subtotal	4,582	6,919	2.18	1,226	2,991	0.94	2,224	8,674	2.74	1,456	582	0.18	7,013	140	0.04
24	Jefferson	12,149	18,345	5.79	2,522	6,154	1.94	3,362	13,112	4.14	3,132	1,253	0.40	0	0	0.00
25	Plaquemines	741	1,119	0.35	193	471	0.15	243	948	0.30	1,268	507	0.16	4,865	97	0.03
26	Bossier	2,458	3,712	1.17	884	2,157	0.68	1,485	5,792	1.83	5,440	2,176	0.69	5,236	105	0.03
26	Webster	889	1,342	0.42	337	822	0.26	809	3,155	1.00	1,368	547	0.17	5,344	107	0.03
	Subtotal	3,347	5,054	1.60	1,221	2,979	0.94	2,294	8,947	2.82	6,808	2,723	0.86	10,580	212	0.07
27	St. Landry	2,307	3,484	1.10	626	1,527	0.48	1,507	5,877	1.86	1,066	426	0.13	32,052	641	0.20
28	Lasalle	378	571	0.18	141	344	0.11	62	242	0.08	1,030	412	0.13	1,490	30	0.01

\*Determinations regarding the need for judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.

**2010  
District Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold\***

JDC	Parish	NON-DOMESTIC (1,511)			DOMESTIC (2,444)			FELONY (3,9)			MISDEMEANOR (4)			TRAFFIC (02)		
		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
29	St. Charles	1,412	2,132	0.67	549	1,340	0.42	191	745	0.24	1,760	704	0.22	30296	606	0.19
30	Vernon	894	1,350	0.43	540	1,318	0.42	805	3,140	0.99	1,648	659	0.21	8863	177	0.06
31	Jefferson Davis	638	963	0.30	330	805	0.25	416	1,622	0.51	621	248	0.08	13199	264	0.08
32	Terrebonne	2,504	3,781	1.19	1,281	3,126	0.99	1,425	5,558	1.75	3,596	1,438	0.45	21933	439	0.14
33	Allen	495	747	0.24	256	625	0.20	230	897	0.28	746	298	0.09	3160	63	0.02
34	St. Bernard	1,570	2,371	0.75	79	193	0.06	1,374	5,359	1.69	6,154	2,462	0.78	5872	117	0.04
35	Grant	509	769	0.24	176	429	0.14	213	831	0.26	680	272	0.09	3152	63	0.02
36	Beauregard	962	1,453	0.46	330	805	0.25	154	601	0.19	598	239	0.08	5576	112	0.04
37	Caldwell	295	445	0.14	97	237	0.07	104	406	0.13	828	331	0.10	796	16	0.01
38	Cameron	215	325	0.10	31	76	0.02	198	772	0.24	902	361	0.11	2301	46	0.01
39	Red River	185	279	0.09	93	227	0.07	110	429	0.14	206	82	0.03	2123	42	0.01
40	St. John	1,954	2,951	0.93	343	837	0.26	533	2,079	0.66	2,365	946	0.30	25408	508	0.16
42	DeSoto	902	1,362	0.43	188	459	0.14	310	1,209	0.38	808	323	0.10	10916	218	0.07
	Orleans Civil	9,728	14,689	4.64	2,954	7,208	2.28	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	Orleans Criminal	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	5,751	22,429	7.08	3,619	1,448	0.46	0	0	0.00
	Subtotal	122,479	186,512	58.89	31,430	76,689	24.22	67,683	263,964	83.35	102,164	40,866	12.90	485,811	9,716	3.07
	Juvenile/Family Courts															
	Caddo	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	458	9	0.00
	E. Baton Rouge	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	376	8	0.00
	Jefferson	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	408	8	0.00
	Orleans	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	207	4	0.00
	EBR Family	0	0	0.00	5,711	13,935	4.40	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00
	Subtotal	0	0	0.00	5,711	13,935	4.40	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1,449	29	0.01
	TOTAL	122,479	186,512	58.89	37,141	90,624	28.62	67,683	263,964	83.35	102,164	40,866	12.90	487,260	9,745	3.08

\*Determinations regarding the need for judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.

2010  
District Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold\*

JDC	Parish	CINC (2.6)			JUVENILE (2.6)			OTHER (.76)			TOTALS			
		Filings	Work Points Needed	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points Needed	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points Needed	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points Needed	Judges Needed*	Actual Judges
1	Caddo	38	98.8	0.03	0	0	0.00	501	380.76	0.12	30,224	48,821	15	11
2	Bienville	10	26	0.01	31	81	0.03	0	0	0.00	5,336	2,117		
2	Calbome	8	21	0.01	40	104	0.03	114	87	0.03	4,907	2,029		
2	Jackson	11	29	0.01	52	135	0.04	392	298	0.09	2,312	2,362		
	Subtotal	29	75	0.02	123	320	0.10	506	385	0.12	12,555	6,508	2	3
3	Lincoln	37	96	0.03	259	673	0.21	172	131	0.04	5,813	4,457		
3	Union	12	31	0.01	136	354	0.11	107	81	0.03	3,316	3,315		
	Subtotal	49	127	0.04	395	1,027	0.32	279	212	0.07	9,129	7,773	2	3
4	Morehouse	20	52	0.02	143	372	0.12	195	148	0.05	8,719	4,151		
4	Ouachita	66	172	0.05	102	265	0.08	923	701	0.22	38,605	23,824		
	Subtotal	86	224	0.07	245	637	0.20	1,118	850	0.27	47,324	27,974	9	11
5	Franklin	14	36	0.01	20	52	0.02	166	126	0.04	2,312	2,374		
5	Richland	7	18	0.01	53	138	0.04	48	36	0.01	5,026	2,477		
5	West Carroll	8	21	0.01	12	31	0.01	52	40	0.01	1,680	1,452		
	Subtotal	29	75	0.02	85	221	0.07	266	202	0.06	9,018	6,303	2	3
6	East Carroll	1	3	0.00	17	44	0.01	57	43	0.01	5,215	1,370		
6	Madison	12	31	0.01	7	18	0.01	130	99	0.03	4,484	2,109		
6	Tensas	3	8	0.00	19	49	0.02	0	0	0.00	2,172	1,302		
	Subtotal	16	42	0.01	43	112	0.04	187	142	0.04	11,871	4,782	2	2
7	Catahoula	6	15.6	0.00	6	16	0.00	1	1	0.00	1,586	1,466		
7	Concordia	6	16	0.00	30	78	0.02	149	113	0.04	3,007	4,425		
	Subtotal	12	31	0.01	36	94	0.03	150	114	0.04	4,593	5,891	2	2
8	Winn	21	55	0.02	18	47	0.01	11	8	0.00	2,862	2,274	1	1
9	Rapides	167	434.2	0.14	210	546	0.17	902	686	0.22	22,233	16,609	5	7
10	Natchitoches	25	65	0.02	150	390	0.12	1,667	1,267	0.40	10,909	6,919	2	2
11	Sabine	21	55	0.02	56	146	0.05	124	94	0.03	5,613	3,533	1	1
12	Avoynes	32	83	0.03	130	338	0.11	243	185	0.06	9,156	8,701	3	2
13	Evangeline	0	0	0.00	16	42	0.01	603	458	0.14	7,950	4,683	1	2
14	Calcasieu	300	780	0.25	487	1,266	0.40	722	549	0.17	28,041	35,811	11	9
15	Acadia	56	146	0.05	6	16	0.00	332	252	0.08	8,851	6,985		
15	Lafayette	408	1061	0.33	1,039	2,701	0.85	942	716	0.23	26,614	30,845		
15	Vermilion	52	135	0.04	67	174	0.06	185	141	0.04	7,789	8,530		

\*Determinations regarding the need for judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.

District Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold\*

2010

Attachment 1

JDC	Parish	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	DELINQUENCY (2.6)				OTHER (.76)				TOTALS		
					Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed*	Actual Judges	
					CINC (2.6)				JUVENILE				TOTALS		
	Subtotal	516	1342	0.42	1,112	2,891	0.91	1,459	1,109	0.35	43,254	46,360	15	13	
16	Iberia	35	91	0.03	46	120	0.04	58	44	0.01	15,630	7,325			
16	St. Martin	18	47	0.01	28	73	0.02	506	385	0.12	12,864	7,263			
16	St. Mary	17	44	0.01	97	252	0.08	536	407	0.13	9,203	8,431			
	Subtotal	70	182	0.06	171	445	0.14	1,100	836	0.26	37,697	23,019	7	8	
17	Lafourche	55	143	0.05	357	928	0.29	347	264	0.08	21,052	12,764	4	5	
18	Iberville	32	83.2	0.03	86	224	0.07	87	66	0.02	12,963	5,329			
18	Pt. Coupee	11	28.6	0.01	1	3	0.00	202	154	0.05	6,805	3,044			
18	W. Baton Rouge	31	81	0.03	39	101	0.03	0	0	0.00	4,771	3,786			
	Subtotal	74	192	0.06	126	328	0.10	289	220	0.07	24,539	12,159	4	4	
19	E. Baton Rouge	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	55,639	41,003	13	15	
20	E. Feliciana	7	18	0.01	20	52	0.02	95	72	0.02	4,204	2,903			
20	W. Feliciana	0	0	0.00	18	47	0.01	0	0	0.00	1,304	1,204			
	Subtotal	7	18	0.01	38	99	0.03	95	72	0.02	5,508	4,107	1	2	
21	Livingston	189	491	0.16	208	541	0.17	388	295	0.09	20,569	15,755			
21	St. Helena	7	18	0.01	52	135	0.04	49	37	0.01	3,346	2,114			
21	Tangipahoa	125	325	0.10	201	523	0.17	605	460	0.15	37,024	20,863			
	Subtotal	321	835	0.26	461	1,199	0.38	1,042	792	0.25	60,939	38,732	12	9	
22	St. Tammany	168	437	0.14	211	549	0.17	661	502	0.16	53,597	29,096			
22	Washington	58	151	0.05	97	252	0.08	336	255	0.08	6,837	6,187			
	Subtotal	226	588	0.19	308	801	0.25	997	758	0.24	60,434	35,283	11	12	
23	Ascension	59	153	0.05	508	1,321	0.42	0	0	0.00	6,456	15,321			
23	Assumption	9	23	0.01	60	156	0.05	126	96	0.03	5,054	2,827			
23	St. James	16	42	0.01	164	426	0.13	79	60	0.02	6,012	3,436			
	Subtotal	84	218	0.07	732	1,903	0.60	205	156	0.05	17,522	21,584	7	5	
24	Jefferson	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	21,165	38,863	12	16	
25	Plaquemines	11	29	0.01	70	182	0.06	1	1	0.00	7,392	3,353	1	2	
26	Bossier	68	177	0.06	1,014	2,636	0.83	800	608	0.19	17,385	17,362			
26	Webster	33	86	0.03	0	0	0.00	381	290	0.09	9,161	6,349			
	Subtotal	101	263	0.08	1,014	2,636	0.83	1,181	898	0.28	26,546	23,711	7	6	
27	St. Landry	39	101	0.03	73	190	0.06	415	315	0.10	38,085	12,562	4	4	
28	Lafayette	13	34	0.01	9	23	0.01	54	41	0.01	3,177	1,697	1	1	

\*Determinations regarding the need for judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.

**2010  
District Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3.167 Work Point Threshold\***

JDC	Parish	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	JUVENILE			OTHER (76)			TOTALS			
					CINC (2.6)	DELINQUENCY (2.6)	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed*	Actual Judges
29	St. Charles	13	34	0.01	251	653	0.21	0	0	0.00	34,472	6,213	2	3
30	Vernon	55	143	0.05	34	88	0.03	234	178	0.06	13,073	7,053	2	3
31	Jefferson Davis	16	42	0.01	31	81	0.03	26	20	0.01	15,277	4,045	1	1
32	Terrebonne	60	156	0.05	0	0	0.00	397	302	0.10	31,196	14,799	5	5
33	Allen	43	112	0.04	94	244	0.08	115	87	0.03	5,139	3,074	1	2
34	St. Bernard	10	26	0.01	0	0	0.00	50	38	0.01	15,109	10,565	3	5
35	Grant	35	91	0.03	82	213	0.07	177	135	0.04	5,024	2,802	1	1
36	Beauregard	31	81	0.03	48	108	0.03	134	102	0.03	7,833	3,500	1	2
37	Caldwell	12	31	0.01	28	73	0.02	45	34	0.01	2,205	1,573	0.5	1
38	Cameron	1	3	0.00	14	36	0.01	30	23	0.01	3,692	1,641	1	1
39	Red River	10	26	0.01	68	177	0.06	63	48	0.02	2,858	1,311	0.4	1
40	St. John	36	94	0.03	203	528	0.17	122	93	0.03	30,964	8,034	3	3
42	DeCade	26	68	0.02	32	83	0.03	80	61	0.02	13,262	3,783	1	2
	Orleans Civil	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	12,682	21,897	7	14
	Orleans Criminal	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	9,370	23,877	8	12
	Subtotal	2,690	6,994	2.21	7,350	19,093	6.03	15,937	12,112	3.82	836,583	615,946	194	217
	Juvenile/Family Courts													
	Caddo	203	528	0.17	2,201	5,723	1.81	1,645	1,250	0.39	4,507	7,510	2	3
	E. Baton Rouge	168	437	0.14	2,151	5,593	1.77	3,625	2,755	0.87	6,320	8,792	3	2
	Jefferson	422	1,097	0.35	1,741	4,527	1.43	3,167	2,407	0.76	5,738	8,039	3	3
	Orleans	187	486	0.15	582	1,513	0.48	569	432	0.14	1,545	2,436	1	6
	EBR Family	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	5,711	13,935	4	4
	Subtotal	980	2,548	0.80	6,675	17,355	5.48	9,006	6,845	2.16	23,821	40,711	13	18
	TOTAL	3,670	9,542	3.01	14,025	36,448	11.51	24,943	18,957	5.99	860,404	656,658	207	235

\*Determinations regarding the need for judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.

**2010  
City and Parish Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold\***

City/Parish	CIVIL (.25)			CRIMINAL (.4)			TRAFFIC (.02)			CINC (2.6)			DELINQUENCY (2.6)			OTHER JUVENILE (.76)			TO TALS		
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed*
Abbeville	540	135	0.04	670	268	0.08	32	0.01	25	65	0.02	184	478	0.15	0	0	0	3,004	978	0.31	1
Alexandria	3,030	758	0.24	8,159	3264	1.03	293	0.09	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	3,004	978	0.31	1
Assension	770	193	0.06	4,741	1896	0.60	0.60	0.08	11	29	0.01	185	481	0.15	0	0	0	18,465	2,854	0.90	1
Baker	531	133	0.04	728	291	0.09	150	0.05	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	8,748	574	0.18	1
Bastrop	896	224	0.07	1,142	457	0.14	38	0.01	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	3,926	719	0.23	3
Baton Rouge	12,157	3,039	0.96	42,302	16921	5.34	2,897	0.91	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	199,288	22,857	7.22	5
Bogalusa	418	105	0.03	1,408	563	0.18	44	0.01	33	86	0.03	170	442	0.14	45	34	0.01	4,285	1,274	0.40	1
Bossier City	2,226	557	0.18	3,043	1217	0.38	213	0.07	0	0	0.00	754	1,960	0.62	712	541	0.17	17,404	4,489	1.42	1
Breaux Bridge	491	123	0.04	647	259	0.08	14	0.00	0	0	0.00	86	224	0.07	0	0	0	1,914	619	0.20	1
Burke	70	18	0.01	286	114	0.04	841	0.26	17	0	0.00	48	125	0.04	7	5	0.00	1,252	279	0.09	1
Crowley	545	136	0.04	2,605	1042	0.33	129	0.04	26	68	0.02	164	426	0.13	17	13	0.00	9,812	1,814	0.57	1
Denham Springs	1,871	468	0.15	1,840	736	0.23	331	0.10	372	967	0.31	259	673	0.21	11	8	0.00	20,999	3,184	1.01	1
Eunice	525	131	0.04	1,642	657	0.21	53	0.02	0	0	0.00	181	471	0.15	0	0	0.00	5,005	1,312	0.41	1
Franklin	502	126	0.04	1,008	403	0.13	26	0.01	0	0	0.00	164	426	0.13	0	0	0.00	2,949	981	0.31	1
Hammond	2,159	540	0.17	2,753	1101	0.35	225	0.07	14	36	0.01	422	1,097	0.35	344	261	0.08	16,949	3,261	1.03	1
Houma	3,912	978	0.31	2,776	1110	0.35	120	0.04	0	0	0.00	1,433	3,726	1.18	206	157	0.05	14,340	6,091	1.92	1
Jeanerette	178	45	0.01	600	240	0.08	83	0.03	0	0	0.00	59	153	0.05	66	50	0.02	5,046	571	0.18	2
Jeff. 1st Parish	2,292	573	0.18	6,233	2493	0.79	63,816	1,276	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	72,241	4,343	1.37	2
Jeff. 2nd Parish	7,806	1,952	0.62	5,789	2316	0.73	54,116	1,082	9	23	0.01	19	49	0.02	0	0	0.00	67,711	5,349	1.69	2
Jennings	447	112	0.04	668	267	0.08	2,566	52	0.02	0	0.00	20	52	0.02	7	5	0.00	3,729	503	0.16	1
Kaplan	80	20	0.01	454	182	0.06	27	0.01	12	31	0.01	34	92	0.02	0	0	0.00	1,941	317	0.10	1
Lafayette	3,226	807	0.25	8,793	3517	1.11	29,917	598	0.19	0	0.00	20	902	0.28	0	0	0.00	42,283	5,824	1.84	2
Lake Charles	3,942	986	0.31	3,526	1410	0.45	18,131	363	0.11	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	25,599	2,759	0.87	2
Leesville	203	51	0.02	1,245	498	0.16	2,324	46	0.01	13	0	0	0	0.00	32	24	0.01	3,817	653	0.21	1
Marksville	676	169	0.05	830	332	0.10	1,651	33	0.01	0	0.00	99	257	0.08	0	0	0.00	3,256	791	0.25	1
Minden	555	139	0.04	913	365	0.12	1,055	21	0.01	0	0.00	108	281	0.09	0	0	0.00	2,641	806	0.25	1
Monroe	4,086	1,022	0.32	4,034	1,614	0.51	17,804	356	0.11	27	0.02	287	746	0.24	34	26	0.01	26,272	3,833	1.21	3
Morgan City	589	147	0.05	1,043	417	0.13	1,491	30	0.01	0	0.00	130	338	0.11	30	23	0.01	3,283	955	0.30	1
Natchitoches	724	181	0.06	1,859	744	0.23	4,346	87	0.03	8	0.01	198	515	0.16	23	17	0.01	7,158	1,565	0.49	1
New Iberia	1,293	323	0.10	1,581	632	0.20	4,818	96	0.03	0	0.00	231	601	0.19	0	0	0.00	7,923	1,653	0.52	3
N.O. 1st City	9,777	2,444	0.77	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	9,777	2,444	0.77	3
N.O. 2nd City	1,809	452	0.14	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1,809	452	0.14	1
N.O. Municipal	0	0	0.00	30,458	12,183	3.85	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	30,458	12,183	3.85	4
N.O. Traffic	0	0	0.00	1,523	609	0.19	153,501	3,070	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	155,024	3,679	1.16	4
Oakdale	318	80	0.03	78	31	0.01	3,187	64	0.02	0	0.00	116	302	0.10	0	0	0.00	3,699	476	0.15	1
Opelousas	1,096	274	0.09	2,547	1,019	0.32	4,972	99	0.03	14	0.01	403	1,048	0.33	54	41	0.01	9,086	2,517	0.79	1
Plaquemine	833	208	0.07	4,958	1,983	0.63	5,345	107	0.03	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	11,136	2,298	0.73	1
Plaquemine	385	96	0.03	436	174	0.06	732	15	0.00	0	0.00	36	94	0.03	0	0	0.00	1,589	379	0.12	1
Port Allen	343	86	0.03	446	178	0.06	11,882	238	0.08	0	0.00	58	151	0.05	0	0	0.00	12,729	553	0.21	1
Rayne	662	166	0.05	631	252	0.08	1,735	35	0.01	0	0.00	46	120	0.04	0	0	0.00	3,074	572	0.18	1

\*Determinations regarding the need for judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.  
\*\*Not all judges are full-time.



City and Parish Court Filings, Work Points, and Judges Needed at 3,167 Work Point Threshold\*

City/Parish	CIVIL (.25)				CRIMINAL (.4)				TRAFFIC (.02)				CINC (.25)				DELINQUENCY (2.6)				OTHER JUVENILE (.76)				TOTALS			
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed		Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed*	Actual**
Ruston	1,460	365	0.12		1,155	462	0.15		2,376	48	0.02		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		4,991	875	0.28	1
Shreveport	10,731	2,683	0.85		12,599	5040	1.59		51,012	1,020	0.32		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		74,342	8,743	2.76	4
Slidell	2,230	558	0.18		2,331	932	0.29		6,855	137	0.04		60	156	0.05		39	30	0.01		39	30	0.01		11,930	2,892	0.91	1
Springhill	336	84	0.03		1,343	537	0.17		1,222	24	0.01		0	0	0.00		134	348	0.11		39	30	0.01		3,074	1,024	0.32	1
Subur	1,043	261	0.08		2,970	1188	0.38		8,784	176	0.06		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		12,797	1,624	0.51	1
Thibodaux	939	235	0.07		2,128	851	0.27		2,968	59	0.02		11	29	0.01		257	668	0.21		29	22	0.01		6,332	1,864	0.59	1
Vidalia	18	5	0.00		232	93	0.03		1,522	30	0.01		0	0	0.00		10	26	0.01		0	0	0.00		1,782	154	0.05	1
Ville Platte	631	158	0.05		1,333	533	0.17		834	17	0.01		0	0	0.00		145	377	0.12		0	0	0.00		2,943	1,085	0.34	1
West Monroe	1,771	443	0.14		2,408	963	0.30		4,058	81	0.03		9	23	0.01		27	70	0.02		0	0	0.00		8,273	1,581	0.50	1
Winfield	95	24	0.01		557	223	0.07		332	7	0.00		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		984	253	0.08	1
Winnsboro	618	155	0.05		643	257	0.08		435	9	0.00		0	0	0.00		59	153	0.05		0	0	0.00		1,755	574	0.18	1
Zachary	329	82	0.03		693	277	0.09		1,493	30	0.01		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		0	0	0.00		2,515	389	0.12	1
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>92,164</b>	<b>23,041</b>	<b>7.28</b>		<b>182,787</b>	<b>73,115</b>	<b>23.09</b>		<b>712,638</b>	<b>14,253</b>	<b>4.50</b>		<b>644</b>	<b>1,674</b>	<b>0.53</b>		<b>7,254</b>	<b>18,860</b>	<b>5.96</b>		<b>1,695</b>	<b>1,288</b>	<b>0.41</b>		<b>997,182</b>	<b>132,232</b>	<b>41.75</b>	<b>73</b>

\*Determinations regarding the need for Judgeships must include a consideration of factors in addition to filings and work points.  
 \*\*Not all Judges are full-time.

## **Attachment 2**

### **Justice of the Peace Data Collection Form**

## Louisiana Supreme Court

Office of the Judicial Administrator

Justice of the Peace New Filings and Services Reporting Form

---

### Frequency of Reporting

Justices of the Peace are to provide the information requested at the end of each quarter within a calendar year, beginning in 2011 and thereafter, by the due dates listed:

- April 5<sup>th</sup> – New filings for January through March.
- July 5<sup>th</sup> – New filings for April through June.
- October 5<sup>th</sup> – New filings for July through September.
- January 5<sup>th</sup> – New filings for October through December.

### Civil Case Filings

**Definition:** The civil case type is a broad category for cases in which a plaintiff requests the enforcement or protection of a right or the redress or prevention of a wrong that is not a crime.

The civil case type may be further divided into several sub-case types, including small claims suits and landlord/tenant matters. Civil case types may also include other case types not covered by these major case categories.

#### A. Units of Count

- Civil Cases: Each Justice of the Peace is requested to provide to the Supreme Court the number of new complaints or petitions that are filed within a calendar year on a quarterly basis.  
***Each new civil filing (petition or complaint) in a calendar year should be counted as one civil case, no matter how many ancillary matters are filed as that case progresses.***

### Criminal Case Filings

**Definition:** The criminal case type is a broad category for court hearings such as those for litter court, arrest hearings, peace bonds, release bonds, and other criminal matters.

The total number of hearings should be grouped by sub-case types, including litter court, arrest hearings, peace bonds, release bonds, and other criminal matters not covered by these major case categories.

#### A. Units of Count

- Criminal Matters: Each Justice of the Peace is requested to provide the Supreme Court the number of new complaints or petitions that are filed within a calendar year on a quarterly basis.  
***Each new criminal filing (petition or complaint) in a calendar year should be counted as one criminal case, no matter how many ancillary matters are filed as that case progresses.***

**For questions or comments please contact:**  
**Scott Griffith, Deputy Judicial Administrator**  
**Office of the Judicial Administrator**  
**Louisiana Supreme Court**  
**Phone: (504) 310-2599**  
**Email: [sgriffith@lajao.org](mailto:sgriffith@lajao.org)**

Louisiana Supreme Court  
Office of the Judicial Administrator  
Justice of the Peace New Filings and Services Reporting Form

Time Period: \_\_\_\_\_  
(from Month/Year) (to Month/Year)

Parish: \_\_\_\_\_ Ward/District \_\_\_\_\_

JOP Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Person Completing Form: \_\_\_\_\_  
(if other than JOP) (Please Print)

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

**Civil Case Filings**

\_\_\_\_\_ Small Claims Suits  
\_\_\_\_\_ Landlord/Tenant Matters  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other Civil Filings

**Criminal Case Filings**

\_\_\_\_\_ Litter Court Hearings  
\_\_\_\_\_ Arrest Hearings  
\_\_\_\_\_ Peace Bond Hearings  
\_\_\_\_\_ Release Bonds  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other Services

**Other**

*Please include in this space any and all activities and actions, verbal or otherwise, which you handle or participate in as a Justice of the Peace and which are not reflected in the Criminal Case Filings or Civil Case Filings sections above.*

Once completed, please mail to:  
Louisiana Supreme Court  
Office of the Judicial Administrator  
Attn: Scott Griffith, Deputy Judicial Administrator  
400 Royal Street, Suite 1190  
New Orleans, LA 70130

I certify that the above figures are correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Justice of the Peace)

**Attachment 3**

**32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Site Visit Report**

**SITE VISIT REPORT**  
**32<sup>nd</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

A timely request for consideration of an additional judgeship for the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court, Parish of Terrebonne, was received by the Judicial Council from Hon. Joe Harrison, State Representative. The request, dated October 1, 2010, reads in pertinent part as follows:

“I would like to request consideration of a new minority judgeship for the 32<sup>nd</sup> JDC. Please allow this to be an item on your next agenda for discussion.”

In response to this request, on October 7, 2010 a letter was sent to the judges of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District (with a copy to Representative Harrison) indicating that the Judicial Council does not make recommendations as to electoral subdistricts, but only as to the basic need for judgeships. Nonetheless, a packet containing the Judicial Council’s new judgeship evaluation criteria was sent in response to Representative Harrison’s letter. The letter indicated that additional information was needed from the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court in order for work on the request to proceed.

No response was received in response to this letter. The Committee to Evaluate the Need for New Judgeships therefore considered the request to have lapsed or been withdrawn, and a recommendation was made by the Chair of the Committee to the Judicial Council at its March 14, 2011 meeting that the request for a new judgeship in the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District not be approved.

After some discussion of this matter at the March 14 Judicial Council meeting, the Council passed a substitute motion directing the Committee to conduct an evaluation and site visit.

A site visit team consisting of Judge Paul Bonin, 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeal, Judge Calvin Johnson, Ret., and Judge Robert H. Morrison, III, 21<sup>st</sup> Judicial District, as well as Scott Griffith, Esq., Deputy Judicial Administrator, and Brian Wiggins, Esq., Staff Attorney, Judicial Administrator’s Office, convened at the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Courthouse on March 30, 2011.

The site visit team conducted individual interviews with the following persons:

Robert Boudreaux, Clerk of Court  
Joseph Waitz, Jr., District Attorney  
Michael Solet, Terrebonne Parish Sheriff's Office  
Michel Claudet, Parish President  
Anthony Champagne, Chief Public Defender  
Anthony Lewis, Esq.  
Jerome Boykin, President, Terrebonne Parish NAACP  
Juan Pickett, Esq., President, Terrebonne Parish Bar Association,  
and Garyland Wallis, Esq.

In the context of the specific request for a minority judgeship which was presented, and relative to the discussion at the March 14 Judicial Council meeting, it is noted in this report that Messrs. Lewis, Pickett, and Wallis are African-American attorneys with practices including Terrebonne Parish cases.

### **THE 32<sup>nd</sup> JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**

The 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District (hereafter, the "District") is comprised of the Parish of Terrebonne. Metropolitan areas served include the City of Houma. In addition to the District Court, there is a City Court of Houma, which has parishwide jurisdiction in Terrebonne Parish.

The 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court has five judges. All of the judges are elected at-large, parishwide. The Judge of the Houma City Court is likewise elected at-large, parishwide.

### **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND FOR THIS REQUEST**

Since 1996, the Judicial Council has reviewed new judgeship issues in the District several times. The Council recommended a new judgeship in 1997, but did not recommend a new judgeship in 1999 or 2001. The legislature has also dealt with the issue several times, though legislation providing for a sixth judgeship in the District has never passed.

### **ANALYSIS UNDER THE GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR NEW JUDGESHIPS**

The Judicial Council has approved evaluation criteria to be used in the consideration of requests for new judgeships. As applied to this particular case, the Site Team makes the following determinations:

**Criterion 1** - The requesting court must be able to document that its judges are, on the average, engaged in working on "judicial activities" for at least 209 work days per year.

All five judges in the District provided documentation indicating that they are engaged in judicial activities at least 209 days per year.

Therefore, the Site Team concludes that Criterion 1 *has* been met.

**Criterion 2** - The requesting court must have a caseload which by application of efficient docket management cannot be handled without undue delay.

Practically all persons interviewed indicated that there was no undue delay in the handling of the existing caseload by the present number of judges. There was no indication that there was any delay in the handling of civil matters. Several of those interviewed indicated an interest in more criminal jury weeks than are presently calendared, and for a reduction of pre-trial detainees in the parish prison, which are common aspirations in most judicial districts. However, most persons involved in the criminal docket did not seem to feel that there was any “undue delay” in the processing of these cases, and it was reported that many judges were willing to adjust their dockets to schedule additional weeks for felony trials and other criminal matters as the need arose. It appeared to the Site Team that while the judges might consider minor alterations to their yearly calendars to accommodate additional felony trial weeks, there did not appear to be inordinate delay in handling the dockets in this District.

Therefore, the Site Team concludes that Criterion 2 *has not* been met.

**Criterion 3** - Based upon work point values for the district courts, a court should have a work point total exceeding 3,167 work points per year by approximately 15%.

The work point calculations for the District are attached to this report as Exhibit 1. These calculations do not indicate that the work point threshold for a new judgeship has been met.

Therefore, the Site Team concludes that Criterion 3 *has not* been met.

**Criterion 4** - The requesting court must have assurances that the parish government, the sheriff, and the clerk of court will provide courtroom space and support personnel to the new judge.

Interviews with representatives from agencies who would be affected by an additional judgeship and staff all expressed their support for court operations, but many also referred to present financial difficulties. In particular, it was noted that the Terrebonne Parish economy has been affected by recent storms and the oil spill, all of which have resulted in



significant revenue swings for local government. Based upon the present status of their finances, several interviewees stated that it would be very difficult for them to absorb the additional costs associated with a new judgeship.

More specifically, it was related that the present courthouse facilities were completely utilized. It was pointed out that a new judgeship – courtroom and staff offices – would necessitate acquiring additional office space. While there is a building adjacent to the courthouse which was acquired to provide additional space for court functions, the building is apparently completely full at present.

Perhaps even more seriously (particularly as it relates to an interest in more felony criminal court time), the District’s Chief Public Defender reported that due to present financial considerations and budget adjustments anticipated in the upcoming year, he might be forced to lay off as many as three attorneys, vastly reducing his staffing ability for criminal cases.

Given these factors, the Site Team concludes that Criterion 4 has not been met.

**Criterion 5** - The requesting court must meet such other requirements as the Judicial Council may deem appropriate.

This is a subjective criterion, which allows for the consideration of special and/or local factors which may affect a need for a judgeship. It should be noted that no specific requirements have been suggested by the Judicial Council as to this particular District. However, the Site Team feels that the following information should be included in this report.

First, with respect to the caseloads reflected in Exhibit 1, and as discussed in Criterion 3 above, while the existing caseload of the district court does not meet the work point threshold for new judges, information was presented to the Site Team as to an inordinate caseload at the Houma City Court. As noted above, that court has parishwide jurisdiction, which is therefore concurrent with the District Court in a number of instances, both as to misdemeanor criminal offenses, certain civil claims up to the monetary ceiling provided for by law for this city court, and juvenile cases arising under the Children’s Code.

As to the juvenile caseload in City Court, present practice is that all delinquency cases are filed in the Houma City Court, and all Child in Need of Care (CINC) cases are filed in the District Court. Combined with the rest of its caseload, City Court has an indicated need under the Judicial Council’s work points formula equal to nearly two judges.

Several of the interviewees believe that subsequent to the District's 1997 application for a sixth judgeship, juvenile delinquency petitions were shifted from the District Court to the City Court in an effort to decrease work points totals and weaken the justification for a new judgeship.

This allegation was not substantiated by the Site Team (nor probably could it have been). However, the Site Team does note that to substantiate this allegation and in order for the shift of cases to have affected the 1997 request for a sixth judgeship, the shift of cases would have to have occurred prior to the 1997 evaluation and recommendation, and it did not. Further, the Site Team notes that the allocation of juvenile delinquency and CINC cases between the District Court and the City Court are at the sole discretion of the district attorney. Any motivation the District Attorney in the 32<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District might have had to manipulate the filings to defeat a new judgeship does not comport with the interest he expressed for additional felony court dates, which would implicate additional, rather than fewer, judgeships.

Under any circumstances, the present request was strictly for an additional *district court* judge. While some future study might be requested that would involve the Houma City Court's caseload and the number of judges that may be needed there, the Site Team was not charged with the responsibility of undertaking such an evaluation, and as such the team did not interview representatives from those agencies that would be affected by changes to the City Court. However, the Site Team did feel that this information should be included in this report.

Secondly, the Site Team does feel that, given the discussion in the March 14 Judicial Council meeting, part of its charge was to hear local concerns as to the racial makeup of the District. The Site Team advised all persons interviewed that the charge of the Judicial Council was only to consider whether a new judgeship was recommended in a particular district, and that any decision as to a subdistrict from which a new judge might be elected was a political consideration which is solely within the purview of the legislature.

The Site Team did receive input from a number of persons who expressed a deep concern that the judiciary and the local courts did not reflect the racial makeup of Terrebonne Parish, and that there was a significant history of same. Given past voting trends, many of those interviewed felt that election of a minority individual to a judgeship would be impossible unless a voting subdistrict with a minority/majority were created. One of the persons interviewed requested that a package of information which he stated documented these concerns be made a part of the Site Team's report. The Site Team agreed to this request, and this information is made part of the report as Exhibit 2.

The persons interviewed who had expressed these concerns were questioned as to any past efforts to address the matters through methods such as court challenges and legislative actions. No prior court challenges were reported. There has never been any successful legislative action pertaining to the creation of a district court judgeship to be elected from a minority subdistrict until the present request has been presented. The Site Team did relate to these participants that under present law, it was not necessary to have a favorable recommendation from the Judicial Council as a prerequisite to the legislative consideration of an additional judgeship; only that the request be previously considered by the Council and its recommendation – favorable or unfavorable – be first obtained.

Significantly, however, it was reported to the Site Team by one of the persons interviewed that legislation would be introduced in the upcoming Regular Session of the Legislature to convert one of the existing judgeships in the District to a minority/majority electoral district. This would take place in 2014, at the end of the present term of a seated judge who faces mandatory retirement from that position. Should this effort be successful, it would solve the issue giving rise to the present request.

## **CONCLUSION**

Some of those persons interviewed spoke to the issue of the need for greater diversity within the local judicial system. Those persons perceive that the election of minorities to the courts in Terrebonne Parish would be difficult absent the creation of a minority/majority electoral subdistrict.

However, under the guidelines of the Judicial Council, the number of judges needed in a particular jurisdiction is based on the number of filings in that jurisdiction, and not the manner in which they are elected. It is of some significance to note that after discussion of this fact with the persons interviewed, all seemed to understand the constraints under which the present evaluation was being made, but wished to make a point as is noted in this report.

Nevertheless, given the fact that three of the four objective criteria established by the Council for evaluation of request for new judgeships have not been met, it is the recommendation of the Site Team that this request ***not*** be approved.

# 32nd JDC - Terrebonne

Year	CIVIL NON-DOMESTIC			CIVIL - DOMESTIC			FELONY			MISDEMEANOR			TRAFFIC		
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
2005	3,552	6,358	2.01	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,395	5,162	1.63	3,658	3,804	1.2	15,127	756	0.24
2006	3,133	5,608	1.77	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,570	779	0.25
2007	3,593	6,431	2.03	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	7,019	2.22	5,561	5,783	1.83	21,163	1,058	0.33
2008	2,253	3,402	1.07	1,229	2,999	0.95	1,524	5,944	1.88	3,672	1,469	0.46	23,364	467	0.15
2009	2,497	3,770	1.19	1,257	3,067	0.97	1,571	6,127	1.93	3,493	1,397	0.44	24,124	482	0.15
2010	2,504	3,781	1.19	1,281	3,126	0.99	1,425	5,558	1.75	3,596	1,438	0.45	21,933	439	0.14

Year	CINC			JUVENILE			OTHER			TOTALS				
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Actual Judges	
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	854	1,922	0.61	24,586	16,080	5.1	5	
2006	179	1,164	0.37	0	0	0	337	256	0.08	19,219	7,806	2.5	5	
2007	72	468	0.15	0	0	0	480	365	0.12	32,766	21,125	6.6	5	
2008	59	153	0.05	0	0	0	603	458	0.14	32,704	14,892	5	5	
2009	74	192	0.06	0	0	0	409	311	0.10	33,425	15,347	4.8	5	
2010	60	156	0.05	0	0	0	397	302	0.10	31,196	14,799	4.7	5	

- Notes:
1. Civil - Domestic was not tabulated prior to 2008.
  2. Felony and Misdemeanor numbers were not made available from the 32nd JDC in 2006 leading to a dramatic decrease in the totals.
  3. Analysis of judges needed is based on the 3,167 work point threshold and not the 15% higher threshold as referenced in the Judicial Council's "General Guidelines for New Judgeships"

# Houma City Court

	CIVIL			CRIMINAL			TRAFFIC		
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed
2005	2,605	866	0.27	2,616	602	0.19	5,113	153	0.05
2006	2,661	878	0.28	3,137	722	0.23	5,610	168	0.05
2007	2,722	898	0.28	3,823	879	0.28	8,166	245	0.08
2008	3,179	795	0.25	3,992	1,597	0.5	6,826	137	0.04
2009	4,426	1,107	0.35	3,369	1,348	0.43	5,990	120	0.04
2010	3,912	978	0.31	2,776	1,110	0.35	6,013	120	0.04

	CIVIL			DELINQUENCY			OTHER JUVENILE			TOTALS			
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Total Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Actual Judges
2005	0	0	0.00	1,708	905	0.29	0	0	0.00	12,210	2,632	0.83	1
2006	0	0	0.00	1,753	929	0.29	0	0	0.00	13,285	2,791	0.88	1
2007	0	0	0.00	1,506	798	0.25	560	134	0.04	16,836	2,983	0.94	1
2008	0	0	0.00	1,370	3,562	1.12	517	393	0.12	15,883	6,483	2.05	1
2009	0	0	0.00	1,703	4,428	1.40	305	232	0.07	15,793	7,234	2.28	1
2010	0	0	0.00	1,433	3,726	1.18	206	157	0.05	14,340	6,091	1.92	1

## Houma-Terrebonne Juvenile Cases

Year	JUVENILE												TOTAL JUDGES JUVENILE
	CINC			DELINQUENCY			OTHER JUVENILE			TOTAL JUDGES JUVENILE			
	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed	Filings	Work Points	Judges Needed				
2005	0	0	0	1,708	905	0.29	854	1,922	0.61		0.96		
2006	179	1,164	0.37	1,753	929	0.29	337	256	0.08		0.74		
2007	72	468	0.15	1,506	798	0.25	1040	499	0.16		0.56		
2008	59	153	0.05	1,370	3,562	1.12	1120	851	0.26		1.43		
2009	74	192	0.06	1,703	4,428	1.40	714	543	0.17		1.63		
2010	60	156	0.05	1,433	3,726	1.18	603	459	0.15		1.38		

DISTRICT COURT TOTALS WITH ALL JUVENILE CASES			
Year	Judges Needed	Adjusted Judges Needed	
2005	5.1	5.39	
2006	2.5	3.08	
2007	6.6	6.89	
2008	5	6.24	
2009	4.8	6.27	
2010	4.7	5.93	