HLS 13RS-526 ORIGINAL

Regular Session, 2013

HOUSE BILL NO. 691

# BY REPRESENTATIVES FANNIN AND KLECKLEY AND SENATORS ALARIO AND DONAHUE

APPROPRIATIONS: Appropriates funds for the expenses of the Louisiana Judiciary for Fiscal Year 2013-2014

1 AN ACT 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 One Hundred Sixty-Seven Million Two Hundred Sixty-Six 7 Thousand Seventy-Five and No/100 (\$167,266,075.00) Dollars, or so much thereof as may 8 be necessary, is hereby appropriated to defray the expenses of the judiciary, including the 9 Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, the District Courts, the Criminal District Court of Orleans 10 Parish, and of the other courts. 11 B. The total amount herein appropriated is hereby allocated to provide as follows: 12 03-8170 SUPREME COURT

**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 has criminal and other appellate jurisdiction. The Supreme Court has exclusive original jurisdiction of disciplinary proceedings against lawyers, recommendations of the Judiciary Commission of Louisiana for the discipline of judges, and fact questions affecting its 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.

**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.

Page 1 of 15

1	Goal: To protect the rule of law.			
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<b>Objective:</b> To provide a reasonable opportu Supreme Court of decisions made by lower tri <i>General Performance Information:</i>		gants to seek	review in the
5	3	2010	2011	2012
6	Total Filings	2,875	2,852	2,769
7	Total Appeals Filed	9	10	10
8	Total Writs Filed	2,674	2,613	2,639
9	Total Dispositions Rendered	2,736	2,916	3,181
10	<b>Goal:</b> To promote the rule of law.	_,, _ ,	_,,	2,232
	Comment of Processing and Comment			
11	Objective: To resolve cases in a timely mann	er.		
12	General Performance Information:			
13		2010	2011	2012
14	Percentage of noncriminal case			
15	applications acted on within Supreme			
16	Court standard of 120 days of filing	90.9%	96.6%	93.3%
17	Percentage of criminal case applications			
18	acted on within Supreme Court			
19	standard of 120 days of filing	39.9%	40.4%	45.9%
20	Percentage of pro se post conviction			
$\bar{21}$	applications acted on within Supreme			
20 21 22	Court standard of 120 days of filing	7.7%	5.2%	8.5%
23	Percentage of bar disciplinary filings	7.770	3.270	0.570
23 24	acted upon within Supreme Court			
25	standard of 120 days of filing	76.5%	98.7%	88.9%
26	Percentage of opinions rendered within	70.570	90.770	00.970
27	Supreme Court standard of 84 days			
28		83.7%	64.4%	80.6%
20	from argument	03.7%	04.4%	80.0%
29	<b>Goal:</b> To ensure the public trust.			
30 31	<b>Objective:</b> To facilitate public access to Supr General Performance Information:	eme Court	decisions.	
<b>-</b>	General Leijormanee Injormanon	2010	2011	2012
32.				
32 33	Percentage of written opinions available	2010		2012
31 32 33 34	Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision			
32 33 34	Percentage of written opinions available to the public within 5 days of decision	100%	100%	100%
34 35	to the public within 5 days of decision <b>Objective:</b> To inform the public of operations	100%	100%	
34 35	to the public within 5 days of decision	100%	100%	
34 35 36 37	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations  General Performance Information:	100%	100% ties.	100%
34 35 36 37 38	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations  General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs	100% s and activit 2010	100% ties.	100% 2012
34 35 36 37 38 39 40	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs Number of media releases on court decisions	100% s and activit 2010 51	100% ties.  2011	100% 2012 58
34 35 36 37 38 39 40	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs Number of media releases on court decisions Number of media releases on other matters	100% s and activit 2010 51 87	100% ties.  2011 63 83	100%  2012 58 77
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations General Performance Information:  Number of outreach programs Number of media releases on court decisions	100% s and activit 2010 51 87	100% ties.  2011 63 83	100%  2012 58 77
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21	100%  2012 58 77 15
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21	100%  2012 58 77 15
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 decisions.	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 of	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 decisions.	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 decisions.	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and con	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  Impetence of the
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 of bench.  General Performance Information:	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and con	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  Impetence of the
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 obench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and con	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  Impetence of the
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 of bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and con	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  Impetence of the company of the c
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 obench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and con	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  Impetence of the company of the c
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 of bench.  General Performance Information:  Average number of hours acquired through continuing legal education per judge  Number of complaints filed against	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and core 2011 30.20	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  mpetence of the  2012 29.35
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 of 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	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and core 2011 30.20	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  mpetence of the  2012 29.35
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	to the public within 5 days of decision  Objective: To inform the public of operations 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 obench.  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	100% s and activit 2010 51 87 22 1,219 5,806 conduct, into	100% ties.  2011 63 83 21 1,498 2,876 egrity, and core 2011 30.20	100%  2012 58 77 15 1,663 3,672  mpetence of the  2012 29.35

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	bar.	ive: To ensure the highest professional c	onduct, inte	egrity, and com	petence of the	
3	Genera	l Performance Information:	2010	2011	2012	
5	Average	e number of hours acquired through	2010	2011	2012	
6		ntinuing legal education per lawyer	15.04	15.36	15.24	
7		r of complaints filed against lawyers	3,240	3,000	3,042	
8		r of complaints filed against lawyers	2 565	2 007	2.066	
9	res	olved or disposed of in calendar year	3,565	2,997	2,966	
10	Payable or	ut of the State General Fund (Dir	rect):			
11	01	Salaries of one (1) Chief Justice	e and six	(6)		
12		Associate Justices of the Supre	me Court	•		
13		as provided by R.S. 13:102			\$	970,480
		-				
14	02	Salaries and other expenses of t	he			
15		Supreme Court Proper and sala	ry of			
16		the Crier of the Supreme Court			\$	9,432,817
		•				, ,
17	03	Expenses of Judicial Administr	ator's			
18		Office and of the Judiciary Con				
19		provided for in Article V, Secti				
20		25 of the Constitution of Louisi				
21		under the provisions of R.S. 13		1.		
		provinces of the re-	••• •••	ľ		
22	A.	Expenses of Judicial Administr	ator's Off	fice	\$	4,777,022
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	adminis of Louis creation Adminis adminis human Manago judgesh courts, s	m Description: The Judicial Administration of the state court system. It staffsiana. Through the Judicial Council, it is not new judgeships and for improving strator's Office provides payroll and estration of a judicial retirement system; resource system; technological serving ement Information System. The Judicial system, monitors cases under advisors the Committee on Judicial Ethics, and the Judiciary.	fs the Judice performs st. ping the acother fiscal support foces to coun ial Adminis ement, prov	ial Council and udies and maked dministration less services to the Suprements; and, manastrator's Office vides outreach	I the Judiciary C es recommendati of justice. Th ne Judiciary, inc Court and Appe ages the Trial C a also manages a services to state	ommission ions for the e Judicial cluding the llate Court Court Case the ad hoc
34	B.	Expenses of Judiciary Commiss	sion		\$	1,926,519
35 36 37 38 39	under A compla	<b>m Description:</b> The Judiciary Commis Article V, Section 25 of the Constitution ints of judicial misconduct. As part of issure, suspension, removal from office, duct.	of 1974 to d ts authority	accept, screen, , it may recom	investigate, and mend to the Supr	l prosecute eme Court
40	C.	Court Reporters; Statistical Rep	orting Sy	vstems	\$	359,357
41	D.	Dues to National Center for Sta	te Courts		\$	148,690
42	04	Expenses of Committee on Pro	fessional			
43	0-	Ethics and Grievances includin				
43 44			_	200	\$	2 000
44		disbarment proceedings, R.S. 3	7.211 Et S	scy.	Ф	3,000
45	05	Companyation and averages of	rativad			
45 46	03	Compensation and expenses of				
		judges assigned under Article V				
47		Section 5(A) of the Constitution			ø	1 464 005
48		Louisiana, be it more or less es	timated at	Ţ	\$	1,464,995
40	0.0	Land Library C.L	1			
49	06	Law Library of Louisiana for sa				
50 51		services, supplies, maintenance	, repairs,		φ.	1.010.100
51		and equipment			\$	1,913,188

1 2		m Description: The Law Library of Louisiana was created by an Act of the the legal information needs of the public, the state judiciary, and the bar.	Legis	lature in 1855
3 4 5 6	07	Salaries and expenses of transferred judges assigned under Article V, Section 5(A) of the Constitution, be it more or less estimated as	\$	182,012
7 8 9 10	08	Retirement pay for services rendered by justices and judges of all courts, as provided by R.S. 11:1358 and R.S. 13:103	\$	1,398,390
11 12 13 14	09	Pensions for widows of justices and judges of all courts, as provided by R.S. 11:1371 and R.S. 11:1381, be it more or less estimated at	\$	1,609,481
15	10	Judicial College	\$	234,310
16 17		m <b>Description:</b> The Judicial College was established by order of the Supremontonium legal education to Louisiana judges.	ne Co	ourt in 1976 to
18 19 20 21	11	State contribution to judicial retirement provided for in Article V, Section 23 of the Constitution and R.S. 11:551 et seq., be it more or		
22		less estimated at	\$	14,561,372
23 24	12	Civil commitment matters as required by R.S. 28:54	\$	143,424
25 26	13	Paul M. Hebert Law Center for the expenses of storage of appellate court records	\$	60,000
27 28 29 30	14	Funding for statewide operations of the Louisiana Protective Order Registry (R.S. 46:2136.2) under the Case Management Information System	\$	1,318,704
31	15	Information Technology	\$	1,037,647
32 33 34	16	Payable out of the State General Fund for the expenses associated with the operation of the Families in Need of Services Program (FINS)	\$	2,037,299
35 36 37 38 39 40	develope the use of and man indicato	m Description: The mission of the FINS Assistance Program is to assist localing and implementing a needs-based allocation formula; developing, implement of a uniform data system for tracking, managing, and reporting FINS informated the use of programmatic standards; developing, implementing, and reports and measures; requiring and monitoring periodic fiscal reports and finance and supervising and assisting local FINS processes in other ways.	ting, d l cas ortin	and mandating es; developing g performance
41	17	Drug court maintenance and enhancement	\$	17,137,372
42 43 44 45 46	provided low-leve progran	m Description: Drug treatment courts, authorized in 1997 by R.S. 13:5301 the d integrated substance abuse treatment, sanctions, and incentives with case pel, nonviolent drug-involved defendants in community-based, judicially superns. Clients are regularly tested and monitored for compliance with educationant requirements set by the court.	proce vised	essing to place rehabilitation
47	18	Court Appointed Special Advocates	\$	6,955,548

Program Description: The purpose of the CASA Assistance Program is to promote timely placement of children in need of care in permanent, safe and stable homes, in accordance with the provisions of Children's Code articles 424-426. Services are provided through local CASA programs which recruit, screen, train and supervise community advocates. Upon appointment by the trial judge, qualified advocates serve children by providing independent factual information to the judge, advocating for the best interest of the children, monitoring cases to which they have been assigned, and advising and assisting the judge in the determination of the best interest of the children involved.

#### 8 TOTAL - GENERAL FUND

67,671,627

- 9 19 Payable out of the State General Fund 10 from Statutory Dedications, Judges' 11 Supplemental Compensation Fund, 12 R. S. 13:10.3, be it more or less 13 estimated at
- 13 estimated at \$ 6,000,000

Program Description: The Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund was established by the Legislature
 in 1985 to fund salary supplements and salary-related expenses to judges and commissioners. The funding
 source is a non-refundable filing fee assessed on civil filings as provided in R.S. 13:10.3.

17 20 Payable out of the State General Fund 18 from Statutory Dedications, Trial Court 19 Case Management Information Fund, for 20 the Case Management Information System, 21 Article 887 (F) of the Code of Criminal 22 Procedure, be it more or less estimated at

Procedure, be it more or less estimated at \$ 3,797,469

**Program Description:** The Case Management Information System (CMIS) was created by the Supreme Court in 1993 to provide a statewide information system for tracking and managing criminal, civil, juvenile, traffic, and appellate cases as well as protective orders. Data is received from courts statewide, transferred to the CMIS repository, and made available to courts and executive branch agencies. Additional information will also be available from the Department of Public Safety & Corrections. CMIS is funded from a court cost assessed on all criminal and traffic convictions as provided under C.Cr.P.887(F).

#### 30 TOTAL - STATE GENERAL FUND

31 BY STATUTORY DEDICATIONS

§ 9,797,469

### 32 TOTAL SUPREME COURT

\$ 77,469,096

## **33 03-8171 COURTS OF APPEAL**

Program Description: The five courts of appeal, domiciled in Baton Rouge, Shreveport, Lake Charles, New Orleans, and Gretna, have supervisory jurisdiction over all cases arising within their respective circuits, subject to the general supervisory jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Each court of appeal also has appellate jurisdiction over all civil matters, all matters appealed from family and juvenile courts, and all criminal cases triable by a jury which arise within its circuit, except for those cases appealable directly to the Supreme Court or to the district courts.

Mission Statement: The mission of the appellate courts of Louisiana is to provide meaningful access to all who seek review under the Courts' appellate and supervisory jurisdiction granted by the Louisiana Constitution while protecting and promoting the rule of law, preserving the public trust, and using public resources efficiently.

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

Objective: To provide a reasonable opportunity for multi-judge review of decisions made by lower tribunals.

48

49

45

#### General Performance Information:

50		2010	2011	2012
51	Total appeals filed	2,587	2,838	2,689
52	Total writs filed	5,102	4,987	4,499
53	Total dispositions rendered	6,530	5,277	6,240

						-	110.071
1	Goal:	To promote the rule of law.					
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		tive: To resolve cases expeditiously.					
<i>3</i> 1	Genera	al Performance Information:	2010	2011	2012		
4			2010	2011	2012		
2		ge number of days from lodging of the					
0		to argument:					
/		tandard = no more than 175 days.	1.15	1.45	100		
8		al cases	145	145	189		
10	Civil C		159	175	161		
10	Mediai	n number of days for all cases	152	155	172		
11 12		ge number of days from argument to ing of the opinion:					
13		tandard = no more than 70 days.					
14		val cases	39	41	37		
15	Civil c	ases	37	37	41		
16		n number of days for all cases	38	38	38		
17							
17	Goal:	To preserve public trust.					
18		tive: To facilitate public access to the	decisions of	the courts of	appeal.		
19	Genera	al Performance Information:	2010	2011	2012		
20 21	n		2010	2011	2012		
21 22		tage of written opinions available the public within 5 days of decision	100%	100%	100%		
23	Payable o	out of the State General Fund:					
24 25	01	Salaries of five (5) Chief Judga and forty-eight (48) Judges of	es				
26		the Courts of Appeal, R.S. 13:	311			\$	6,949,328
27	02	Salaries and expenses of opera					
28 29		maintenance of the Court of A First Circuit	ppear,			\$	9,681,993
30	03	Salaries and expenses of opera	tion and				
31		maintenance of the Court of A					
32		Second Circuit	ppcar,			\$	5,561,156
32		Second Circuit				φ	3,301,130
22	0.4	6.1.: 1. 6	1				
33	04	Salaries and expenses of opera					
34		maintenance of the Court of A	ppeal,				
35		Third Circuit				\$	8,457,126
36	05	Salaries and expenses of opera	tion and				
37	32	maintenance of the Court of A					
		Fourth Circuit	ppcar,			Φ	7 701 027
38		FOURTH CITCUIT				\$	7,701,037
20	A -						
39	06	Salaries and expenses of opera					
40		maintenance of the Court of A	ppeal,				
41		Fifth Circuit				\$	5,719,937
42	TOTAL					ф.	
42	IUIAL (	COURTS OF APPEAL				<u> </u>	44,070,577

24

38 39 40

42 43

44 45 46

47 48 49

#### 03-8172 DISTRICT COURTS

Program Description: There are forty-one 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-one 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 District 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 Info	ormation:
--------------------------	-----------

	2010	2011	2012
Percentage of surveyed district court of	chief		
judges indicating actions taken in FY	2011-2012		
to improve compliance withthe Americ	cans with		
Disabilities Act (ADA)	89.6%	91.7%	89.6%

**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:

	2010	2011	2012
Percentage of surveyed district court chie	ef		
judges indicating actions taken in FY 20.	11-2012		
to assist self-represented litigants	100%	93.8%	95.8%

**Goal:** To meet all responsibilities to everyone affected by the court and its activities in a timely and expeditious manner.

#### Objective: To encourage timely case management and processing.

jury service more convenient or effective 97.7%

General Performance	Information:
---------------------	--------------

	2010	2011	2012
Number of parishes reporting criminal			
disposition data to CMIS	62	62	63
Percentage of parishes reporting criminal			
disposition data to CMIS	96.9%	97.0%	98.4%
Percentage of surveyed district court chief			
judges indicating that their courts had			
taken steps within FY 2011-2012 to red			
delays and improve the timeliness of co	ase		
processing	97.9%	91.7%	91.7%
<b>Objective:</b> To enhance jury service.			
General Performance Information:			
, , ,	2010	2011	2012
Percentage of surveyed district court chief			
judges indicating that their court had			
taken steps within FY 2011-2012 to me	ıke		

95.3%

93.0%

12 Goal: To provide due process and equal protection of the law to all who have business before the court; and to demonstrate integrity in all procedures and decisions. 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Objective: To recognize new conditions or emerging events and to adjust court operations as necessary. General Performance Information: 2010 2011 2012 Percentage of surveyed district court chief judges indicating actions taken in FY 2011-2012 to improve employee training and development 87.5% 93.8% 89.6% Percentage of surveyed district court chief 12 judges indicating actions taken in FY 2011-2012 to install or implement 14 95.8% 93.8% 91.7% technologies 15 Goal: To maintain judicial independence, while observing the principle of comity in 16 its governmental relations and accountability to the public. 17 **Objective:** To inform the community of the court's structure and function. 18 19 General Performance Information: 2010 2011 2012 20 21 22 Percentage of surveyed district court chief judges indicating that their courts regularly provided public education 23 24 and public outreach services in FY 2011-2012 97.9% 91.7% 89.6% 25 Payable out of the State General Fund: 26 01 Salaries of one hundred ninety-one 27 (191) District Judges as provided 28 by R.S. 13:691 23,787,827 29 02 Office and travel expenses of District 30 Judges as provided by R.S. 13:698 and 31 R.S. 13:694, respectively \$ 1,285,850 32 03 Salaries of fourteen (14) Judges of 33 Civil District Court, Orleans Parish, 34 as provided by R.S. 13:691 \$ 1,743,611 35 04 Expenses of Judges of Civil District Court, Parish of Orleans, for salaries 36 37 of stenographers, clerks, law books, 38 stationery, telephone, and like expenses 39 as provided by R.S. 13:698 \$ 80,500 40 05 Salaries of two (2) Court Reporters 41 of the Twentieth Judicial District Court, 42 including retirement contributions, as 43 provided by R.S. 13:966.1 \$ 109,364 44 06 Clerk of Civil District Court, Orleans 45 Parish, as provided by R.S. 13:1212(A) \$ 10,000 46 07 State share of Group, Workers' 47 Compensation, General Liability, 48 and Property Insurance Premiums 49 as provided by R.S.42:851 \$ 5,652,873

	HLS 13R	S-526	_	ORIGINAL HB NO. 691
1 2 3 4 5 6	08 Sa	the Nineteenth Judicial District and one (1) commissioner of the Fifteenth Judicial District as provided by R.S. 13:712 and R.S. 13:715, respectively	\$	474,997
7 8 9 10	09	Office expenses for the Judicial Expense Fund of the Nineteenth Judicial District Court as provided by R.S. 13:711-713	\$	452,388
11 12 13 14	10	Office expenses for the Judicial Expense Fund of the Fifteenth Judicial District Court as provided by R.S. 13:714-716	\$	282,306
15 16	11	Law Clerk, Twentieth Judicial District Court as provided by Act 747 of 1977	\$	47,968
17 18 19	12	For the expenses of the Judicial Expense Fund, Tenth Judicial District Court as provided by Act 57 of 2006	<u>\$</u>	35,000
20	SUBT	TOTAL	\$	33,962,684
21	13	Criminal Court - Parish of Orleans		
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	of the a Orlean with as the pow cases b	Im Description: The Criminal District Court for the Parish of Orleans had trial and punishment of all crimes, misdemeanors, and offenses committees, if the jurisdiction is not vested by law in some other court. The court, three sistance from its commissioners, has the power of committing magistrates in over to hold preliminary examinations, with authority to bail or discharge, of the court. The court has appellate jurisdiction of all cases tried before Orleans and the Traffic Court of New Orleans and has general supervisory	ed with ough its n all felo or to holo ore the M	in the parish of magistrate and ony charges and d for trial, in all Municipal Court
30 31 32	A	Salaries of thirteen (13) District Judges of Criminal Court, Orleans Parish as provided by R.S. 13:691	\$	1,619,067
33 34	В.	Office expenses of Judges of Criminal Court, Orleans Parish as provided by R.S. 13:698	\$	74,750
35 36	C.	State's share of group insurance for the personnel of Criminal Court as provided by R.S. 42:851	\$	604,800
37 38	D.	Salaries of thirteen (13) minute clerks as provided by R.S. 13:1373.1	\$	272,611
39 40	E.	Salaries of twenty-six (26) court reporters as provided by R.S. 13:1373.1	\$	432,379
41 42 43	F.	Salaries of four (4) commissioners of Criminal Court, Orleans Parish, including related benefits as provided by R.S. 13:1347	\$	422,706
44 45	G	Office and travel expenses of commissioners as provided by R.S. 13:1347	\$	10,000
46 47	Н	Salaries of four (4) minute clerks, one for each commissioner as provided by R.S. 13:1347	\$	69,921

	HLS 13RS	S-526			DRIGINAL HB NO. 691
1 2	I.	Salaries of four (4) court reporte commissioner as provided by R		\$	52,710
3 4	J.	Salaries of Judicial Administrate including related benefits	or, and assistants,	\$	901,284
5	K.	Salaries of thirteen (13) law cler	rks	\$	699,327
6	L.	Salaries of four (4) secretaries		\$	202,659
7	M.	Sanity Commissions		\$	165,221
8	N.	Board of Jury Commissioners		<u>\$</u>	406,841
9	SUBT	OTAL		<u>\$</u>	5,934,276
10	14	Juvenile and Family Court Judg	es		
11 12	A.	Salaries of fourteen (14) Juvenil Judges as provided by R.S. 13:6		\$	1,743,611
13 14	В.	Salaries of four (4) Family Cour as provided by R.S. 13:691	t Judges	\$	498,175
15 16 17	C.	Office and travel expenses of Ju Court Judges as provided by R.S. and R.S. 13:694, respectively	•	\$	103,500
18	SUBT	OTAL		<u>\$</u>	2,345,286
19	TOTAL D	DISTRICT COURTS		<u>\$</u>	42,242,246
20 21		OTHER COURTS - SALARIES CATUTE	S AND OFFICE EXPENSE	S AS I	REQUIRED
22 23 24		m Description: The category includes lew Orleans), one traffic court (New Or			
25 26 27 28 29	access t provide indepen	A Statement: The mission of the city and to justice, to meet all responsibilities in equality, fairness and integrity in the dence and accountability, and to reach caral and substantive law, thereby instilling	n a timely and expeditious manne eir proceedings, to maintain jud ufair and just result by adherence to	r, to icial o the	
30	Goal: 1	Γο establish a more open and accessible	system of justice.		
31 32 33 34	costs of money,	ve: To encourage all responsible public access to the court's proceedings and time, or the procedures that must be fold <i>Performance Information:</i>	records - whether measured in te	rms of	
35 36 37 38	Percent jud	age of surveyed city/parish court chief ges indicating actions taken in 2011-2012 to assist pro se litigants		2012 96.2%	
39 40	Goal:	To meet all responsibilities to everyone in a timely and expeditious manner.		90.276	
41 42		ve: To encourage timely case managent left Performance Information:	-		
43 44 45 46 47 48	jud <sub>e</sub> take dele	age of surveyed city/parish court chief ges indicating that their courts had en steps within FY 2011-2012 to reduce ays and improve the timeliness of case cessing	,	<b>2012</b> 86.5%	
	•				

1 2	<b>Goal:</b> To maintain judicial independence, while observing the principle of comity in its governmental relations and accountability to the public.						
3 4	<b>Objective:</b> To inform the community of the court's structure and function.  General Performance Information:						
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Percenta	ge of surveyed city/parish court chie es indicating that their courts regula		2011	2012		
8 9		ided public education and public each services in FY 2011-2012	94.2%	90.4%	88.5%		
10 11 12	<b>Objective:</b> To recognize new conditions or emerging events and to adjust court operations as necessary. <b>General Performance Information:</b>						
13 14 15	Percenta judg	ge of surveyed city/parish court chie es indicating actions taken in	<b>2010</b>	2011	2012		
16 17 18 19 20	trair Percenta judg FY 2	2011-2012 to improve employee ning and development ge of surveyed city/parish court chie es indicating actions taken in 2011-2012 to install or implement		90.4%	92.3%		
21		nologies	88.5%	90.4%	86.5%		
22	Payable ou	t of the State General Fund:					
23 24		Salaries of sixty (60) City Cou Judges as provided by R.S. 13:			\$	2,412,714	
25 26 27 28		Salaries of four (4) Municipal, Traffic and one (1) Parish Cou Judges as provided by R.S. 13: 13:2501.1, and 13:2563.5, resp	rt 2492,		\$	389 <u>,156</u>	
29	TOTAL OTHER COURTS REQUIRED BY STATUTE \$ 2,801,870						
30 31		OTHER COURTS - SAI REQUIRED BY STATUTE	ARIES ANI	OFFICE .	EXPEN	ISES NOT	
32	Payable out of the State General Fund:						
33 34		Orleans Parish Juvenile Protec Care Monitoring Program	tive		\$	563,937	
35 36	<b>Program Description:</b> The program tracks and maintains 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.						
37	02	Orleans Parish Juvenile Court	Reporters		\$	87,785	
38 39		For the expenses of the Judges Assistance Program	•		<u>\$</u>	30,564	
40 41	<b>Program Description:</b> The Judges' Assistance Program provides counseling and other assistance to judges with substance abuse problems.						
42	TOTAL OTHER COURTS NOT REQUIRED BY STATUTE \$ 682,286						
43	Section 2.A. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, or her duly authorized and						
44	appointed agent, shall warrant the state treasurer for the allocations herein provided, or for						
45	so much thereof as may be necessary. The aforesaid warrant shall be paid out of the state						
46	general fund, and the state treasurer shall pay said warrant by preference over all other						
47	warrants, except warrants for the salaries of constitutional officers of the state and warrants						

HLS 13RS-526

1 for expenses of the legislature, which shall be concurrent with the warrant provided by this

- 2 Act.
- B. The funds drawn as provided herein shall be deposited in the name of the judiciary in
- 4 an approved bank that has been selected by the Supreme Court and is located in the state.
- 5 C. Any funds herein allocated to the judiciary, any portion of the funds previously
- 6 appropriated to the judiciary, other revenue of the judiciary or its agencies, and interest
- 7 earnings are hereby appropriated and may be used to defray the expenses of the judiciary;
- 8 however, all funds remaining unexpended or unencumbered shall be returnable to the state
- 9 general fund on or before September 1, 2014.
- D. For Fiscal Year 2013-2014, any surpluses occurring in the appropriations made in this
- 11 Act may be transferred from one agency or line-item to another during the fiscal year in
- 12 accordance with the rules of the Judicial Budgetary Control Board, or as approved by the
- 13 Supreme Court.
- E. The adjustment to be made in the salaries of judicial employees and the number of
- authorized positions of the judiciary shall be as decided by the judicial agency affected,
- subject to the approval of the Judicial Budgetary Control Board or as approved by the
- 17 Supreme Court.
- F. The program descriptions, general performance information and indicators, objectives,
- 19 goals, and mission statements contained in this Act are not part of the law and are not enacted
- into law by virtue of their inclusion in this Act. The missions, goals, and objectives contained
- 21 in the Act are derived from performance standards established by Section 10 of Part G
- General Administrative Rules of the Supreme Court of Louisiana.
- G. The inclusion in this Act of staff salaries and benefits for lower court or other judicial
- branch agency employees shall not be deemed to create or impose any obligation upon the
- 25 State of Louisiana Judicial Branch, the Supreme Court of Louisiana, the Judicial Budgetary
- 26 Control Board, or the Supreme Court Judicial Administrator's Office relative to the
- administration of pay, retirement or other benefits to any such employees. Accordingly, the
- 28 State of Louisiana Judicial Branch, the Supreme Court of Louisiana, the Judicial Budgetary
- 29 Control Board, and the Supreme Court Judicial Administrator's Office are not to be
- 30 considered the "employer" or "employing agency" of lower court or other judicial agency
- 31 employees whose staff salaries and other benefits are included in this Act.

1 Section 3. Contingent on the passage of separate legislation, a sum to be determined shall 2 be appropriated out of the State General Fund for the purpose of funding an increase in the 3 salaries of the Justices of the Supreme Court, judges of the Courts of Appeal, judges of the 4 District Courts, judges of the City and Parish Courts, and certain commissioners as provided 5 for by law. Any such appropriation shall be allocated to the various judges and 6 commissioners in a manner contemplated by the Judicial Compensation Commission's report 7 dated January 9, 2013. 8 Section 4. This Act shall become effective on July 1, 2013; if vetoed by the governor and 9 subsequently approved by the legislature, this Act shall become effective on July 1, 2013, or 10 on the day following such approval by the legislature, whichever is later.

#### COMPARATIVE STATEMENT

In accordance with R.S. 39:51(D), the following represents a comparative statement for each Court and program. The operating budget for FY 2012-2013 is compared to the appropriations for FY 2013-2014 as contained in the original bill.

O	perating Budget	Appropriation Request
Courts and Programs	FY 2012-2013	FY 2013-2014
Supreme Court Total Supreme Court	\$65,463,068	\$ 67,671,627
Courts of Appeal Total Courts of Appeal	\$42,428,117	\$ 44,070,577
District Courts Total District Courts	\$41,953,795	\$ 42,242,246
Other Courts Total Other Courts	\$2,801,870	\$ 2,801,870
Other Programs  Total Other Programs	<u>\$652,084</u>	\$ 682,286
Total State General Fund and Interagency Transfer		
All Line Items	<u>\$153,298,934</u>	<u>\$ 157,468,606</u>
Total Statutory Dedications	\$9,650,831	\$ 9,797,469
Total Funding	<u>\$162,949,765</u>	<u>\$ 167,266,075</u>

#### **DIGEST**

The digest printed below was prepared by House Legislative Services. It constitutes no part of the legislative instrument. The keyword, one-liner, abstract, and digest do not constitute part of the law or proof or indicia of legislative intent. [R.S. 1:13(B) and 24:177(E)]

Fannin HB No. 691

**Abstract:** Appropriates funds for FY 2013-2014 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.

Appropriates funds for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 for the ordinary operating expenses of the judicial branch of government with total funding of \$167,266,075 from the following sources: \$157,468,606 out of the State General Fund (Direct); and, \$9,797,469 from statutory dedications out of the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund and the Trial Court Case Management Fund.

Funding for the ordinary operating expenses of the judicial branch of government is provided as follows:

(1)	Louisiana Supreme Court	\$ 77,469,096
(2)	Courts of Appeal	44,070,577
(3)	District Courts	33,962,684
(4)	Criminal Court, Parish of Orleans	5,934,276
(5)	Juvenile and Family Courts	2,345,286
(6)	Other Courts (Required by Statute)	2,801,870
(7)	Other Courts (Not Required by Statute)	682,286
	TOTAL	<u>\$167,266,075</u>

Contingent on the passage of separate legislation, a sum to be determined shall be appropriated out of the State General Fund for the purpose of funding an increase in the salaries of the Justices of the Supreme Court, judges of the Courts of Appeal, judges of the District Courts, judges of the City and Parish Courts, and certain commissioners as provided for by law. Any such appropriation shall be allocated to the various judges and commissioners in a manner contemplated by the Judicial Compensation Commission's report dated January 9, 2013.

Effective July 1, 2013.