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I am pleased to transmit the 2005 Annual Report of the Illinois Courts. This report highlights the work of the Illinois Judicial Branch over the past year. Included within this report is a comprehensive summary of the numerous projects and initiatives pursued by the Illinois Judicial Branch in 2005, a summary of the 2005 Illinois Judicial Conference Annual Meeting, statistical data on court caseloads, a summary of activities of the Supreme Court's several committees, and an overview of state and local funding for the Illinois Judicial Branch. Also contained in the Annual Report is a brief description of the six divisions that comprise the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. This report also presents a photographic sampling of the rich and diverse architecture of Illinois' supreme, appellate and circuit courthouses.

The accomplishments outlined in the pages of this report are the result of the commitment of countless judges, administrators and staff of the judicial branch. The Administrative Office is indebted to the clerks of the supreme, appellate and circuit courts for their assistance in supplying the statistical information provided herein. I invite you to read about our continuing efforts to earn and maintain the trust of the citizens of Illinois.

For further information on the Illinois Courts and the Administrative Office, visit us at www.state.il.us/court/.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Y. Cobbs, Director
Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
A MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE

On behalf of my colleagues on the Illinois Supreme Court and the entire Judicial Branch of our state, it is my pleasure to present the 2005 Annual Report of the Illinois Courts. This is my initial opportunity to submit the Annual Report in my capacity as Chief Justice and to describe and define the important place the judiciary has in our form of government and the free society we all enjoy.

The judicial article of the 1970 Illinois Constitution vests general administrative and supervisory authority over all courts in the Supreme Court. As Chief Justice, I look forward to meeting the challenges which likely will confront the judiciary. The considerable task of running the judicial branch of government was wisely and comprehensively addressed by the drafters of the constitution through the provision that the Supreme Court shall appoint an Administrative Director and staff to assist in this responsibility. The Chief Justice and the entire Supreme Court appropriately rely on our Administrative Director and the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts to manage the day-to-day operations of the judicial branch.

The judiciary plays an essential role in our constitutional system. The Courts preserve the balance of power between the Executive and Legislative Branches and have the vital function of protecting the most basic rights of Americans. Individual rights and the obligations of government become tangible and meaningful through the functioning of a neutral judiciary. The Judicial Branch provides citizens a means for assuring that statutes passed by the legislature are enforced fully and even-handedly. An independent judiciary can be relied upon by the public to give force and mutual accountability to those protections enumerated in the Bill of Rights as well as private contracts between parties.

During my tenure as Chief Justice, I seek to reaffirm the Supreme Court's commitment to preserving and improving a judicial system that is fair and effective. The Supreme Court has recently taken some important initial steps to attain these ends with two new major initiatives aimed at ensuring the quality of legal services in Illinois as well as promoting civility among lawyers within the profession and with their clients.

The Court has established a Commission on Professionalism, the purpose of which is "to promote among the lawyers and judges of Illinois principles of integrity, professionalism and civility; to foster commitment to the elimination of bias and divisiveness within the legal and judicial systems; and to ensure that those systems provide equitable, effective and efficient resolution of problems and disputes for the people of Illinois." (Supreme Court Rule 799) The philosophy of the Court, which is the underpinning for the work of the Commission, is to send a clear and unequivocal message to the attorneys of our state that they are expected to deliver services with improved competency, effectiveness and civility. The elimination of past patterns of divisiveness and bias in our legal system can be achieved in large measure as attorneys set an example for new attorneys entering the field, their colleagues in the bar, and society at large.
The Court believes the Commission is a necessary new component of a legal environment that has become increasingly competitive and combative as attorneys seek clients and favorable verdicts. The Commission formalizes and builds on the efforts of the Special Supreme Court Committee on Professionalism. It will act as a resource for ideas on professionalism and develop public statements on ethical and professional principles which can serve as a guide to assist attorneys on the critical tenets of the legal profession. The Commission will coordinate with law schools in preparing and presenting programs for law students on ethics and professionalism. An important further mission of the Commission will be to focus on the role of the judiciary in establishing and maintaining the highest levels of professional conduct. The Commission also will seek to expand opportunities for scholarship and study for a more representative body of law students.

With the recent establishment of Supreme Court rules (MCLE Rules) on continuing legal education for attorneys in our state, the Court has put in place an additional major component for raising the competency, effectiveness and civility of our legal profession. (Supreme Court Rules 790 - 797) "Under the new rules, attorneys are required to study both substantive legal matters as well as matters relating to professional civility. ... This dual focus will help to ensure that the public is served by capable professionals who are fully informed of the latest developments in the law. The Commission will play a key role in the new continuing legal education program, working closely with both the bar and the law schools to ensure that professionalism and civility instruction is a part of every lawyer's education." (Press Release, September 29, 2005)

As provided in the preamble, Minimum Continuing Legal Education requirements (MCLE) are designed "to assure that those attorneys licensed to practice law in Illinois remain current regarding the requisite knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill the professional responsibilities and obligations of their respective practices and thereby improve the standards of the profession in general." The public contemplates nothing less from attorneys.

A key component of the program requires every new Illinois attorney admitted to practice after December 31, 2005, to complete a Basic Skills Course, totaling at least 15 hours of instruction. The course will cover local court practice and rules, filing requirements for various government agencies, the drafting of pleadings and other documents, practice techniques and procedures under the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct, client communications, the use of trust accounts, required record keeping and other rudimentary elements of practice. (Rule 793) "Law school teaches us how to think like lawyers, but not always how to practice law. ... The basic skills course will ensure that every new attorney enters the profession with a firm understanding of the tools that are essential to the day-to-day practice of law." (Press Release, September 29, 2005)

During 2005, the Court instituted additional initiatives aimed at improving the judicial system. The Court amended Rule 281 on small claims cases and filed a new Rule 46 on the official record of court proceedings. The upper limit for small claims court jurisdiction was raised from $5,000 to $10,000 to recognize the increase in dollar value of business transactions and the associated value of tort and contract disputes. This change by the Court will allow the circuit courts and litigants to efficiently and effectively resolve such matters. (Supreme Court Rule 281)

Court reporting personnel were removed from the operational and budgetary control of the Supreme Court by the General Assembly. In recognition of this change, the Court adopted Supreme Court Rule 46 and authorized appropriate standards promulgated by the Administrative Office to assure the timely preparation and availability of a record on appeal. The rule and standards also are necessary for managing the operation of digital recordation as an additional authorized means of making a record on appeal. Fiscal and operational responsibility for this technology remains under the Supreme Court through its Administrative Office.
Innovations in technology will continue to be a principal focus of the Supreme Court. Our citizens will benefit from the conveniences provided by the utilization in the courts of technologies that have proven to be effective in the private sector. Exploration on a pilot basis of emerging electronic applications in the circuit courts will permit the Court to make informed decisions before full implementation of appropriate new technologies.

This message would not be complete without describing the structure and highlighting some of the programs of the Administrative Office, led by the Supreme Court's Administrative Director, Cynthia Y. Cobbs. Under the leadership of Director Cobbs, the Administrative Office provides administrative and technical support to all three levels of Illinois' courts and serves as liaison to the Court's various committees, including the committees of the Judicial Conference, a constitutionally mandated forum for the development of improvements in the administration of justice. The divisions of the Administrative Office include the Executive Office, Administrative Services, Court Services, Judicial Education, Judicial Management Information Services (JMIS) and Probation Services.

The Administrative Director and Executive Office work closely with the Chief Justice and the Court to prepare, present and follow-up on the policy matters contained in the Court's Administrative Agenda. These issues include fiscal and programmatic issues, rules and issues related to the other branches of state government and to entities which are involved in, or have an interest in, the administration of the Judicial Branch. Staff of the Executive Office also act as secretariat to the Court's Commission, the constitutionally created body for judicial discipline. The Administrative Services Division is responsible for budgeting, payroll, benefits and contract administration and procurement. The Court Services Division has operational responsibility for program areas focused on the circuit courts. These include the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges, mandatory arbitration, circuit clerk case and statistical reporting and the Court Improvement Program. The Judicial Education Division organizes and coordinates the extensive array of educational programs for Illinois judges in conjunction with the Education Committee of the Judicial Conference. The JMIS Division supports the communication, technology and resources for the Supreme and Appellate Courts, and is instrumental in the automated information exchange between the circuit courts and state entities including the Secretary of State and the Illinois State Police. The Probation Division is responsible for the administration of a significant level of salary reimbursement to the counties for circuit court based probation services. Training, technical assistance, statistical and case reporting as well as improvement of professional practices are also within the domain of the Probation Division. A further description of the responsibilities and programs of each of the divisions of the Administrative Office is contained elsewhere in this publication. (Administrative Summary to the Annual Report of 2005)

I am pleased to invite your review of the work of the Illinois Judicial Branch and the Administrative Office as contained in the 2005 Annual Report. Finally, I want to extend my appreciation to all who have assisted with the numerous projects and initiatives featured herein.

[Signature]

Robert R. Thomas
Chief Justice
January 31, 2006

Honorable Michael J. Madigan
Speaker of the House
House of Representatives
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Honorable Emil Jones, Jr.
President of the Senate
State Senate
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Honorable Tom Cross
Republican Leader
House of Representatives
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Honorable Frank C. Watson
Republican Leader
State Senate
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Gentlemen:

Attached is the 2005 Annual Report of the Illinois Supreme Court. I submit this Report to the General Assembly pursuant to Article VI, section 17 of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, which requires the Supreme Court to report annually in writing to the General Assembly regarding the annual Judicial Conference. The Judicial Conference considers the work of the courts and suggests improvements in the administration of justice. In compliance with the constitutional mandate, this Report includes a summary of the work performed by the several committees which make up the Judicial Conference. In addition, this report includes a summary of selected Supreme Court decisions which are offered for the General Assembly's consideration. In offering these matters for the Legislature's consideration, the Court is not unmindful of the respective roles of the General Assembly and the Court. While we intend no intrusion upon the prerogatives of the General Assembly in the exercise of its authority, we do respectfully offer these matters for your consideration and look forward to the General Assembly's continued responsiveness and support.

The Committees of the Judicial Conference include (1) Alternative Dispute Resolution, (2) Automation and Technology, (3) Criminal Law and Probation Administration, (4) Discovery Procedures, (5) Education, (6) Study Committee on Complex Litigation, and (7) Study Committee on Juvenile Justice. The Judicial Conference was convened on October 20, 2005, to consider the aforementioned committees' reports and recommendations. Those reports detailed initiatives undertaken by the respective committees during Conference Year 2005. This Annual Report summarizes those initiatives, which also foretell of the projects and goals anticipated to be undertaken by the conference committees in 2006.

With the submission of this report to the General Assembly, the Supreme Court renews its commitment to the effective administration of justice and the management of the courts, to the careful stewardship of those resources provided for the operation of the courts, and to the development of plans and goals designed to assure that the Illinois court system is meeting the needs of our citizens.

On behalf of the Court, I respectfully submit the Supreme Court's 2005 Annual Report to the General Assembly.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Thomas
Chief Justice
Supreme Court of Illinois
2005 Illinois Judicial Conference  The Annual Meeting of the Illinois Judicial Conference was held on October 20, 2005, in Chicago. The Conference, which is authorized by Article VI, section 17 of the Illinois constitution, is mandated to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice. The constitutional mandate is implemented through Supreme Court Rule 41, which defines the duties and the membership of the Illinois Judicial Conference. Consistent with the Rule, the Conference is composed of judges from every level of the judiciary representing Illinois' five judicial districts. The Justices of the Illinois Supreme Court, including the Chief Justice, who presides over the conference, also serve as members.

The work of the Conference is ongoing, conducted throughout the year, largely through the efforts of seven separately appointed committees: Automation and Technology Committee, Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee, Study Committee on Complex Litigation, Committee on Criminal Law and Probation Administration, Committee on Discovery Procedures, Study Committee on Juvenile Justice, and the Committee on Education. The various committee rosters include appellate, circuit and associate judges who serve as full Judicial Conference members. The committees are assisted in their work by non-Judicial Conference judges, attorneys, and law professors, who are appointed by the Supreme Court to serve as either associate members or advisors. Senior level staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts serve as liaisons to the committees to support their work as defined in the committee charge.

The Executive Committee, which is also authorized by Supreme Court Rule 41, acts on behalf of the Conference when the Conference is not in session. This Committee is comprised of fourteen judges, six of whom are from the First Judicial District (County of Cook) and the remaining eight of whom are from judicial districts two, three, four and five. The Executive Committee previews the written reports of the conference committees and submits, for the Supreme Court’s approval, an agenda for the annual meeting.

The 2005 Annual Meeting of the Judicial Conference was, for the second consecutive year, consolidated into a one-day format in order to effectively manage costs during difficult budgetary times and minimize judicial time away from the bench. The meeting was convened by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, the Honorable Robert R. Thomas. In his opening remarks, Justice Thomas welcomed the attendees and also recognized the presence of current members of the Supreme Court as well as retired Supreme Court Justices Benjamin K. Miller, John L. Nickels, Phillip J. Rarick, Seymour Simon and John Stamos. Noting especially former Chief Justice Mary Ann G. McMorrow, Chief Justice Thomas commended the former Chief Justice for her leadership in pioneering women in the law and for her excellent stewardship of Illinois’ judicial branch of government during the past three years.

In brief, Chief Justice Thomas remarked that the recent and remarkable occurrence of two simultaneous vacancies on the United States Supreme Court had moved the humble judicial branch of government to the forefront of public discourse. Further, the new Chief offered that as the least visible, and therefore the least understood branch of government, this new level of prominence serves the interests of both the public and the judiciary. The executive branch, as embodied by the president, defines the news. The news channels are

“The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for an annual judicial conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice and shall report thereon annually in writing to the General Assembly not later than January 31.” Article VI, Section 17, Illinois Constitution
dominated by coverage of presidential elections, both general and primary, presidential news conferences, presidential policy initiatives, and even presidential vacations. The legislative branch is perhaps only slightly less visible, with cable television including channels devoted exclusively to the business and proceedings of Congress. In contrast judicial proceedings for the most part are not televised, its judicial campaigns not covered, and often the names and faces of the judiciary are unknown to the public.

Justice Thomas noted that within the valuable civics lesson that a Supreme Court vacancy brings, lies the opportunity to relate the essential role that the judiciary plays in our constitutional system. Preserving the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches, protecting fundamental rights, ensuring that laws passed by the legislature are enforced fairly and fully, and that rights set forth on paper are not just empty promises, incapable of enforcement or vindication by a neutral tribunal, are but a few of the core duties of the judicial branch that, from time to time, should be brought to the public's collective conscience.

In closing, Chief Justice Thomas commented that the important work of the Conference, achieved through its committees, is a hint of the great things to come that will continue to shape the very bright future of Illinois' judicial branch and the administration of justice.

The Annual Meeting continued with time dedicated to Conference committee meetings, devoted in part to finalization of the Committees' annual reports and to preliminary planning for Conference Year 2006. The afternoon plenary session included a presentation of each of the committees' activities in Conference Year 2005 as detailed in the annual reports and recommendations to the full Conference. The following summarizes the written and oral substance of those reports:

**Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee**

The Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee monitored both Court-Annexed Mandatory Arbitration Programs and Court-Sponsored Major Civil Case Mediation Programs.

**Court-Annexed Mandatory Arbitration**

As in prior years, the Committee met with arbitration administrators and supervising judges of circuits with mandatory arbitration programs. Topics for discussion included the amendment of Supreme Court rules and several programmatic issues raised by arbitration administrators and supervising judges.

The Committee forwarded to the Supreme Court Rules Committee proposed amendments to Supreme Court Rule 87(e) (Appointment, Qualification and Compensation of Arbitrator), and Supreme Court Rule 91(a) (Absence of a Party at Hearing). The proposed amendment to Rule 87(e) would permit arbitrators to be paid an additional hearing fee for those matters which extend beyond the two-hour hearing limit, pursuant to prior motion and at the discretion of the presiding arbitration judge. The proposed amendment to Rule 91(a) would require major participants in cases to be present at arbitration.

**Court Sponsored Mediation Programs**

The Committee monitored existing court-approved mediation programs, observed the inception of new mediation programs and continued to track statistical information to determine program efficacy.
During Conference Year 2006, the Committee plans to continue to monitor court-annexed mandatory arbitration programs; oversee and facilitate the improvement of court-approved mediation programs; continue to study, draft and propose rule amendments in light of suggestions from program practitioners; and to study and evaluate other alternative dispute resolution options such as summary jury trials.

Committee on Criminal Law and Probation Administration

The Committee on Criminal Law and Probation Administration has devoted time to address strategies to monitor, support and improve probation practices throughout the state. There has been focus on probation’s work in assessing, intervening and monitoring specialized offender populations, which include domestic violence, gang, drug, and sex offenders. Another focus of this committee’s work has been on the changing role of probation as it relates to the implementation of the Evidence-Based Practices (EBP).

There has been a growing interest and implementation of these problem solving/speciality courts throughout the state. While there are a number of existing established drug courts, many jurisdictions have begun to explore the feasibility of establishing such courts in their judicial circuits. Recognizing this developing trend, the Committee began exploring the role of problem solving/specialty courts in Illinois. The development and implementation of mental health courts is on the rise and is also being monitored by the Committee. To aid a jurisdiction that may be contemplating establishing a specialty court, the Committee has developed, for the Supreme Court's consideration, a guide: Issues and Factors to Consider When Planning and Implementing Specialty Courts.

The Committee continued to examine the utility of implementing the Youthful Offender Program. Several states have created statutes that provide for alternative sentencing for non-violent offenders to avoid the stigma of a criminal conviction. It is believed that non-violent offenders who demonstrate the ability to comply with the requirements of the court and become productive, law-abiding citizens will have a much better chance of long-term success without the burden of a record of conviction. The Committee supports endorsing the principles underlying the Youthful Offender Sentencing Program as such reforms broaden the sentencing options for judges focusing on rehabilitation and alternative treatment. The Committee continues to support the adoption of legislation that would support Youthful Offender Programming as an effective alternative sentencing option for non-violent offenders.

The Committee continued to monitor and support revisions of Illinois' criminal law statutes to simplify and clarify existing law, to provide trial courts with a range of effective sentencing options, and to provide trial judges with the discretion essential to a fair and effective system of criminal justice. The Committee has continued to discuss and monitor the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the case of Crawford v. Washington and those cases and articles which discuss how courts will review Confrontation Clause issues.

During the upcoming Conference year, the Committee intends to continue its review of probation programs and practices. With the Court's permission, the Committee will continue to examine principles and implementation in Illinois Courts of both Evidence-
Based Practices and the development of Problem Solving/Specialty Courts. The Committee will also study, review and analyze criminal law statutes. The Committee will also continue to review the existing Supreme Court Rules on criminal cases, and consider new and pending proposals to amend the Rules.

**Automation and Technology Committee**

The Automation and Technology Committee continued to review security and technology issues on behalf of the judiciary. Having reviewed several reports on "viruses" and "worms", the Committee focused attention on methods available to inform the judiciary on such matters. Additionally, the Committee drafted, distributed, and compiled the results of a survey on Illinois court technology, and its use. Finally, the Committee reviewed its charge to identify other technologies to be explored and considered for possible application in the judiciary, including the use of video conferencing to reduce hearing and trial time, as well as costs for expert witnesses and prisoner transport.

During the 2006 Conference Year, the Committee will continue its efforts to review the results of the Illinois court technology survey on funding, continue its efforts to evaluate and provide notice to the judiciary of security issues, and continue to review the benefits of the use of video conferencing and other technologies by the judiciary.

**Study Committee on Juvenile Justice**

The Study Committee on Juvenile Justice continued its preparation of an update to the *Illinois Juvenile Law Benchbook*. The Committee reasonably anticipates that an update to Volume I, which addresses juvenile court proceedings involving allegations of delinquency, minors requiring authoritative intervention, and addicted minors, will be available by December 2005.

The Committee also continued its review of various initiatives directly impacting juvenile court practice and policy. Specifically, the Committee compiled information on innovative programs, including *Redeploy Illinois* and the concept of juvenile drug courts. Additionally, the Committee discussed the best practices guidelines for delinquency cases as recommended in the *Juvenile Delinquency Guidelines*, published by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. The Committee monitored legislation, case law, and executive initiatives, including the progress and results of the federal Child and Family Services Review and Program Improvement Plan, which are aimed at improving court performance in the processing of abuse, neglect, and dependency cases.

In the next Conference year, the Committee plans to continue its review of juvenile justice practices and policies and other issues of concern in proceedings brought in juvenile court. The Committee will publish the update to Volume I of the *Illinois Juvenile Law Benchbook* and commence its update to Volume II of the *Illinois Juvenile Law Benchbook*, which serves as a guide to procedural, evidentiary, and substantive issues arising in proceedings involving allegations of abuse, neglect, and dependency. Finally, the Committee will continue to monitor statutory and common law developments affecting the juvenile justice system and recommend and participate in the presentation of juvenile law education programs.
Study Committee on Complex Litigation

The Study Committee on Complex Litigation tracked and reviewed case law and other legal developments in complex civil and criminal cases in order to insure that the *Illinois Manual for Complex Civil Litigation* and the *Illinois Manual for Complex Criminal Litigation* remain current. Based upon its review, the Committee determined that further updates and new chapters were necessary for both the civil and criminal manuals. The Committee drafted case law updates for the civil manual and criminal manual for decisions issued during Conference Year 2004-2005 and integrated all previous case law updates and supplements into the main text of the manuals. These materials are in the process of being finalized. The text of the manuals will continue to be available on CD-ROM which affords users the convenience of downloading and hyperlink and search capabilities.

During the next Conference year, the Committee plans to further update the *Illinois Manual for Complex Civil Litigation* and the *Illinois Manual for Complex Criminal Litigation* and to develop a supplement to expand topics covered. The Committee will also explore the impact of electronic discovery in the context of complex litigation cases.

Finally, the Committee anticipates continuing discussion on how the manuals can be formatted and disseminated to best serve Illinois judges, including the distribution of the updated CD-ROM version of the manuals with revised and updated instructions to all judges having received hard copies of the volumes.

Committee on Discovery Procedures

The Committee on Discovery Procedures considered proposed amendments to Supreme Court Rules 202, 204, 208, 213, and 216. The proposals and the Committee's actions are summarized below.

A proposed amendment to Supreme Court Rule 202 would eliminate the distinction between discovery and evidence depositions. After review, the Committee determined that the use of discovery and evidence depositions should be maintained. The Committee therefore forwarded its recommendation to reject the proposal to eliminate dual depositions to the Supreme Court Rules Committee.

An amendment to Supreme Court Rule 204(b) would compel the appearance of a deponent when the action is pending in another state. The proposed amendment provided that the petition to issue a subpoena to compel the appearance of the deponent or for an order to compel the giving of testimony by the deponent shall be filed with the circuit court in accordance with such court's procedure or local rule for issuing a subpoena for a foreign action. The proposal remains under review by the Committee. The proposal to amend Rule 213(g) would preclude testimony disclosed in an evidence deposition from acting as a disclosure under Rule 213. The Committee recommended that Rule 213(g) be amended as proposed and forwarded its recommendation to the Supreme Court Rules Committee.

The Committee also considered a proposal to amend Supreme Court Rule 208(d) to provide that the trial court may award to any party in whose favor judgment is entered, the reasonable cost of any appearance fee charged by any non-retained physician witness who testified at trial or at an evidence deposition or at a videotaped evidence deposition that was used at trial. Upon review, the Committee voted to disapprove the proposed amendment to Rule 208(d).
Finally, the Committee considered and rejected an amendment to Supreme Court Rule 216 which would permit an attorney to sign a statement or objection for the party in response to a request to admit. Although the Committee rejected amending the Rule, there was discussion concerning allegations for abuse surrounding the strict requirements for responding to a Rule 216 request to admit, and possible means for eliminating such abuse.

In addition to consideration given to proposed rule amendments, the Committee discussed the increasing problem of the failure to receive relevant information before trial. Some thought was given to the possibility of creating a new rule to require mandatory disclosure of relevant documents similar to the disclosure requirements set forth in Rule 222.

In the next Conference year, the Committee plans to continue its discussion of proposed amendments to Rule 204, eliminating the abuses associated with the application of Rule 216, and the feasibility of rule on mandatory disclosure of relevant information prior to trial. The Committee also plans to study the production of documents and responses to interrogatories. Finally, the Committee will review any proposals submitted by the Supreme Court Rules Committee.

Committee on Education

In June 2005, the Committee on Education oversaw the presentation of the 2005 Advanced Judicial Academy in Champaign. The Academy, which examined the changing public expectations of the Courts in an era of technological, social and political change, featured nationally and internationally prominent speakers on the topic of judicial independence. In addition to the Academy, the Committee conducted a full schedule of seminars during the 2004-2005 Judicial Conference year, presented a New Judge Seminar and conducted a Faculty Development Workshop for judges teaching Judicial Conference Programs. The seminar series included six regional (2 day) seminars and five mini (1 day) seminars. Faculty for all programs were assisted by staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts.

In addition to the annual seminar series, the Committee significantly revised the annual New Judge Seminar curriculum, with the approval of the Court, to incorporate both substantive law sessions as well as “workshops and “skill-building” techniques to ensure that new judges can identify and apply the requisite legal knowledge and judicial skills as they begin careers on the bench. Lastly, the Committee conducted a judicial education “needs assessment” through surveys sent to each Illinois trial and appellate judge and, in collaboration with the Administrative Office, oversaw the Resource Lending Library for Illinois judges.

During the upcoming Conference year, the Committee will plan and present the 2006 Education Conference, the 2005-2006 seminar series, including regional and mini seminars, a Faculty Development Workshop, and a New Judge Seminar. In addition to these activities, the Committee will develop a proposed 2006-2007 seminar series, apply to the Illinois Department of Transportation for funding to conduct the annual seminar on issues related to driving under the influence, and issue an updated Resource Lending Library Catalog.
Adoption Act – Appointment of Counsel on Appeal

In *In re Adoption of L.T.M.*, S. Ct. Docket Nos. 95746, 97947 cons. (January 21, 2005), this court held that the enactment of a statutory scheme that provides appointed counsel for indigent parents facing termination of parental rights under the Juvenile Court Act, but not under the Adoption Act, violates the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment. In so holding, this court reasoned that a parent who stands to lose his parental rights under the Adoption Act if he is found unfit is in a very similar position to a parent who stands to lose the very same constitutional rights, based on the very same finding, in proceedings under the Juvenile Court Act.

Section 1(D)(q) of the Illinois Adoption Act – Constitutionality

In *In re D.W.*, S. Ct. Docket Nos. 97292, 98896 cons.(March 24, 2005), this court considered the constitutionality of section 1(D)(q) of the Illinois Adoption Act (Act) (750 ILCS 50/1(D)(q) (West 2000)). While section 1(D)(q) of the Act denies respondents an opportunity to rebut its presumption of parental unfitness, respondents charged with unfitness under section 1(D)(i) for similar and, in some instances, more serious offenses are granted an opportunity to rebut the presumption of unfitness. As both sections based their presumptions of parental unfitness on prior convictions, this court found no compelling state interest in having different presumptions in similar statutory provisions. Accordingly, we held that, in mandating a conclusive presumption of parental unfitness, section 1(D)(q) was violative of equal protection and, thus, unconstitutional.

Recovery of Fraudulently Obtained Public Funds - Standing

In *County of Cook ex rel. Robert F. Rifkin, et al. v. Bear Stearns & Company, Inc. et al.*, S. Ct. Docket No. 97022 (June 3, 2005), this court considered the constitutionality of section 20-104(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure (735 ILCS 5/20-104(b) (West 1998)), which purports to confer standing on private citizens to sue if the appropriate government official fails to file suit or arrange for settlement of the action, after notice. In this action, the court held that section 20-104(b) is an invalid usurpation of the constitutional authority of the State's Attorney. Here, the county was the real party in interest and, under the Constitution, could be represented only by the State's Attorney.

Section 4.1(a) of the Illinois Interest Act – Implicit Repeal

In *U.S. Bank National Association v. Clark*, S. Ct. Docket No. 98379 (September 22, 2005), this court held that the limitation on lender changes in section 4.1(a) of the Illinois Interest Act (Act) (815 ILCS 205/4.1(a) (West 2002)) was implicitly repealed by the General Assembly's 1981 amendment to section 4 of the Act. Our court further found that neither of the opt-out provisions of the federal Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980 (DIDMCA) (12 U.S.C.S. §1735f-7a (2000)) have been applied by the legislature. Therefore, the court concluded that section 501 of the DIDMCA preempts section 4.1(a)'s limitation on points and fees.

Real and Personal Property – Tax Liens

In *In re Application of the County Collector*, S. Ct. Docket No. 97165 (October 20, 2005), this court affirmed the tax sale of real estate belonging to a disabled person who lacked actual notice of the sale. In conclusion, we noted the circuit court's suggestion that, when a patient is hospitalized for mental illness and no family member or guardian is available, the legislature might consider allowing the hospital to notify the county collector, under seal, of the patient's situation, to permit the tolling of any time periods relating to the payment of taxes. This court expressed no opinion on the wisdom of this suggestion but agreed that the issues raised in the case merited legislative attention.
STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR THE COURTS
STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR THE COURTS

Financing the state court system is a shared responsibility of the state and the 102 counties of the state. Revenue to provide court services to the people of the state comes from a variety of sources: the state income tax, county property taxes, case filing fees, court-imposed fines and assessments, and other fees.

State government pays for the salaries, benefits, and office expenses of supreme and appellate court judges, and salaries and benefits of circuit court judges. Effective July 1, 2005, judicial salaries, as determined by the legislature, were: supreme court justices, $177,073; appellate court judges, $166,658; circuit court judges, $152,930; and associate judges, $142,514. The state also pays for support staff of supreme and appellate court judges, staff in other units of the supreme and appellate courts, court reporters and a small number of other personnel in the circuit courts, and mandatory arbitration staff in several counties. Part of the cost of operating the mandatory arbitration program is offset by fees paid by participants in the program. During 2005, the arbitration filing and rejection fees collected amounted to $5,559,468.

State funding for probation departments currently covers approximately 3,250 probation personnel, for which the counties receive partial salary reimbursement on a monthly basis. At the present time, state funding provides for about 25% of the total cost of probation services in the state.

County governments pay part of the cost of financing circuit court operations. Counties provide office and courtroom space, maintenance, and support staff to assist the circuit court judges. Circuit clerks collect money to help pay for their operations and some court operations. They also collect and disburse revenues to help fund local and state government programs, as summarized on the next page.

STATE FUNDING

The pie chart below shows the supreme court’s share of the total appropriations for fiscal year 2006 (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006). The total appropriation was $46,087,030. The appropriation for the courts was $278,663,000.

Appropriations for State Agencies
Fiscal Year 2006

Source: Table I-A: Appropriations by Agency, Chapter 11
Governor’s Budget Message to the General Assembly for Fiscal Year 2007
LOCAL FUNDING

The circuit clerk's office in each county provides a variety of court recordkeeping and financial accounting services. Circuit clerks are elected for four-year terms by the voters in each county. Circuit clerks, with help from deputy clerks, attend sessions of the court, preserve court files and papers, and maintain complete records of all cases. Employees of the clerks' offices are appointed by and are accountable to the circuit clerk, with the county board having budgetary authority. During 2005, the total number of full-time employees in all 102 circuit clerk offices was 3,875, assisted by a total of 227 part-time employees. The cost of operating all circuit clerks' offices totaled $168,303,342 in 2005.

Revenue to pay for these court-related services comes primarily from property taxes, filing fees, and court-ordered fines and costs. Fines, fees and other costs collected by circuit clerks are governed primarily by statute and supreme court rule.

REVENUE TO FINANCE LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS

Fees and court-ordered fines were collected in 2005 by circuit clerks and earmarked for improvements in the clerks' offices and to help defray the cost to the county of operating the courts at the local level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Document Storage Fund</td>
<td>is used for any costs relative to the storage of court records.</td>
<td>$11,507,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Automation Fund</td>
<td>is used to establish and maintain automated systems for keeping court records.</td>
<td>$13,123,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Law Library Fund</td>
<td>helps defray the costs of maintaining a law library in the county for judges, attorneys, and the public.</td>
<td>$7,138,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Fund To Finance the Court System</td>
<td>is available from fees collected by circuit clerks to help finance the court system in the county.</td>
<td>$7,067,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNCOLLECTED CLAIMS

The Administrative Office, the Supreme Court Clerk, the Supreme Court Library, and the Clerks of the five Appellate Districts are responsible for collecting certain fees. Outstanding accounts receivable are normally collected by the unit to which the account is owed. Additionally, a small number of accounts receivable are turned over to private collection agencies and the State Comptroller's offset system. At the end of FY 05, there were 191 claims due and payable, totaling $231,542.28.

REVENUE TO FINANCE OTHER PROGRAMS

In addition to collecting fees for local improvements, circuit clerks receive, account for, and distribute millions of dollars to county governments, various local governmental entities, and various state funds. Some of the programs and dollars collected in 2005 by circuit clerks are listed below:

**Drug Treatment Fund:** Court-ordered drug assessments are used to pay for treatment programs for people addicted to alcohol, cannabis, or controlled substances. $3,854,879

**Violent Crime Victims Assistance:** Court-ordered penalties in criminal and certain traffic cases are used to support victim and witness assistance centers throughout the state. $6,871,351

**Trauma Center Fund:** Fees collected in certain traffic, DUI, and criminal cases are used to support Illinois hospitals that are designated as trauma centers. $4,924,231

**Traffic and Criminal Conviction Surcharges:** An additional penalty imposed in traffic and criminal cases is used for training of law enforcement and correctional officers. $10,282,496

**Drivers Education Fund:** Penalties and forfeitures in offenses reportable to the Secretary of State are used for driver education programs in high schools. $3,045,753

**Child Support and Maintenance:** During 2005, circuit clerks and the State Disbursement Unit collected and distributed $947,274,148 for child support and maintenance.
I linois has had a unified court system since 1964. In that year, voters approved an amendment to the 1870 constitution which made major changes in the system.

Prior to 1964, the court system was fragmented. The courts of original jurisdiction had some concurrent and overlapping jurisdiction, and each court operated independently of the others. The old system had a circuit court with statewide original jurisdiction in all cases and some appellate jurisdiction; a Superior Court of Cook County having concurrent jurisdiction with the Circuit Court of Cook County; the Criminal Court of Cook County also having concurrent jurisdiction with the Circuit Court of Cook County but limited to criminal cases; a county court in each county with special jurisdiction that partially overlapped that of the circuit court; a probate court in certain counties with special jurisdiction; statutory municipal, city, town and village courts, with jurisdiction overlapping that of the circuit court; and justice of the peace and police magistrate courts with limited jurisdiction.

By 1962, Cook County alone had 208 courts: circuit court, superior court, family court, criminal court, probate court, county court, twenty-four city, village, town and municipal courts, seventy-five justice of the peace courts, and 103 police magistrate courts.

In addition, there were seven supreme court districts numbered from south to north and four appellate court districts numbered from north to south. For example, the first supreme court district was in a part of the fourth appellate court district and the seventh supreme court district was in a part of the first appellate court district.

In today's system, as shown on the left, there are three levels of courts: circuit, appellate, and supreme, all operating within clearly defined geographical boundaries. The circuit court is a court of original jurisdiction which is divided into twenty-two circuits. Each circuit is located in one of five appellate court districts. Cases enter circuit court via the circuit clerk's office in a county of the circuit. Cases may be appealed to the appellate court in the district containing the circuit court, or, in certain circumstances, directly to the supreme court. After an appellate court decision, parties to the case may seek discretionary review by the supreme court. Supreme and appellate district and circuit maps are found in their respective sections of this publication.
JUDICIAL BRANCH ADMINISTRATION

Supreme Court

The Supreme Court of Illinois, in addition to being the state's highest court, is responsible for the state's unified trial court, one appellate court with five districts, and several supporting units. General administrative and supervisory authority over the court system is vested in the supreme court. Several advisory bodies assist with this mission by making recommendations to the court. These include the Judicial Conference of Illinois and the various committees of the court. More information about committees can be found in the following sections. The supreme court also makes appointments to other committees, commissions, and boards as listed at the right.

The chief justice is responsible for exercising the court's general administrative and supervisory authority in accordance with the court's rules. The supreme court appoints an administrative director to assist the chief justice in her duties. The staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts support this function.

Key support personnel exist at each level of the court to assist judges with the administration of justice. At the supreme court level, this includes the clerk of the supreme court, research director, marshal, and supreme court librarian and their staffs. Each support unit is described on page twenty-four.

Appellate Court

At the appellate court level, the presiding judge and judges of each appellate district are assisted by a clerk of the appellate court and research director and their staffs appointed by the appellate judges. Appeals enter the clerk's office, where deputy clerks assign them filing schedules and actively monitor and review cases as they progress through record preparation, motions, briefing, and oral arguments. Problems such as late filings, jurisdictional defects, inadequate records or noncompliant briefs are referred to the court. After the court has heard an appeal, the clerk's office issues the court's decision and tracks all post-decision activity. The clerk's office also manages the court's computerized and manual recordkeeping systems and oversees the maintenance of physical facilities. The clerk responds to requests and questions concerning the court's cases and procedures. The research director oversees a staff of attorneys and secretaries providing centralized legal research services to judges.

Circuit Court

Each circuit is administered by a chief judge who is selected by the circuit court judges of the circuit. The chief judge is assisted by an administrative assistant and/or trial court administrator and other support staff. The number of counties in each circuit currently ranges from one to twelve. In each county, voters elect a circuit clerk for a four-year term. Circuit clerks, with help from deputy clerks hired by the circuit clerk, attend sessions of the court, preserve court files and papers, maintain complete records of all cases, and maintain records of money received and disbursed.

Judicial Inquiry Board

The supreme court appoints two circuit judges to the board (the governor also appoints four non-lawyers and three lawyers) which receives and investigates complaints against judges and prosecutes the validated complaint before the Illinois Courts Commission.

Illinois Courts Commission

The commission consists of a supreme court justice, two circuit judges selected by the supreme court, two appellate court judges selected by the appellate court, and two citizen members selected by the governor. The commission hears complaints brought by the Judicial Inquiry Board and can discipline a judge or remove a judge from office.

Board of Admissions to the Bar

The supreme court establishes rules and standards for the education, testing, and admission of law school graduates to the practice of law in the state and appoints seven attorneys to sit on the board. The board oversees the process of admitting law school graduates to the practice of law.

Committee on Character and Fitness

The supreme court appoints attorneys to a committee in each of the five judicial districts to evaluate the moral character and general fitness of applicants to practice law.

Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission

The supreme court establishes rules for the registration and discipline of attorneys and appoints four lawyers and three non-lawyers to the commission which oversees the registration and disciplinary process.

State Appellate Defender

The supreme court appoints the State Appellate Defender and two members of the State Appellate Defender Commission. Each appellate court district appoints one member to the Commission (the governor appoints two members).

Board of Trustees of the Judges Retirement System

The supreme court appoints three judges to the Board of Trustees of the Judges Retirement System and the chief justice is an ex-officio member (as is the state treasurer).
Justice Freeman received a Juris Doctor degree from The John Marshall Law School, Chicago. Early in his career he served as an Assistant Attorney General, Assistant State's Attorney, and an attorney for the Board of Election Commissioners. He served as a commissioner on the Illinois Commerce Commission from 1973 to 1976. He was in the private practice of law from 1962 to 1976. In 1976, he was elected a Circuit Judge in Cook County where he served for ten years. He was elected to the Appellate Court in 1986 and to the Illinois Supreme Court on November 6, 1990, as the first African-American to serve on the Court. On May 12, 1997, he was selected as Chief Justice and served in that capacity until January 1, 2000.

Justice Fitzgerald received his law degree from The John Marshall Law School, Chicago. He began his career in the law as a prosecutor in the Cook County State's Attorney's Office. When first elected to the bench in 1976, he was the youngest Cook County judge. In 1989, he was elevated to presiding judge of Cook County's criminal courts and was appointed to serve as the presiding judge of Illinois' first statewide Grand Jury. Justice Fitzgerald was elected to the Supreme Court of Illinois for the First District in 2000.

Justice Garman received a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Iowa College of Law in 1968. She was an Assistant State's Attorney in Vermilion County from 1969-1973. She then engaged in private practice with Sebat, Swanson, Banks, Lessen & Garman and was an Associate Judge for 12 years. Justice Garman was a Circuit Judge in the Fifth Judicial Circuit (1986-95) and Presiding Circuit Judge (1987-95). She was assigned to the Appellate Court, Fourth District, in July 1995, and was elected to the position in November 1996. Justice Garman was appointed to the Supreme Court on February 1, 2001 and subsequently elected to the Supreme Court on December 2, 2002.
Justice McMorrow received her law degree from Loyola University School of Law, Chicago. Prior to being elected a Circuit Judge in Cook County in 1976, she was engaged in the private practice of law and later appointed an Assistant State's Attorney of Cook County, assigned to the criminal division. She was assigned to the Appellate Court for the First District by the Supreme Court in 1985 and won election to that post in 1986. She was elected to the Illinois Supreme Court in 1992, the first woman to serve on the state's highest court. With her election as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois in May 2002, she became the first woman to head any of the three branches of state government.

Justice Kilbride received his law degree from Antioch School of Law in Washington, D.C., in 1981. He practiced law for 20 years in Rock Island, engaging in the general practice of law, including appeals, environmental law, labor law, employment matters, and other general civil and criminal matters. He was admitted to practice in the United States District Court of Central Illinois and the United States Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Justice Kilbride was elected to the Supreme Court of Illinois for the Third District in 2000.

Justice Karmeier received his law degree from the University of Illinois. From 1964 through 1986, he engaged in private law practice, clerked for Illinois Supreme Court Justice Byron O. House and United States District Court Judge James L. Foreman, and served as Washington County State's Attorney. Justice Karmeier has served on the Illinois Supreme Court Committee on Pattern Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases, presiding as Chair of the Committee from 2003 to 2004. He served as Resident Circuit Judge of Washington County from 1986 through 2004 when he was elected to the Supreme Court.
SUPPORT STAFF

There are several support units which assist the supreme court with its work as the state's highest court. These units are located in Springfield, Bloomington, and Chicago.

**Clerk of the Supreme Court.** The clerk of the supreme court directs a staff of deputies who process cases according to court rules, monitor the caseload of the court, keep court files and records, and maintain court statistics. The clerk's office maintains the roll of attorneys licensed to practice in the state, processes the licensing of attorneys, and coordinates the semiannual attorney admission ceremonies. The clerk also registers and renews law firms under Rule 721, keeps files of judicial financial disclosure statements, and serves as a public information officer of the court. The clerk maintains offices in Chicago and Springfield.

**Marshal of the Supreme Court.** The marshal attends all sessions of the court held in September, November, January, March, and May. In addition, the marshal directs a staff which maintains the Supreme Court Building and grounds, provides security for justices and employees, and conducts tours of the building.

**Reporter of Decisions.** The reporter of decisions directs a staff which publishes opinions of the supreme and appellate courts in the *Official Reports*. Employees also verify case citations; compose head notes, attorney lines, tables of cases, topical summaries, and other materials appearing in the *Official Reports*; and edit opinions for style and grammar.

**Supreme Court Librarian.** The supreme court librarian directs a staff who provide legal reference services to the courts, state agencies, and citizens of the state. The Supreme Court libraries include a 100,000 volume public law library in Springfield, a 40,000 volume private branch library in Chicago, and four private judicial libraries across the state. The Librarian oversees all aspects of library administration including budget and program planning, materials and equipment acquisition, cataloging and collection development, and library reference and research services.

**Supreme Court Research Director.** The supreme court research director supervises a staff of attorneys who provide legal research and writing assistance to the court.

**Supreme Court Chief Internal Auditor.** The supreme court chief internal auditor and staff perform audits of the state-funded activities of the judicial branch. In addition, the internal auditor annually assesses the adequacy of internal controls for state-funded activities.
SUPREME COURT COMMITTEES
Standing committees of the court and chairpersons during 2005

**Appellate Court Administrative Committee**...Justice Rita B. Garman, liaison officer.

**Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission**...Benedict Schwarz, II, Esq., Chair; Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier, liaison officer.  **Review Board**...John W. Rapp, Jr., Esq., Chair.

**Board of Admissions to the Bar**...David W. Andich, Esq., President; Justice Thomas R. Fitzgerald, liaison officer.

**Committee on Jury Instructions in Civil Cases**...H. Kent Heller, Esq., Chair; Professor Nancy S. Marder, Reporter; Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, liaison officer.

**Committee on Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases**...Judge Bertina E. Lampkin, Chair; Patrick J. Cotter, Reporter; Professor John F. Erbes, Professor-Reporter; Justice Thomas R. Fitzggerald, liaison officer.

**Committee on Character and Fitness**...James R. Carroll, Esq., Chair; Nancy-Ellen Zusman, Esq., Vice-Chair (First Judicial District); Edward J. Walsh, Esq., Chair; Robert E. Jones, Esq., Vice-Chair (Second Judicial District); William F. Smith, Esq., Chair; Robert H. Alvine, Esq., Vice-Chair (Third Judicial District); Harold L. Jensen, Esq., Chair (Fourth Judicial District); John H. Leskera, Esq., Chair; John T. Papa, Esq., Vice-Chair (Fifth Judicial District); Justice Robert R. Thomas, liaison officer.

**Committee on Professional Responsibility**...Richard A. Redmond, Esq., Chair; Professor Vivien C. Gross, Professor-Reporter; Chief Justice Mary Ann G. McMorrow, liaison officer.

**Judicial Mentor Committee**...Judge Robert L. Carter, Status Member (Chairperson of Chief Judges' Conference); Judge Robert K. Kilander, Status Member (Vice-Chairperson of Chief Judges' Conference).

**Legislative Committee of the Illinois Supreme Court**...Justice Alan J. Greiman, Chair.

**Planning and Oversight Committee for a Judicial Performance Evaluation Program**...Judge Bill Taylor, Chair; Justice Rita B. Garman, liaison officer.

**Special Supreme Court Committee on Capital Cases**...Judge Michael P. Toomin, Chair; Judge Thomas E. Callum, Vice-Chair; Professor Lorraine A. Schmall, Professor-Reporter; Justice Thomas R. Fitzgerald, liaison officer.

**Special Supreme Court Committee on Child Custody Issues**...Justice Alan J. Greiman, Chair; Justice Thomas R. Fitzgerald and Justice Rita B. Garman, liaison officers.

**Special Supreme Court Committee on Pro Bono Legal Service**...Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, liaison officer.

**Special Supreme Court Committee on Professionalism**...David F. Rolewick, Esq., Chair; Professor Bruce A. Boyer, Professor-Reporter; Justice Robert R. Thomas, liaison officer.

**Supreme Court Committee on Judicial Conduct**...Judge Ronald D. Spears, Chair.

**Supreme Court Rules Committee**... Martin J. Healy, Jr., Esq., Chair; Hugh C. Griffin, Esq., Vice-Chair; Professor Keith H. Beyler, Esq., Reporter; Professor Jo Desha Lucas, Esq., Emeritus; Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, liaison officer.

**Special Supreme Court Committee to Study Courtroom Security**...Judge Robert K. Kilander, Chair.

**Special Supreme Court Committee to Study Supreme Court Rule 23**...Justice Thomas R. Appleton and J. Timothy Eaton, Esq., Co-chairs.

**Minimum Continuing Legal Education Board**...Jack L. Brooks, Chair.
**JUDICIAL CONFERENCE**

During the 2005 Conference Year, the Committee monitored both Court-Annexed Mandatory Arbitration Programs and Court-Sponsored Major Civil Case Mediation Programs. The Committee considered several rule amendments and forwarded them to the Supreme Court Rules Committee during the Conference Year 2005. One rule consideration included Supreme Court Rule 87(e), Appointment, Qualification and Compensation of Arbitrators. By amending paragraph (e), this proposed change would premit arbitrators to be paid an additional hearing fee for those matters which extend beyond the two hour hearing limit, pursuant to prior motion and at the discretion of the presiding arbitration judge. The Committee also considered Supreme Court Rule 91 (a), Absence of a Party at Hearing. By amending paragraph (a), this proposed change would require participants in arbitration cases to be present at the arbitration hearing. In the area of mediation, the Committee monitored existing Court-approved mediation programs, observed the inception of new mediation programs and continued to track statistical information to determine program efficacy.

The Committee on Discovery Procedures

Judge Frederick J. Kapala
Appellate Court
2nd District
Chair

The Study Committee on Complex Litigation studies and makes recommendations for procedures to reduce the cost and delay attendant to lengthy civil and criminal trials and continuously updates the *Illinois Manual for Complex Litigation* (Civil and Criminal) for distribution to Illinois judges. During the past Illinois Judicial Conference year, the Committee met to discuss caselaw and other legal developments in order to keep the *Illinois Manual for Complex Civil Litigation* and the *Illinois Manual for Complex Criminal Litigation* current. The Committee determined that further updates were necessary for both the civil and criminal manuals. The Committee drafted caselaw updates for the civil manual and criminal manual for decisions issued during Conference Year 2004-2005. Additionally, the Committee integrated all previous caselaw updates and supplement "pocket-parts" from 1998 through 2004 into the main text of the Manuals. The Committee also cite-checked the entire text of the Manuals. The Manuals are available in hard copy and on CD-ROM, which affords users the convenience of downloading and hyperlink and search capabilities.

**Study Committee on Juvenile Justice**

Judge C. Stanley Austin
18th Circuit
Chair

During the 2005 Conference Year, the Committee completed its preparation of an update to Volume I of the *Illinois Juvenile Law Benchbook*, which addresses juvenile court proceedings involving allegations of delinquency, minors requiring authoritative intervention, and addicted minors. The Committee also continued its review of various initiatives directly impacting juvenile court practice and policy. Specifically, the Committee compiled information on innovative programs including Redeploy Illinois and the concept of juvenile drug courts. Additionally, the Committee discussed the best practices recommended in the *Juvenile Delinquency Guidelines*, published by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Finally, the Committee monitored legislation, case law and executive initiatives, including the progress and results of the federal Child and Family Services Review process and the state Program Improvement Plan, which are aimed at improving court performance in the processing of abuse, neglect, and dependency cases.

**Committee on Discovery Procedures**

Judge Lance R. Peterson
13th Circuit
Chair

During the 2005 Conference Year, the Committee considered several amendments to Supreme Court Rules 202, 204, 208, 213, and 216. The Committee considered and rejected a proposal by the Honorable William D. Maddux to amend Supreme Court Rule 202 to eliminate the distinction between discovery and evidence depositions. The Committee decided that the use of discovery and evidence depositions should be maintained. The Committee also considered the Chicago Bar Association's proposal to amend Supreme Court Rule 204(b) with respect to compelling the appearance of a deponent when the action is pending in another state. The Committee sought and awaits clarification from the Chicago Bar Association concerning the problem meant to be remedied by the proposal. The Committee, however, voted in favor of the Chicago Bar Association's proposal to amend Supreme Court Rule 213(g) to preclude testimony disclosed in an evidence deposition from acting as a disclosure under Rule 213. The Committee rejected the Illinois State Bar Association's proposal to amend Supreme Court Rule 213(d) to provide that the trial court may award to any party in whose favor judgment is entered, the reasonable cost of any appearance fee charged by any non-retained physician witness who testified at trial or at an evidence deposition or at a videotaped evidence deposition that was used at trial. The Committee initiated but did not conclude its discussion on possible ways to eliminate abuses arising from the strict requirements for responding to a Rule 216 Request to Admit. Finally, the Committee began discussion on creating a rule to require mandatory disclosure of relevant documents to address the increasing problem of receiving relevant information before trial.

**Study Committee on Complex Litigation**

Judge Mary Ellen Coghan
Circuit Court of Cook County, Chair

The Study Committee on Complex Litigation studies and makes recommendations for procedures to reduce the cost and delay attendant to lengthy civil and criminal trials and continuously updates the *Illinois Manual for Complex Litigation* (Civil and Criminal) for distribution to Illinois judges. During the past Illinois Judicial Conference year, the Committee met to discuss caselaw and other legal developments in order to keep the *Illinois Manual for Complex Civil Litigation* and the *Illinois Manual for Complex Criminal Litigation* current. The Committee determined that further updates were necessary for both the civil and criminal manuals. The Committee drafted caselaw updates for the civil manual and criminal manual for decisions issued during Conference Year 2004-2005. Additionally, the Committee integrated all previous caselaw updates and supplement "pocket-parts" from 1998 through 2004 into the main text of the Manuals. The Committee also cite-checked the entire text of the Manuals. The Manuals are available in hard copy and on CD-ROM, which affords users the convenience of downloading and hyperlink and search capabilities.

**The Judicial Conference of Illinois**, consisting of eighty-two judges, is responsible for suggesting improvements in the administration of justice in Illinois. The Executive Committee, composed of the chief justice and fourteen members of the Judicial Conference, reviews recommendations of the various committees and makes recommendations to the supreme court, resolves questions of committee jurisdiction, acts on behalf of the Judicial Conference between annual meetings, and performs other duties delegated by the supreme court. The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts serves as Secretary of the Conference.
Committee Activities

The Committee on Education is charged by the Supreme Court with developing and providing ongoing judicial education for Illinois judges. The Committee does so within the framework of the Court's Comprehensive Judicial Education Plan, which recognizes that judicial education is a primary means of advancing judicial competency. In June 2005, the Committee oversaw the presentation of the 2005 Advanced Judicial Academy at the University of Illinois College of Law. The Academy, which examined the changing public expectations of the Courts in an era of technological, social and political change, featured nationally and internationally prominent speakers on the topic of judicial independence and public confidence in the courts. In addition to the Academy, the Committee conducted a full schedule of seminars during the 2004-2005 Judicial Conference year, presented a New Judge Seminar and conducted a Faculty Development Workshop for judges teaching Judicial Conference Programs. The seminar series included six regional (2-day) seminars and five mini (1-day) seminars. Faculty for all programs were assisted by staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. In addition to the annual seminar series, the Committee significantly revised the annual New Judge Seminar curriculum, with the approval of the Court, to incorporate both substantive law sessions as well as "workshops" and "skill-building" techniques to ensure that new judges can successfully develop the specialized skills and knowledge necessary for their careers on the bench. Lastly, the Committee oversaw the Resource Lending Library for Illinois judges, in collaboration with the Administrative Office. The Resource Lending Library sponsored by the Committee and operated by the Administrative Office continued to provide judicial education resources to Illinois judges. Loan material available through the library includes videotapes, audiotapes and publications. Permanent use items include seminar reading materials, bench books, manuals, and other materials. The total number of loan and permanent use items distributed to judges in Fiscal Year 2005 was 732. As in prior years, seminar reading materials and informational videotapes were the most requested items.

During the 2005 Conference year, the Committee reviewed numerous security briefs and articles which identified viruses and worms that affect various computer systems. The Committee continues to review these types of threats and will distribute to the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges general information regarding security threats. The Committee drafted, distributed and analyzed the results of a survey regarding the use of the case management systems in Illinois circuit courts, how case management systems are managed, who accesses this information, and how circuit court technologies are funded. Additionally, the Committee discussed the development of statewide standards for information exchange and the use of video conferencing to reduce the time and cost associated with expert witnesses and prisoner transports. Currently, some arraignments in Illinois are held via video arraignment or closed-circuit systems. Expansion of such concepts may prove beneficial to the circuit courts.

During 2005, the Committee on Criminal Law and Probation Administration worked on a number of significant issues of a continuing nature, including: a comprehensive review of probation programs centering upon Evidence-Based Practices; examination of the implementation and practices of specialty courts, ie "Drug Courts and Mental Health Courts"; examination of new issues affecting criminal law and procedure; and review of proposals to amend Supreme Court Rules governing criminal cases. Given the growing interest and implementation of problem solving/specialty courts, the Committee conducted research and examined a number of articles on the issue. A guideline on "Issues and Factors to Consider When Planning and Implementing Specialty Courts" was developed to assist jurisdictions who have existing specialty courts or are considering implementing one. The Committee has continued to discuss and monitor the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the case of Crawford v. Washington and those cases and articles which discussed the way courts will review Confrontation Clause issues.

Committee on Education
Judge Hollis L. Webster
18th Circuit
Chair

Committee on Automation and Technology
Judge Robert E. Byrne
Appellate Court
2nd District
Chair

Committee on Criminal Law and Probation Administration
Judge Michael P. Toomin
Circuit Court of Cook County, Chair

Members of the Executive Committee of the Illinois Judicial Conference During 2005

Chief Justice Mary Ann G. McMorrow, Chair
Cynthia Y. Cobbs, Secretary

Robert P. Bastone, Associate Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County
Joseph F. Beatty, Circuit Judge, 14th Circuit
Robert L. Carter, Chief Circuit Judge, 13th Circuit
James K. Donovan, Appellate Judge, 5th District
Timothy C. Evans, Chief Circuit Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County
Susan Fox Gillis, Associate Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County
Robert K. Kilander, Chief Circuit Judge, 18th Circuit
John C. Knight, Circuit Judge, 3rd Circuit
Rita M. Novak, Associate Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County
Stuart A. Nudelman, Circuit Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County
Stephen H. Peters, Circuit Judge, 6th Circuit
M. Carol Pope, Circuit Judge, 8th Circuit
Ellis E. Reid, Appellate Judge, 1st District
Robert B. Spence, Circuit Judge, 16th Circuit
Each district manages its own operations, subject to the overall authority of the supreme court. In the first district (Cook County), an executive committee exercises general administrative authority. This committee elects a chairperson and vice-chairperson for one year. In the other districts, judges select one of their members to serve as presiding judge for one year.

**Appellate Court Administrative Matters**

**Annual Meeting.** The appellate court held its annual meeting in November with Justice Margaret Stanton McBride presiding as honorary chair. Forty-four appellate judges attended the meeting. Pursuant to amended section 15(e) article VI of the Illinois Constitution, the Illinois Appellate Court selects two appellate judges to serve as regular members and three appellate judges to serve as alternate members on the Illinois Courts Commission. Judges Anne M. Burke and Robert E. Byrne served as regular members. Judges Daniel L. Schmidt, Susan E. Myerscough and Stephen F. McGlynn were elected as alternate members. Justice Susan F. Hutchinson was selected to be the next honorary chair of the Illinois Appellate Court Annual Meeting.

**Administrative Committee.** The Appellate Court Administrative Committee studies and recommends improvements to the Illinois Appellate Court. Among other things, the Committee met to plan the 2005 Appellate Court Seminar which is sponsored annually by the Committee. The Seminar was held in November 2005 and was attended by 49 Illinois appellate judges. In addition to attending the Seminar curriculum, the appellate judges met to discuss various appellate court issues during the past year, including the Appellate Settlement Conference Program initiated as a pilot program in the First District Appellate Court in January 2005. The judges also elected members and alternates to the Illinois Court's Commission. The Hon. Tom M. Lytton serves as Chair to the Committee. The Hon. Rita B. Garman is the Supreme Court liaison officer.

*Totals include Industrial Commission Division Cases*
FIRST DISTRICT

160 North LaSalle St.
Chicago, IL (60601)
(312) 793-5600
Steven M. Ravid, Clerk
Marilyn T. Kujawa, Research Director

Circuit: Circuit Court of Cook County

District Population: 5,327,777 (2004 est.)

APPELLATE JUDGES

DIVISION I
Robert Cahill, Presiding Judge
Anne M. Burke
Joseph Gordon
Margaret S. McBride

DIVISION II
Rodolfo García*, Presiding Judge
Shelvin Louise Marie Hall
Leslie E. South
Warren D. Wolfson*

DIVISION III
Thomas E. Hoffman++, Presiding Judge
David A. Erickson*
Themis Karnezis*
Mary Jane Theis

DIVISION IV
Patrick J. Quinn, Presiding Judge
Calvin C. Campbell
Alan J. Greiman*+
Michael J. Murphy*

DIVISION V
Michael J. Gallagher, Presiding Judge
P. Scott Neville, Jr.*
Sheila M. O'Brien
Margaret O'Mara Frossard*

DIVISION VI
Jill K. McNulty, Presiding Judge
Denise O'Malley
James G. Fitzgerald Smith
John P. Tully
+ chair ++ vice-chair:
Executive Committee;
*circuit judge assigned to appellate court

Criminal Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>2,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>2,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>1,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Caseload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>2,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>2,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>2,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Pending Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>4,691</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>5,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases
SECOND DISTRICT

Circuits (Counties):
15th (Carroll, Jo Daviess, Lee, Ogle & Stephenson)
16th (DeKalb, Kane & Kendall)
17th (Boone & Winnebago)
18th (DuPage)
19th (Lake & McHenry)

District Population:
3,070,321 (2004 est.)

APPELLATE JUDGES
Jack O’Malley, Presiding Judge
John J. Bowman  R. Peter Grometer*
Robert E. Byrne*  Susan F. Hutchinson
Thomas E. Callum  Frederick J. Kapala*
Barbara Gilleran Johnson  Robert D. McLaren

*Circuit judge assigned to appellate court

Appellate Court Building
55 Symphony Way
Elgin, IL (60120)
(847) 695-3750

Robert J. Mangan, Clerk
Jeffrey H. Kaplan, Research Director

APPENDIX

Second District Courthouse - Elgin
Completed in 1966 (C. Jane Bradley photo)

Criminal Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Pending Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases

District Population:
3,070,321 (2004 est.)

Second District Courthouse - Elgin
Completed in 1966 (C. Jane Bradley photo)
Circuits (Counties):
9th (Fulton, Hancock, Henderson, Knox, McDonough & Warren)
10th (Marshall, Peoria, Putnam, Stark & Tazewell)
12th (Will)
13th (Bureau, Grundy & LaSalle)
14th (Henry, Mercer, Rock Island & Whiteside)
21st (Kankakee & Iroquois)

District Population
1,721,750 (2004 est.)

Third District Courthouse - Ottawa
Completed in 1860 (Gist Fleshman photo)

Criminal Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Caseload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third District
1004 Columbus Street
Ottawa, IL (61350)
(815) 434-5050

Gist Fleshman, Clerk
Gerald Ursini, Research Director

APPELLATE JUDGES
Kent Slater, Presiding Judge
Tobias Barry
William E. Holdridge
Tom Lytton
Mary W. McDade
Mary K. O’Brien
Daniel Schmidt
Fourth District

Circuits (Counties):
5th (Clark, Coles, Cumberland, Edgar & Vermilion)
6th (Champaign, DeWitt, Douglas, Macon, Moultrie & Piatt)
7th (Greene, Jersey, Macoupin, Morgan, Sangamon & Scott)
8th (Adams, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Mason, Menard, Pike & Schuyler)
11th (Ford, Livingston, Logan, McLean & Woodford)

District Population
1,288,261 (2004 est.)

APPPELLATE JUDGES
John W. Turner, Presiding Judge
Thomas R. Appleton* John T. McCullough
Robert W. Cook Sue E. Myerscough
James A. Knecht Robert J. Steigmann

* circuit judge assigned to the appellate court

Criminal Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Pending Caseload

All Case Categories (including Industrial Commission Division Cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civil Caseload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases
Circuits (Counties):
1st (Alexander, Jackson, Johnson, Massac, Pope, Pulaski, Saline, Union & Williamson)
2nd (Crawford, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jefferson, Lawrence, Richland, Wabash, Wayne & White)
3rd (Bond & Madison)
4th (Christian, Clay, Clinton, Effingham, Fayette, Jasper, Marion, Montgomery & Shelby)
20th (Monroe, Perry, Randolph, St. Clair & Washington)

District Population
1,290,401 (2004 est.)
The court of "original jurisdiction" is the circuit court. There are twenty-two circuits in the state, three of which are single county circuits (Cook, Will, and DuPage). The remaining nineteen circuits contain two to twelve counties per circuit.

The circuit court can decide, with few exceptions, any kind of case. The exceptions are redistricting of the general assembly and the ability of the governor to serve or resume office. The circuit court also shares jurisdiction with the supreme court to hear cases relating to revenue, mandamus, prohibition, and habeas corpus. However, if the supreme court chooses to exercise its jurisdiction over these cases, the circuit court may not decide them. Finally, the circuit court also reviews administrative orders from certain state agencies.

There are two kinds of judges in the circuit court: circuit judges and associate judges. Circuit judges are elected for six years, may be retained by voters for additional six year terms, and can hear any kind of case. Circuit judges are elected on a circuit-wide basis or from the county where they reside. In Cook County, circuit judges are elected from the entire county or as resident judges from each of the fifteen subcircuits within the county. Associate judges are appointed by circuit judges, under supreme court rules, for four-year terms. An associate judge can hear any case, except criminal cases punishable by a prison term of one year or more, unless the associate judge has received approval from the supreme court to hear other criminal cases.

Circuit judges in a circuit elect one of their members to serve as chief circuit court judge. Cases may be assigned to general or specialized divisions by the chief judge who has general administrative authority in the circuit, subject to the overall administrative authority of the supreme court.

CIRCUIT COURT ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS


Conference Committees: The committees of the Conference include the Article V Committee, Committee on Forms, Committee to Revise the Chief Circuit Judges' Manual, Domestic Relations Committee, Juvenile Committee, Long-Range Planning Committee, Orientation Committee, Prison Committee, Probation Committee, Speciality Courts Committee and several ad hoc committees convened to study specific, short-term subject matter.

Some of the Committee activities from 2005 included promulgation of a revised Uniform Citation and Complaint Packet coordinated by the Conference's Article V Committee. The Long Range Planning Committee held a leadership program for chief judges. The Prison Committee worked with the Department of Corrections to develop a revised version of the Adult Sentencing Order Form. The Juvenile Justice Committee undertook a new charge to examine mechanisms for counties to receive funding under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act. The Conference created the Speciality Courts Committee to study how specialized courts function, who these courts serve and funding options for specialty courts and related programs.

During 2005, the Article V Committee, Domestic Relations Committee, Committee on Forms, Juvenile Committee, Prison Committee, Speciality Courts Committee and Probation Committee continued to monitor and analyze new legislation and Supreme Court Rules, and provide necessary forms, policy, orders, etc. in accordance with the new provisions.
CIVIL: lawsuits for monetary damages; arbitration; small claims (amounts up to $5,000)*; chancery (e.g., title to real property and injunctions); miscellaneous remedy (e.g., review of decisions of administrative bodies, habeas corpus matters, and demolition); probate (e.g., estates of deceased persons and guardianships); order of protection and civil no contact order (petition for order of protection and civil no contact order filed separately from an existing case); dissolution (e.g., divorce, separate maintenance, and annulment); mental health (e.g., commitment and discharge from mental facilities); eminent domain (e.g., compensation when property is taken for public use); municipal corporation and tax (e.g., matters pertaining to the organization of municipalities and collection of taxes at the local level); adoptions; family (e.g., proceedings to establish parenthood and actions relating to child support). CRIMINAL: felony (e.g., a criminal case in which the offense carries a penalty of at least one year in prison) and misdemeanor. OTHER: ordinance, conservation, traffic (excluding parking tickets), and DUI. JUVENILE: abuse and neglect, delinquent, and other (e.g., a minor who requires authoritative intervention).

* Small Claim amount increased to $10,000 effective January 1, 2006 (Amended Supreme Court Rule 281).
Circuit Population
5,327,777 (2004 est.)

CIRCUIT JUDGES:
Martin S. Agran
Nancy J. Arnold
David B. Atkins
Robert Balanoff
Patricia Banks
Ronald F. Bartkowicz
Carole K. Bellows
Gerald C. Bender
Richard B. Berland
Andrew Berman
Jeanne Cleveland Bernstein
Robert W. Bertucci
Paul P. Biebel, Jr.
Janice L. Bierman
Richard J. Billik Jr.
Patricia Martin Bishop
Margaret Ann Brennan
Eileen M. Brewer
Cynthia Brim
Philip L. Bronstein
Rodney Hughes Brooks
Janet Adams Brossnahan
Mary M. Brossnahan
James R. Brown
Henry A. Budzinski
Kathleen Marie Burke
Charles P. Burns
Edward R. Burr
Anthony L. Burrell
Bernetta D. Bush
Diane Gordon Cannon
Thomas F. Carmody, Jr.
Robert Lopez Cepero
Thomas R. Chiola
Evelyn B. Clay
Mary Ellen Coghan
Matthew E. Coghlan
Melvin J. Cole
Sharon Johnson Coleman
Claudia G. Conlon
Maureen E. Connors
Clayton J. Crane
Lisa R. Curcio
Paula M. Daleo
Daniel P. Darcy
Thomas Michael Davy
David Delgado
Donald M. Devlin
Barbara J. Disko
Frank J. Dolan
Christopher J. Donnelly
David R. Donnersberger
John T. Doody, Jr.
Deborah M. Dooding
Jennifer Duncan-Brice
Laurence J. Dunford
Loretta Eadie-Daniels
James D. Egan
Lynn M. Egan

Richard J. Elrod
James R. Epstein
Candace J. Fabri
Thomas P. Fecarotta, Jr.
Roger G. Fein
Peter A. Felice
Raymond A. Figueroa
Denise K. Filan
Kathy M. Flanagan
James P. Flannery, Jr.
John J. Fleming
Peter A. Flynn
Nicholas R. Ford
Raymond Funderburk
Sheldon Gardner
Vincent M. Gaughan
James J. Gavin
Bettina Gembala
Francis W. Glowacki
Allen S. Goldberg
James F. Henry
Pamela E. Hill Veal
Michael J. Hogan
Thomas L. Hogan
Vanessa A. Hopkins
Garratt E. Howard
Michael J. Howlett, Jr.
Nathanial R. Howse, Jr.
Arnette R. Hubbard
Cheyrl D. Ingram
Anthony A. Josco
Moshe Jacobius
Raymond L. Jagielski
Arthur L. Janura, Jr.
Dorothy F. Jones
Rickey Jones
Daniel E. Jordan
Edward R. Jordan
Michelle D. Jordan
Paul A. Karkula
Joseph G. Kazmierski, Jr.
Jeffrey Lawrence
Marjorie C. Laws
Casandra Lewis
Marcella C. Lipinski
Thomas J. Lipscomb
Daniel M. Locallo
Gay-Lloyd Lott
Noreen V. Love
Michele F. Lowrance
Stuart F. Lubin
Marvin P. Luckman
Daniel Joseph Lynch
William D. Maddux
William O. Maki
Marcia Maras
LeRoy K. Martin, Jr.
Mary Anne Mason
Veronica B. Mathein
Cook Pearce McCarthy
James P. McCarthy
Barbara A. McDonald
Susan J. McDunn
Patrick E. McGann
Sheila McGinnis
Dennis M. McGuire
Kathleen M. McGury
Paddy H. McNamara
Clare E. McWilliams
Barbara M. Meyer
Mary L. Mikva
Judy I. Mitchell-Davis
Anthony S. Montelione
Colleen McSweeney Moore
John J. Moran Jr.
Dennis J. Morrissey
John E. Morrissey
Mary A. Mulhem
Lisa Ruble Murphy
Joyce Marie Murphy
Gorman
Patrick T. Murphy
Timothy P. Murphy
James C. Murray, Jr.
Marya T. Negu
Lewis Nixon
Julia M. Nowicki
Stuart A. Nudelman
Donald J. O'Brien, Jr.
Edward P. O'Brien
Joan M. O'Brien
William T. O'Brien
Lawrence O'Gara
James P. O'Malley
William P. O'Malley
William D. O'Neal
Sandra R. Otaka
Stuart E. Palmer
Thomas P. Panichi
Kathleen M. Pantle
Sebastian T. Patti
Sheryl A. Pethers
William Michael Phelan
Donna Phelps Felton
Edward N. Pietrucha
Edmund Ponce de Leon
Lee Preston
Jesse Prince
Aurelia Pucinski
Robert J. Quinn
Thomas P. Quinn
Ralph Reyna
**OF COOK COUNTY District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Total Caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel J. Betar III</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,654,954</td>
<td>1,820,929</td>
<td>1,822,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam D. Bourgeois, Jr.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>308,815</td>
<td>1,192,378</td>
<td>1,190,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston L. Bowie Jr.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>419,763</td>
<td>1,024,433</td>
<td>1,024,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stewart Boyd</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>393,164</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
<td>1,871,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Y. Brodley</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>390,164</td>
<td>1,834,637</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Brown</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>390,164</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
<td>1,871,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary L. Brownfield</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>390,164</td>
<td>1,834,637</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth M. Budzinski</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>390,164</td>
<td>1,834,637</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis J. Burke</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>390,164</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
<td>1,871,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank B. Castiglia</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>390,164</td>
<td>1,834,637</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl D. Cesario</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>390,164</td>
<td>1,854,637</td>
<td>1,871,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Caseload**

*Large number includes traffic cases with dispositions of supervision that were previously counted as pending.*

**Pending Caseloads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>396,180</td>
<td>380,815</td>
<td>419,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23,039</td>
<td>24,386</td>
<td>23,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>14,168</td>
<td>17,165</td>
<td>22,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>23,506</td>
<td>17,165</td>
<td>22,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>39,826</td>
<td>15,188</td>
<td>22,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Associate Judges:**

- James L. Rhodes
- Barbara A. Riley
- Daniel A. Riley
- James G. Riley
- Ronald C. Riley
- Thomas D. Roti
- Maureen Durkin Roy
- James Ryan
- James T. Ryan
- Leida J. Gonzalez Santiago
- Drella C. Savage
- James M. Schreier
- Colleen F. Sheehan
- Kevin M. Sheehan
- Nancy Drew Sheehan
- Lon W. Shultz
- Richard A. Siebel
- Henry R. Simmons, Jr.
- Henry M. Singer
- David A. Skryd
- Maura Slattery Boyle
- Irwin J. Sojganiuck
- Cheryl A. Starks
- John O. Steele
- David P. Sterba
- Victoria A. Stewart
- Paul Stralka
- Jane Louise Stuart
- Daniel J. Sullivan
- Laura M. Sullivan
- Sharon M. Sullivan
- Fred G. Suria, Jr.
- Donald J. Suriano
- Shelley Suter-Dermer
- Rhoda D. Sweeney
- William Taylor
- Lawrence Terrell
- Mary Maxwell Thomas
- Karen Thompson Tobin
- Amanda S. Toney
- Michael P. Toomin
- Sandra Tristano
- Edna M. Turkington
- John D. Turner, Jr.
- Valerie E. Turner
- Joseph J. Urso
- James Michael Varga
- Raul Vega
- Kenneth J. Wadas
- Richard F. Walsh
- John A. Ward
- Edward Washington, II
- Daniel S. Weber
- Alexander P. White
- Walter Williams
- Camille E. Willis
- Charles R. Winkler
- Gregory J. Wojkowski
- E. Kenneth Wright, Jr.
- Anthony L. Young
- Frank G. Zelezinski
- Susan F. Zwick

**Associate Judges:**

- Jorge L. Alonso
- Edward A. Antonietti
- Larry Axelrod
- Reginald H. Baker
- Mark J. Ballard
- Consuelo E. Bedoya-Witt
- Helaine L. Berger
- Timothy J. Chambers
- Joseph M. Claps
- Joseph A. Clifford
- Robert J. Clifford
- Gloria G. Coco
- Susan M. Coleman
- Thomas J. Condon
- Abishi C. Cunningham
- Noreen M. Daly
- Ronald S. Davis
- Lawrence E. Flood
- Lawrence P. Fox
- Thomas V. Gainer, Jr.
- Sheldon C. Garber
- Daniel T. Gillespie
- Susan Fox Gillis
- Gregory R. Ginex
- Renee Goldfarb
- Maxwell Griffin, Jr.
- Colleen A. Hyland
- John J. Hynes
- Marianne Jackson
- Moira Susan Johnson
- Jordan Kaplan
- James N. Karahalios
- Pamela G. Karahalios
- Nancy J. Katz
- Richard A. Kavitt
- Lynne Kawamoto
- Carol A. Kipperman
- Randye A. Kogan
- Alfred L. Levinson
- Neil J. Linehan
- James B. Linn
- Mark J. Lopez
- Patrick F. Lustig
- Thadeus S. Machnik
- Jeffrey A. Malak
- John J. Mannion
- Martin E. McDonough
- Brigid Mary McGrath
- Clifford L. Meacham
- Patricia Mendoza
- Mary R. Minella
- Daniel R. Miranda
- James V. Murphy II
- Michael J. Murray
- Raymond Myles
- Rita M. Novak
- Gregory M. O’Brien
- Thomas J. O’Hara
- James M. Ophill
- Marcia B. Orr
- Donald D. Panarese, Jr.
- Luciano Panichi
- Alfred J. Paul
- Arthur C. Perivoldis
- William G. Pileggi
- Dennis J. Porter
- Carolyn G. Quinn
- Jesse G. Reyes
- Wayne D. Rhine
- Hyman Riehman
- Elizabeth Loredo Rivera
- Mary K. Rochford
- James J. Ryan
- Stanley J. Sachs
- Marcus R. Salone
- Joseph M. Sconza
- John J. Scitollo
- Robert E. Senecaille, Jr.
- Terrence V. Sharkey
- Karen G. Shields
- Darryl B. Simko
- Michele M. Simmons
- Douglas J. Simpson
- Terence B. Smith
- James F. Stack
- Eddie A. Stephens
- Richard A. Stevens
- Michael W. Stuttle
- Thomas R. Sumner
- Sanjay T. Tailor
- Sybil C. Thomas
- Elmer J. Tolmaire III
- John D. Tuelotol
- Thomas M. Tucker
- Renu M. Van Tine
- John A. Wasilewski
- Daniel G. Welser
- Gerald T. Winieck
- Lori M. Wolfson
- Leon Wool
- Willie B. Wright
- James A. Zafiratos
FIRST CIRCUIT
(Fifth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Alexander (Cairo)
Jackson (Murphysboro)
Johnson (Vienna)
Massac (Metropolis)
Pope (Golconda)
Pulaski (Mound City)
Saline (Harrisburg)
Union (Jonesboro)
Williamson (Marion)

Circuit Judges:
Brad K. Bleyer, Mark M. Boie, Mark H. Clarke, Ronald R. Eckiss, Terry J. Foster, W. Charles Grace, Donald Lowery, Philip G. Palmer, Sr., William G. Schwartz, Bruce D. Stewart, William J. Thurston, James R. Williamson

Associate Judges:
Rodney A. Clutts, Kimberly L. Dahlen, Everett D. Kimmel, Brocton D. Lockwood, Christy W. Solverson, John A. Speroni, William H. Wilson

Michael J. Henshaw
Chief Judge
Williamson County Courthouse
200 Jefferson Street
Marion, IL 62959

Circuit Population: 214,570
(2004 est.)

SECOND CIRCUIT
(Fifth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Crawford (Robinson)
Edwards (Albion)
Franklin (Benton)
Gallatin (Shawnetown)
Hamilton (McLeansboro)
Hardin (Elizabethtown)
Jefferson (Mount Vernon)
Lawrence (Lawrenceville)
Richland (Olney)
Wabash (Mount Carmel)
Wayne (Fairfield)
White (Carmi)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:
Kathleen M. Alling, Leo T. Desmond, Kimbara Graham Harrell, Robert W. Lewis, Mark Lane Shaner

George W. Timberlake
Chief Judge
Jefferson County Courthouse
P.O. Box 1197
Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

Circuit Population: 202,574
(2004 est.)

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File Disposed

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIRD CIRCUIT
(Fifth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Bond (Greenville)
Madison (Edwardsville)

Edward C. Ferguson
Chief Judge
Madison County Courthouse
155 North Main, #405
Edwardsville, IL 62025

Circuit Population
282,330
(2004 est.)

Circuit Judges:
Nicholas G. Byron, Ann Callis, John Knight, A. Andreas Matoesian, George J. Moran, Jr., Charles V. Romani, Jr., Daniel J. Stack, Don Weber

Associate Judges:

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>101,035</td>
<td>163,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>97,250</td>
<td>94,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>91,488</td>
<td>95,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>97,041</td>
<td>97,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>97,992</td>
<td>97,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,449</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOURTH CIRCUIT  
(Fifth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Christian (Taylorville)
Clay (Louisville)
Clinton (Carlyle)
Effingham (Effingham)
Fayette (Vandalia)
Jasper (Newton)
Marion (Salem)
Montgomery (Hillsboro)
Shelby (Shelbyville)

Circuit Judges:
John P. Coady, Patrick J. Hitpas, Michael P. Kiley, Kelly D. Long, Kathleen P. Moran, Kevin S. Parker, David L. Sauer, Steven P. Seymour, Ronald D. Spears, Wm. Robin Todd, Sherri L.E. Tungate

Associate Judges:
William J. Becker, James J. Eder, James R. Harvey, Mark M. Joy, John W. McGuire, Dennis Middendorff, David W. Slater

S. Gene Schwarm  
Chief Judge
Montgomery County Courthouse
120 N. Main St., #231
Hillsboro, IL 62049

Circuit Population:
245,211
(2004 est.)

FIFTH CIRCUIT  
(Fourth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Clark (Marshall)
Coles (Charleston)
Cumberland (Toledo)
Edgar (Paris)
Vermilion (Danville)

James R. Glenn  
Chief Judge
Edgar County Courthouse
Paris, IL 61944

Circuit Population:
181,562
(2004 est.)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>66,111</td>
<td>67,484</td>
<td>65,411</td>
<td>65,441</td>
<td>67,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>63,894</td>
<td>66,628</td>
<td>67,189</td>
<td>59,376</td>
<td>61,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>44,472</td>
<td>45,956</td>
<td>46,742</td>
<td>47,375</td>
<td>49,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>48,098</td>
<td>49,761</td>
<td>51,737</td>
<td>51,766</td>
<td>54,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>8,804</td>
<td>8,588</td>
<td>8,339</td>
<td>8,072</td>
<td>8,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SIXTH CIRCUIT**
(Fourth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Champaign (Urbana)
DeWitt (Clinton)
Douglas (Tuscola)
Macon (Decatur)
Moultrie (Sullivan)
Piatt (Monticello)

John P. Shonkwiler  
Chief Judge  
Piatt County Courthouse  
Room 306  
Monticello, IL 61856

Circuit Population 362,774  
(2004 est.)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:

---

**SEVENTH CIRCUIT**
(Fourth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Greene (Carrollton)
Jersey (Jerseyville)
Macoupin (Carlinville)
Morgan (Jacksonville)
Sangamon (Springfield)
Scott (Winchester)

Robert J. Eggers  
Chief Judge  
Sangamon County Complex  
Springfield, IL 62701

Circuit Population 319,444  
(2004 est.)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:
Diane L. Brunton, Charles J. Gramlich, Robert T. Hall, Roger W. Holmes, Theodis P. Lewis, John A. Mehlick, Steven H. Nardulli, Tim P. Olson, George H. Ray, Stuart H. Shiffman

---

**Total Caseload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pending Caseloads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EIGHTH CIRCUIT
(Fourth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Adams (Quincy)
Brown (Mount Sterling)
Calhoun (Hardin)
Cass (Virginia)
Mason (Havana)
Menard (Petersburg)
Pike (Pittsfield)
Schuyler (Rushville)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:
Scott J. Butler, Diane M. Lagoski, Thomas J. Ortbl, Chet W. Vahle, John C. Wooleyhan

Thomas L. Brownfield
Chief Judge
Adams County Courthouse
521 Vermont St.
Quincy, IL 62301

Circuit Population:
145,459
(2004 est.)

NINTH CIRCUIT
(Third Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Fulton (Lewistown)
Hancock (Carthage)
Henderson (Oquawka)
Knox (Galesburg)
McDonough (Macomb)
Warren (Monmouth)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:
Steven R. Bordner, John R. Clerklin, Richard H. Gambrell, Larry W. Heiser, Gregory K. McClintock, Patricia A. Walton

Total Caseload

Circuit Population
169,157
(2004 est.)

Pending Caseloads

Civil
Felony
Juvenile

2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
Counties (seats):
Marshall (Lacon)
Peoria (Peoria)
Putnam (Hennepin)
Stark (Toulon)
Tazewell (Pekin)

John A. Barra
Chief Judge
Peoria County Courthouse
324 Main Street, #215
Peoria, IL 61602

Circuit Population
337,004
(2004 est.)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:

TENTH CIRCUIT
(Third Appellate District)

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>106,391</td>
<td>106,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>107,437</td>
<td>102,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>96,867</td>
<td>97,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>102,670</td>
<td>102,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>97,190</td>
<td>99,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20,161</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>2,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18,703</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>3,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25,701</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>2,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>24,181</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>2,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24,746</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>2,894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3rd Judicial Circuit
Jersey County
Jerseyville
7th Judicial Circuit
(Henderson County Photo)

Henderson County
Oquawka
9th Judicial Circuit
(Henderson County Photo)
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT  
(Fourth Appellate District)  

Counties (seats):
Ford (Paxton)
Livingston (Pontiac)
Logan (Lincoln)
McLean (Bloomington)
Woodford (Eureka)

Circuit Judges:
Donald D. Bernardi, David L. Coogan, Ronald C. Dozier,
Scott D. Drazewski, Harold J. Frobish, John B. Huschen,
Stephen R. Pacey, G. Michael Prall, Charles G. Reynard,
James E. Souk

Associate Judges:
Jennifer Hartmann Bauknecht, Donald A. Behle, David W.
Butler, Thomas G. Ebel, Charles M. Feeney III, Kevin P.
Fitzgerald, Rebecca Simmons Foley, Robert L. Freitag, Paul
G. Lawrence, Robert M. Travers

Elizabeth A. Robb
Chief Judge
McLean County
Law & Justice Center
104 W. Front St., #511
Bloomington, IL 61701

Circuit Population: 279,022
(2004 est.)

TWELFTH CIRCUIT  
(Third Appellate District)  

County (seat):
Will (Joliet)

Circuit Judges:
Carla J. Alessio Goode, Amy M. Bertani-Tomczak, Herman
S. Haase, Gerald R. Kinney, Rodney B. Lechwar, Susan T.
O’Leary, Daniel J. Rozak, Richard C. Schoenstedt, Richard J.
Siegel

Associate Judges:
James Jeffrey Allen, Barbara J. Badger, Robert J. Baron,
Robert P. Brumund, Edward A. Burmila, Jr., James E.
Garrison, Edwin B. Grabiec, Lawrence C. Gray, Kathleen G.
Kallan, Ludwig J. Kuhar, Jr., Robert P. Livas, Robert C. Lorz,
William G. McMenamin, Barbara N. Petrunaro, Michael J.
Powers, Marzell L. Richardson, Jr.

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>89,665</td>
<td>87,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>86,651</td>
<td>91,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>91,231</td>
<td>87,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>87,853</td>
<td>91,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>83,562</td>
<td>88,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>209,082</td>
<td>186,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>171,009</td>
<td>167,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>161,365</td>
<td>159,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>170,569</td>
<td>161,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>166,810</td>
<td>159,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,730</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7,719</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>1,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8,618</td>
<td>8,780</td>
<td>1,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>2,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Counties (seats):
Bureau (Princeton)
Grundy (Morris)
LaSalle (Ottawa)

Circuit Judges:
Marc Bernabei, Eugene P. Daugherity, James A. Lanuti, Robert C. Marsaglia, Cynthia M. Raccuglia, Howard C. Ryan, Jr.

Associate Judges:
William P. Balestri, James L. Brusatte, Daniel J. Bute, A. Scott Madson, Lance R. Peterson

Robert L. Carter
Chief Judge
LaSalle County
Courthouse
119 W. Madison, #204
Ottawa, IL 61350

Circuit Population
188,559
(2004 est.)

Total Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>55,828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>57,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>56,734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>61,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>59,854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending Caseloads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4,923</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ford County
Paxton
11th Judicial Circuit
(Ford County Photo)

Stephenson County
Freeport
15th Judicial Circuit
(Stephenson County Photo)
FOURTEENTH CIRCUIT  
(Third Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Henry (Cambridge)
Mercer (Aledo)
Rock Island (Rock Island)
Whiteside (Morrison)

Jeffrey W. O'Connor  
Chief Judge
Rock Island County Courthouse
210 15th Street, #408
Rock Island, IL 61201

Circuit Population:
275,327  
(2004 est.)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:
Michael R. Albert, John L. Bell, Thomas C. Berglund, Alan G. Blackwood, Raymond J. Conklin, John R. McClean, Jr., Dana R. McReynolds, James J. Mesich, Carol M. Pentuic, Vicki R. Wright

FIFTEENTH CIRCUIT  
(Second Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Carroll (Mount Carroll)
Jo Daviess (Galena)
Lee (Dixon)
Ogle (Oregon)
Stephenson (Freeport)

David T. Fritts  
Chief Judge
Carroll County Courthouse
301 North Main Street
Mt. Carroll, IL 61053

Circuit Population:
176,508  
(2004 est.)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:
Jacquelyn D. Ackert, Michael Paul Bald, Charles T. Beckman, David L. Jeffrey, John F. Joyce, Kathleen O. Kauffmann, Victor V. Sprengelmeyer

Total Caseload


Filed Disposed

Total Caseload


Filed Disposed

Pending Caseloads


Civil Felony Juvenile

Pending Caseloads


Civil Felony Juvenile
SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT
(Second Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
DeKalb (Sycamore)
Kane (Geneva)
Kendall (Yorkville)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT
(Second Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
Boone (Belvidere)
Winnebago (Rockford)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:
Fernando L. Engelsma, Patrick L. Heaslip, Donald J. Hennessy, John Todd Kennedy, Angus S. More, Jr., Steven M. Nash, Steven L. Nordquist, J. Edward Prochaska, Gary Pumilia, R. Craig Sahlstrom, Brian Dean Shore, John R. Truitt, Steven G. Vecchio, Ronald J. White
EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT
(Second Appellate District)

County (seat):
DuPage (Wheaton)

Circuit Judges:

Associate Judges:

Ann B. Jorgensen
Chief Judge
DuPage County Courthouse
505 N. County Farm Rd.
Wheaton, IL 60187

Circuit Population: 928,718
(2004 est.)

Circuit Population:
989,284
(2004 est.)

NINETEENTH CIRCUIT
(Second Appellate District)

County (seats):
Lake (Waukegan)
McHenry (Woodstock)

Circuit Judges:
James K. Booras, Michael T. Caldwell, Michael J. Chemiel, Fred Foreman, David M. Hall, Maureen P. McIntyre, Raymond J. McLoski, Margaret J. Mullen, Sharon L. Prather, Victoria A. Rossetti, Mary S. Schostok, Michael J. Sullivan, Henry C. Tonigan III, Jane D. Waller, Stephen E. Walter

Associate Judges:
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TWENTIETH CIRCUIT
(Fifth Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
- Monroe (Waterloo)
- Perry (Pinckneyville)
- Randolph (Chester)
- St. Clair (Belleville)
- Washington (Nashville)

Jan V. Fiss
Chief Judge
County Building
10 Public Square
Belleville, IL 62220

Circuit Population
359,436
(2003 est.)

Circuit Judges:
- John Baricevic, James W. Campanella, Lloyd A. Cueto,
- Dennis B. Doyle, Annette A. Eckert, Dennis Hatch, Robert P.
- LeChien, William C. Norton, Michael J. O'Malley, William
- A. Schuwerk, Jr., Milton S. Wharton

Associate Judges:
- Richard A. Aguirre, Brian A. Babka, Walter C. Brandon, Jr.,
- Richard Brown, Laninya Cason, Ellen A. Dauber, Andrew J.
- Gleeson, Vincent J. Lopinot, Scott Mansfield, Alexis Otis-
- Lewis, James M. Radcliffe III, Stephen R. Rice, Patrick M.
- Young

TWENTY-FIRST CIRCUIT
(Third Appellate District)

Counties (seats):
- Iroquois (Watseka)
- Kankakee (Kankakee)

Clark E. Erickson
Chief Judge
Kankakee County
Courthouse, Ste. 101
450 East Court St.
Kankakee, IL 60901

Circuit Population
134,996
(2001 est.)

Circuit Judges:
- Kathy S. Elliott, J. Gregory Householter, Michael J. Kick,
- Gordon Lee Lustfeldt, Susan Sumner Tungate, Kendall O.
- Wenzelman

Associate Judges:
- James B. Kinzer, Michael D. Kramer, William O. Schmidt, J.
- Scott Swaim

Total Caseload

Filed Disposed

Filed Disposed

Pending Caseloads

Civil Felony Juvenile

Civil Felony Juvenile
The Executive Office is comprised of the Administrative Director, the Executive Assistant to the Director, the Senior Attorney, attorneys, and administrative staff. Through the Administrative Director, the Executive Office is responsible for directing and coordinating the operations of each of the divisions of the Administrative Office and serves as a central resource for the multitude of operational issues which impact the administration of the judicial branch. As well, the Executive Office, on behalf of the Supreme Court, manages and coordinates liaison activities with executive and legislative branch officials and agencies.

The Executive Office plans and directs Administrative Office staff support for the Supreme Court Committees and the Committees of the Illinois Judicial Conference. In 2005, the Administrative Director, concomitant with the Court's approval of modified charges and identified projects and priorities for the Judicial Conference Committees for the new year, restructured staff liaison assignments to ensure that the Administrative Office provides substantive assistance to the committees in the accomplishments of their goals. The revised assignment structure is also intended to promote systemic coordination among all committees in their work to provide the Court with recommendations to improve the administration of justice.

One of the major duties performed for the Supreme Court is the consideration of non routine administrative matters, which are presented during each of the Court's terms. The Administrative Director, in collaboration with the Chief Justice, prepares and presents the agenda issues to the Court for discussion and disposition. Agenda items approved by the Court for action are then implemented by the Director through the Executive Office.

In 2005, the Executive Office, in its administration of Supreme Court Rule 39 (Appointment of Associate Judges) on behalf of the Supreme Court, conducted seventeen associate judge elections in fifteen of Illinois' twenty-two judicial circuits. The Executive Office also processes applications filed under Supreme Court Rule 295, which concerns the assignment of associate judges to felony jurisdictions. Additionally, applications for licenses issued to those law students seeking to provide limited legal representation under Supreme Court Rule 711 are processed through the Executive Office.

Other matters which fall within the scope of the Executive Office's activities include securing and tracking legal representation through the Office of the Attorney General for members of the judicial branch named in a case or controversy arising out of the performance of their official duties. Executive Office staff also negotiates, prepares, and manages office leases and contracts for the Supreme and Appellate Courts, mandatory arbitration programs, and the Administrative Office.

The nation's judicial communities were stunned and deeply saddened by the tragic events in Illinois and Georgia in early 2005 in which the spouse of a U. S. District Judge in Chicago and a state court judge in Atlanta were killed in violent acts related to the judges performing the sworn duties of their office. In
response, the Administrative Office completed a comprehensive analysis of security protocols and resources for the Supreme and Appellate Courthouses securing the necessary personnel and equipment to enhance court security.

Written summaries of recent Supreme Court opinions are prepared by legal staff in the Executive Office for distribution to all Illinois judges. The Executive Office, in its capacity as secretariat, provides services to the Illinois Courts Commission, including filing and preservation of Commission records, distributing the Official Illinois Courts Commission Reports, and performing all other duties typically executed by a clerk of a court of record. Executive Office staff also prepares and executes grants which provide for programming funded through the Lawyers' Assistance Program Act.

In September 2005, the Administrative Director, representing Chief Justice Robert R. Thomas, lead Illinois' interdisciplinary (judicial branch and child welfare agency) delegation to the National Leadership Summit on the Protection of Children. In conjunction with the administration of the federally funded Court Improvement Program (CIP), the National Leadership Summit assisted the judicial branch in preparing a plan for improving its management of data collection and analysis that will, ultimately, improve the safety, permanence and well-being outcomes for Illinois' at-risk children.

Finally, in 2005, the Administrative Director convened an inter and intra governmental state and county Task Force on Probation Funding. The fifteen member Task Force was created to advise the Supreme Court and its Administrative Office regarding strategies and options for state probation funding. It was charged with issuing a report and recommendations to the Director by the end of 2005. Justice Rita B. Garman serves as the Supreme Court's liaison to the Task Force.

The Administrative Services Division consists of five units that provide technical and support services to the judicial branch: Budget, Vouchering, Payroll, Human Resources, and Mail/Reprographics. The Budget Unit works closely with the Administrative Director to develop the judicial branch budget. Staff of this unit also provide daily accounting of expenditures and projected operating costs. The Accounting Unit processes all payment vouchers for the Supreme Court, the Appellate Court, the state-paid functions of the circuit courts, and the Administrative Office. The Accounting Unit also maintains all financial records for the expenditure of resources appropriated by the General Assembly. Staff of this unit work closely with staff of the Comptroller’s Office to reconcile payment information and provide that office any additional information needed to facilitate the payment of judicial branch bills. The Payroll Unit maintains all payroll records for the current state-paid judicial branch employees, as well as records for all previous employees. Staff of this unit also work with the Office of
the Comptroller in processing the payroll for over 1,500 current judicial branch employees, as well as interact with personnel within the Department of Central Management Services (CMS) in the coordinated of employee benefit programs, including health, dental and life insurance. The Human Resource Unit provides personnel services to judicial branch employees and managers. Staff within this unit maintain comprehensive attendance records for all judicial personnel covered by the Supreme Court’s Leave of Absence Policies and assist individuals with questions regarding the associated paid and unpaid leave of absences. Staff interact with CMS personnel to coordinate the state’s workers’ compensation program, and also work with judicial branch employees and managers in administering the judicial branch’s classification and compensation plan. When requested, staff also assist judicial branch managers in recruitment and selection process, including the placement of advertisements, the dissemination, collection, and review of applications, administering proficiency testing and securing reference checks. The Mail/Reprographics Unit oversees the distribution of mail and parcel services for the Administrative Office. Computerized records are maintained in order to track packages. The Unit also coordinates copying and mailing of large objects. Acting as it’s own printing shop, staff review materials presented for copying and determine the best method to replicate the originals.

The Court Services Division is involved in a wide range of activities and projects affecting judges, circuit clerks, court reporters, and other components of the judicial branch of government. Ongoing responsibilities include staffing committees of the Supreme Court and the Judicial Conference as well as the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges, production of the Judicial Conference Report, and production of this annual report. The Division also provides ongoing legislative support services to the Supreme Court, and prepares summaries of pending and enacted legislation for the chief circuit judges and circuit clerks. Division staff serve as liaison for court-annexed mandatory arbitration programs and mediation programs. During 2005, division labor relations personnel represented judicial employers in collective bargaining for approximately 40 contracts. Court Services staff continued to serve as liaison to the Special Supreme Court Committee on Professionalism which is charged with providing recommendations to the Supreme Court on ways to promote respectful conduct, as the norm, within the legal profession. The Court Services Division continues to administratively process applications for membership in the Capital Litigation Trial Bar. The Court Services Division, during 2005, administratively processed Continuing Legal Education programs and membership compliance with CLE requirements for members of the Capital Litigation Trial Bar. In 2005, Administrative Office staff continued to manage all technical, fiscal and program components of the federal Court Improvement Project (CIP) grant.

The Court Services Division continues to serve as liaison to the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges Ad Hoc Committee on the Article V Rules. In 2005, the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges authorized the establishment of a working sub-committee to examine, review and recommend what traffic violations should have a required court appearance, and study the bonding procedures of the Article V Rules. The Court Services Division provides staffing support for the working sub-committee. Areas of service to circuit clerks and their staff, include guidance and technical support. Specific and detailed assistance was provided to the 18 circuit clerks who were newly elected in 2004 and the 3 circuit clerks who were appointed in 2005. Division staff planned and conducted a two and a half day New Clerk Orientation for 17 of the newly elected circuit clerks. The division staffs the Oversight Board for Continuing Education of the Illinois Association of Court Clerks which sponsored two full-day educational programs for circuit clerks and their staff. Division staff, in conjunction with the Oversight Board, administered the New Clerk Mentor Program. Staff updated the manuals pertaining to the Mentor Program and monitored the effects of the program. A thorough review and update of the Manual on Fines and Fees and the Manual on Recordkeeping is near completion. This comprehensive update will be provided to Chief Circuit Judges and Circuit Clerks in both paper and CD, with future updates provided in an electronic format. Court Services Division along with the Court Information System Technology Advisory Committee (CISTAC)
continue to work on updates to Automated Disposition Reporting concepts, the AOIC Data Dictionary, and the Civil Procedures Manual. Cook County submitted an application to participate in the Electronic Filing Pilot Project. In addition, Cook and Winnebago Counties submitted requests to pilot the acceptance of Electronic Guilty Pleas. The Court authorized an exploration of the concept. The Automated Disposition Reporting (ADR) Program currently processes traffic and criminal dispositions from 80 counties statewide. Seventy-seven counties are currently exchanging ADR files using the AOIC secure socket link (SSL). The Division also supplied merged jury lists to 95 counties along with petit juror and grand jury handbooks to the counties requesting them. The Division continues to manage the Offense Code Table (OFT) as a method of identifying offenses reported through the Automated Disposition Reporting Program. Updated tables were issued in June and October of 2005. Finally, the Division assisted the Director in developing a long-range capital plan that will ensure ongoing repairs and renovations of state owned facilities used by the judicial branch.

As a result of the passage of Public Act 94-0098, effective July 1, 2005, the Court Services Division assisted in the significant transfer of duties and responsibilities associated with Court Reporting Services to Chief Circuit Court Judges. Division staff continued to work with the JMIS Division in the oversight of electronic recordation.

The Judicial Education Division provides administrative oversight of continuing education programs for Illinois' more than 900 judges. In doing so, the Division provides staff support to the Judicial Conference Committee on Education, which is charged by the Supreme Court with developing a comprehensive series of judicial seminars on an annual basis. In addition to recommending topics, the Committee also identifies and recruits judicial faculty panels to teach each seminar and crafts a "seminar charge" to guide its preparation. Division staff work with the Committee to develop the annual seminar series as well as to staff individual seminar faculty panels in all stages of seminar preparation and implementation, including development of seminar curricula, materials and presentations.

In Conference Year 2005, the Division worked with the Committee to oversee preparation and presentation of the Advanced Judicial Academy, a full schedule of seminars during the 2004-2005 Judicial Conference year, presented a New Judge Seminar and conducted a Faculty Development Workshop for judges teaching Judicial Conference Programs. The seminar series included six regional (2 day) seminars and five mini (1 day) seminars. Faculty for all programs were provided extensive assistance by staff of the Division. In addition to the annual seminar series, the Division worked closely with the Committee to revise the annual New Judge Seminar curriculum to ensure that new judges can successfully develop the specialized skills and knowledge necessary for their careers on the bench. Lastly, the Division oversaw the Resource Lending Library for Illinois judges, in collaboration with the Committee on Education. The Lending Library continues to provide Illinois judges with judicial education loan materials such as videotapes, audiotapes and publications as well as permanent use items such as seminar reading materials, bench books and manuals. In addition to its work with the Committee on Education, the Division also works closely with the Supreme Court Committee on Capital Cases to plan and present Capital Cases Seminars for Illinois judges hearing death penalty cases, which are conducted under the auspices of Supreme Court Rule 43. In conjunction with its oversight of judicial education programming, the Division also staffs the Judicial Mentor Committee to administer the Judicial Mentoring Program, which provides an experienced judicial mentor for all new Illinois judges taking the bench.

The Judicial Management Information Services Division (JMIS) provides technology to the offices and staff of the Illinois Supreme and Appellate Courts, the Supreme Court supporting units, and divisions within the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. JMIS implements technology at the direction of the Administrative
Office Director and Supreme Court with the primary objective of improving the procedures and efficiencies of court operations. JMIS responds to the needs of the judicial branch for application development and information technology by analyzing processes, designing applications, or procuring technology that leverages existing investments with an overall goal of improving organizational benefits to office procedures.

Technology initiatives during the past year include the implementation of a highly scalable, redundant Dell/Oracle RAC database environment to support existing and future web-based application and data collection projects. Work continued on the installation of new, and support of existing digital recording systems in the trial courts. JMIS continues to leverage the internet and web services to facilitate the work of the judiciary, providing information to the general public, legal and education communities via the Supreme Court’s web site (www.state.il.us/court).

The Probation Services Division provides services to chief judges and their probation staffs in all circuits. The Probation and Probation Officer Act, at 730 ILCS 100/15(1), states: "The Supreme Court of Illinois may establish a Division of Probation Services whose purpose shall be the development, establishment, promulgation, and enforcement of uniform standards for probation services in this State, and otherwise carry out the intent of this Act." Consistent with its statutory responsibility, the mission of the Probation Division is to improve the quality, effectiveness, and professionalism of probation services in Illinois. In carrying out this mission, the Division monitoring, standard-setting, and technical assistance activities extend to all aspects of the administration and operation of Illinois probation and court services departments. These activities include the administration of state reimbursement to counties for probation services, review and approval of annual probation plans submitted by each department, collection and analysis of statewide probation data, administration of probation employment and compensation standards, development and implementation of effective correctional intervention strategies for offenders on probation, monitoring and evaluation of probation programs and operations, administration of the interstate compact for probationers transferring into or out of the state, design and delivery of basic and advanced training for probation personnel, and provision of technical assistance and staff support to circuit courts to improve the administration and operation of probation services in Illinois.

In 2005, the Division continued its efforts to improve probation practices and outcomes through the implementation of evidence-based practices. These research based practices provide a framework for greater public safety through reducing the risk of re-offending by offenders sentenced to probation. During this year, the Probation Division completed statewide training for juvenile probation officers and managers on the "Effective Casework Model", which incorporates the Youth Assessment Screening Instrument (YASI) advanced interviewing and comprehensive case planning. The Illinois Juvenile Probation Effective Case Work and Supervision System Guidebook has been developed to assist in implementing evidence-based practices (EBP). The Adult Risk Reduction Strategy was launched and includes the applicants of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R), an advanced risk assessment tool for adult offenders. In partnership with the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), a research project was initiated to study the impact of evidence-based practices in reducing adult probationer recidivism within six probation and court service departments.

In collaboration with the Judicial Education Division, two major interdisciplinary training events were conducted: Changing Offender Conduct Through Evidence-Based Practices: Implications for Judges and At Risk Youth and Families: A Multi-disciplinary Conference for Delinquency and Child Protection Practitioners. Both of these events were designed to provide judges, attorneys, probation officers and child protection workers with information and skills to assist their efforts to improve outcomes for court involved youth, families and adults.
NOTES