THE COURTRAN PROJECT: A BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Prepared by

Philip X. Murray

for

The Federal Judicial Center

1520 H Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005

August 1980

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Innovations and Systems Development Division of the Federal Judicial Center was given the responsibility to investigate the possible uses of technology in the federal court environment. From this mandate the Courtran Project was born.

Because of the central role of the Clerk of Court in case processing, initial development efforts were focused on that office.

With the passage of the Speedy Trial Act of 1974 and the call by Chief Justice Burger for better administrative control in the federal courts, the Courtran Project was expanded both in resources committed to the project and the recruitment of a staff of computer professionals.

The need to develop applications that were capable of being utilized by all courts resulted in the Center staff selecting a centralized management approach. The potential system users, however, were involved in every aspect of application development and provided the "local" expertise required to make the system truly responsive to the administrative requirements of the Clerk's Office. The result was the development of "universal" applications capable of being tailored for particular court

needs. The applications were then tested locally in one or more sites and modified when hands-on experience justified.

The system development approach has been highly successful and Courtran has provided substantial benefits both organizationally in its interactions among courts, agencies and the public as well as internally and operationally in improving upon standardization and accuracy of information, upgrading clerical operations, and eliminating many time-consuming and redundant tasks.

The Clerks were concerned over the impact this system would have on their court operations. They were primarily concerned over the effect the introduction of the various applications would have on their control of office operations, as well as the clerical burden this system would place on the local courts and the real value these applications would provide.

Experience gained during the development process and the responsiveness of the system developers to "local" needs allayed these concerns.

The applications developed for the district courts have substantially affected office operations. The Courtran Criminal system has replaced the manual dockets, increased and improved control over litigation, and expanded the Clerk's responsibility in the administration of the case processing function.

The Speedy Trial Accounting and Reporting System (STARS) has allowed many courts to respond to the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act of 1974. By keeping data entry to a minimum and responding to the requirements of the Act, this application has upgraded the local courts' ability to operate under the Speedy Trial Act.

Probably the most visible and successful application to date is the Index system. This application has replaced large manual indexing systems in courts and improved their ability to respond to requests on case information from the public and the bar quickly and more accurately. Further, it has provided the courts the ability to easily look at the profile of their caseloads and produce listings of pending cases.

A Central Violations Bureau application was developed to control and track the many citations issued by various federal agencies. This application substantially impacted the manual effort required to maintain the records system and substantially improved the courts' ability to schedule and process the citations.

Several Courtran applications were developed to assist appellate courts in the preparation of opinions and the processing of appeals. In the word processing area, the FJC staff evaluated the commercially available facilities. In the areas of both word processing and electronic mail, substantial benefit was

found in the development, transmission and dissemination of appeals. Opinion preparation and review times were greatly reduced and clerical burden alleviated.

In the appellate case processing area, the major application has been the Appellate Information Management System. This application provides substantial improvement over the previous manual system in providing for greater control over case information.

The value of Courtran from the local standpoint is easy to assess. In every instance the various applications were providing the local courts with what they desired. These applications have substantially enhanced the courts' ability to perform. However, much of the system's potential is yet to be realized. In the future, users of the available data should be directed to improving management decision-making, expanding the data gathered by the Administrative Office, and providing a basis for operations research.

Future applications will be directed toward filling the areas now unattended, like civil and probation case management, and providing support to local application needs.

INTRODUCTION

The Courtran Project is a research and development project being undertaken by the Federal Judicial Center. The aim of this project is to investigate how technology, especially the introduction of computer systems, can be used to support the federal courts. This study analyzes several existing and planned Courtran applications in terms of the benefits delivered to the courts. Each of the applications discussed has had a significant impact by assisting in day-to-day court operations and managerial requirements, as well as providing increased capabilities to satisfy the administrative and research needs of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Federal Judicial Center.

Section I of this study provides a historical perspective on the development of Courtran, as well as an overview of the goals of the project and the fundamental development approach. Section II provides an explanation of the system-wide impact anticipated upon the introduction of this technology and explains the operational and procedural benefits accomplished system-wide. Section III reviews the "local" court manager's concerns relating to the introduction of Courtran into his office and discusses how a common development approach satisfies those concerns. Section IV

examines the particular applications under development, examining the functions these applications perform and describing the various benefits derived therefrom. Finally, Section V reviews the Courtran Project as a whole and comments on the state of development.

In conducting this study, Courtran documentation, Federal Judicial Center reports, and other relevant materials were reviewed. This study was not intended as an exhaustive analysis of every Courtran court, nor as an in-depth evaluation of each Courtran application. Site visits were limited to the district courts of California Central, Northern and Southern; Massachusetts; Texas Western; and the Courts of Appeals for the Ninth and Tenth Circuits. Discussions were held with court clerks, law clerks, courtroom deputies, Courtran coordinators, judges, and Federal Judicial Center staff; a Courtran User Committee meeting was also attended. During the site visits, the operational aspects of the various applications were observed, the objective being to determine what system functions were of positive value to the user courts.

SECTION I: COURTRAN BACKGROUND

A. HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Federal Judicial Center (FJC) was established in 1967 by an Act of Congress (Public Law 90-219, 28 U.S.C. 620). According to this statute, the mission of the FJC is "to further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in the courts of the United States." The FJC serves as the research, development and training organization for the federal judiciary, complementing the administrative support role of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the adjudicatory role of the courts themselves. The several divisions of the FJC were established to fulfill the various aspects of the FJC's statutory mandate. In particular, the Innovations and Systems Development Division (I&SD) was designated to undertake, among other things, the investigation of how best to apply existing and evolving technology to the benefit of judicial administration. The Courtran Project began as an attempt to merge the capabilities of office automation and computer-based information management systems with current administrative management techniques. The Courtran Project has since come to be synonymous with "FJC-supported court automation" in the federal courts, encompassing a broad spectrum of computer-related research and development

projects intended to enhance the administrative capabilities of the federal judiciary.

Clerk's Office as Primary User

In its early stages, the Courtran Project sought to address various caseload management problems being experienced by larger federal courts. These courts were largely not automated. Most clerical and administrative tasks (filings, record-keeping, indexing, calendaring, noticing, statistics gathering, etc.) were performed manually, with the Clerk's Office of each court primarily responsible for these administrative operations.

Each of the federal district (trial) courts and appellate courts is set up as a relatively autonomous organization, under the direction of its Chief Judge, with the administrative aspects of managing the court's business being relegated to its Clerk's Office. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts promulgates guidelines for operation and nationwide standard record-keeping requirements as directed by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the circuit judicial conferences and the Supreme Court, but substantial freedom is left to each court as to the structure and operation of its local administrative organization.

Increasing caseloads and record-keeping and reporting requirements have made it necessary for the Clerk's Office to change its methods of operation in order to maintain and improve

its level of service to the court family and the public. Since the Clerk's Office is the focal point for the collection and dissemination of case information in the federal courts, it was felt that the information needs of the entire court family could best be served by enhancing the ability of the Clerk's Office to perform these vital functions. Therefore, keeping within its resource limitations, the FJC focused its initial efforts on the development of methods to assist the Clerk's Office in the management of its administrative burdens, including the primary task of providing case information. The FJC sought, thereby, to serve judges, court administrative offices, the bar, and the public.

Central Role of Docket Sheet in Caseload Management

As part of its commitment to assist the Clerk's Office, the FJC decided to undertake a pilot project to investigate how computer automation might assist the Clerk's Office in better managing its caseload. As a necessary part of this research effort, a review of current case management methods was initiated.

It was found that case management centered on the maintenance of the docket sheet associated with each case. The docket sheet recorded, in outline form, all the significant events that occurred in a case. The docket sheet was the source of case status and case scheduling information (the actual documents,

filings, etc., related to a case were kept in a corresponding case jacket); it was also the source of statistical information used to measure the dynamic workload of the court; and it was the source of information used by the Clerk's Office for maintaining various cross-reference indexes and tickler systems.

If the information contained on the docket sheet could be captured electronically, many of the administrative operations, such as indexing, scheduling, noticing, and statistics gathering, that use the docketing information as input, could be automated. The task of automating the docketing process was therefore chosen as a principle area for investigation, and the area of criminal case docketing was selected for the initial pilot project.

Batch Criminal

In the earlier years of the FJC, the level of technical staffing was quite limited. As a result, much of the systems analysis work for the docketing automation project was performed by contracted personnel and by volunteers from the various interested participating courts. Funding was also quite limited, and the initial pilot project to undertake the automation of the docketing process for criminal cases was by necessity of a rather limited scope. A batch-oriented criminal docketing system was developed, using the federal district courts in Chicago and Washington, D.C., as the pilot test courts. Data entry was accomplished via keypunched cards, and computer time was acquired

from local computer service bureaus. The capabilities of the initial system were limited, but it was able to keep track of the events occurring in each criminal case before the two pilot courts. It was also able to produce various case management reports that were useful in tracking the various cases through the caseflow process. Judges were able to receive reports on the progress of their caseloads and reports on scheduled (and overdue) actions in each case; the Clerk was able to get limited statistical reports and sorted index listings on pending caseloads, and case filings and terminations.

The initial criminal docketing system also made an attempt to maintain the integrity of the automated case dockets by performing various consistency checks on the data input entries. There was a model of criminal case processing built into the computer software which provided reasonably flexible error detection capabilities, resulting in more reliable output reports. Not only could the program relieve the Clerk's Office of the task of manually preparing periodic case status reports, it could also help assure the integrity of those reports by helping the data entry personnel (the docketing clerks) to be more accurate.

Minicomputer Civil

Having shown that automation of the docketing process was possible and could alleviate some of the periodic reporting duties of the Clerk's Office, the FJC sought to improve upon its

previous efforts by producing an on-line interactive automated docketing system (in which data entry would be accomplished by typing on computer terminals linked directly to the computer). Such a system would give the Clerk's Office more control of data entry and report generation turnaround times. Again as a research project, the FJC, still having limited staffing and a limited budget, acquired minicomputers and computer terminals for the Chicago and Washington, D.C., pilot court sites. With the batch-oriented criminal docketing system still in operation, the FJC decided to develop an on-line docketing capability for civil cases. Because there are substantially more federal civil cases than criminal cases and civil cases have more docket entries per case than do criminal cases, the development of a civil docketing system was a significantly greater task than the development of a criminal system, with a correspondingly greater potential impact on the workload of the Clerk's Office.

Using FJC-owned hardware, the software design and development of the proposed civil docketing system was primarily carried out by contracted personnel. To ensure the integrity of the case data base, the civil docketing software was developed with an embedded model of case processing, similar to that used in the earlier criminal docketing system. The capabilities of the civil system were roughly equivalent to those of the earlier criminal system, but the on-line mode of data entry, with its interactive user dialogue and instantaneous error detection and response was a significant advance. The Clerk's Office now had

better control over the data entry process and better control over the timeliness of report generation due to the dedicated hardware facilities in each court -- the Clerk's Office could even query individual cases on-line to get a case status check or a current docket sheet listing.

Speedy Trial Act and Better Administration

As the minicomputer on-line civil docketing system was nearing the end of its development phase, the Speedy Trial Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-619, 18 U.S.C. 3161) was signed into law. The federal courts were required to keep better records on federal criminal cases than ever before in order to comply with this Act. As the significance of the Act became clearer, many federal courts with substantial criminal caseloads had a dramatic increase in their record-keeping workload. The time guidelines of the Act were very detailed and required the time-consuming maintenance of large bodies of data. An assessment of the impact of the Speedy Trial Act indicated that each Clerk's Office would need to support the judges by keeping track of the deadline before which trial must begin in each criminal case.

The Speedy Trial Act created requirements that the time between an arrest and the filing of an information or indictment should not exceed thirty days, and that the time between the later of indictment and first appearance and the beginning of trial not exceed seventy days. The sanction for violation of

these limits was dismissal of the case with or without prejudice as the judge should determine. The Act also specified certain reasons for which the time limits could be extended. These "excludable delay periods" greatly complicated the calculation of the dates on which the indictment and pre-trial limits expired.

The Speedy Trial Act also created the requirement that defendants in federal custody solely for purposes of trial be tried within 90 days or released. In situations where the custody period began on a date different than the procedural intervals, the effects of excludable delay periods in extending deadlines can be entirely different.

The manual computation of trial deadlines on even moderately complex cases was a time consuming task. Courts having manual Speedy Trial systems were generally not able to report on defendant status more frequently than monthly, if, indeed, they produced Speedy Trial reports at all. In this environment, the provision of timely information about a defendant's status was a problem.

In addition to the requirements for monitoring defendant progress against the Speedy Trial limits, the courts were required by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to submit complex Judicial Statistics (JS) reports showing how long defendants spent in each interval, and what the reasons and duration of excludable delay periods were. These reporting

requirements were imposed to assure the collection of information to measure the extent of compliance with the Act, but did not help the courts in executing their responsibility to monitor pending defendants.

As the impact of the Speedy Trial Act was beginning to be felt, Chief Justice Warren Burger was expounding the need for improved judicial administration. He emphasized the need to adopt better managerial and administrative techniques. As caseloads increased, the tracking of cases and establishment of priorities became more difficult. Authorizing additional judgeships was not a sufficient solution, although additional judges were certainly necessary. Better methods for efficient case disposition were also required, as well as better ways to expedite the processing of cases without jeopardizing the litigants' rights to proper due process of law.

One approach to expediting the processing of cases was to minimize the associated administrative overheads by introducing appropriate managerial methods and aids for controlling and monitoring caseflow. Such methods could alleviate the administrative delays due to poor paperflow, unavailable information, untimely notifications, unnecessary or inappropriate reschedulings, poor reporting capabilities, and the inability to keep track of case and caseload status. In calling for improved management, the Chief Justice said:

> "...I have little patience with those who are fearful that efficiency will undermine justice and that, somehow, a skillfully administered court system will be mechanistic, heartless, insensitive to human needs. A court system overcrowded with bewildered litigants, harried judges and overworked personnel cannot provide fair treatment." [Warren E. Burger, "Rx for Justice: Modernize the Courts," Nation's Business, Sept. 1974]

With the passage of the Speedy Trial Act and the general desire for better administrative control in the federal courts, the FJC decided to take advantage of their recent positive experiences in automated caseflow management. Previous experience had shown that, while the introduction of Courtran systems could not, in and of itself, speed up the disposition of cases, Courtran could give the courts better and more timely information for use in managing their cases. This information could then help the courts respond intelligently to pressures created both by the Speedy Trial Act and increased civil case filings.

The decision was made to attack the problem of caseflow management on a much larger scale than was attempted before. The recruitment of a staff of computer professionals was begun and a major computer hardware acquisition was accomplished. Although this new undertaking was still a research project, its aspirations for success were more ambitious. More was at stake now. This was the beginning of the Courtran Project as we know it today.

B. COURTRAN PROJECT GOALS

The objectives of the Courtran development effort may be summarized as:

a) The improvement of the productivity of the case disposition process in the federal courts,

b) The reduction of the resources required for the courts to process each case,

c) The improvement of the decision-making process through an increased availability and exchange of information,

d) The elimination of redundant and unnecessary clerical and administrative effort,

e) The improvement of the court's ability to serve the public by increasing the availability and accessibility of court information, and

f) The improvement of the court's ability to monitor cases and caseflow and to make administrative decisions based upon improved management information.

C. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

Centralized Approach

To ensure the success of this undertaking, it was important to select an appropriate management approach. After examining various alternatives, a centralized management and development philosophy was adopted for the new Courtran Project. Rather than dispersing minicomputers to every participating federal court and trying to manage many small and somewhat autonomous operations, it was decided, primarily for managerial reasons, to centralize the computing facility into a few large interactive timesharing computer sites. These sites would serve the various court users via a proven commercial telecommunications network. With this approach, the technical expertise necessary to develop and support the software systems could be centralized, and the staff could be kept quite small.

Similarly, by centralizing the computing hardware, economies of scale could be realized. By using a nationwide commercial telecommunications network, service to new courts could be added or existing ones expanded merely by providing the necessary computer terminal hardware and user training. No remote computer hardware, operations staff, or facilities would be necessary.

This centralized approach lent itself well to the research aspects of the Courtran Project. Given the centralized hardware facility and a high level of staff competence, the size of the software development staff could be kept small. Once the initial set of software projects was implemented and under control, the general-purpose software tools created during the development of these applications would become available for use in subsequent application development. Additional capabilities could then be provided to participating courts at a very reasonable marginal increase in required computing resources and software development staff effort. The centralized project development approach also provided economies of scale for computer operations, user support, and the training.

User Involvement

The technical staff assembled by the FJC to support the enhanced Courtran effort were primarily computer specialists or attorneys with a background in data processing and systems analysis. The FJC intended to rely upon the participating courts to provide the requisite expertise in specifying the functional requirements of automated information management systems which could best assist in supporting the administrative tasks of the Clerk's Office. By involving the end users in the entire software development process, from project inception and design through software testing, delivery, and operation, the chances

for ultimate system acceptance and success by integration into the working environment of the Clerk's Office were improved.

The method of software specification and development became a process by which a group of potential system users engaged in a series of meetings with FJC technical staff members to sketch out desired system capabilities. The FJC technical staff would then prepare a system design specification, based on the agreements reached by the user committee as to the functional requirements of the proposed system. Due to technical considerations, this document might contain compromises with the original functional specification. Once the user committee approved the system design specification, the FJC would implement and test a prototype software system. Upon acceptance of this prototype, and after any required modifications, the software system would be released for general use, subject to the limited resources available to the FJC for user training and support. For each major software application developed, a user group composed of representatives from each participating court would be established to suggest and approve subsequent modifications to the software and share problems, solutions, and insights into the operational aspects and benefits of the software application.

Common Software

The goal of centralized software development was to attempt to develop for each application a single piece of software which

would meet the needs of as many potential user courts as possible while allowing some degree of court variation. Not only would such "universal" systems be easier to maintain (since there would be one for the entire judiciary, rather than one per court), but they would create a de facto standard for case processing, which would make court management and national statistics gathering more uniform. The early involvement of the user courts in the design process was an essential ingredient in establishing the consensus necessary to develop "universal" software applications.

Prototype Software Development Approach

The FJC chose the "prototype" approach as its desired method for software development. Under this approach, once the functional capabilities of a desired system are reasonably well understood, a prototype system is delivered to the user as quickly as possible, even if it is lacking some of the functional details. Access to a prototype of the application allows users with a relatively low level of computer experience to easily discover functions that were originally overlooked, or perhaps to find that certain specified functions were not as important as originally thought. The prototype software is then modified and enhanced to reflect the findings and recommendations of the user experimentation phase. The cycle continues until the software is deemed acceptable by the user group as a whole. The prototype approach encourages user involvement in the design process and

avoids spending substantial amounts of time on implementing specified features that turn out not to be so useful after all.

Software Tools

To facilitate the evolutionary style of software development that is typified by the prototype method, it is necessary to develop software tools that permit the rapid modification of software. Many Courtran applications involve the accumulation and aggregation of data related to day-to-day case processing activities. It is necessary to develop or acquire software facilities that can aid in the collection and organization of such substantial volumes of data. Commercially available data base management systems are a definite asset in this regard in that such systems allow software developers to devote more time to system design and a lesser proportion to implementation efforts. A change in system specification need not destroy many hours or days of careful data base structure planning because the data base management system takes care of such details automatically.

A complete data base management system consists of three components: (1) a data base manager and file structure manipulator, (2) an interactive query language that permits the user to peruse and update the data base, and (3) a report generation facility. A data base management system allows the software designer considerable flexibility in data base design without

having to attend to the details of the physical implementation of the data base -- thus, no substantial design investment is lost if the data base structure needs to be rearranged to meet modifications to the functional specification. (Of course, substantial work could be incurred in data base conversion efforts should this data base design change occur after courts had established their operational data bases.) Secondly, an interactive query language allows a user to pose ad hoc queries to an existing data base; it also provides the data base administrator a mechanism whereby he can investigate and resolve problems that arise in a court's data base. Finally, a report generation facility permits the users and the software developers to specify reporting requirements based on the data base structure and to retrieve desired data and manipulate it in a manner suitable for report production. This facility gives the user the ability to tailor existing reports to his own needs or to create special purpose ad hoc reports in a format suitable to his court's needs.

There are other software tools besides data base management systems that are useful in an application-oriented research software development environment. Appropriate language processors and operating systems utilities are essential in supporting large-scale software application development. Such software components are expected to be available on the central site hardware.

In addition, the FJC has found that many of the applications being requested by the courts may be implemented in terms of a "transaction processing" environment, in which the user interactively fills in an entire information form (called a "transaction") and then requests that the transaction be submitted for data verification and processing. For example, in an automated docketing system, transaction forms might be specified for opening new cases, filing motions in a case, or scheduling hearing or trial dates in a case. A transaction processor may be developed for each application area, and one or more copies of each transaction processor may be initiated to handle the transaction requests of all user courts. In the instance of the automated docketing system, the transaction processor would be responsible for accepting and validating each input transaction and then modifying the appropriate data base records to reflect the requested action in the stored electronic docket sheet.

CHARTS

To facilitate the development of transaction processing systems, the FJC has developed a special software-writing system called CHARTS, for Courtran High Activity Record Transaction System. The CHARTS system is capable of taking a tabular representation of the desired transaction processing system (e.g., tables describing desired data base data fields and record formats, and desired data entry transactions and edit checks) and

processing those descriptions to produce an automatically generated software system which will implement those specifications. In addition, it is possible for individual courts to request specially tailored versions of the input transactions to suit their local procedural requirements.

A flexible report generation facility is also being developed to complement the CHARTS software generation facility. With software development tools such as these, it is indeed possible to move from a functional specification to a prototype software system in a very short period of time, without a significant investment in application specific programming effort. Such software tools allow a relatively small software development staff to develop and produce a substantial number of application systems. In addition, the use of these tools simplifies the task of subsequent software maintenance, since many of the resultant software systems are quite similar internally, having been written by a common software generation program. Furthermore, user training on the various CHARTS-generated systems is simplified since the systems generated thereby have a common user interface.

SECTION II: SYSTEM-WIDE BENEFITS

A. ORGANIZATIONAL BENEFITS

In developing the various Courtran applications, it became obvious their impact on the federal courts and their support agencies would be felt at many levels. Courtran has affected the relationships between the courts, other agencies, the public, and within each court. In general, the impact has already been felt in the following ways.

Between Courts

Prior to the introduction of Courtran, there was little uniformity across courts in the way records were kept, documents were maintained, or information was stored and disseminated. The same action in two different courts was often described in different ways and recorded in different formats.

Courtran has helped reduce these variations. For example, several appellate courts have noticed that docketing in district courts has become much more consistent and readable in those district courts using the Courtran criminal docketing application.

Another significant trend has been the development of regional centers for the efficient performance of certain court applications. Some Courtran courts have assumed the burden of other non-automated courts. The Western District of Texas, the District of Colorado and Central District of California have assumed the processing of central violations for neighboring district courts with minimal increase in local manpower requirements.

Between Courts and Other Agencies

Traditionally, the federal courts have not had the resources available to them to provide much information to other agencies within the judicial community. When information has been provided, it has been at considerable expense to the Clerks' Offices.

"Courtran" courts now share Speedy Trial information with U.S. Attorneys and the Federal Public Defender offices, warrant information with the U.S. Marshal, violation information with federal agencies, and scheduling information with the Probation Service. Reporting to the Administrative Office is also being automated.

Courts and Public

Litigants, the bar, the press and other interested parties have found case information more accessible through the court as a result of the combination of on-line query, microfiche and the listings provided by various Courtran applications. Timely information is now available at several locations within courts, as well as at all divisional offices. Moreover, this improved public access to information has been provided with little or no disruption to Clerk's Office operations.

Within Courts

As might be expected, the greatest impact resulting from tne introduction of Courtran to the Clerk's Office has been on internal court operations.

Although many Courtran users encountered problems when integrating applications into their day-to-day operations, most of the problems relating to the installation were rooted in poor local manual operations and not related to system design. The impact of automation in the court sites is readily apparent. The Central District of California is an example of a Clerk's Office with a totally integrated operation that maximizes information flow and communication, and minimizes operational disruption with the use of Courtran.

As a result of having a centralized data base, courts with divisional offices find that Courtran applications permit increased access to information about cases outside the main office. The creation of the centralized data bases in these courts has enhanced the clerk's ability to control and monitor the day-to-day operations in the divisional offices.

B. OPERATIONAL BENEFITS

Courtran applications have provided the following benefits in specific operational areas:

1. Standardization

Common definitions and an increased understanding of procedural requirements and statutory mandates have been provided by Courtran User Committees. Representatives of the courts, FJC staff and Administrative Office personnel on these committees have conducted extensive reviews of terms, procedures and statutory requirements during the development of the functional descriptions and system specifications for each application. As a result, local manual operations have been improved and the systems' designs are responsive to the processing requirements of the courts.

2. Better Understood and More Accurate Clerical Operations

The data entry procedures imposed by the Courtran applications and the increased precision in definition of terms has fostered more consistent and complete communication of information and increased control over paperflow.

The increased discipline in data entry has resulted in an improved understanding by the staff of case processing. In this way, clerical operations have become much more meaningful within the court operations.

3. Redundant Entries and Manual File Control Systems Have Been Made Obsolete

Prior to the introduction of Courtran, federal courts (like most other courts) had many indexes and filing card systems which were required to keep track of parties and case events. Courtran applications replaced these various systems by providing more efficient methods of accessing case information.

4. Increased Security of Information and Records

Courtran applications have provided substantial security of indexes, court records and dockets. Courtran protects court records by controlling access to the data and by duplicating the

data in several forms. Neither the public nor court personnel can unintentionally misplace or permanently destroy these records.

5. Improved Accuracy and Data Control

Courtran data entry transactions create a standard format for the entry of information into court records.

Courtran applications help entry clerks to complete all required data fields, to check the data for accuracy, and to notice and reject inappropriate data or illogically sequenced information. Moreover, for many applications, reports are available which assist in finding errors not caught at the time of data entry, further ensuring the integrity of the court's data base.

6. Improved System "Audit" Information

The courts can use Courtran applications to quickly and easily review their entire caseload, as often as necessary, to provide reports on case activity and the status of parties. This has substantially improved their ability to fulfill their responsibilities. For example, the Criminal and STARS applications provide reports the clerks use for monitoring compliance with Speedy Trial requirements. Other applications provide similar case monitoring capabilities.

SECTION III: COURT MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

A. THRESHOLD CONCERNS

Before committing to the implementation of any Courtran application, Clerks of Court raised several significant management questions.

1. Control

Larry Polansky, a leading authority on data processing in courts, has described Courtran as "the only game in town ... the [District Court] will have to use Courtran or forego automation." The Courtran Project is currently the major source of automation for the federal courts. Its hardware, software and staff resources are centralized in Washington, D.C.

Clerks considering a centralized system looked closely at the degree of control exerted by the central facility's managers. The courts were properly concerned about the requirements and constraints that would be placed on their use of the central facilities. However, all users interviewed were satisfied that they had a sufficient degree of local automony and control over their use of the Courtran applications.

The concern over control was met in three ways. First, the Courtran user committees (discussed in Section I) provided a means of exerting local court influence on applications development and implementation. Second, the systems developed were able to accommodate demands both for standardized data processing and for adaptation to local data entry and reporting needs. Finally, as the courts gained experience with the overall user support provided by the FJC, they realized the extent to which the system could be "tuned" to meet their changing needs. In summary, the clerks felt that a commitment to Courtran did not inhibit in any way the local administration of their court systems.

2. Integration with Minimum Disruption

The clerks were concerned about the effects of introducing Courtran systems on their existing staff and procedures. Their fear of maintaining parallel manual and automated systems was allayed by the level of staffing, training, and implementation support provided by the Administrative Office and the FJC. The fear of too rapid a transition to the automated system was countered by each clerk planning and executing his court's implementation plan for each Courtran application.

3. Local Tool vs. Local Burden

Another concern of the clerks was whether Courtran would be a system primarily designed for local court use, or just as a reporting tool for the Administrative Office or other agencies.

In fact, Courtran applications improved local operations. The clerks reported an increased availability of information, more accurate information, a reduction in burdensome or boring clerical tasks, and the ability to provide better support to all court users.

In summary, the Courtran applications have been well received by the clerks; the project approach, as well as the system design, have made Courtran an attractive administrative tool for the clerks.

B. CRITERIA FOR APPLICATION ACCEPTANCE

The decision by a clerk to use a particular application is based on many factors, including its functions, its cost of maintenance, and its reliability. The clerks must be convinced that the automated functions are performed as well as or better than the manual functions which are replaced. To the extent that the automated system provides new functions, the clerks must feel they offer real benefit to their court.

The following is a sample list of criteria that clerks might use in reviewing the benefits to be derived from the use of a Courtran application, and, once the system has been tested at the court, in deciding whether to rely on it and to discontinue prior manual systems.

1. Will the information made available by the application be superior to that provided by the manual system? Will the data:
   a) be more accurate (e.g., due to syntax and consistency checks),
   b) be more consistent,
   c) be more readily available to users,
   d) be more readable and understandable,
   e) be secure from loss,
   f) be stored in a manner that permits access to be controlled by the court,
   g) be available on shorter notice,
   h) be more extensive, and
   i) be more timely?

2. Will the application relieve the burdens of the clerk's staff in preparing reports for judges and the Administrative Office by:

a) identifying items to be reported,

b) calculating required JS statistics, and

c) producing locally required reports?

3. Will the information provided assist in the solution of current problems, such as:

a) identifying cases requiring attention,

b) helping in reassignments, or

c) monitoring deadlines?

4. Does the system have capabilities that may be used to help identify and solve management problems in the future, such as:

a) tracking new types of cases, e.g., Iranian Asset cases or Student Loan cases.

b) reallocating cases among judges,

c) assessing the need for docketing Speedy Trial emergencies,

d) assessing the need for visiting judges, and

e) addressing research questions, e.g.,

i. Has the Speedy Trial Act affected the time required for disposition of defendants, or the frequency of types of dispositions?

ii. Is the rate of payment of CVB violations affected by more extensive court tracking?

iii. Does increased awareness by the Appeals Court of types of cases pending affect assignment of cases to panels?

5. Will the changes in court procedures and paperflow required to implement the application in the court be reasonable?

6. Will the maintenance of current information on the automated system require more or less effort than on the manual system?

7. Will the court be able to control the application when it is shared by other courts and implemented by another agency? For example, will the court have adequate control over the direction of future changes, access to the court's data, and the times when the system is available for data entry and access?

8. Can the court access its data when part or all of the computer system is inoperative? Are there safeguards, such as:

   a) backup communications,

   b) backup computers,

   c) backup copies of data, and

   d) court copies of data (e.g., microfiche)?

The clerks have been satisfied that the various Courtran applications meet their requirements, not only for reporting and on-line retrieval, but also for system availability, reliability, security and backup.

SECTION IV. SPECIFIC APPLICATION BENEFITS

The Federal Judicial Center has succeeded with Courtran where many large system development projects have failed. It has successfully designed system applications for users who have had the tradition of local administrative autonomy and independence. This autonomy and independence not only exists from court to court, but, because judges run individual calendars, exists from courtroom to courtroom.

This section will discuss the benefits of four district court Courtran applications: Criminal, STARS, Index, and CVB. Three appellate court applications will also be described: AIMS/ARMS, Word Processing/Electronic Mail, and CALEN9.

Table 1 shows the various courts where these systems have been installed to date.

TABLE 1

Courtran Installations

Court	Criminal	STARS	Index	CVB	AIMS
Alabama Northern		X	X		
Arizona	X		X		
Arkansas Eastern		X	X		
California Central	X		X	X	
California Eastern		X	X		
California Southern	X		X		
California Northern	X		X		
Colorado		X	X	X	
District of Columbia	X		X		
Florida Middle		X	X		
Georgia Northern	X		X		
Illinois Northern	X		X		
Indiana Southern		X	X		
Kentucky Western		X			
Louisiana Western		X	X		
Maryland			X	X	
Massachusetts		X*	X		
Michigan Eastern	X		X		
Minnesota			X		
Missouri Western		X*	X		
New Jersey		X			
New Mexico		X	X		
New York Eastern		X*	X		
New York Southern	X		X		
Ohio Northern		X	X		
Oregon	X		X		
Pennsylvania Eastern		X	X		
Puerto Rico		X	X		
South Carolina		X	X		
Tennessee Middle		X	X		
Texas Southern		X*	X		
Texas Western	X		X	X	
Virginia Eastern				X	
Washington Western		X	X		
Ninth Circuit					X**
Second Circuit					X
Tenth Circuit					X

*Criminal/STARS
**ARMS/CALEN9

Table II shows, in summary form, the various functions the individual case management applications perform.

TABLE II

COURTRAN FUNCTIONS (see code below)

SYSTEM	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Criminal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
STARS	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X
Index	X		X			X	X				X
Civil*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
AIMS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
CVB	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
PIMS*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X

*Development stage -- non-operational

A = On-line Data Entry and Edit
B = Current and Archive Files
C = Inquiry Capability
D = Case Tracking
E = Calendaring/Scheduling
F = Tailored Report Generation
G = Required Administrative Office Reporting
H = Full Docketing
I = Docketing Support
J = Notices and Labels
K = R&D Capability

A. DISTRICT COURT APPLICATIONS

1. CRIMINAL

General Description

The Criminal docketing system is the most comprehensive and complete Courtran application. It is an on-line, interactive, full-docketing system with substantial inquiry and report generation capability. The system keeps track of each defendant and all charges, motions, and appeals filed on criminal cases. It also keeps track of all time intervals relevant to Speedy Trial status calculations.

The technique of data entry, update, and inquiry is conversational; the user and the computer engage in a dialogue in which the system prompts the clerk for the information required for proper docketing. In the event the data entry clerk is unable to provide a proper response, the system may be queried for help to allow the clerk to complete data entry.

The Criminal application is typical of many case tracking systems in that it replaces many of the traditional case processing operations performed manually. Typically, there are three components of the manual case tracking system in a Clerk's Office: a card index, case jackets, and docket sheets.

The card index cross-references party names to a case number. Any individual can use the index to look up any party's name, and retrieve the proper case number. Given the case number, that person can obtain either the case jacket, which contains all relevant case papers, or the docket sheet, which contains the summary information of all procedural activity in the case. The card index, the case jacket, and the docket sheet form the information base from which all case reporting is produced. The procedures used to maintain these components comprise the "case management" system.

The case management system gives a court the ability to calendar, schedule, provide response to inquiry, and provide monitoring information on the case processing. Substantial clerical effort is required to maintain this type of manual system.

Criminal Benefits

The Criminal application has improved and upgraded district court case management systems in the following ways:

a) Automated dockets replace manual dockets.

Court dockets prior to the introduction of Criminal consisted of the listing of all events and papers filed in a case.

Although there was standardization of some of the information contained in the docket, the amount of information kept, the sequence of entries, and the abbreviations and notations used varied significantly from court to court and from clerk to clerk.

Uniformity in the establishment of the case "record" and the docket has been achieved through the standardization process developed by the Criminal Courtran User Committee. For the first time, dockets submitted from various courts can be easily read and understood. Exhibits A, B, and C, illustrate a typical transition from an unstructured manual system (A), through a Courtran II-oriented manual docket (B), to finally a full-docketing Criminal Courtran II docket (C).

In these examples, it should be noted that as each new event is posted to the docket, abbreviations similar to those contained in Exhibit B are used by the entry clerk. When the docket sheets are generated by the system, they are printed in full language text, the conversion from the abbreviated form being accomplished automatically by the system. This makes docketing faster and the dockets easier to read. If there are multiple defendants on a case, events occurring during the case process can be posted either to an individual docket or to all dockets of the case in a single transaction. Furthermore, event entries are chronologically ordered by the system, making the sequence of activities in a particular case more understandable. Criminal also checks to see that all data elements required as part of the event entry

have been provided. If they are not provided, the entry is rejected. The Criminal program provides many hundreds of events so that the local court docketing requirements can be satisfied.

What has occurred in the Central and Southern Districts of California with the introduction of full docketing is exceptional. In these two districts, there is an almost total integration of automated support systems into the judicial process. For example, in the Central District of California, the court has established a criminal information area. Prior to the full-docketing automated system, an individual seeking a copy of the docket had to go to the file room, get a docket check-out card, find the docket clerk assigned that case, get the docket sheet, and take the docket sheet for photocopying.

With automated docketing, the individual goes to the criminal information area. The case is found on an archive microfiche file if terminated, or either on microfiche or the on-line data base if pending. Paper copies of the dockets are easily obtained from either the microfiche or the computer.

Savings are demonstrated in several ways by this process. First, the entire data base is available to each of the clerks assigned to the criminal information area. This permits one clerk to handle all information requests of attorneys and the public, and substantially reduces the disruption experienced by other clerks in the performance of their functions. Secondly,

the response time to answer requests for information using Courtran has been found in local studies to take an average sixteen seconds per request. Whereas in the manual system the response time averaged about a minute if the information is properly filed and even longer if it must be located by automated search. Thirdly, dockets will not be temporarily unavailable when required to answer questions, since all dockets are available to all users at all times.

A further benefit is that the data entered in Criminal is not only more complete and more readily available, but is much more secure; the dockets cannot be misplaced, destroyed, or stolen. Information entered is protected by a programmed system journalizer which records all transactions and can automatically restore any data lost during a particular day through system failure. The Criminal program also controls the type of access that each clerk can have to the data. For example, some clerks may be allowed to read, but not modify, criminal case information.

b) Calendar support

Trial calendaring is essentially performed by utilizing the event information entered into the data base during the normal course of the docketing process. Scheduling data is retrieved either on-line or provided in the many reports generated periodically. This information can be used by the clerk,

courtroom deputy or judge to make timely and accurate scheduling decisions.

Although calendaring information was available prior to introducing Courtran Criminal, it was not as complete nor as accessible and usually not as current. The availability of this data in Courtran in easily retrievable form facilitates auditing and verification.

c) Improved control over litigation

One of the major impediments to caseflow management in any judicial system is the failure of the court to ensure that all matters and motions relating to the case are properly reviewed prior to trial setting. The Criminal system permits more comprehensive and timely case management. All motions are identified by type and number. Those awaiting disposition can be quickly identified. The system provides the ability for joinder of motions by late filing co-defendants to assure that motions are heard and disposed of for all proper defendants.

Courtroom deputies as well as judges and clerks point to the motion report as a major scheduling tool, and it is used more than any other report generated for the judge and his staff.

d) Early case control

In several jurisdictions, the introduction of the Criminal application and the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act have provided the incentive to extend the case management system to capture magistrate proceedings beginning with the time of arrest. For example, the U.S. Attorney traditionally had the responsibility to monitor the initial stages of the criminal case process. The Speedy Trial Act has required the court to properly monitor the imposed time standards from arrest to trial. Several user courts stated that to ensure adequate control over the cases through the mandated intervals, court monitoring of cases during the magistrate's process was required. The Criminal application provides these courts with the ability to track cases from the time of arrest and provides on-line information relating to the status of cases at the magistrate's stage without substantially impacting the office operation.

The expansion of the Criminal system to monitor all criminal case intervals should substantially improve the data accuracy for those periods previously inadequately monitored (viz., the time from arrest to indictment).

Another example of improved criminal case monitoring is found in districts like Texas Western, which has seven divisions and ten to twelve magistrates (some part-time). The clerk is able to enter magistrates' data centrally and provide turnaround

to return docketing and Speedy Trial information to the various divisions within twenty-four hours, through computer terminals located in San Antonio, Austin, and El Paso and using "relay" magistrates.

The clerks in Los Angeles and San Diego find that gathering data during magistrate proceedings substantially increases case control during the arrest-to-indictment interval specified in the Speedy Trial Act.

e) Required Administrative Office Report Production

A significant impact of Criminal is the automatic preparation of the detailed defendant reports now required by the Administrative Office. At present the Administrative Office requires all courts to submit JS-2 and JS-3 statistical cards for each defendant. To produce these cards manually required the research and entry of 47 data fields for the JS-2, and 60 fields for the JS-3. The Criminal application can now automatically produce all JS-2 and JS-3 reports from the stored docket information, selecting the appropriate dockets for report generation, and generating the JS data on computer tape rather than on paper. Some courts, after a significant test period to verify the accuracy of these statistical submissions, are now automatically generating this data. The impact of the JS statistical component

of the Criminal system on the accuracy and currency of Administrative Office data will become readily apparent as the use of this capability spreads to other courts.

f) Expansion of Data Control

The expansion of the docketing process to include arrest and magistrate information benefits the courts in two ways. First, the Administrative Office found the Courtran II data more accurate than the manual JS submissions.

When a computer system is centralized, the usual criticism stems from its lack of responsiveness to the user needs. Not only did all Courtran users comment that the Criminal application was comprehensive, but they also noted that it was flexible and could be tailored to make the system responsive to local needs and procedures. Tailored reports and other features have eliminated the "big brother" atmosphere that usually surrounds a "system-wide" application. Users find the application provides support to track, process, and monitor cases without imposing undue constraints on their local operations.

g) Unique Capabilities

This system is unique relative to other court case management systems. There are three functions that require special comment.

First, the Criminal application contains a model of those sections of the rules of criminal procedure that are relevant to docketing practices. Using this model, new docketing entries can be checked during data entry for consistency with the recorded status of the case and previous entries.

Secondly, the Criminal application automatically calculates and reports the Speedy Trial requirements. It provides the courts with the ability to track the case, calculate its age, identify "problem" cases, and provide reports and lists of cases/defendants in various categories, all as automatic by-products of the normal docketing process.

This application also provides the various courts with the ability to select the defendants and to define the kinds of data desired in "custom" Speedy Trial reports. In addition, the courts are given the ability to store their unique report requests for repeated use.

The capabilities of the flexible Speedy Trial report facility are substantial. Included are:

1) The ability to request both the maximum and minimum deadlines for trials by including excludable time;

2) The ability to report by individual counts in a case if counts are filed at different times, or have reached different stages of case processing;

3) The ability to generate a list of defendants whose cases have a particular type of excludable interval running or terminated;

4) The ability to report on pending or terminated defendants by the time spent in past intervals; and

5) The ability to produce reports to highlight problem cases needing action or reassignments, or those which are in danger of exceeding the Speedy Trial limits.

It should be reemphasized that the information generated to produce these reports is entered in the normal docketing process of the Criminal application, with no additional effort required of the Clerk's Office.

2. SPEEDY TRIAL ACCOUNTING/REPORTING SYSTEM (STARS)

General Description

The primary reason for the development of the STARS application was the passage of the Speedy Trial Act of 1974. For

those courts with a considerable criminal caseload, the time accounting required by the Act was substantial, and the ability to meet these requirements manually was limited. The FJC staff, in consultation with various clerks, determined the most effective way to address the requirements of the Act for non-automated courts was to design a prototype system, smaller in scope than Criminal, that minimized the data entry burden and concentrated on collecting the minimum information necessary to meet the requirements of the Act.

STARS maintains a record for each criminal defendant and performs the often complex time calculations which are necessary for accurate monitoring of Speedy Trial intervals. Through the use of built-in checks and verifications, STARS provides the user with a reasonable assurance that the Speedy Trial information being entered is accurate, while allowing the user some control over data entry.

STARS facilitates quick implementation by requiring that minimal data be entered. Only data required for Speedy Trial accounting is entered; other docket information is excluded.

STARS produces sets of Speedy Trial reports divided into three groups:

1) Reports for judges, providing them timely information on deadlines for actions and giving warnings that scheduled actions are outside the allowances of the Act;

2) Reports for the Clerk's Office, providing comprehensive information on the status of all defendants; and

3) Closing reports, providing required data to aid in court preparation of reports to the Administrative Office.

STARS also gives the courts a flexible inquiry capability. It can provide information on each defendant's procedural and custody intervals, as well as associated excludable delay periods. STARS also maintains a history for each defendant of all actions taken of relevance to Speedy Trial.

STARS courts fall into two categories: 1) courts not qualified by caseload size for the Criminal application but requiring Speedy Trial help; and, 2) courts qualified for Criminal but not yet ready to implement the full application.

This application illustrates the value of centralized development. First, since there are currently sixteen courts all using the same program to produce reports on procedural and excludable time periods, there is substantial uniformity across courts in reporting on implementation of the requirements of the Act. Secondly, there have been changes in the Act since 1974.

The STARS application has accommodated these changes and quickly provided updated capabilities to the users.

STARS Benefits

The most valuable feature of STARS is its capability to produce timely reports on the Speedy Trial status of all pending defendants. Reports that might take weeks to produce in a manual system can be generated in only a few minutes, and as often as desired. The courts thereby gain day-to-day management control over Speedy Trial problems.

In several jurisdictions, exception reports on cases reaching the maximum Speedy Trial age, as well as the inventory reports designating the "excludable time", have been provided to the U.S. Attorney's office and the Federal Public Defender. Reports designating the time limits on cases are also used by the judges and their staffs for scheduling purposes.

In summary, the benefits of STARS are:

a) It is easy to use;

b) The required data entry is held at a minimum;

c) All the calculations regarding time intervals and excludable intervals mandated by the Act are made by the system

automatically, and can be performed quickly; and where appropriate those interval limits can be changed for a particular defendant; and

d) The "as of" reporting capability, available both in the query and report programs, gives the user the ability to determine the status of the defendants as of a past, current, or future date.

3. THE INDEX SYSTEM

General Description

The Courtran Index system was designed to replace the manual systems maintained by federal district courts to provide cross-references to cases by party name. These manual systems were usually card-based and required extensive manual processing. They have been replaced by an automated system which allows quick, efficient data entry at a terminal and ready retrieval of that data.

For each case to be indexed by the Courtran system, a court enters the case number, case title, assigned judge, case category, and divisional office number. A court may also optionally enter additional information, including party aliases, the case filing date, the case termination date, and the names of all

parties involved (plaintiff, defendant, intervenor, impleaded third party, trustee, etc.).

All of this information is then made available on the Index party report for subsequent cross-referencing, sequenced by party name. This report is available to user courts on microfiche. This microfiche case party Index replaces the manual card catalogue, previously maintained by the Index courts. It saves a considerable amount of filing space, permits faster retrieval of information, and provides more detailed case information than the manual systems it replaces.

Once the case information described above has been entered into the Index system, it may be retrieved in a variety of ways. Many Index courts now obtain a number of reports in addition to the standard Index party report. These additional reports are used for case management purposes in both the Clerk's Office and the judges' offices.

The clerk's reports include the party report (described above); the case report (which is a listing of all cases indexed, in case number sequence); the case category report (which is a listing of all cases sorted by the nature of suit (JS-44) codes); and the statistical report of cases filed, terminated, or reassigned within the previous month.

The judges' reports include two pending case reports, one sorted by case number and the other by case category. Both of these reports are subdivided according to the judge assigned to each case, such that each judge receives a separate report of his or her cases. The report by case category groups together those cases of similar type to assist in case assignment and calendar management.

Index Benefits

The most immediate benefit of the Courtran Index system is the replacement of the large card filing systems in use at most courts. These systems occupy substantial floor space and have several inherent operational problems. They also cost approximately $5000 per electric filing unit (e.g., the "Stratomatic"), and have a per month overhead for repairs of nearly $100. A large metropolitan court may require ten of these machines to store its manual card index. On the other hand, a microfiche reader costs $250 and can be used to access a complete separate copy of the entire Courtran index to the federal docket of that district.

Cards in the manual system must be manually filed, a tedious process which is quite prone to almost indetectable errors. Cards tended to become mutilated after several years of use. Furthermore, since the public has access to the files for legal and research purposes, the integrity of the data is always in

question. This has been a particularly significant problem for bankruptcy indexes.

The time to perform the case indexing operation has also been substantially reduced. Manual filing of the cards generally occurred from three to twenty days after the case was opened. Each card took nearly a minute to file accurately. With the computer system, the data entry process is streamlined at the terminal (a typical case with four defendants takes no more than a minute to enter) and the data is available for public use in from one to four days (depending on the court's method of operation). The Districts of South Carolina and Minnesota measured the number of hours to process manual cards and to enter information into a terminal. They found a three to one ratio -- it took three times as long to type the manual cards as to enter the data for the Courtran index.

The time to retrieve data has also been reduced. It takes far less time to scan the index microfiche than to search the manual index file. Attorneys who are accustomed to microfiche from law library use find no difficulty in using the new technology. With minimal direction, the public can find the information it needs.

The system, using the information required to produce the party index, is able to produce several other reports, some of which were not previously available at all. For example, the

previously mentioned case category report lists all cases filed, sorting them by the type of suit (insurance, contract, personal injury, etc.). This report, available on microfiche, is useful to the press, the public, and the bar in answering questions on caseload profiles. Another report made available to the public is the case numerical listing. This report lists the case title, category, pending status, and judge for each docket number. It is generally used by attorneys filing papers.

In addition, a periodic statistical report is produced based upon the date information entered for cases. This report was previously produced manually by all the courts that now use the automated index system. Since the report is now produced automatically, the staff time formerly required to produce it can be used for other purposes.

The same benefits and savings are realized for the case pending reports produced for the judges. These reports list all pending cases before each judge. In addition, they also provide a listing of pending cases for each judge sorted by case category, a useful tool for case management not previously available in most of the courts. Most of the initial courts to use the Index system reported that they had not before produced lists of pending cases for judges. Several stated that they had received requests for such lists from various judges on occasion, but had had to inform the judge that to prepare the list would be too time consuming. Several Index courts had previously used an IBM

word processing system. Pennsylvania Eastern had used a word processor, and estimated that report preparation time was about two weeks. They are now using the Courtran Index reports.

The ability to generate several report formats that provide useful case management information for the Clerk's Office, in addition to the standard case party index reports, demonstrates the expansion of traditional uses of the index, as well as the flexibility of an automated data management system. The user is able to get a multiple payback for the investment of one time data entry.

4. CENTRAL VIOLATIONS BUREAU

General Description

The final district court application reviewed is the Central Violations Bureau (CVB) application which supports the processing of minor violations, such as traffic tickets, within the Clerk's Office. The main objective in the development of this application was to replace many of the time consuming and redundant clerical functions being performed by the clerk's staff and to give the clerk better control over citation processing. Although a case-tracking capability as exhibited in the Criminal application is also present in CVB, the structure of the data

base and the approach to data entry differ. Special emphasis has been placed on tailoring data entry dialogues and report formats in order to meet the differing requirements of the various courts using this application. The information collected by the system is broken into five basic categories relating to the individual, the offense, hearing activity, disposition, and other follow-up information.

Prior to the introduction of Courtran CVB, citations were manually filed either alphabetically or numerically. There was very little capability within the Clerk's Office to effectively manage the caseload. Because CVB was not a high priority operation within the Clerk's Office, the level of clerical support and management effort devoted to its day-to-day operation was limited.

In one office, the introduction of Courtran CVB changed the entire approach to the CVB processing operation. Every aspect of the CVB operation in that office, with the exception of the financial accounting component, is now supported by the system.

CVB Benefits

The primary benefit resulting from the introduction of the CVB application has been the ability to track citations through each stage of processing until final disposition. This increased

control lets the court provide reports to agencies issuing violations of citations on which follow-up actions are required.

The improved accessibility of data permits the court to respond more quickly to inquiries about citations. Prior to the introduction of this application, the ability of the courts to find any particular citation, let alone to control them, was greatly limited by manpower constraints and by other priorities within the office.

Another benefit resulting from the development of Courtran CVB is the reduction of the manual effort required to maintain basic accounting information for citations.

B. APPELLATE COURT APPLICATIONS

To this point, the discussion has centered on the support Courtran has given to the district courts. There has been considerable testing and development at the appellate court level as well.

At the appellate level, there are two major functional administrative tasks: a) the preparation, publication, and dissemination of appellate court opinions; and, b) the case processing and tracking of cases on appeal.

The Courtran Project has provided support in handling both of these tasks.

1. APPELLATE OPINIONS: WORD PROCESSING/ELECTRONIC MAIL

General Description

Because of the complexity of the cases and the significance of U.S. Circuit Court opinions to litigants and the public, most appellate opinions evolve through an elaborate editorial process requiring a substantial number of drafts by the originating author and further review and comments by other judges within the particular Circuit Court. Traditionally, judges' secretaries have been required to do extensive, repetitive typing of similar text materials, and then laborious duplication and mailing of the resulting draft opinions among court members located in different cities and states. Judges and law clerks spent substantial time in the mechanical process of proofreading text. The geographical dispersion of judges' chambers frequently extended the intra-circuit review process by weeks. All of these elements combined to produce substantial delays in the printing and dissemination of published opinions to litigants, the bar, and the public.

The Courtran Project staff reviewed the problems associated with the production of appellate opinions and determined that word processing facilities, together with an electronic mail

capability, could provide significant assistance to the appellate courts in the production of these opinions. The word processing facility would expedite the production of an opinion by a judge's staff within his chambers; an electronic mail capability (enabling the transmission via telephone lines of the material stored on the word processors from judges' chambers in one city to those in another city and/or state) would speed the dissemination of opinions among geographically dispersed appellate judges.

As an experiment, both of these facilities were installed in thirteen different locations in six cities (in three states) in the Third Circuit.

The Courtran staff chose to select one of a large number of commercially available word processors for experimentation, rather than developing specialized software. However, FJC-developed software was required to provide the desired electronic mail capabilities, which allowed the in-place centralized Courtran computer facilities to be used as the hub of a message-switching network connecting the geographically dispersed word processors.

Word Processing/Electronic Mail Benefits

Integration of these technologies served to improve court efficiency by (a) expediting the production of court opinions

within individual judges' chambers, and (b) decreasing the time to process and prepare appeals, particularly for those cases requiring official published opinions. Specifically, these technologies:

a) Substantially increased secretarial productivity (by over 200 percent) by simplifing the text-editing of draft opinions, reducing heavy revision typing, and making dissemination of draft opinions among court members easier and faster;
b) Substantially decreased (by over one month) the average preparation and review time of opinions by judges' law clerks;
c) Substantially shortened the time to exchange and review opinions among court members from days to hours;
d) Eliminated typographical errors inadvertently entered by secretaries or printers;
e) Decreased clerical support staff time (in the Clerk's Office) necessary in processing and publishing slip opinions;
f) Allowed faster production and dissemination of published slip opinions while reducing publication costs (opinions were often published within one day rather than taking one week, at a 20 percent cost savings).

For further detail see Federal Judicial Center Reports, "The Impact of Word Processing and Electronic Mail on United States

Courts of Appeals," 1979; and "Follow-Up Study of Word Processing and Electronic Mail in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals," 1980.

2. CASE MANAGEMENT: AIMS

General Description

In order to support the appellate courts in the processing and tracking of appeals, the FJC staff, assisted by personnel from the appellate courts, produced a functional description of an appellate information management system (AIMS). The description has been approved by the appellate courts, and development of the described system begun.

As an initial step in the development process, a prototype system has been developed and is being tested in several jurisdictions. AIMS differs from the Criminal docketing system in design in that AIMS is not a full-docketing system and does not generate inquiry and report data automatically from docket information as does the Criminal application. However, as a support to docket management in the Clerk's Office, the AIMS application does provide about sixty percent of all the functions and benefits derived from a full docketing system.

In the technical area, the AIMS program provides considerable improvement over the manual system in that it has internal checking for data entry validation, thereby improving the quality

of information from which schedules and reports are generated. It also provides a special program which can be run periodically to note inconsistencies in the data base. This program will check for missing or unaccounted for docket numbers, abnormal dates, and incomplete case associations which can occur during a case consolidation. Using these audits, the Clerk's Office is able to increase its control over the quality of information being collected and generated by the office.

AIMS provides a variety of case management reports. Like Index in the district courts, AIMS can generate cross-reference party name indexes, thereby reducing much of the manual effort required to produce and maintain such indexes. AIMS has also enhanced the scheduling capabilities of the Clerk's Office. Much appellate scheduling and case status checking had been performed manually through the use of numerous tickler systems maintained by various Clerk's Office and law clerk staff. The tickler reports generated by AIMS include all actions due or past due on particular cases, either by a party or by the Clerk's Office.

In the inquiry mode, AIMS provides the ability to inquire as to the status of a case, party, motion or scheduled hearing. As in the other tracking systems, this information is extremely useful for planning and scheduling purposes.

AIMS Benefits

AIMS provides the user with the flexibility to accommodate the various administrative structures that exist in the circuit courts. The ability to tailor the system to the individual court is aided by giving the court the ability to implement the system in phases, to tailor the data entry commands to reflect different data entry dialogues for different courts, to allow the courts to choose which data elements they wish to include in their data bases, and to respond to individual requests for custom data entry commands for particular circumstances.

The modular functional design of AIMS permits each court to phase the implementation of the application. With this structure, each court may determine which functions it wishes to implement initially, and then add further functions as appropriate.

In the area of caseload management, the system provides significant support. Standard report programs provide the court with a means of producing statistical and exception reports which could be produced (if at all) in the manual system only by a case-by-case inspection of docket sheets. Data verification utility programs allow systematic review of data quality, often revealing procedural problems in the parallel manual system. A flexible report generation program allows the user to group cases

for the purpose of setting calendars, by using such data as case type, origin, issues and judicial case weight. The inquiry capability, like that of the other Courtran applications, provides quicker access to case information. Indexing and party noticing are also supported by AIMS.

3. CASE MANAGEMENT: CALEN9

Another application which will be included as part of AIMS and is now operational in the Ninth Circuit is a calendaring support system, CALEN9. This program was developed locally with FJC support and is a calendaring system designed to group cases into calendars based up: a) their difficulty; b) the subject matter to be heard; and, c) the district from which they originate. The result of this development has been to give the court better control over its caseload by easing the burden in tracking these cases by specific data items for eventual assignment. The collection of nature of suit data also provides the court with an easy way to profile the caseload being handled or awaiting assignment to a panel.

C. CONCLUSIONS

This section has described several of the existing applications in Courtran. Each application is designed to provide

a specific level of support within the courts. Each is still evolving as the user courts' experience with it grows. What is known at this point is that each and every application has improved the management capabilities of the user courts; the court's control over its caseload has improved; and the accuracy of case information collected by the court has improved, while the clerical redundancy associated with data collection has decreased.

SECTION V: COURTRAN ASSESSMENT AND FUTURE POTENTIAL

Courtran is still in a developmental phase. The individual applications are in various stages of attaining their full potential. However, across the board, the initial objectives of system implementation, system credibility, and FJC credibility have been reached.

This section will look into operational acceptance, application utilization and the future potential for Courtran in the various courts.

It is important in any assessment of a computer application to determine whether the application is appropriate for the user, whether the user is utilizing the application's capabilities, and its future potential for the user.

A. OPERATIONAL ACCEPTANCE

What is quickly apparent from observations made in the courts is that the courts' attitude toward Courtran applications is positive. The Courtran approach has been well accepted by all aspects of the judicial community. From system design to development, there has been a high degree of good will associated with

the project. Many of those skeptical about centralized automation have become believers. Many of the problems associated with system implementation have been overcome. The system design approach has provided a product with sufficient flexibility to minimize any complaint from users that the system inhibits local court operations. The training programs associated with this effort have provided the courts with the ability to become operational with a minimum of effort and commitment of staff.

However, consideration of the general operational benefits that were anticipated upon the implementation of the various applications reveals that much of the potential benefit to be derived from Courtran is still potential. The use of the various applications to improve information flow and communications between courts and with court-related agencies has been limited. There are examples of the U.S. Attorney's Office "checking" information, the U.S. Marshal's office using listings, etc. These are ad hoc system uses; there is no consistent procedural use of the data between agencies. Courtran data exchanges between courts are also relatively rare occurrences.

Even within the courts, the use of the various system applications has been limited primarily to the Clerk's Office. The reason for this can be primarily attributed to three factors. First, the primary "marketing" of Courtran was done at the

Clerk's Office level. Little information was provided to the judges or to related court agencies on the different applications. Secondly, the clerks generally are not set up to provide operational information on a scheduled basis outside their own office. Finally, being in the "pilot" stage, most Courtran operations until recently were not fully integrated into the operational environment. In many cases, court sites still maintain the Courtran operation separate from their normal operations.

With the normalization of operations after Courtran implementation, there should be substantial improvement in the flow of information between courts and among the court-related agencies.

The one area where there has been significant improvement already is the courts' ability to provide increased and more accurate information to the public. In every location visited, the various applications have been used to provide the litigants, the attorneys and the public with greater access to the court's information.

B. SYSTEM UTILIZATION

An analysis of the utilization of different Courtran applications should take into consideration the scope of the applications and the different development stages for each of

them. Nonetheless, the Courtran applications can be analyzed together in terms of their utilization in the courts. Two levels of utilization were considered. First, at the case processing level, the applications had a major impact on operations. Increased accuracy, replacement of manual functions, replacement of the paper criminal docket, improved record-keeping, standardized notation procedures, etc., were all observed and reflected substantial application utilization. The effort exerted by the FJC and local staff in providing relevant training, in upgrading procedures, and in validating and improving the data bases has reaped substantial benefits in this area.

However, at the second level, in the area of management support, the utilization appears to be only in the preliminary stages. The distinction between case processing support and management support is as follows: the former relates to the day-to-day activity of a court in terms of managing files, preparing calendars, and responding to inquiries from the public, etc.; the latter provides information to management evoking the need to respond or take action.

With the exception of some Speedy Trial reports, the utilization of the various reports and special search capabilities has been limited. Again, the primary reason for this has been the concentration during implementation on operational

matters. The effort of future training and application enhancement should be in upgrading local operations in the management information area.

C. FUTURE POTENTIAL

The potential is present to extend the effectiveness of existing applications. System utilization should be improved not only by the local managers, but also by the Administrative Office and FJC and court researchers.

The increased availability of data and improved accuracy of the data base has remained relatively untouched by the Administrative Office and the researchers. For the first time, with relatively little additional effort required by the Administrative Office or local court personnel, the ability to determine the status of local operations, to evaluate resource requirements, and to assess the courts' ability to meet various statutory requirements, including Speedy Trial, is now attainable. The Administrative Office has recently begun accepting the "JS" data from the automated files in a number of courts, but has apparently not seen the existence of the various applications as an opportunity to go beyond that.

In the research area, the data base is relatively untouched. Professor Arthur Miller from Harvard in 1972, when looking at the potential of automation for courts, stated:

"The computer's capacity to ingest vast amounts of information, to masticate in it ways that are not feasible without a computer, and regurgitate entirely new pools of information that are derived from the interstices or the hidden interrelationships that exist in the original data means that experimenters and court administrators will have at their disposal highly detailed information about each of the many cases entered on their dockets. Using the techniques of quantitative multi-variate analysis, unsuspected patterns might be revealed. For example, information about the length of jail sentences imposed by different judges within a given judicial system for a particular criminal offense could be analyzed to see whether there is a norm, whether any judges habitually devitate from the norm, whether discrepancies in sentencing appear in tandem with certain variables, such as the offender's social background, or race, or whether judges appear to be taking account of those factors commonly thought to be relevant to sentencing decisions ...

"Let us proceed to another level of sophistication... it will be possible to answer questions that hitherto have been left to idle speculation... To what degree does the character of cases instituted in various courts differ?... Are lawsuits becoming more complex, lengthier, or more expensive?... How frequently are novel, legal propositions raised and do they receive special attention?... Is there a difference in the frequency of recourse to the courts by people in different income strata? Do larger courts operate less efficiently than small rural courts? Are peoples' propensity to litigate and lawyers' tactics uniform across the country?...."

Many of Professor Miller's questions and beyond may now be answered. The potential is there, but thus far the data is being used in a very limited way.

D. PLANNED APPLICATIONS

There are two major applications now in development that will provide significant additional support to the courts.

A Civil Case Tracking System is in the process of definition. Several iterations of a functional description have been distributed to the user courts for review and modification. The design philosophy of the system parallels to a great extent the AIMS design, using the CHARTS software development approach. It is not a full docketing system, but is designed to provide tracking, calendaring and scheduling support to the various courts. This program will provide easy access to case, party, event, and motion information. For those courts not using the Index system, Civil will provide the ability to replace the manual index and cross-reference systems.

The system benefits of the Civil application will include better and more accurate case information, improved case processing and more accessible data for the courts and the public. Using the tailoring facilities for data entry protocols and report generation, the Civil system will be responsive to the local data collection requirements of the various courts. It will also provide the ability to produce in a timely, efficient manner the case management reports required by the Administrative Office.

The other major application under development is the Probation Information Management System (PIMS). This program, which is in the early planning stages, has two main objectives: a) to improve the case management capability at the local level, by

providing a modern information system, and b) to provide a feedback and research capability to judges for sentencing analysis. The PIMS application is being planned as a nationwide information management system to serve probation officers, judges, administrative and research staff members, and related governmental agencies. Like other Courtran applications PIMS will develop its widespread management applicability and research potential by effectively utilizing common clerical data captured during the course of normal case processing.

With these two major applications in place, the Courtran Project will have established management support in each major process in the court environment. Throughout the court system there will be accurate, consistent and timely data; there will be better scheduling and case assignment; and there will be improved service to the public in every aspect of court operations.

E. LOCALLY INITIATED APPLICATIONS

Outside the major Courtran applications, the impetus for future developments will come primarily from local courts. As these courts become comfortable within the automated environment, other types of applications either for ad hoc or long-range support will be developed. Some of this type of activity is already visible.

The clerks in the district courts in Los Angeles and San Diego are using the system capability to support the naturalization process. The burden of naturalization cases on these courts is much heavier than on others, and the automation of the administrative processing has relieved a significant paperwork nightmare.

The U.S. Attorney in San Francisco began focusing on defaults relating to student loans. The numbers of defaults in that jurisdiction were substantial. The system was used to support the court's ability to track and schedule these cases in a more expeditious manner.

Finally, the "laboratory" development of ideas at the local level will always enhance the Courtran Project's ability to respond to local needs. At present, Los Angeles is looking to develop a financial management package for CVB and other fine and fee operations. Most courts have expressed the need to develop similar capabilities and are awaiting the results in Los Angeles.

The one area where there has been random proliferation of automated support without first identifying specific functional and hardware requirements is word processing. There appears to be a need for standards to ensure compatibility in this area.

EXHIBIT A

SA 78 CR007

FELONY Fel X | JUDGE-MAGISTRATE Assigned: 542 (District) 5 (Office) 4208 (Disp./Sentence)

U.S. vs. SILVA, ROGELIO BANDA (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)

Case Filed: Mo. 1 Day 10 | JUVENILE | No. of Def's * 1 | 78 Yr. | 007 Docket No.

U.S. MAG. CASE NO.

U.S. TITLE/SECTION — OFFENSES CHARGED — ORIGINAL COUNTS: 4

8 USC 1324(a)(2) Illegal transportation of Aliens (Counts 1,2,3,4)

SUPERSEDING COUNTS

Denied | AMT Set | Fugitiv | Pers. | PSA | $ 000 | Date | Bail Not Made | Status Changed (See Docket) | 10% De | Surety | Collater | 3rd Prty Cust

KEY DATES & INTERVALS

ARREST: 12-27-77 | Process: 1-16-78 | JS-3 → 3-78

INDICTMENT X: Information 1/10/78 | High Risk Date | Indict. Waived | Superseding Indict/Info | In Charging District

ARRAIGNMENT: 1/16/78 | 1st Plea 1/16/78 | Final Plea 2-28-78

TRIAL: Trial Set For 2/27/78 | Voir Dire | Trial Began | Trial Ended

Disposition of Case: 2-28-78 X | 3-21

MAGISTRATE

	DATE	INITIAL/NO.
Search Warrant: Issued / Return		
Summons: Issued / Served		
Arrest Warrant Issued		
COMPLAINT ▶		
OFFENSE (In Complaint)		

INITIAL APPEARANCE DATE ▶ | INITIAL/NO.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OR REMOVAL HEARING: Date Scheduled ▶ / Date Held ▶

☐ WAIVED ☐ NOT WAIVED

☐ INTERVENING INDICTMENT

Tape Number

OUTCOME:

☐ DISMISSED

☐ HELD FOR GJ OR OTHER PROCEEDING IN THIS DISTRICT

☐ HELD FOR GJ OR OTHER PROCEEDING IN DISTRICT BELOW:

U.S. Attorney or Asst.: RONALD GUYER

ATTORNEYS — Defense: ☐ CJA, ☐ Ret: ☐ Waived.. ☐ Self, ☐ None / Other, X PD, ☐ CD: Edward Prado, Public Defender

7

* Show last names and suffix numbers of other defendants on same indictment/information:

DATE	(DOCUMENT NO.) PROCEEDINGS	EXCLUDABLE DE (a)	(b)
1/10/78	1. Indictment filed, Cy. to Jg., AUSA, Marshal, Prob., Deft.		
1-13-78	2. Order Appointing Counsel, filed. (J, Micro, Prob. & Attorneys)		
1-16-78	** ARRAIGNMENT PROCEEDINGS: Deft. waives reading of indictment and advice of maximum penalties. PLEA: NOT GUILTY to all counts. Pretrial Conference set for February 21, 1978 at 9:30 a.m. docket call & jury selection set for Feb. 27, 1978, at 9:30 a.m. Order Setting Schedule signed in open Court and copy delivered to counsel.		
1-16-78	3. Order Setting Schedule for Pretrial Motions, Final Pretrial Conference and Trial, filed. (J)		
2-21-78	** PRETRIAL CONFERENCE: Held Appointed counsel, Ed Prado, announced to the Court that he had been advised that deft. has retained Mr. Ruben Montemayor as his counsel and that Mr. Montemayor is out of town today and not able to attend this pretrial conference, but that Mr. Montemayor will file a motion to appear as counsel for this defendant. Pretrial conference passed to later date.		
2-28-78	** RE-ARRAIGNMENT PROCEEDINGS: Deft. moves for rearraignment on Ct. 1 of the indictment. Deft. sworn and interrogated regarding his plea. Indictment read to deft. and deft. advised of maximum penalties.		

OPPOSITE THE APPLICABLE DOCKET ENTRIES SHOW, IN SECTION V, ANY OCCURRENCE OF EXCLUDABLE DELAY PER 18 USC § 3161(h)

DATE	IV. PROCEEDINGS (continued) PAGE TWO (DOCUMENT NO.)	V. EXCLUDABLE DELAY Interval Section II (a)	Start Date End Date (b)	Ltr Code (c)
2-28-78	** RE-ARRAIGNMENT PROCEEDINGS: (Continued) PLEA: GUILTY to Ct. 1. Court finds factual basis to support plea. PLEA BARGAIN: U. S. Atty. will move to dismiss Cts. 2, 3 & 4 at time of sentencing. Sentencing set for March 21, 1978, at 9:30 a.m.			
3/21/78	*** SENTENCE: 4 yrs. impr., pursuant to 18 USC 3651; deft. to serve 6 months, execution of remaining 42 months suspended, 5 yrs. probation, without supervision so long as deft. resides outside the U.S., but should deft. return to the U.S., probation is to be with supervision the first 2 yrs. with further supervision to be at the option of the probation officer, said probation under the terms and conditions of the Court's General Order of Probation dated 12/26/73. On motion of the U.S. Atty., Counts 2, 3 & 4 dismissed, pursuant to the plea bargain.			
4-6-78	4. J & P/C Order, filed. (J, Micro, Prob., Marshal, Attys., CSD)			
5-3-78	5. Marshal's Return on J & P/C Order by delivering Defendant to Bexar County Jail on 3-21-78, filed.			

FINE AND RESTITUTION PAYMENTS

DATE	RECEIPT NUMBER	C.D. NUMBER	DATE	RECEIPT NUMBER	C.D. NUMBER

EXHIBIT B

SAMPLE DOCKET

SILVA, ROGELIO BANDA

(LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)

542 | 5 | 4208 (Docket | Office | Sentence)

JUVENILE

Case Filed Mo. 1 Day 10

No. of Defs. 1

78 Yr | 007 Docket No.

U.S. MAG. CASE NO. 77-3465M

8 USC 1324(a)(2) Illegal transportation of aliens
(Ct 1-4)

OFFENSES CHARGED

ORIGINAL COUNTS 4

SUPERSEDING COUNTS

BAIL: Denied / Set $ 20,000 / Date / Bail Not Made X / Status Changed (See Docket) / Fugitive / Pers. Rec. / PSA / conditions / 10% Depos / Surety Bo X / Collateral / 3rd Pty Cust

KEY DATES & INTERVALS

ARREST	INDICTMENT X	ARRAIGNMENT	TRIAL	DISPOSITION	SENTENCE
12/27/77	Information 1/10/78	1/16/78	2/27/78	2/28/78	3/21/78
Filed 1/16/78	Arrest Warrant Issued / Superseding Indictment	Filed 1/16/78	NG X	Dismissed	X
		Final Plea 2/28/78			

MAGISTRATE

	DATE	INITIAL/NO.		INITIAL/NO	OUTCOME
Search Warrant Issued / Return					
Summons Issued / Served					
Arrest Warrant Issued	12/20/77	JPG	INITIAL APPEARANCE DATE		
COMPLAINT	12/20/77	JPG	PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OR REMOVAL HEARING: Date Scheduled / Date Held		DISMISSED / HELD FOR GJ OR OTHER PROCEEDING IN THIS COURT
			WAIVED / NOT WAIVED		
			INTERVENING INDICTMENT		
OFFENSE charged in Complaint	18 USC 1324(a)(2) Illegal transportation of aliens				

U.S. Attorney: RONALD GUYER

ATTORNEYS: XX

EDWARD PRADO, Public Defender

Ruben Montemayor
301 W. Market
SAT 78205
224-5471

(Show full names and docket numbers of other defendants on same indictment/information)

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
12/20/77	Magistrate Complaint filed.
12/20/77	Arrest Warrant issued--bond set at $20,000 surety.
1/10/78	1. Indictment, filed. (cy J, AUSA, Marshal, Prob, deft)
1/13/78	2. ORDER appointing Counsel (Edward Prado, Public Defender), fld. (Cy to J, micro, prob & attys)
1/13/78	* Argn set for 1/16/78 at 2:00 PM.
1/16/78	3. Arrest warrant returned executed on 12/27/77, filed.
1/16/78	**ARRAIGNMENT HELD: Deft entered plea of Not Guilty as to all counts. Pretrial Conference set for 2/21/78 at 9:30 AM. Docket call & jury selection set for 2/27/78 at 9:30 AM. Plea Agreement deadline 2/24/78 at 12 noon.
1/16/78	4. ORDER Setting Pretrial Schedule, filed. (J,micro,attys)

(CONTINUED)

EXHIBIT C

3

'!77CR9007-1 US-V-SILVA
'!'!
'! as of 02/02/79 at 5:41 PM'!
'!'!
'!----------'!
'!'!

Judge: Unassigned Case Filed: 12/20/77

Defendant:

D1 SILVA, ROGELIO BANDA

Address: 1422 N.E. Loop 410
San Antonio, TX

Dft ID: -443

Defendant terminated: 03/21/78

Terminated counts:	Disposition
Illegal transportation of aliens	(Count 1) Four years imprisonment, six months to serve ess. the remainins mo. s, 5 years probation without supervision(03/21/78)
Illegal transportation of aliens	(Counts 2-4) Dismissed on govt's motion. 03/21/78

Total Jail: 6 Mo Total Probation: 60 Mo

Complaints:
Fld mag complaint 12/20/77 (Illegal transportation of aliens 18USC 1324(a)(2)).

'!77CR9007-1 US-V-SILVA '!

'!'!

'! PROCEEDINGS'!

'!'!

12/20/77 Filed magistrate complaint (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Arrest warrant issued (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Order surety/cash bond set for $20,000.00 (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

01/10/78 Filed indictment (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

01/13/78 Order federal defender program appointed to represent defendant ((Edward Prado)) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Arraignment and plea set for 01/16/78 @ 2:00 PM (Counts 1-4) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

01/16/78 Filed warrant of arrest executed by arrest on 12/27/77 (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Arraignment held (Counts 1-4) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Defendant's first appearance (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Defendant enters plea of not guilty (Counts 1-4) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

Pre-trial set for 02/21/78 @ 9:30 AM (Counts 1-4) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Status hearing set for 02/27/78 @ 9:30 AM ((docket call)) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Trial date set for 02/27/78 @ 9:00 AM (Counts 1-4) ((Jury selection)) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
- ORDER setting Pretrial Schedule, filed. (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

02/21/78 Pre-trial held (Counts 1-4) ((Appinted counsel, Ed Prado, advised deft. has retained Mr. Ruben Montemayor as his counsel.) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

02/28/78 - Re-Arraignment Held. (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Defendant withdraws plea of not guilty (Count 1) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

Defendant enters plea of guilty (Count 1) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Court judgment of guilty (Count 1) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).
Sentencing set for 03/21/78 @ 9:30 AM (Count 1) (Dkt'd 02/01/79).

03/21/78 Sentencing of defendant (Count 1) (Four years imprisonment, six months to serve ess. the remaining mo.s, 5 years probation without supervision As long the defendant resides outside U.S. but should the defendant return to the U.S., probation is to be with supervision the first two years with further supervision to be at the option of the probation officer.) (Dkt'd 02/02/79).
Dismissed on government's motion (Counts 2-4) (Dkt'd 02/02/79).

04/04/78 Issued judgment and commitment to U.S. Marshal (Count 1) (Dkt'd 02/02/79).

04/06/78 - Judgment and commitment order filed (Dkt'd 02/02/79).

DATE	IV PROCEEDINGS (continued) PAGE TWO	V EXCLUDABLE DELAY Interval Code (a)	Start Date End Date (b)	Up Code (c)
	COMMENTS			
2/21/78	***PRETRIAL CONFERENCE HELD: Appointed counsel, Ed Prado, advised deft has retained Mr. Ruben Montemayor as his counsel.			
2/28/78	***RE-ARRAIGNMENT HELD: Deft withdraws plea of Not Guilty as to Count 1. Deft pleads Guilty as to Count 1. Judgment of Guilty entered. Sentencing set for 3/21/78 at 9:30 AM.			
3/21/78	***SENTENCE: 4 yrs. impr pursuant to 18 USC 3651; 6 mos serve execution of remaining 42 mos suspended, 5 yrs probation, WO/suprv so long as deft resides outside U.S., but should deft return to U.S. probation is to be W/suprv the first 2 yrs with further suprv to be at the option of the probation officer, said probation under the terms and conditions of the Court's General Order of Probation dtd 12/26/73. On motion of U.S. Atty, Counts 2,3, & 4 dismissed.			
4/4/78	Issued Judgment & Commitment Order to J,micro,attys,Prob,Marshal)			
4/6/78	5. Judgment & Commitment Order, filed.			

FINE AND RESTITUTION PAYMENTS

DATE	RECEIPT NUMBER	C D NUMBER	DATE	RECEIPT NUMBER	C D NUMBER

OCT 2 1981