

MINUTES OF MEETING  
SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
January 30, 1979

The twentieth meeting of the Senate Judiciary Committee was called to order by Senator Everett R. Lensink in Room 331 of the capitol building on the above date at 9:31 a.m.

ROLL CALL:

All members were present.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 228:

Senator Goodover gave an explanation of this bill which is an act to make persistent felony offenders ineligible for parole or to participate in the prisoner furlough program. He stated that this bill was the result of a study by a group from Great Falls called the Great Falls Crime Control Committee and they tried to find ways and means of what can be done to protect the law-abiding citizen rather than stress the rights of criminals. He said that there were several other bills that have been drafted by this group, who are interested in cleaning up on crime.

He introduced Judge Bob Nelson, representing the Great Falls Crime Control Organization, who gave a statement in support of this bill. He stated that this does not mean that the criminal is not eligible for good time. He stated that the Department of Justice of Crime in the United States says that the average person, who is in court, has a criminal record of 10 years duration, has three felony convictions, and that odds are better than 50 per cent that he is on probation or parole. He stated that this may deter some, but not the habitually anti-social.

Senator Goodover introduced Mr. Charles Follick, who represented the American Association of Retired People and he stated that in working with senior citizens, that there is great concern with these people. He gave an example of a man who had beaten up on an old woman numerous times and each time he was given probation. He said that people were starting to bet on when he would kill her.

Senator Goodover introduced Mr. James R. Burnes, who represents the Montana Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association and who gave a statement in support of this legislation.

Mr. Kent Rodebaugh, from the City of Great Falls, gave a statement in support of this bill.

Mr. Larry Zanto, Director of the Department of Justice, stated that he was not a proponent or an opponent but that the department has some concern about the sentencing bills in general. A suggestion was made that because of the number of bills covering sentences, that perhaps the committee should

give some thought to appointing a conference committee to consider all the sentencing bills. He stated that with more people in prison for longer periods of time, they will have to address the problem of more inmates and judges must be given some discretion in matters. He did not think that this bill denies this discretion.

Tom Honzel, representing the Association of County Attorneys, stated that they opposed section 2 of this bill and noted that it conflicts with Senate Bill 223.

There were no further opponents and no further proponents.

Senator Goodover, in closing, said that this bill tries to address some of the problems and he is trying to get something that will act as a deterrent and will let people know that Montana is not the place to fool around with people and their property. He stated that new facilities may be used for first offenders and let the criminal know that he better look for another playground.

Senator Brown questioned what is the present situation in relationship to prison population, and what would be the impact on prison population. Mr. Zanto said that he didn't have time to prepare the information that was needed. He stated that sentencing bills generally do not have much impact the first or second year. He stated that Mr. Thomas, who is the head of the computer division, could get this information for the committee.

Senator Towe wondered about striking "or a" on page 3, line 3, and wondered if the judge has the discretion to determine if dangerous or not dangerous and if there may be confusion with the habitual offender. He also wondered if the inclination of the judges would be to give lighter sentencing to make up the difference. Judge Nelson replied that in sentencing you do a kind of backward figuring and figure the time you want him to do and take off for parole, goodtime, etc. He stated that if you are going to have any degree of control, you must have "good time".

Senator Olson requested an explanation of plea bargaining and Senator Towe explained this to him.

Senator Brown stated that the court is not bound by any offer made during plea bargaining.

Senator Towe questioned about prison population and Mr. Zanto stated that they expect the prison population to hit sometime in the next four to six months the maximum allowable with doubling up on the quarters right now. He said there were 670 inmates now, 515 two years ago and 718, which is the

maximum prison population and this will be reached in the next few months.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 223:

Senator Thomas introduced Tom Honzel, who represents the Montana Association of County Attorneys, who gave an explanation of this bill which is an act relating to the designation of offenders as nondangerous for the purposes of parole eligibility. He stated that this bill changes an "or" to an "and". He gave an example of an aggravated assault on an old man and the individual was sentenced to twenty years and just last month was picked up for armed robbery. The judge had designated him a nondangerous offender because it had been five years between each offense. He stated that a dangerous offender has to serve one-half of his sentence before he is eligible for parole, while a nondangerous offender has only to serve one-fourth the time. He also said that the committee should be aware of HB 396, which would do away completely with the nondangerous designation. It also would require that everybody would have to serve one-half time until they are eligible for parole.

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

Senator Towe questioned as to how this was working at the present time and Mr. Honzel said that he did not think they paid too much attention as to how this read.

There being no further questions, the hearing on this bill closed at 10:23 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 202:

Senator Van Valkenburg stated that he introduced this bill with the signatures of virtually all the senators from the fourth district. He stated that the judges in this district face a tremendous workload - the highest workload in the state and also one that involves a substantial amount of driving on the highways in this district. He introduced Judge Jack L. Green, a judge in the Fourth District.

Judge Green gave statistics which supported the bill and commented that civil litigants are being neglected, particularly the bench trials.

Dexter Delaney, practicing lawyer in Missoula and President of the Western Montana Bar Association, stated that if this was not remedied in the near future, that it might become catastrophic. He said that there was a tremendously congested trial calendar and that he felt that the only solution was to add another additional judge. He passed out statistics (see attachments) for

the senators. He stated that they now handle almost 2 1/2 times as many cases as they handled before and on the average they drive 11,000 miles a year.

Senator Van Valkenburg introduced Mike Abley, the court administrator of the Supreme Court, who handed out additional statistics showing the case load was much greater than what was testified. (See attachments).

There were no further proponents and no opponents.

Senator Turnage felt that in section 2, the date of January, 1981 should be taken out as he felt that this would delay any benefit in the bill for nearly two years and he stated that he hoped that the committee would see the problem this district has.

Senator Van Valkenburg questioned as to where the fourth judge would be housed and Judge Green stated that this could be anywhere in the district and that it would not necessarily have to be in Missoula.

There were no further questions and the hearing on this bill was closed.

#### CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 215:

Senator Ryan stated<sup>1</sup> that he introduced this bill, which is an act to punish the commission of an assault upon a youth less than 12 years old by an adult by imprisonment in the state prison for a term not to exceed 5 years, at the request of eight county attorneys. He introduced Carroll Blend, deputy county attorney in Cascade County.

Mr. Blend gave an example of a case wherein a child was beaten and the offender was charged with a misdemeanor as they could not charge him with aggravated assault because there was no serious injury. He stated that this statute would provide that if the victim is less than 12 years old and the offender is more than 18 years of age, and if convicted, then the offender shall be put in prison for no more than five years. He felt that this would give more control over people who do beat children. He stated that this, of course, would not insulate children against corporal punishment.

Mr. Douglas Allen, representing himself, gave a statement in support of this bill.

There were no further proponents and no opponents. Senator Ryan made a closing statement and asked serious consideration for a serious matter.

Minutes - January 30, 1979  
Senate Judiciary Committee  
Page Five

Senator Turnage commented that he felt that there should be a more severe punishment for assaulting a child under 12 than for an adult, but he was concerned about a school teacher or a neighbor who shakes a child, and he wondered if they could be found guilty. He was concerned about the way the bill reads. He felt that it should be narrowed down some.

There were no further comments or questions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

*Everett R. Lensink*

---

SENATOR EVERETT R. LENSINK, Chairman  
Senate Judiciary Committee

Date July 21 1979

ROLL CALL

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

46th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - 1979

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Lensink, Everett R., Chr. (R)	✓		
Olson, S. A., V. Chr. (R)	✓		
Turnage, Jean A. (R)	✓		
O'Hara, Jesse A. (R)	✓		
Anderson, Mike (R)	✓		
Galt, Jack E. (R)	✓		
Towe, Thomas E. (D)	✓		
Brown, Steve (D)	✓		
Van Valkenburg, Fred (D)	✓		
Healy, John E. (Jack) (D)	✓		

Each Day Attach to Minutes.





Please sign and return to secretary

SB-197

SENATE Judiciary COMMITTEE

BILL 204

VISITORS' REGISTER

DATE 1/30/

BILL 205

HB-165

" 167

Please note bill no.

(check one)

NAME

REPRESENTING

BILL #

SUPPORT OPP

Karlen Mae

myself

Karen Zucke

myself

Christina Hancock

myself

Karen S. Townsend

Missoula County Attorney

197

✓

Mire Raniel

MCHA

204, 205

✓

Tom Honyel

County Attorney

197

204 205

## TESTIMONY REGARDING SB 215

Whether or not child abuse is more prevalent now than it has been, it is certain that we are more conscious of it than ever. While such abuse can take many forms, the most common form is the direction of physical violence toward a physically small and emotionally and economically dependant person by an adult whether natural parent, step-parent or girl-friend or boyfriend of the natural parent. In terms of the criminal law this would be an assault. Yet young children, as can be observed from their normal activities and play, have an enormous ability to absorb physical abuse without permanent injury. The same abuse directed to an adult would surely result in hospitalization and permanent injury.

The result of the nature of the victims of these assaults is that only bodily injury as defined in Section 45-2-101(5), MCA 1979, results and rarely serious bodily injury as defined in Section 45-2-101((53), MCA 1979. Thus the assailant is usually charged with Assault, a misdemeanor, which carries a maximum penalty of six months imprisonment and a \$500 fine and not Aggravated Assault, a felony, which carries a penalty of not less than two nor more than twenty years in prison. In other words, the parent who beats his or her child is exposed to the same punishment as a person who runs a stop sign.

It is submitted that child abuse is more repugnant than running a stop sign and more dangerous to society. The purpose of Senate Bill 215 is to increase the possible penalty to five years in prison where the assailant is 18 years or older and the victim is less than 12 years old. The imposition of more severe penalties when there is a difference in the ages of the assailant and the victim is not new. In both the crimes of Sexual Assault, Section 45-5-502, MCA 1979, and Sexual Intercourse Without Consent, Section 45-5-503, MCA 1979, the penalty is increased where the victim is less than 16 and the offender 3 or more years older.

We do not promise that enactment of this bill will put an end to assaults on children. However, such enactment would officially recognize and publicize the concern of the State that assaults on children are serious matters. Practically, not only would it increase the amount of imprisonment which could be imposed by a factor of ten but would allow for considerably more intervention by the State into the particular problem. A justice of the peace or police judge can only place an offender on probation for a year and rarely requires supervision of that probation. On the other hand, a district judge can place an offender on probation for three or, here, five years, and customarily requires supervision by the Bureau of Probation and Parole.

We respectfully request your earnest consideration of Senate Bill 215 and that you recommend its passage.

Douglas Allen  
3305 Antelope Drive  
Great Falls, Montana 59404  
Tel: 761-3181 (home)  
761-5335 (business)

Carroll C. Blend  
2323 3rd Avenue South  
Great Falls, Montana  
Tel: 761-6110 (home)  
761-6700 (business)

## EXPLANATIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The statistical summaries reflect District Court caseload for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1978. Case type filings are provided in seven (7) categories. These categories include the following types of filings:

- CRIMINAL:** Felonies; high misdemeanors; extraditions; criminal appeals (City and J.P.).
- CIVIL:** Personal injury; property damage; condemnation; lien; foreclosure; eviction; partition; quiet title; agreement suits; injunctions; declaratory judgments; certificate of amount due; warrant of distraint; abstract of judgment; transcript of judgment; mandamus; habeas corpus; habitual traffic offender; note; wage claim; amount due; unlawful detainer; zoning; taxes; workman's compensation; and water rights.
- DOMESTIC RELATIONS:** Marriage dissolution; invalid marriage; legal separation; URESA (outgoing); URESA (incoming); paternity.
- JUVENILE:** Youth in need of care (YINC); Youth in need of supervision (YINS).
- PROBATE:** Formal probate; informal probate; supervised probate; guardianship; conservatorship; trust.
- INSANITY:** Mentally ill; inebriation (commitments).
- ADOPTIONS:** Adoptions (minor or adult).

Column 1 (Original Filings) in each of the Caseload Tables reflects an actual count made by either the Clerk of the District Court or staff of the Court Administrator's Office for the previously mentioned period. Column 2 (Reopened Filings) is an estimated figure based on a statistical extrapolation from a 14 county sample, in which a physical court of case reopenings was made by either the Clerks of the District Court or Court Administrative staff. Column 3 (Total Filings) is again an estimated figure representing the addition of Columns 1 and 2.

Column 4 (Case Dispositions) is an estimated figure based on the statistical extrapolation of the 14-county sample. Column 5 (Dispositions -- Average Time in Days) are actual time averages based on actual cases filed and disposed by the District Courts during the previously mentioned period of time. Some 25,000 District Court Cases were analyzed by computer. None of the caseload figures attempt to reflect those cases handled by judges out-of-district through substitutions (disqualification) provisions.

The Methods of Disposition Table reflects an actual percentage calculation based on the 25,000 District Court cases analyzed by computer. The figures derived for judicial district population, population density and square miles were obtained from tables provided by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Montana. The figures compiled for Attorney population were derived from the Montana Directory of Attorneys 1977-78. Excluded from this compilation were attorneys who were judges or high-ranking government officials.

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

SUMMARY BY JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 115500  
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 10488  
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 11.013

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4  
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5  
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3  
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 194

C A S E L O A D

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPTU (4)/(3) X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	414	57	471	474	118	100
(2) CIVIL CASES	3187	179	3366	2671	122	79
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	1794	49	1843	1419	136	76
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	1393	130	1523	1252	102	82
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	781	59	840	629	305	74
JUVENILE (DJ)	156	19	175	145	108	82
ADOPTION (DA)	107	0	107	101	33	94
PROBATE (DP)	498	38	536	363	533	67
INSANITY (DI)	20	2	22	20	6	90
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	4382	295	4677	3774	144	80

METHODS OF DISPOSITION

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL	---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-		-JUV, PROB & MISC	
ACQUITTED	3			ACQUITTED	0
GUILTY PLEA	75	FOR DEFEND	1	GUILTY PLEA	5
GUILTY VERD	7	FOR PLAINT	11	GUILTY VERD	0
DISMISSED	11	DISMISSED	17	DISMISSED	4
DEFAULT	0	DEFAULT	42	DEFAULT	0
CH OF VENUE	0	CH OF VENUE	2	CH OF VENUE	0
OTHER	4	OTHER	28	OTHER	89
NOT KNOWN	0	NOT KNOWN	1	NOT KNOWN	2

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF LAKE  
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 17600  
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 1494  
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 11.780  
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 15

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4  
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5  
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3

C A S E L O A D

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPTUT (4)/(3) %100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	78	6	84	66	89	78
(2) CIVIL CASES	426	27	453	342	92	75
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	240	8	248	194	86	78
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	186	19	205	148	99	72
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	141	5	146	81	173	55
JUVENILE (DJ)	26	1	27	20	54	74
ADOPTION (DA)	24	0	24	24	37	100
PROBATE (DP)	88	4	92	34	275	36
INSANITY (DI)	3	0	3	3	7	100
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	645	38	683	489	114	71

M E T H O D S   O F   D I S P O S I T I O N

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL	---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-		-JUV, PROB & MISC	
ACQUITTED	4			ACQUITTED	0
GUILTY PLEA	75	FOR DEFEND	0	GUILTY PLEA	1
GUILTY VERD	7	FOR PLAINT	9	GUILTY VERD	0
DISMISSED	9	DISMISSED	16	DISMISSED	3
DEFAULT	2	DEFAULT	42	DEFAULT	0
CH OF VENUE	0	CH OF VENUE	1	CH OF VENUE	0
OTHER	2	OTHER	31	OTHER	94
NOT KNOWN	0	NOT KNOWN	0	NOT KNOWN	1

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF MINERAL  
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 3400  
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 1222  
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 2.782  
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 2

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4  
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5  
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3

C A S E L O A D

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPT (4)/(3) Y100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME (5) DAYS	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	7	0	7	7	119	100
(2) CIVIL CASES	79	2	81	68	89	83
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	37	2	39	38	98	97
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	42	0	42	30	77	71
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	16	1	17	10	180	58
JUVENILE (DJ)	1	0	1	1	14	100
ADOPTION (DA)	5	0	5	4	10	80
PROBATE (DP)	10	1	11	5	349	45
INSANITY (DI)	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	102	3	105	85	103	8

M E T H O D S O F D I S P O S I T I O N

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL	---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-		-JUV, PROB & MISC	
ACQUITTED	0			ACQUITTED	0
GUILTY PLEA	100	FOR DEFEND	0	GUILTY PLEA	0
GUILTY VERD	0	FOR PLAINT	22	GUILTY VERD	0
DISMISSED	0	DISMISSED	7	DISMISSED	0
DEFAULT	0	DEFAULT	4	DEFAULT	0
CH OF VENUE	0	CH OF VENUE	4	CH OF VENUE	0
OTHER	0	OTHER	62	OTHER	100
NOT KNOWN	0	NOT KNOWN	0	NOT KNOWN	0

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF MISSOULA  
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 66800  
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 2612  
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 25.574  
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 158

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4  
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5  
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3

C A S E L O A D

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRU PUT (4)/(3) X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	223	40	263	305	140	115
(2) CIVIL CASES	2131	117	2248	1803	108	80
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	1241	31	1272	947	120	74
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	890	86	976	856	89	87
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	411	46	457	412	265	90
JUVENILE (DJ)	83	17	100	90	174	90
ADOPTION (DA)	70	0	70	65	38	92
PROBATE (DP)	248	27	275	247	484	89
INSANITY (DI)	10	2	12	10	3	83
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	2765	203	2968	2520	125	84

M E T H O D S O F D I S P O S I T I O N

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL	---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-		-JUV, PROB & MISC	
ACQUITTED	3	FOR DEFEND	1	ACQUITTED	0
GUILTY PLEA	72	FOR PLAINT	11	GUILTY PLEA	11
GUILTY VERD	7	DISMISSED	17	GUILTY VERD	0
DISMISSED	15	DEFAULT	49	DISMISSED	5
DEFAULT	0	CH OF VENUE	1	DEFAULT	0
CH OF VENUE	0	OTHER	22	CH OF VENUE	0
OTHER	4	NOT KNOWN	0	OTHER	83
NOT KNOWN	0			NOT KNOWN	2

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF RAVALLI  
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 19300  
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 2382  
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 8.102  
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 14

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4  
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5  
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3

C A S E L O A D

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPT (4)/(3) X100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	80	7	87	76	81	87
(2) CIVIL CASES	378	25	403	322	223	79
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	189	6	195	174	272	89
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	189	19	208	148	165	71
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	126	5	131	67	470	51
JUVENILE (DJ)	36	1	37	28	71	75
ADOPTION (DA)	0	0	0	0	13	0
PROBATE (DP)	83	4	87	32	833	36
INSANITY (DI)	7	0	7	7	10	100
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	584	37	621	465	253	

M E T H O D S O F D I S P O S I T I O N

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL ---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-	-JUV, PROB & MISC
ACQUITTED 1	FOR DEFEND 0	ACQUITTED 0
GUILTY PLEA 87	FOR PLAINT 5	GUILTY PLEA 0
GUILTY VERD 4	DISMISSED 22	GUILTY VERD 0
DISMISSED 1	DEFAULT 7	DISMISSED 6
DEFAULT 0	CH OF VENUE 6	DEFAULT 0
CH OF VENUE 0	OTHER 54	CH OF VENUE 2
OTHER 4	NOT KNOWN 5	OTHER 90
NOT KNOWN 1		NOT KNOWN 2

SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA: ANNUAL REPORT, 1977-78

DISTRICT COURT OF SANDERS  
 POPULATION(7/1/1977) 8400  
 AREA IN SQUARE MILES 2778  
 DENSITY PER SQ MILES 3.024  
 ATTORNEY POPULATION 5

JUDICIAL DISTRICT NO 4  
 COUNTIES IN THE DIST 5  
 JUDGES ASSIGNED 3

C A S E L O A D

CASE TYPE	FILINGS			DISPOSITIONS		THRUPTUT (4)/(3) %100
	ORIG (1)	RE-OP (2)	TOTAL (3)	CASES (4)	AVE TIME DAYS (5)	
(1) CRIMINAL CASES (DC)	26	4	30	20	109	66
(2) CIVIL CASES	173	8	181	136	85	75
GENERAL, CIVIL (DV)	87	2	89	66	78	74
DOMESTIC REL. (DR)	86	6	92	70	93	76
(3) JUV., PROB. & MISC.	87	2	89	59	92	66
JUVENILE (DJ)	10	0	10	6	73	60
ADOPTION (DA)	8	0	8	8	27	100
PROBATE (DP)	69	2	71	45	187	63
INSANITY (DI)	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL CASES (1+2+3)	286	14	300	215	88	71

M E T H O D S O F D I S P O S I T I O N

(ALL FIGURES ARE PERCENTAGES)

-- CRIMINAL	---	-CIVIL & DOM REL-		-JUV, PROB & MISC	
ACQUITTED	0	FOR DEFEND	0	ACQUITTED	0
GUILTY PLEA	68	FOR PLAINT	20	GUILTY PLEA	0
GUILTY VERD	9	DISMISSED	10	GUILTY VERD	0
DISMISSED	14	DEFAULT	28	DISMISSED	0
DEFAULT	0	CH OF VENUE	4	DEFAULT	0
CH OF VENUE	0	OTHER	37	CH OF VENUE	0
OTHER	9	NOT KNOWN	0	OTHER	100
NOT KNOWN	0			NOT KNOWN	0

1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979

TOTALS Civil Criminal Total	1165	1318	1480	1500	1691	1824	1956	1920	1923	2051
	77	99	140	153	216	211	243	240	220	229
	<u>1179</u>	<u>1417</u>	<u>1620</u>	<u>1653</u>	<u>1907</u>	<u>2035</u>	<u>2199</u>	<u>2160</u>	<u>2143</u>	<u>2280</u>
LAKE Civil Criminal Total	157	186	194	222	254	327	362	340	377	380
	31	15	25	60	42	62	54	90	83	92
	<u>8</u>	<u>201</u>	<u>219</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>389</u>	<u>416</u>	<u>430</u>	<u>460</u>	<u>472</u>
MINERAL Civil Criminal Total	103	103	101	103	119	168	171	159	189	168
	18	18	12	21	26	36	31	40	25	28
	<u>121</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>145</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>214</u>	<u>196</u>
SANDERS Civil Criminal Total	47	240	274	303	297	316	302	324	431	422
	9	51	59	76	57	73	73	49	69	76
	<u>56</u>	<u>291</u>	<u>333</u>	<u>379</u>	<u>354</u>	<u>389</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>373</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>498</u>
RAVALLI Civil Criminal Total	1894	2130	2190	2427	2701	2859	2815	3016	3086	3086
	192	244	314	376	396	416	427	403	434	434
	<u>2086</u>	<u>2374</u>	<u>2504</u>	<u>2803</u>	<u>3097</u>	<u>3275</u>	<u>3242</u>	<u>3419</u>	<u>3520</u>	<u>3520</u>

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964

18	450	462	534	584	567	610	643	636	632	784	934	909	849	907
23	49	35	28	73	115	44	45	63	67	68	26	27	28	49
11	<u>499</u>	<u>497</u>	<u>562</u>	<u>657</u>	<u>682</u>	<u>654</u>	<u>688</u>	<u>699</u>	<u>699</u>	<u>852</u>	<u>960</u>	<u>936</u>	<u>877</u>	<u>956</u>
59	169	132	124	111	120	113	106	139	110	132	122	146	173	147
12	24	20	13	11	10	12	16	10	15	23	20	28	17	16
1	<u>193</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>163</u>
52	84	59	74	101	104	137	129	130	101	100	87	88	87	70
0	6	11	12	3	11	4	12	16	8	13	7	8	13	5
2	<u>90</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>75</u>
17	29	27	30	35	33	49	45	37	59	38	46	76	69	60
6	5	8	6	9	2	2	5	3	4	2	4	5	11	9
3	<u>34</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>69</u>
8	155	163	164	154	189	196	156	222	164	153	213	211	218	170
4	9	10	15	14	15	14	15	18	13	8	14	5	6	14
2	<u>164</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>179</u>	<u>168</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>161</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>216</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>184</u>
887	835	835	926	985	1013	1105	1079	1164	1066	1207	1402	1430	1396	1354
93	84	74	74	110	153	76	93	110	107	114	71	73	75	93
980	919	1000	1095	1181	1166	1181	1172	1274	1173	1321	1473	1503	1471	1447

30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4