HLS 01-719 ORIGINAL

Regular Session, 2001

1

30

**Goal:** To protect the rule of law.

HOUSE BILL NO. 1783

BY REPRESENTATIVES LEBLANC, DEWITT, AND TOWNSEND AND SENATOR DARDENNE

AN ACT

APPROPRIATIONS: Appropriates funds for the expenses of the judiciary

2	To appropriate funds to defray the expenses of the Louisiana Judiciary, including the
3	Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, District Courts, Criminal District Court of Orleans
4	Parish, and other courts; and to provide for related matters.
5	Be it enacted by the Legislature of Louisiana:
6	Section 1.A. The sum of Eighty-two Million Five Hundred Seventy-eight Thousand
7	Eighty-two and No/100 (\$82,578,082.00) Dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary.
8	is hereby appropriated to defray the expenses of the judiciary, including the Supreme Court,
9	Courts of Appeal, the District Courts, the Criminal District Court of Orleans Parish, and of
10	the other courts.
11	B. The total amount herein appropriated is hereby allocated to provide as follows:
12	03-8170 SUPREME COURT
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Program Description: The Supreme Court has general supervisory jurisdiction over all lower courts. It may establish procedural and administrative rules not in conflict with law and may assign a sitting or retired judge to any court. The Supreme Court has sole authority to provide by rule for appointments of attorneys as temporary or ad hoc judges. It considers applications for writs to review individual cases, and in addition, has criminal and other appellate jurisdiction. The Supreme Court has exclusive original jurisdiction of disciplinary proceedings against lawyers, recommendations of the Judiciary Commission for the discipline of judges, and fact questions affecting its own appellate jurisdiction. It has inherent authority to regulate the legal profession and to promulgate and update the Code of Judicial Conduct. The court also provides judicial training through the Judicial College and works to improve the administration of justice.
25 26 27 28 29	Mission Statement: The mission of the Supreme Court of Louisiana is to protect and promote the rule of law, to ensure public trust, to use public resources efficiently, to ensure the highest professional conduct, integrity, and competence of both the bench and the bar, and to ensure the proper administration and performance of all courts under its authority.

1 2 3 4	<b>Objective:</b> To provide a reasonable opportu Supreme Court of decisions made by lower tri <i>General Performance Information:</i>		nts to seek re	view in the
$\Delta$	General I erjormance Injormation.	1998	1999	2000
5	Total Filings	3,223	3,652	3,565
6	Total Appeals Filed	3,223	43	3,303
7	Total Writs Filed	3,037	3,455	3,378
8		3,386	3,290	3,027
o	Total Dispositions Rendered	3,300	3,290	3,027
9	Goal: To promote the rule of law.			
10	Objective: To resolve cases in a timely mann	ner.		
11	General Performance Information:			
12		1998	1999	2000
13	Percentage of noncriminal case			
14	applications acted on within Supreme			
15	Court standard of 120 days of filing	96.60%	95.30%	96.07%
16	Percentage of criminal case applications			
17	acted on within Supreme Court			
18	standard of 120 days of filing	53.00%	61.00%	29.40%
19	Percentage of pro se post conviction			
20	applications acted on within supreme			
21	Court standard of 120 days of filing	19.00%	28.00%	15.72%
22	Percentage of bar disciplinary filings			
23	acted upon within Supreme Court			
24	standard of 120 days of filing	99.00%	94.60%	86.15%
25	Percentage of opinions rendered within	<i>)</i>	J4.0070	00.1370
26				
27	Supreme Court standard of 84 days	71 900/	62 900/	90.000/
21	from argument	71.80%	63.80%	80.00%
28	Goal: To ensure the public trust.			
29	<b>Objective:</b> To facilitate public access to Supp	reme Court d	ecisions.	
	Objective: To facilitate public access to Supr General Performance Information:	reme Court d	ecisions.	
30	<b>Objective:</b> To facilitate public access to Suppose General Performance Information:			2000
30 31	General Performance Information:	reme Court d	ecisions.  1999	2000
30 31 32	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available	1998	1999	
30 31	General Performance Information:			<b>2000</b> 100%
30 31 32	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available	<b>1998</b> 100%	<b>1999</b> 100%	
30 31 32 33	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision	<b>1998</b> 100%	<b>1999</b> 100%	
30 31 32 33	<ul> <li>General Performance Information:</li> <li>Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision</li> <li>Objective: To inform the public of operation</li> </ul>	<b>1998</b> 100%	<b>1999</b> 100%	
30 31 32 33 34 35	<ul> <li>General Performance Information:</li> <li>Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision</li> <li>Objective: To inform the public of operation</li> </ul>	1998 100% s and activiti	1999 100% es.	100%
30 31 32 33 34 35 36	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16	1999 100% es. 1999	100% <b>2000</b>
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107	1999 100% es. 1999 17	100% 2000 11
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110	100% 2000 11 94
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66	1999 100% ess. 1999 17 110 38	2000 11 94 16
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions of recipients of releases on court decisions	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110	100% 2000 11 94
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105	2000 11 94 16 4,418
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions of recipients of releases on court decisions	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66	1999 100% ess. 1999 17 110 38	2000 11 94 16
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077	1999 100% ess. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	<ul> <li>General Performance Information:</li> <li>Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision</li> <li>Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:</li> <li>Number of outreach programs</li> <li>Number of media releases on court decisions</li> <li>Number of media releases on other matters</li> <li>Number of recipients of releases on court decisions</li> <li>Number of recipients of releases on other matters</li> <li>Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.</li> </ul>	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077	1999 100% ess. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077	1999 100% ess. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge  Number of complaints filed against	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con 1999 27.39	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697 expetence of 2000
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge  Number of complaints filed against judges and justices of the peace	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge  Number of complaints filed against judges and justices of the peace  Number of complaints against judges	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con 1999 27.39	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697 expetence of 2000
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions Number of media releases on other matters  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge  Number of complaints filed against judges and justices of the peace  Number of complaints against judges and justices of the peace resolved or	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con 1999 27.39 427	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697  Inpetence of 2000
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	General Performance Information:  Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operation General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs  Number of media releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on court decisions  Number of recipients of releases on other matters  Objective: To ensure the highest professional the bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge  Number of complaints filed against judges and justices of the peace  Number of complaints against judges	1998 100% s and activiti 1998 16 107 66 1,040 1,077 conduct, inte	1999 100% es. 1999 17 110 38 1,105 1,090 egrity, and con 1999 27.39	2000 11 94 16 4,418 3,697 expetence of 2000

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the bar	ive: To ensure the highest professional c al Performance Information:	onduct, integ	grity, and comp	petence of		
4			1998	1999	2000		
5		ge number of hours acquired through					
6		ntinuing legal education per lawyer	21.3	19.5			
7		er of complaints filed against lawyers	3,056	2,873	3,008		
8		er of complaints filed against lawyers	2.025	1.600	1.627		
9	re.	solved or disposed of in calendar year	2,835	1,608	1,637		
10	Payable o	out of the State General Fund:					
11	01	Salaries of Chief Justice and six	(6)				
12	01	Associate Justices of the Supre	` '				
13		R.S. 13:102	ine Court,	,		\$	648,149
13		K.S. 13.102				φ	040,149
14	02	Salaries and other expenses of	the				
15	02	Supreme Court Proper and sala					
		1	•			\$	5 945 020
16		the Crier of the Supreme Court				Э	5,845,039
17	03	Expanses of Judicial Administr	otor'a				
	03	Expenses of Judicial Administr					
18		Office of the Judiciary Commis					
19		provided for in Article V, Secti					
20		25 of the Constitution of Louis					
21		under the provisions of R.S. 13	3:32 et seq	<b>[.</b>			
22		A T	. , ,				
22		A. Expenses of Judicial Admir	nstrator s			ф	2 206 502
23		Office				\$	2,286,502
24	Progr	am Description: The Judicial Adminis	strator's Off	Sica assists tha	Suprama		
25	_	in the administration of the state court s			-		
26		e Judiciary Commission. Through the J		**			
27		ikes recommendations for the creation o					
28		ninistration of justice. The Office provid			-		
29	to the .	Judiciary, including the administration	of a judicial	l retirement sy	stem, and		
30		rts the Supreme Court and Appellate C					
31		al Administrator's Office provides tec	_				
32		es the Trial Court Case Management In					
33		hoc judgeship system, and monitors co					
34 35	_	es outreach services to state and local cour					
36	Judicio	, and performs numerous legal servic urv.	es joi ine s	supreme Cour	ина те		
37		B. Expenses of Judiciary Com	mission			\$	677,963
38	Progra	m Description: The Judiciary Commission	sion of Loui	siana is a cons	titutional		
39		stablished under Article V, Section 25 oj					
40		investigate, and prosecute complaints of			_		
41	authori	ity, it may recommend to the Supreme Cou	rt the censu	re, suspension	, removal		
42	from o	ffice, or involuntary retirement of any ju	ıdge for ethi	ical misconduc	t.		
12		C C ID	1.1				
43		C. Court Reporters as require	d by			φ.	•••
44		R.S. 13:981				\$	220,578
15		D. Duos to National Contact					
45		D. Dues to National Center fo	1			Φ	120.225
46		State Courts				\$	120,225
47	04	Expenses of Committee on Pro	faccional				
48	U <del>1</del>	<del>-</del>					
		Ethics and Grievances including	_	200		Φ	2,000
49		disbarment proceedings, R.S. 3	1.211 et s	seq.		\$	3,000

**ORIGINAL** 

HLS 01-719

HLS 01-719 ORIGINAL H.B. NO. 1783

1 2	reporting performance indicators and measures; requiring and monitoring periodic fiscal reports and financial accountability; and generally supervising and assisting		
2 3	local FINS processes in other ways.		
4	TOTAL - GENERAL FUND	<u>\$</u>	21,874,339
5	15 Administrative expenses of the office		
6	of the Clerk of the Louisiana Supreme		
7	Court attributable to the selection		
8	process of attorney chairman of the		
9	Medical Review Panel as provided		
10	for in R.S. 40:1299.47 to be paid out		
11	of the Patient's Compensation Fund	\$	10,000
12	Payable out of the State General Fund		
13	from Statutory Dedications, Judges'		
14	Supplemental Compensation Fund,		
	· ·		
15	R.S. 13:10.3, be it more or less	ф	4 000 000
16	estimated at	\$	4,000,000
17	Program Description: The Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund was		
18	established by the Legislature in 1985 to fund salary supplements and salary-related		
19	expenses to judges and commissioners. The funding source is a non-refundable		
20	filing fee assessed on civil filings as provided in R.S. 13:10.3.		
21	17 Payable out of the State General Fund		
22	from Statutory Dedications, Trial Court		
23	Case Management Information Fund, for		
24	the Case Management Information System,		
22 23 24 25	Article 887(F) of the Code of Criminal		
26	Procedure, be it more or less estimated at	<u>\$</u>	1,597,840
27	Program Description: The Case Management Information System (CMIS) was		
28	created by the Supreme Court in 1993 to provide a statewide information system for		
29	tracking and managing criminal, civil, juvenile, traffic, and appellate cases as well		
29 30 31 32 33 34	as protective orders. Data is received from courts statewide, transferred to the		
31	CMIS repository, and made available to courts and executive branch agencies.		
32	Additional information will also be available from the Department of Public Safety		
33 24	& Corrections. CMIS is funded from a court cost assessed on all criminal and		
) <del>4</del>	traffic convictions as provided under C.Cr.P. 887(F).		
35	TOTAL SUPREME COURT	\$	27,482,179
36 37	03-8171 COURTS OF APPEAL		
38	Program Description. The five courts of appeal demiciled in Paten Pouge		
39	<b>Program Description:</b> The five courts of appeal, domiciled in Baton Rouge, Shreveport, Lake Charles, New Orleans, and Gretna, have supervisory jurisdiction		
40	over all cases arising within their respective circuits, subject to the general		
41	supervisory jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Each court of appeal also has		
12	appellate jurisdiction over all civil matters, all matters appealed from family and		
<del>1</del> 3	juvenile courts, and all criminal cases triable by a jury which arise within its circuit,		
14 15	except for those cases appealable directly to the Supreme Court or to the district		
+3	courts.		
46 47	Mission Statement: The mission of the appellate courts of Louisiana is to provide		
17 10	meaningful access to all who seek review under the Courts' appellate and		
18 19	supervisory jurisdiction granted by the Louisiana Constitution while protecting and		
<del>1</del> 9 50	promoting the rule of law, preserving the public trust, and using public resources efficiently.		
- •	-33 ***********		
51	Cool. To protect the rule of law		

1 2 3	made b	tive: To provide a reasonable opportunit by lower tribunals. al Performance Information:	y for multi-ju	ıdge review of	decisions		
4			1000	1000	••••		
4	<b>T</b> 1	1 (1)	1998	1999	2000		
5		appeals filed	4,136	4,213	4,555		
6		vrits filed	6,374	6,900	6,123		
7		lispositions rendered	9,074	9,385	8,767		
8	Goal:	To promote the rule of law.					
9 10 11 12	<b>Gener</b> Averag	tive: To resolve cases expeditiously. al Performance Information: we number of days from lodging of the ap re than 175 days Year 1996 Compared		ment: Time Si	tandard =		
13			1996	2000			
	$\alpha$	1					
14		nal cases	263	255			
15	Civil co	ases	178	236			
16	Total		204	243			
17 18		re number of days from argument to rend nore than 70 days	ering of the o	opinion: Time	Standard		
19	Crimin	nal cases	48	41			
20	Civil co		63	55			
21	Total	uses	58	49			
21	10141		50	17			
22	Goal:	To preserve public trust.					
23	Object	tive: To facilitate public access to the d	ecisions of th	ne courts of ap	peal.		
24		al Performance Information:		1.	L		
25		<b>y</b>	1998	1999	2000		
26	Percen	ntage of written opinions available	1770	1,,,,	2000		
27		the public within 5 days of decision	100%	100%	100%		
21	10	the public within 5 days of decision	10070	10070	10070		
28	Payable o	out of the State General Fund:					
20	01	Colonies of fifty three (52) Ind.	and of				
29	01	Salaries of fifty-three (53) Judg	-			4	
30		the Courts of Appeal, R.S. 13:	311			\$	4,607,616
31	02	Salaries and expenses of opera	tion and				
32		maintenance of the Court of A	nneal.				
33		First Circuit	pp-uz,			\$	5,887,254
33		That Cheun				Φ	3,007,234
2.4	0.2						
34	03	Salaries and expenses of opera					
35		maintenance of the Court of A	ppeal,				
36		Second Circuit				\$	3,439,431
		Second Chedit				Ψ	3,133,131
37	04	Salaries and expenses of opera	tion and				
	04						
38		maintenance of the Court of A	ppeal,				
39		Third Circuit				\$	5,046,134
40	05	Salaries and expenses of opera	tion and				
41	32	maintenance of the Court of A					
			ppcai,			Φ.	4.050.501
42		Fourth Circuit				\$	4,978,704
43	06	Salaries and expenses of opera	tion and				
44	-	maintenance of the Court of A					
			ppear,			φ	2 105 106
45		Fifth Circuit				\$	3,425,486
46	TOTAL	COURTS OF APPEAL				<u>\$</u>	27,384,625

1

23

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

37

38

39

40 41 42

43

44

45

56

57 58

59

#### 03-8172 DISTRICT COURTS

Program Description: There are forty district courts in Louisiana that have general jurisdiction over all matters within their territorial limits, except in those judicial districts (the 1st, the 19th, and the 24th Judicial Districts) where family and juvenile courts have exclusive jurisdiction over certain types of cases and except in Orleans Parish where there are separate courts exercising civil, criminal, and juvenile jurisdictions, respectively. In certain cases, the forty general jurisdiction courts have concurrent jurisdiction with justices of the peace and parish courts. The district courts generally have appellate jurisdiction of criminal cases tried by city, parish, municipal, traffic, and mayors' courts, except in certain cases. The district courts also have appellate jurisdiction over justices of the peace in parishes where no parish courts exist. The Civil District Court of Orleans Parish has jurisdiction of all civil cases in that parish. The Criminal Court of Orleans Parish has jurisdiction over all criminal cases in the parish. It also has general supervisory jurisdiction over the municipal and traffic courts in Orleans Parish. The Family Court of East Baton Rouge Parish has exclusive jurisdiction of many domestic cases in the parish. The four juvenile courts located in Caddo, East Baton Rouge, Jefferson, and Orleans parishes have exclusive jurisdiction of juvenile cases in their respective parishes.

Mission Statement: The mission of the trial courts of Louisiana is to provide access to justice, to meet all responsibilities in a timely and expeditious manner, to provide equality, fairness, and integrity in their proceedings, to maintain judicial independence and accountability, and to reach a fair and just result by adherence to the procedural and substantive law, thereby instilling trust and confidence in the public.

**Goal:** To establish a more open and accessible system of justice.

Objective: To encourage responsible parties to make court facilities safe, accessible, and convenient.

#### General Performance Information:

	1999
Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating court	
security is an issue the judiciary should address	
within the next five years	87.0%
Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating customer	
service/user-friendly courts is an issue the judiciary	
should address within the next five years	77.3%

**Objective:** To give all who appear before the court reasonable opportunities to participate effectively without undue hardship or inconvenience.

# General Performance Information:

	2000
Percentage of district courts audited for ADA compliance	38.3%
Percentage of parishes covered by audit of ADA compliance	40.6%

**Objective:** To ensure that all judges and other trial court personnel are courteous and responsive to the public and accord respect to all with whom they come into contact.

## General Performance Information:

<b>,</b>	1998	1999
Percentage of surveyed court users indicating judges		
show courtesy and respect to people using		
the Louisiana court system	64%	
Percentage of surveyed court users indicating court		
personnel show courtesy and respect to people		
using the Louisiana court system	69%	
Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating		
professionalism is a continuing issue the		
judiciary should address within the next five years		79.2%

Objective: To encourage all responsible public bodies and public officers to make the costs of access to the trial court's proceedings and records -- whether measured in terms of money, time, or the procedures that must be followed -- reasonable, fair, and affordable.

General Performance Information:	
	1998
Percentage of surveyed court users indicating going to court	
costs too much	83%

2	<b>Goal:</b> To meet all responsibilities to everyone affected by the in a timely and expeditious manner.	court and its	activities
3	Objective: To encourage timely case management and proce	essing.	
4 5	General Performance Information:	1999	2000
6	Number of parishes reporting criminal disposition		
7	data to CMIS	39	50
8 9	Percentage of parishes reporting criminal disposition data to CMIS	60.9%	78%
10	Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating	00.970	7070
11	improved delay reduction is an issue the judiciary		
12 13	should address within the next five years	69.5%	
13	Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating		
14 15	improved training in delay reduction and case		
16	management is an issue the judiciary should address within the next five years	77.6%	
17	Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating	77.070	
18	the use of better case management techniques is		
19	an issue the judiciary should address within the		
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	next five years	75.3%	
21	Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating		
22 <b>2</b> 3	the use of better case management information		
23 24	systems is an issue the judiciary should address Within the next five years	83.4%	
25	Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating	03.770	
26	the use of integrated case management information		
27	systems is an issue the judiciary should address		
28	within the next five years	73.3%	
29	Objective: To enhance jury service.		
30	General Performance Information:	1000	
31 32	Demonstrate of aumonial district countingless in diserting	1999	
33	Percentage of surveyed district court judges indicating better jury management is an issue the judiciary		
34	should address within the next five years	68.2%	
35	Goal: To provide due process and equal protection of the	e law to all v	who have
36	business before the court; and to demonstrate integrity in all pro-		
37	<b>Objective:</b> To ensure that the jury venire is representative of ju	urisdiction fro	om which
38	it is drawn.		
39	General Performance Information:		
40		1999	
41 42	Percentage of surveyed parish clerks of court using more	34.4%	
† <i>L</i>	than voter registration rolls to select jury pool	34.4%	
13 14	<b>Goal:</b> To maintain constitutional independence, while obsection with other branches of government.	erving the pri	inciple of
45	Objective: To maintain the courts' constitutional independent	ce while obse	erving the
46 47	principle of cooperation with other branches of government.		
47 48	General Performance Information:	1000	
48 49	Percentage of surveyed district court judges believing	1999	
50	improved coordination/communication with the other		
51	branches of government is an issue the judiciary		
52	should address within the next five years	68.0%	
53	<b>Objective:</b> To seek, use and account for public resources in	a responsible	e manner.
54 55	General Performance Information:	_	
55		1999	
56 57	Number of district court judges lacking full-time law clerks	54 24.80/	
) <i>[</i>	Percentage of those judges lacking full-time law clerks	24.8%	

1 2 3 4 5		ive: To inform the community of the court's structure and functional Performance Information:	on.		
3		· ·	1999		
4		tage of surveyed district court judges indicating improved			
		treach/public education is an issue the judiciary should			
6	ado	dress within the next five years	72.7%		
7 8		<b>cive:</b> To recognize new conditions or emerging events and to a cons as necessary.	djust court		
9	Genera	d Performance Information:			
10	_		1999		
11 12		tage of surveyed district court judges indicating better court			
13		chnology is an issue the judiciary should address within exercise next five years	91.4%		
14		tage of surveyed district court judges indicating computer	<i>91.</i> 470		
15		eracy training for judges is an issue the judiciary should			
16		dress within the next five years	87.7%		
17	Percent	tage of surveyed district court judges indicating uniform			
18		al court rules is an issue the judiciary should address			
19		thin the next five years	58.8%		
20		tage of surveyed district court judges indicating expansion of			
21 22		ernative sanctions and treatment services for juvenile courts	76.00/		
22	is c	an issue the judiciary should address in the next five years	76.0%		
23	Payable of	ut of the State General Fund:			
24	01	Salaries of one hundred seventy-nine			
25	01	(179) District Judges as provided			
26		by R.S. 13:691		\$	14,520,480
20		by K.S. 13.091		φ	14,320,460
27	02	Office and travel expenses of District			
28	02	Judges as provided by R.S. 13:694		\$	1,213,000
20		Judges as provided by R.B. 13.074		Ψ	1,213,000
29	03	Salaries of fourteen (14) Judges of			
30	0.5	Civil District Court, Orleans Parish,			
31		as provided by R.S. 13:691		\$	1,135,680
31		as provided by R.B. 13.071		Ψ	1,133,000
32	04	Expenses of Judges of Civil District			
33	01	Court, Parish of Orleans, for salaries			
34		of stenographers, clerks, law books,			
35		stationery, telephone, and like expenses			
				\$	70,000
36		as provided by R.S. 13:694		Ф	70,000
37	05	Salaries of two (2) Court Reporters			
38	0.5	of the Twentieth Judicial District Court,			
39					
		including retirement contributions, as		\$	71 217
40		provided by R.S. 13:966.1		Ф	71,317
41	06	Clerk of Civil District Court, Orleans			
	00	·		\$	10,000
42		Parish, as provided by R.S. 13:1212(A)		Ф	10,000
43	07	State share of Group, Workers'			
44	07	<u> </u>			
		Compensation, General Liability,			
45		and Property Insurance Premiums		ф	2 406 160
46		as provided by R.S. 42:851		\$	2,486,169
47	08	Salarias of two (2) commissioners of			
	Uð	Salaries of two (2) commissioners of			
48		the Nineteenth Judicial District and			
49		one (1) commissioner of the Fifteenth			
50		Judicial District as provided by			
51		R.S. 13:712 and R.S. 13:715,		<b>*</b>	050 155
52		respectively		\$	259,172

	HLS 01-7	19	ORIGINAL B. NO. 1783
1 2 3 4	09	Office expenses for the Judicial Expense Fund of the Nineteenth Judicial District Court as provided by R.S. 13:711-713	\$ 261,625
5 6 7 8	10	Office expenses for the Judicial Expense Fund of the Fifteenth Judicial District Court as provided by R.S. 13:714-716	\$ 183,140
9 10	11	Law Clerk, Twentieth Judicial District Court as provided by Act 747 of 1977	\$ 25,800
11	SUBT	OTAL	\$ 20,236,383
12	12	Criminal Court - Parish of Orleans	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	exclusive offenses law in so its command the porto hole of all case	m Description: The Criminal District Court for the Parish of Orleans has a jurisdiction of the trial and punishment of all crimes, misdemeanors, and a committed within the parish of Orleans, if the jurisdiction is not vested by time other court. The court, through its magistrate and with assistance from missioners, has the power of committing magistrates in all felony charges power to hold preliminary examinations, with authority to bail or discharge, and for trial, in all cases before the court. The court has appellate jurisdiction the sest tried before the Municipal Court of New Orleans and the Traffic Court Orleans and has general supervisory jurisdiction over these courts.	
22 23 24	A.	Salaries of thirteen (13) District Judges of Criminal Court, Orleans Parish as provided by R.S. 13:691	\$ 1,054,560
25 26 27 28	В.	Office expenses of Judges of Criminal Court, Orleans Parish and the state's share of group insurance for the personnel of Criminal Court as provided by R.S. 13:694 and R.S. 42:851, respectively	\$ 226,258
29 30	C.	Salaries of thirteen (13) minute clerks as provided by R.S. 13:1373	\$ 236,605
31 32	D.	Salaries of twenty-six (26) court reporters as provided by R.S. 13:1373	\$ 383,339
33 34 35	E.	Salaries of four (4) commissioners of Criminal Court, Orleans Parish, including related benefits as provided by R.S. 13:1347	\$ 206,904
36 37	F.	Office and travel expenses of commissioners as provided by R.S. 13:1347	\$ 10,000
38 39	G.	Salaries of four (4) minute clerks, one for each commissioner as provided by R.S. 13:1373.1	\$ 60,634
40 41	H.	Salaries of four (4) court reporters, one for each commissioner as provided by R.S. 13:1373.1	\$ 45,706
42 43	I.	Salaries of Judicial Administrator, and assistants, including related benefits	\$ 511,063
44	J.	Salaries of thirteen (13) law clerks	\$ 405,830
45	K.	Salaries of four (4) secretaries	\$ 117,284

	HLS 01-719		ORIGINAL H.B. NO. 1783		
1	L.	Sanity Commissions	\$	182,172	
2	M	. Board of Jury Commissioners	<u>\$</u>	231,380	
3	SUBT	TOTAL	\$	3,671,735	
4	13	Juvenile and Family Court Judges			
5 6		A. Salaries of fourteen (14) Juvenile Court Judges as provided by R.S. 13:691	\$	1,135,680	
7 8		B. Salaries of four (4) Family Court Judges as provided by R.S. 13:691	\$	324,480	
9 10 11		C. Office expenses of Juvenile and Family Court Judges as required by R.S. 13:694	\$	100,800	
12	SUBTOTAL		<u>\$</u>	1,560,960	
13	TOTAL DISTRICT COURTS			25,469,078	
14 15	03-8173	OTHER COURTS - SALARIES AND OFFICE E REQUIRED BY STATUTE	EXPE	NSES AS	
16 17 18	<b>Program Description:</b> The category includes forty-seven city courts, one municipal court (New Orleans), one traffic court (New Orleans), and one parish court (Ascension Parish).				
19	Payable out of the State General Fund:				
20 21	01	Salaries of sixty-one (61) City Court Judges as provided by R.S. 13:1875	\$	1,571,429	
22 23 24	02	Salaries of four (4) Municipal, four (4) Traffic and one (1) Parish Court Judges as provided by R.S. 13:2492,			
25		2501.1, and 2563.5, respectively	<u>\$</u>	253,468	
26	TOTAL (	OTHER COURTS REQUIRED BY STATUTE	<u>\$</u>	1,824,897	
27 28	03-8174	OTHER COURTS - SALARIES AND OFFICE EX REQUIRED BY STATUTE	PENS	SES NOT	
29	Payable out of the State General Fund:				
30 31	01	Orleans Parish Juvenile Protective Care Monitoring Program	\$	335,713	
32 33 34	<b>Program Description:</b> The program tracks and monitors child abuse and neglect cases in the Orleans Parish Juvenile Court. It also provides assistance in support of the Families in Need of Services Program.				
35	02	Orleans Parish Juvenile Court Reporters	\$	56,590	
36 37	03	For the expenses of the Judges' Assistance Program	\$	25,000	
38 39	<b>Program Description:</b> The Judges' Assistance Program provides counseling and other assistance to judges with substance abuse problems.				
40	TOTAL (	OTHER COURTS NOT REQUIRED BY STATUTE	<u>\$</u>	417,303	

30

1	Section 2.A. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, or his duly authorized and
2	appointed agent, shall warrant the state treasurer for the allocations herein provided, or for
3	so much thereof as may be necessary. The aforesaid warrant shall be paid out of the state
4	general fund, and the state treasurer shall pay said warrant by preference over all other
5	warrants, except warrants for the salaries of constitutional officers of the state and warrants
6	for expenses of the legislature, which shall be concurrent with the warrant provided by this
7	Act.
8	B. The funds drawn as provided herein shall be deposited in the name of the judiciary
9	in an approved bank that has been selected by the Supreme Court and is located in the state.
10	C. Any funds herein allocated to the judiciary, any portion of the funds previously
11	appropriated to the judiciary, other revenue of the judiciary or its agencies, and interest
12	earnings, are hereby appropriated and may be used to defray the expenses of the judiciary;
13	however, all funds remaining unexpended or unencumbered shall be returnable to the state
14	general fund on or before September 1, 2002.
15	D. For Fiscal Year 2001-2002, any surpluses occurring in the appropriations made
16	in this Act may be transferred from one agency or line-item to another during the fiscal year
17	in accordance with the rules of the Judicial Budgetary Control Board, or as approved by the
18	Supreme Court.
19	E. The adjustment to be made in the salaries of judicial employees and the number
20	of authorized positions of the judiciary shall be as decided by the judicial agency affected,
21	subject to the approval of the Judicial Budgetary Control Board or as approved by the
22	Supreme Court.
23	F. The program descriptions, general performance indicators, objectives, goals, and
24	mission statements contained in this Act are not part of the law and are not enacted into law
25	by virtue of their inclusion in this Act. The missions, goals, and objectives contained in the
26	Act are derived from performance standards established by Section 10 of Part 6 General
27	Administrative Rules of the Supreme Court of Louisiana.
28	Section 3A. The sum of One Million Six Hundred Forty-one Thousand Nine Hundred
29	Eighty-three and No/100 (\$1,641,983.00) Dollars is hereby appropriated out of the State

General Fund to fund a five-percent salary increase in the actual salaries of Justices of the

Supreme Court and Court of Appeal and District Court judges and a five-percent increase in the state-paid salaries of City Court and Parish Court judges pursuant to a concurrent resolution adopted during the 2001 Regular Session of the Legislature. This appropriation shall be allocated to the various judges in accordance with the recommendations adopted by the Judicial Compensation Commission on January 23, 2001, and as approved by the Judicial Budgetary Control Board and the Supreme Court.

B. The sum of Fifty-one Thousand Two Hundred Sixty-seven and No/100 (\$51,267.00) Dollars is hereby appropriated out of the State General Fund to fund the salary increases for the Commissioners of the Fifteenth Judicial District Court and the Nineteenth Judicial District Court, provided, however, that such increase shall only be effective in the event that legislation revising the statutory provisions governing such compensation as contained in R.S. 13:713 and R.S. 13:715, respectively, is enacted into law in the 2001 Regular Session of the Legislature.

C. The sum of Fifty-four Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty-four and No/100 (\$54,854.00) Dollars is hereby appropriated out of the State General Fund to fund salary increases for the Commissioners of the Orleans Parish Criminal District Court, provided, however, that such increase shall only be effective in the event that legislation revising the statutory provisions governing such compensation as contained in R.S. 13:1347 is enacted into law in the 2001 Regular Session of the Legislature.

Section 4. This Act shall become effective on July 1, 2001; if vetoed by the governor and subsequently approved by the legislature, this Act shall become effective on July 1, 2001, or on the day following such approval by the legislature, whichever is later.

## **DIGEST**

The digest printed below was prepared by House Legislative Services. It constitutes no part of the legislative instrument.

LeBlanc, et al. HB No. 1783

**Abstract:** Section 1 provides for expenses of the Louisiana Judiciary, including the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, District Courts, Criminal Court of Orleans Parish, juvenile and family courts, and other courts. Section 3 appropriates money for a 5% salary increase for the Justices of the Supreme Court, Judges of the Courts of Appeal, Judges of District Courts, for the state-paid salaries of City and Parish Court Judges

HLS 01-719

ORIGINAL

H.B. NO. 1783

as recommended by the Judicial Compensation Commission on January 23, 2001, pursuant to the adoption of a concurrent resolution in the 2001 Regular Session. Also provides pay increase for certain Commissioners of the 15th and 19th JDC and the Orleans Criminal Court contingent upon statutory changes in the Regular Session.

Provides for the expenses of the judicial branch of government as follows:

(1)	Louisiana Supreme Court	\$27,482,179
(2)	Courts of Appeal	27,384,625
(3)	District Courts	20,236,383
(4)	Criminal Court, Parish of Orleans	3,671,735
(5)	Juvenile and Family Courts	1,560,960
(6)	Other Courts (Required by Statute)	1,824,897
(7)	Other Courts (Not Required by Statute)	417,303
	TOTAL	<u>\$82,578,082</u>

Of the \$82,578,082 appropriated to the Judiciary in Section 1 of the Act, \$76,970,242 is from the state general fund, \$4,000,000 is from the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund, \$1,597,840 is from the Trial Court Case Management Fund, and \$10,000 is from the Patient's Compensation Fund.

Section 3 appropriates \$1,641,983 for a 5% salary increase for the Justices of the Supreme Court, Judges of the Courts of Appeal, Judges of District Courts, for the state-paid salaries of City and Parish Court Judges as recommended by the Judicial Compensation Commission on January 23, 2001, pursuant to the adoption of a concurrent resolution in the 2001 R.S. Provides for allocation in accordance with the Compensation Commission recommendation and as approved by the Judicial Budgetary Control Board and the Supreme Court.

Section 3 also appropriates \$51,267 for a salary increase for Commissioners of the 15th Judicial District Court (JDC) and the 19th JDC in the event that the statutory provisions governing such compensation are revised in the 2001 R.S. Appropriates \$54,854 for the Commissioners of the Orleans Parish Criminal District Court in the event that the statutory provisions governing such compensation are revised in the 2001 R.S.

Effective July 1, 2001.