

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> |
|--|-----------------|
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Work of the Committee to Review the Need for Judgeships, 2010-2011 | 2 |
| A. Evaluation Criteria | 2 |
| B. Evaluation of Case Filings and Judges Needed | 3 |
| C. Ongoing Efforts | 3 |
| III. Judicial Council Recommendations Regarding Requests for New Judgeships | 4 |
| A. 7th Judicial District Court | 4 |
| B. 12th Judicial District Court | 5 |
| C. 32nd Judicial District Court | 5 |
| Attachment 1 | |
| • Analysis of District Court Case Filings and Judges Needed, 2010 | 8 |
| • Analysis of City and Parish Court Case Filings and Judges Needed, 2010 | 14 |
| Attachment 2 | |
| • Justice of the Peace Data Collection Form | 17 |
| Attachment 3 | |
| • 32nd Judicial District Site Visit Report | 20 |

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 2010.¹ 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.

¹ 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.

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.² 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.

² 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. 7TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

A request was received from the judges in the 7th 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 7th 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. 12TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

A request was received from the judges in the 12th 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. 32ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

A request was received from Representative Joe Harrison for "consideration of a new minority judgeship for the 32nd JDC." In response to this request a letter was sent to the judges of the 32nd 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 32nd 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 attachments³ 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.

³ Site Visit team members received a large file of historical information relating to the need for an additional judgeship in the 32nd 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 | Ourchita | 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 | 3,205.2 | 64.1 | 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* | Actual** |
| Abbeville | 540 | 135 | 0.04 | 670 | 268 | 0.08 | 32 | 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 | 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 | 12,758 | 255 | 0.08 | 11 | 29 | 0.01 | 185 | 481 | 0.15 | 0 | 0 | 18,465 | 2,854 | 0.90 | 1 |
| Baker | 531 | 133 | 0.04 | 728 | 291 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 7,489 | 150 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 8,748 | 574 | 0.18 | 1 |
| Bastrop | 896 | 224 | 0.07 | 1,142 | 457 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 1,888 | 38 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 3,926 | 719 | 0.23 | 3 |
| Baton Rouge | 12,157 | 3,039 | 0.96 | 42,302 | 16921 | 5.34 | 5.34 | 144,229 | 2,897 | 0.91 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 199,288 | 22,857 | 7.22 | 5 |
| Bogalusa | 418 | 105 | 0.03 | 1,408 | 563 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 2,211 | 44 | 0.01 | 33 | 86 | 0.03 | 170 | 442 | 0.14 | 45 | 34 | 4,285 | 1,274 | 0.40 | 1 |
| Bossier City | 2,226 | 557 | 0.18 | 3,043 | 1217 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 10,669 | 213 | 0.07 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 754 | 1,960 | 0.62 | 712 | 541 | 17,404 | 4,489 | 1.42 | 1 |
| Breaux Bridge | 491 | 123 | 0.04 | 647 | 259 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 690 | 14 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 86 | 224 | 0.07 | 0 | 0 | 1,914 | 619 | 0.20 | 1 |
| Burke | 70 | 18 | 0.01 | 286 | 114 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 841 | 17 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 48 | 125 | 0.04 | 7 | 5 | 1,252 | 279 | 0.09 | 1 |
| Crowley | 545 | 136 | 0.04 | 2,605 | 1042 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 6,455 | 129 | 0.04 | 26 | 68 | 0.02 | 164 | 426 | 0.13 | 17 | 13 | 9,812 | 1,814 | 0.57 | 1 |
| Denham Springs | 1,871 | 468 | 0.15 | 1,840 | 736 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 16,546 | 331 | 0.10 | 372 | 967 | 0.31 | 259 | 673 | 0.21 | 11 | 8 | 20,999 | 3,184 | 1.01 | 1 |
| Eunice | 525 | 131 | 0.04 | 1,642 | 657 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 2,657 | 53 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 181 | 471 | 0.15 | 0 | 0 | 5,005 | 1,312 | 0.41 | 1 |
| Franklin | 502 | 126 | 0.04 | 1,008 | 403 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 1,275 | 26 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 164 | 426 | 0.13 | 0 | 0 | 2,949 | 981 | 0.31 | 1 |
| Hammond | 2,159 | 540 | 0.17 | 2,753 | 1101 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 11,257 | 225 | 0.07 | 14 | 36 | 0.01 | 422 | 1,097 | 0.35 | 344 | 261 | 16,949 | 3,261 | 1.03 | 1 |
| Houma | 3,912 | 978 | 0.31 | 2,776 | 1110 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 6,013 | 120 | 0.04 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 1,433 | 3,726 | 1.18 | 206 | 157 | 14,340 | 6,091 | 1.92 | 1 |
| Jeanerette | 178 | 45 | 0.01 | 600 | 240 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 4,143 | 83 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 59 | 153 | 0.05 | 66 | 50 | 5,046 | 571 | 0.18 | 2 |
| Jeff. 1st Parish | 2,292 | 573 | 0.18 | 6,233 | 2493 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 63,816 | 1,276 | 0.40 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 72,341 | 4,343 | 1.37 | 2 |
| Jeff. 2nd Parish | 7,806 | 1,952 | 0.62 | 5,789 | 2316 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 54,116 | 1,082 | 0.34 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 67,711 | 5,349 | 1.69 | 2 |
| Jennings | 447 | 112 | 0.04 | 668 | 267 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 2,566 | 52 | 0.02 | 9 | 23 | 0.01 | 19 | 49 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 3,729 | 503 | 0.16 | 1 |
| Kaplan | 80 | 20 | 0.01 | 454 | 182 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 1,368 | 27 | 0.01 | 12 | 31 | 0.01 | 20 | 52 | 0.02 | 7 | 5 | 1,941 | 317 | 0.10 | 1 |
| Lafayette | 3,226 | 807 | 0.25 | 8,793 | 3517 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 29,917 | 598 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 347 | 902 | 0.28 | 0 | 0 | 42,283 | 5,824 | 1.84 | 2 |
| Lake Charles | 3,942 | 986 | 0.31 | 3,526 | 1410 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 18,131 | 363 | 0.11 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 25,999 | 2,759 | 0.87 | 2 |
| Leesville | 203 | 51 | 0.02 | 1,245 | 498 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 2,324 | 46 | 0.01 | 13 | 34 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 32 | 24 | 3,817 | 653 | 0.21 | 1 |
| Marksville | 676 | 169 | 0.05 | 830 | 332 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 1,651 | 33 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 99 | 257 | 0.08 | 0 | 0 | 3,256 | 791 | 0.25 | 1 |
| Minden | 555 | 139 | 0.04 | 913 | 365 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 1,055 | 21 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 108 | 281 | 0.09 | 0 | 0 | 2,641 | 806 | 0.25 | 1 |
| Monroe | 4,086 | 1,022 | 0.32 | 4,034 | 1,614 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 17,804 | 356 | 0.11 | 27 | 70 | 0.02 | 287 | 746 | 0.24 | 34 | 26 | 26,272 | 3,833 | 1.21 | 3 |
| Morgan City | 589 | 147 | 0.05 | 1,043 | 417 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 1,491 | 30 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 130 | 338 | 0.11 | 30 | 23 | 3,283 | 955 | 0.30 | 1 |
| Natchitoches | 724 | 181 | 0.06 | 1,859 | 744 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 4,346 | 87 | 0.03 | 8 | 21 | 0.01 | 198 | 515 | 0.16 | 23 | 17 | 7,158 | 1,565 | 0.49 | 1 |
| New Iberia | 1,293 | 323 | 0.10 | 1,581 | 632 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 4,818 | 96 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 231 | 601 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 7,923 | 1,653 | 0.52 | 3 |
| N.O. 1st City | 9,777 | 2,444 | 0.77 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 9,777 | 2,444 | 0.77 | 3 |
| N.O. 2nd City | 1,809 | 452 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 1,809 | 452 | 0.14 | 1 |
| N.O. Municipal | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 30,458 | 12,183 | 3.85 | 3.85 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 30,458 | 12,183 | 3.85 | 4 |
| N.O. Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 1,523 | 609 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 153,501 | 3,070 | 0.97 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 155,024 | 3,679 | 1.16 | 4 |
| Oakdale | 318 | 80 | 0.03 | 78 | 31 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 3,187 | 64 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 116 | 302 | 0.10 | 0 | 0 | 3,699 | 476 | 0.15 | 1 |
| Opelousas | 1,096 | 274 | 0.09 | 2,547 | 1,019 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 4,972 | 99 | 0.03 | 14 | 36 | 0.01 | 403 | 1,048 | 0.33 | 54 | 41 | 9,086 | 2,517 | 0.79 | 1 |
| Plaquemine | 833 | 208 | 0.07 | 4,958 | 1,983 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 5,345 | 107 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 11,136 | 2,298 | 0.73 | 1 |
| Plaquemine | 385 | 96 | 0.03 | 436 | 174 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 732 | 15 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 36 | 94 | 0.03 | 0 | 0 | 1,589 | 379 | 0.12 | 1 |
| Port Allen | 343 | 86 | 0.03 | 446 | 178 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 11,882 | 238 | 0.08 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 58 | 151 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | 12,729 | 553 | 0.21 | 1 |
| Rayne | 662 | 166 | 0.05 | 631 | 252 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 1,735 | 35 | 0.01 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 46 | 120 | 0.04 | 0 | 0 | 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.

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) | | | | 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 |
| TOTALS | 92,164 | 23,041 | 7.28 | | 182,787 | 73,115 | 23.09 | | 712,638 | 14,253 | 4.50 | | 644 | 1,674 | 0.53 | | 7,254 | 18,860 | 5.96 | | 1,695 | 1,288 | 0.41 | | 997,182 | 132,232 | 41.75 | 73 |

*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 5th – New filings for January through March.
- July 5th – New filings for April through June.
- October 5th – New filings for July through September.
- January 5th – 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

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

32nd Judicial District Site Visit Report

SITE VISIT REPORT
32nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

A timely request for consideration of an additional judgeship for the 32nd 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 32nd 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 32nd 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 32nd 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 32nd 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, 4th Circuit Court of Appeal, Judge Calvin Johnson, Ret., and Judge Robert H. Morrison, III, 21st Judicial District, as well as Scott Griffith, Esq., Deputy Judicial Administrator, and Brian Wiggins, Esq., Staff Attorney, Judicial Administrator’s Office, convened at the 32nd 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 32nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

The 32nd 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 32nd 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 32nd 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 | 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 | |