

Marcia Cohan, PA3

PRELIMINARY EVALUATION: 7-13-77

CLINTON COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER PROGRAM
NORTHEAST IOWA AREA CRIME COMMISSION
No. 702-76-06-2300-31-01

Background:

Prior to the implementation of this project in November of 1975, criminal defense work for indigent clients residing in Clinton County was provided by a court-appointed counsel system. In cases where total indigency was established, that is, when it was shown that the accused "... would be unable to retain in his behalf, legal counsel without prejudicing his financial ability to provide economic necessities for himself or his family" (Iowa Code, Chapter 336A, Section .4), the judge would appoint an attorney to represent the accused indigent from private attorneys expressing willingness to accept such appointments. In cases where the accused was not financially able to retain a private attorney but able to obtain some financial resources, the judge would appoint an attorney to represent the accused and establish a repayment schedule to be assumed by the defendant after final disposition of the case.

The cost of providing court-appointed attorneys for indigent offenders in Clinton County was continuing to escalate. In 1973 there were 128 cases assigned to court-appointed attorneys at a total cost of \$13,361.30; this was an average of \$104.44 per case. The following year 226 cases were assigned at a total cost of \$39,353.77 or an average of \$174.13 per case. This reflects an individual case increase of \$68.69 or approximately a 40% rise from 1973 to 1974.

The large increases in court-appointed attorneys' fees were due to a number of factors: a sharply rising crime rate, a continuing trend toward more complex legal defense for indigents, increased involvement of the justice system in juvenile matters, a constantly rising cost of legal services due to inflation and an increase in the number of points at which an attorney is involved in indigent defense.

Most of the court-appointed attorneys had very limited experience in criminal defense; consequently, they were required to spend substantial amounts of time in research when assigned a criminal defense case. Thus, it was felt that there were certain advantages inherent in utilizing an experienced, practicing defense attorney in comparison to court-appointed attorneys.

Consequently, in August of 1975 the Clinton County Public Defender project was approved by the Iowa Crime Commission for the purpose of "providing quality criminal defense counsel for indigent adult offenders". In addition to funding the defense attorney himself, provisions were also made for a legal secretary, financial access to necessary professional consultation, investigator services, equipment and basic operations.

According to the data available from the first year of this project, the public defender did not represent a large volume of clients during November

45704

and December, the initial months of the project, in part due to administrative responsibilities. However, from November of 1975 through May of 1976, the public defender handled 53.3% or 65 of the 122 court appointments. The majority of the clients served during the initial grant period were between the ages of 18 and 24, unemployed, and faced felony or indictable misdemeanor charges.

As evidence substantiated a continual need for an experienced defense attorney, a request for funding second-year continuation of the public defender project in Clinton County was subsequently made and approved by the Iowa Crime Commission. The total budget was \$43,080 with a federal share of \$30,500 and match of \$10,750. Given pre-agreement arrangements, extension and revision requests, the continuation grant period extended from July 1, 1976 through July 15, 1977.

Goal:

The overall goal of this continuation project is to continue to provide a public defender program for Clinton County which is consistent with the statutory provisions of the Iowa Code (336.A).

Objectives:

The following objectives were established in the grant:

- 1) To provide an alternative but compatible system of appointing indigents' counsel in criminal matters.
- 2) To assume a caseload of approximately 55-60% of all criminal cases for comparison to the exclusive court-appointed system handled by private attorneys.
- 3) To reduce the amount of time an indigent defendant's case is in the court docket from arraignment until final disposition.

Impact:

In addition, the following specific impact of the project would hope to be realized:

- 1) educational upgrading of the public defender provided by state and national legal sessions
- 2) expanding public awareness of constitutional rights and the adversary systems through presentations at schools and local civic organizations by the public defender
- 3) influencing a reduction of court expenditures for appointed attorneys' costs

Data Analysis:

An attempt was made to collect comprehensive data for all persons represented by the Clinton County Public Defender and represents the period from July 1, 1976 to April 30, 1977 for his professional services.

Data were collected by means of the development of a Client Profile Form, included in the appendix of this evaluation (see Appendix I). Comprehensive data were collected and tabulated by the evaluator from this form for each defendant represented by the public defender during the ten-month period. The form itself facilitated the use of cases rather than persons as the best unit to be used for analysis purposes. However, the public defender indicated that his office may not have always been consistent in completing the client profile forms, i.e. providing data for each case as opposed to each client charged with multiple offenses. Consequently, questions regarding the reliability of data in such cases would arise.

At this point in time there is only a limited amount of comparable data pertaining to the clients handled by either privately-retained attorney or through other court appointments. When such data is available, it will be included for comparative purposes in this second year project evaluation. Furthermore, as the assignment of cases is made in a somewhat nonrandom manner and dependent upon whether the full-time magistrate perceives that the public defender is carrying a heavy workload, a true statistical comparison of the two defense systems could hardly be made even if data were available.

Performance Measures:

The performance measures were based on the objectives of the grant; in addition, criteria for measuring each objective were provided in the evaluation design (see Appendix II). Thus, the evaluation is based on this design and addresses each of the following objectives:

1. TO PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE SYSTEM OF INDIGENT COUNSEL. Criteria include: conviction rate and sentence severity.

Conviction Rate and Sentence Severity

It is assumed that the objectives of a legal defense attorney are to obtain a low conviction rate or light sentence for his clients. Thus, information on the public defender system was reviewed on the basis of conviction rate and sentence severity. The court outcome information was tabulated on individual cases on a month-by-month basis that were handled by the public defender (Appendix III).

Based upon information available on 81 of the cases closed from July, 1976 through April, 1977 (note: no data was available on three additional cases), the conviction rate was computed at 65% (53/81) for the public defender. (No data was available pertaining to the conviction rate for court-appointed counsel). Moreover, of those cases closed during this period, 38% (31/81) of the sentences were either suspended or deferred.

2. TO ASSUME A CASELOAD OF APPROXIMATELY 55-60% OF ALL CRIMINAL CASES. Criteria include: a) number of cases closed by month and b) client characteristics.

a. Cases Closed by Month

It was intended that approximately 55-60% of the criminal cases would be handled by the public defender with the remaining cases assigned to the court-appointed counsel. Table I on the next page reflects the number

of cases closed monthly by each defense system from July 1, 1976 to March 31, 1977. It should be noted that both totals reflect all the cases that were closed by either defense system and do not take into account those cases in which attorneys withdrew, e.g. for conflict of interest. Based upon the 149 cases handled by both defense systems, the public defender closed approximately 51% of the criminal cases as compared to 49% handled by the court-appointed attorneys.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF CASES CLOSED PER MONTH
BY BOTH DEFENSE SYSTEMS

	<u>Public Defender</u>	<u>Court-Appointed Attorneys</u>
July	13	5
August	10	6
September	4	6
October	13	5
November	4	10
December	8	8
January	7	11
February	12	10
March	<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>
TOTALS	76 (51%)	73 (49%)

GRANT TOTAL: 149

A further review of cases is also provided for those assigned on a monthly basis to only the public defender and categorized according to felony, indictable misdemeanor, misdemeanor and other charges. The following data, as given in Table 2, indicates that the majority of the 171 cases assigned to the public defender were either felonies or indictable misdemeanors with a lesser number being misdemeanors.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF CASES ASSIGNED PER MONTH
TO THE PUBLIC DEFENDER

	<u>Felonies</u>	<u>Indictable Misdemeanors</u>	<u>Misdemeanors</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
July	3	11	7	-	21
August	9	12	3	-	24
September	11	6	4	-	21
October	6	3	1	3	13
November	4	1	8	2	15
December	8	7	5	3	23
January	6	6	-	7	19
February	3	4	3	1	11
March	4	6	4	-	14
April	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>
TOTAL	55	58	40	18	171

b. Client Characteristics

An examination of a number of personal factors pertaining to clients handled by the public defender was made. Appendix IV provides a tabulation of socio-demographic data on each client in terms of the following: sex, race, criminal history, marital status, employment, occupation, student status and education. In general, most of the clients were single, white males who were unemployed but semi-skilled with a high school education or less. No conclusions could be drawn from information pertaining to the clients' criminal history due to incomplete data on the Client Profile Forms; evidently, such data was seemingly more difficult to obtain than other personal data.

3. TO REDUCE TIME THE CASE IS IN THE COURT DOCKET. Criteria include:
a) length of time between arrest and adjudication and b) cost comparison.

a. Length of time between arrest and adjudication

The length of time was computed by determining the difference in days from the date of arrest to that of final adjudication. A comparison was made on the basis of length of time taken for each case as well as averages for all cases handled within each month (see Appendix III).

With the exception of the month of January, the range of cases closed per month averaged between 32.60 days (cases closed in March) to 66.88 days (cases closed in August). (The overall average of cases closed from July, 1976 to April, 1977 was computed at 52.74 days.) An examination of this data, arbitrarily categorized by month, showed that often, when the number of cases closed per month was light, the average time spent in disposing of these cases was reduced. Variation in monthly averages, however, did not take into account differences in the seriousness of the arrest allegation levied against the indigent defendant. Therefore, it is not possible to make a judgment as to whether time was actually decreased as per stated objective.

For the purpose of analysis, cases were divided into these categories: crimes against the person, crimes against property, drug charges and other. Examples of crimes against the person include assault and battery, robbery with aggravation and manslaughter; those examples of crimes against property include breaking and entering, larceny of a motor vehicle and malicious injury to a motor vehicle; and those considered as drug charges include OMVUI and possession of a controlled substance.

As the formal charge for an offense was often unknown due to incomplete information submitted by the public defender, a breakdown of the different types of cases could only be done by examining arrest allegations. Of those cases handled by the public defender, Appendix III shows that the majority involve crimes against property. This can be verified by the monitoring report of March 25, 1977 which states, "Wolfe (public defender) indicated that he handles all types of cases but most of the cases are property offenses. He handles few crimes against persons merely because there are not that many in Clinton County. He has not handled many OMVUI and most of the cases have been marijuana charges, breaking and entering, grand larceny, and false drawing and uttering."

b. Cost Comparison

Cost effectiveness is an issue that also needs to be addressed since, in effect, the taxpayer bears the expense of providing counsel for indigents. Costs of legal defense services in Clinton County were very difficult to obtain with limited information provided by the Northeast Iowa Area Crime Commission.

In 1975, which includes two months of the public defender project, total court-appointment expenditures were approximately \$54,805, an increase of 40% over the previous year. In 1976 total expenditures were given as \$48,577.14 with the court-appointed attorneys handling 88 cases during this year; the average cost per case for this defense system was computed at \$552.01.

In comparison, total expenditures of the 105 cases assigned to the public defender were computed at \$37,929 for 1976 with the average cost per case at \$361.23. Computations, provided by the public defender to the SPA, were given as follows:

Jan. 1 - June 30, 1976 (projected costs)	=	\$19,928
July 1 - December 31, 1976 (actual costs based on Clinton County budget work sheets)	=	19,140
Total Expenditures for the Office	=	39,068
Capital Costs (furniture, equipment)	=	- 1,139
Total Expenditures for Case Appointments	=	\$37,929

$$\$37,929 \div 105 \text{ cases} = \$361.23$$

Based upon figures reflecting the expenditures of both defense systems, the average cost per case handled by the Clinton County Public Defender is lower than the average cost per case handled by court-appointed attorneys.

Conclusions:

The primary purpose of this evaluation was to provide a comparison of the public defender and court-appointed attorney systems in Clinton County with the perimeters of the project's objectives. Ideally, the two defense systems should have been compared on the basis of each point addressed in the evaluation design. Data collection sheets for criminal cases were completed only by the public defender as a requirement to meet the special condition regarding evaluation; however, no such requirements were placed on court-appointed attorneys. As a result, only a very limited amount of data pertaining to court appointments was accessible, such as caseload and cost analysis. Where such data was available for comparative analysis, it appears as though two objectives of the grant were satisfactorily met, i.e. the public defender is handling at least half of the total criminal cases and is as cost-effective as the court-appointed counsel in providing legal defense service for indigent clients. Beyond these conclusions, no determination can be made as to whether the public defender system is compatible with that of court appointments. Consequently, much of the evaluation was only able to provide information as to the efforts of the public defender and thus, serves to describe his efforts rather than compare them with the other defense systems in Clinton County. Given the limited data available to clients handled by either privately retained attorneys or through other court-appointments, judging the overall effectiveness of the public defender project was difficult.

A request for funds for third year continuation of the operation of the public defender office has recently been submitted to the SPA. In addition, the Chairman of the Clinton County Board of Supervisors specified that following completion of federal assistance, the County will assume continuation costs of the project. Based upon the cost-assumption policy and the conclusion that when data were available, objectives of the project were satisfactorily met, it is recommended that the third year project be approved by the Iowa Crime Commission.

No evaluation effort will be undertaken during the third year of the project given the difficulty in obtaining/analyzing available data. Even if comparable data were available for all defense systems in Clinton County, the nonrandom assignment of cases makes an analysis invalid and unreliable.

Should the subgrantee or area crime commission express interest in performing an evaluation on the effectiveness of the project for whatever reasons, such as internal management upgrading, the data collection forms have been revised based on input from the SPA staff and from one of the Public Defenders currently practicing in the State (Pottawattamie County) and are available upon request.

APPENDIX I

CLIENT PROFILE FOR OFFENDER ADVOCATE
AND COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL SYSTEMS

Personal Data

Sex _____
1. Male 2. Female

Race _____
3. White 4. Black
5. Other (Specify)

Criminal History
Number of prior adult convictions _____
Number of prior adult sentences _____
Number of prior adult jail terms _____
Number of prior adult probation terms _____

Drug or Alcohol History
Drug Connected with Case _____
6. No connection 8. Other connection
7. Related charge 9. Unknown

Type of drug connected with case _____
10. None
11. Alcohol
12. Marijuana, hashish
13. Amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers
14. Hallucinogens
15. Narcotics, cocaine
16. Unknown

History of illegal drug or excessive alcohol use _____
17. No known history
18. Yes
19. Unknown

Residence and Family Information
Marital Status _____
20. Single (Never Married) 23. Divorced
21. Married 24. Widowed
22. Separated 25. Unknown

Number of legal dependents _____

Living arrangement of client _____
26. Alone
27. With spouse and/or children
28. With family
29. Unknown

Employment
Client's employment status _____
30. Unemployed/laid off
31. Employed full-time
32. Employed part-time
33. Unemployable due to handicap
34. Unknown

Usual Occupational level _____
35. None
36. Unskilled
37. Semi-skilled, sales, clerical
38. Skilled (trades)
39. Managerial, proprietary, professional
40. Unknown

Client's primary income source _____
41. None
42. Own employment
43. Spouse's employment
44. Family
45. Compensation, benefit, retirement
46. Inheritance, investments
47. Public assistance
48. Other individual
49. Unknown

Public Assistance
50. None
51. Self only
52. Dependents only
53. Self and dependents
54. Dependent a recipient of public assistance
55. Unknown

Education
Student Status of client _____
56. Not a student
57. Full-time student
58. Part-time student
59. Unknown

Highest educational level achieved _____
60. Less than high school
61. High school or equivalent
62. Special trade or business school
63. One or more years of college
64. Unknown

Years of formal schooling completed _____

APPENDIX I (Con't.)

Court Outcome

Date of Arrest _____
 Month Day Year

Release status of client between
 adjudication and sentencing _____

Arrest Allegation _____

Did this defendant fail to appear for any
 scheduled court date?

- 65. None
- 66. Lower court arraignment
- 67. Preliminary hearing
- 68. Trial-misdemeanor
- 69. Traffic court
- 70. District court arraignment
- 71. Trial-indictable offense
- 72. Sentencing

- 98. Sentenced at time of adjudication
- 99. Released on recognizance or bond
- 100. Released to volunteer supervision
- 101. Released to Pre-Trial Release
Project
- 102. Released to Pre-Trial Services
Project
- 103. Released on bail
- 104. Detained in jail
- 105. Returned to other facility
(Specify)
- 106. Other (Specify)

Date of failure to appear _____

Defendant representation at time of final
 adjudication _____

- 73. Self
- 74. Privately retained
- 75. Court-appointed (specify)
- 76. Offender advocate
- 77. Private organization
- 78. Unknown

Date of final adjudication _____

Where did final adjudication occur _____

- 79. Traffic court
- 80. Lower court
- 81. District court
- 82. Other (specify)

Last step in formal court process before
 final adjudication _____

- 83. Lower court arraignment
- 84. Preliminary hearing
- 85. Grand jury indictment
- 86. County attorney information
- 87. District court arraignment
- 88. Trial
- 89. Other (Specify)

Convicting Offense _____

How Adjudicated _____

- 90. Guilty plea
- 91. Judge's finding
- 92. Jury verdict
- 93. Dismissed
- 94. Ignored
- 95. Bond forfeiture
- 96. No contest
- 97. Other (Specify)

Sentencing Information

Date of Sentence _____

Incarceration

- a. Jail _____ (days)
- b. Corrections program _____ (Specify)
Number of months _____
- c. Other program or institution _____
Number of months _____

Credit for time served prior to sentencing (actual number of days) _____

Sentence suspended
107. Yes 108. No

Sentence deferred
109. Yes 110. No

Probation _____ (Actual number of months or years)

Condition _____

- 111. No condition specified
- 112. Drug treatment
- 113. Alcohol treatment
- 114. Psychological treatment
- 115. Medical treatment
- 116. Correctional program
- 117. Other (specify)

Length of treatment specified as condition
From _____ to _____

Amount of fine _____ (in dollars)

Amount of restitution _____ (in dollars)

Was choice of sentences offered to defendant _____
118. Yes 119. No

Sentencing Judge (Specify) _____

APPENDIX II

EVALUATION DESIGN CLINTON COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER PROJECT

Goal

To upgrade indigent defense services in Clinton County

Objectives

1. To provide an alternative but compatible system of appointing indigents' counsel in criminal matters.
2. To assume a case load of approximately 55-60% of all criminal cases for comparison to the exclusive court appointment system handled by private attorneys.
3. To reduce the amount of time an indigent defendant's case is in the court docket from arraignment until final disposition.
4. To provide a highly specialized professional to represent criminal indigents so that they may have the benefit of being represented by an attorney of expertise and skill above and beyond that of attorneys who take criminal appointments on a limited and occasional basis or comparable to the community's most notable criminal lawyers.

Research Design

To provide a comparison of the Offender Advocate System and the current court appointed attorney system, cases should be assigned to either system in as random a fashion as possible. Every other client could be assigned to the Offender Advocate, keeping in mind that indictable misdemeanors and misdemeanor traffic offenses are a low priority. These cases should be assigned to court appointed attorneys. Thus, the court appointed attorney will handle more cases, but the two systems should share equally in criminal cases. By attempting a relatively random assignment of criminal cases, the chance that significantly different types of cases or offenders are being referred to either system will be reduced.

This method of assignment will allow a comparison of the two systems to be made without causing major disruptions in the court system and without jeopardizing the welfare of indigent clients. The provision for this type of research design has been built into the program (see Objective #2).

Research Criteria

- I. Provide an alternative system of indigent counsel.
 - a. Conviction Rate
 - b. Sentence Severity

Each client entering the courts system should theoretically be judged and sentenced only on the merits of his case. However, in our present court system, the quality of justice is perhaps best measured by how well the counsel represents the best interests of his client. It must be assumed that the objectives of a legal defense attorney are to obtain a low conviction rate or light sentence for his client. It must be assumed that the objectives of a legal defense attorney are to obtain a low conviction rate or light sentence for his client. Thus, the two systems will be com-

pared on the basis of conviction rate and sentence severity. Lower conviction rates and less severe sentences will be presumed to indicate the more effective defense representation.

II. Assume 55-60% of criminal cases for comparison.

a. Client characteristics

The Offender Advocate will assume at least 50% of criminal cases from the assignment of cases by judges. Data on the socio-demographic characteristics of clients will identify the differences in types of clients and cases represented by the two types of defense systems. By using a random assignment of cases plus recording client data, the chance that significantly different types of cases or offenders are being referred to either system will be reduced.

III. Reduce time the case is in the court docket.

a. Length of time between arrest and adjudication.

1. Relationship between seriousness of arrest allegation and length of adjudication.
2. Relationship between charge reduction and length of adjudication.
3. Relationship between client characteristics and length of adjudication, conviction rate, and sentencing severity.

b. Cost Comparison.

Although the reduction of expenses is not one of the stated objectives of this project, it should be a consideration. Since, in effect, the taxpayer bears the expense of providing defense counsel for indigents, the cost factors must be considered in determining the better system for providing defense counsel at public expense.

Basic Data Elements

A questionnaire has been prepared for each client. This is located at the back of this evaluation design.

Data Collection

Data on client characteristics, court appearances, and sentencing for those persons assigned to the Offender Advocate would be collected by the Offender Advocate Office. Data on those persons assigned to court appointed attorneys would have to be collected during on-site visits by the evaluators, unless the judges could be prevailed upon to request court appointed attorneys to complete the data forms for criminal cases. Data collection should start within one month after the Offender Advocate Office begins operation.

Data Analysis

Data collection sheets will be edited and coded as they are received at the SPA. The units of analysis will be individuals as opposed to the number of cases. A number of people will be arrested on a variety of charges, one of which will probably be more serious than the others. If a conviction on one charge results, the other charges are often dropped. If number of cases was used as the unit of analysis, the result would be an inflated rate of dismissals.

Steps in the legal defense systems will include court appointed attorneys and the Public Advocate. Statistical tests will be used to determine the meaning of observed differences between the two systems of defense. The selection of particular statistical tests will be dependant on the type and quality of data to be analyzed. Attention will be focused on the meaning of such test results, rather than on the statistical test itself.

APPENDIX III

COURT OUTCOME INFORMATION FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

(CASES CLOSED BY MONTH)

<u>Date of Arrest</u>	<u>Date of Final Adjudication</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Arrest Allegation</u>	<u>Convicting Offense</u>
<u>July</u>				
7-5-76	7-30-76	25 days	grand larceny	petty larceny
7-3-76	7-23-76	20	making beer available to a minor	dismissed
7-3-76	7-23-76	20	contributing to delinq. of minor	dismissed
7-3-76	7-23-76	20	improper registration	(same)
5-11-76	7-19-76	69	malicious mischief	(same)
5-13-76	5-24-76	11	possession of marijuana	(same)
3-11-76	7-13-76	124	OMVUI	dismissed
3-11-76	-	-	possession of LSD	dismissed
3-1-76	7-13-76	134	possession of marijuana	dismissed
4-6-76	-	-	affray	dismissed
-	7-9-76	-	-	dismissed
6-28-76	7-8-76	10	shoplifting	dismissed
7-27-76	-	-	false drawing and uttering	dismissed
Average:		49.22		
<u>August</u>				
4-1-76	8-16-76	137	tampering with a motor vehicle	(same)
5-7-76	8-26-76	111	grand larceny	petty larceny
7-18-76	7-23-76	5	contributing to delinq. of minor	dismissed
5-11-76	8-25-76	106	malicious mischief	criminal trespass.
6-4-76	8-11-76	68	possession of marijuana	(same)
7-4-76	8-3-76	30	LMV	OMV without owner's consent
6-2-76	8-2-76	61	possession of marijuana	(same)
8-11-76	8-28-76	17	assault w/intent	dismissed
4-1-76	-	-	false pretense	(same)
Average:		66.88		
<u>Sept.</u>				
9-11-76	10-6-76	25	possession of marijuana	dismissed
8-27-76	-	-	possession of anphetamines	(same)
5-16-76	7-14-76	59	grand larceny	larceny in night-time
Average:		44.00		
<u>October</u>				
12-3-76	12-20-76	17	LMV	OMV without owner's consent
10-3-76	10-18-76	15	possession of marijuana	(same)
7-31-76	9-27-76	58	false drawing and uttering	(same)
9-9-76	10-18-76	39	B & E	(same)
7-4-76	10-5-76	93	criminal trespassing	(same)
9-14-76	10-18-76	34	false drawing and uttering	dismissed

APPENDIX III (Con't.)

<u>Date of Arrest</u>	<u>Date of Final Adjudication</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Arrest Allegation</u>	<u>Convicting Offense</u>
-	10-12-76	-	-	dismissed
10-1-76	-	-	probation revoked	(same)
3-27-77	3-29-77	2	disturbing peace and quiet	(same)
3-20-77	3-29-77	9	forgery	false drawing & uttering
12-27-76	1-17-77	21	grand larceny	(same)
3-2-77	3-9-77	7	possession of marijuana	(same)
10-29-76	3-2-77	124	A & B	(same)
Average:		38.09		
<u>November</u>				
10-7-76	11-17-76	41	B & E	Larceny under \$20
-	11-17-76	-	OMVUI	(same)
8-10-76	-	-	larceny in daytime	-
10-20-76	11-19-76	30	intoxication	dismissed
Average:		35.50		
<u>December</u>				
10-13-76	12-6-76	54	possession of marijuana w/intent	possession of marijuana
11-13-76	12-6-76	23	possession of marijuana w/intent	possession of marijuana
11-30-76	1-3-77	34	LMV	OMV without owner's consent
10-17-76	12-16-76	60	5 traffic charges	2 traffic charges
8-19-76	10-18-76	60	B & E	(same)
9-25-76	10-23-76	28	intoxication	dismissed
8-9-76	10-25-76	77	shoplifting	(same)
10-15-76	12-6-76	52	possession of marijuana w/intent	possession of marijuana
Average:		48.50		
<u>January</u>				
9-25-76	1-3-77	100	armed w/intent	(same)
-	-	-	-	-
9-12-76	1-5-77	115	possession of marijuana	dismissed
4-16-76	1-19-77	278	robbery w/aggravation	dismissed
10-12-76	12-1-76	50	-	dismissed
12-9-76	-	-	criminal trespassing	dismissed
10-28-76	1-14-77	78	carrying a concealed weapon	dismissed
Average:		124.20		
<u>February</u>				
2-5-77	2-16-77	11	LMV	OMV without owner's consent
2-1-77	2-16-77	15	grand larceny	larceny under \$20
12-25-76	2-28-77	65	armed w/intent	carrying a concealed weapon
12-1-76	2-17-77	78	grand larceny	(same)
1-21-77	2-25-77	35	possession of marijuana	dismissed
1-21-77	2-25-77	35	possession of marijuana	(same)

APPENDIX III (Con't.)

<u>Date of Arrest</u>	<u>Date of Final Adjudication</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Arrest Allegation</u>	<u>Convicting Offense</u>
1-15-77	2-11-77	27	failure to surrender MV registration	dismissed
1-25-77	1-25-77	0	probation violation	(same)
12-20-76	2-4-77	46	intoxication	(same)
12-14-76	2-14-77	62	possession of marijuana	(same)
12-24-76	2-28-77	66	contributing to delinquency of a minor	dismissed
Average:		44.00		
<u>March</u>				
10-29-76	3-2-77	124	A & B	(same)
3-2-77	3-9-77	7	possession of marijuana	(same)
12-27-76	1-17-77	21	grand larceny	(same)
3-20-77	3-29-77	9	forgery	false drawing and uttering under \$20
3-27-77	3-29-77	2	disturbing peace and quiet	(same)
Average:		32.60		
<u>April</u>				
3-23-77	4-26-77	34	possession of marijuana	dismissed
3-13-77	4-27-77	45	possession of marijuana	(same)
1-22-77	-	-	receiving stolen property over \$20	receiving stolen property under \$20
2-11-77	4-18-77	66	carrying a concealed weapon	(same)
12-16-77	-	-	larceny by shoplifting	shoplifting
2-25-77	-	-	possession of marijuana w/intent	-
2-25-77	4-18-77	52	contributing to the delinquency a minor	dismissed
3-12-77	4-6-77	25	driving while license is suspended	(same)
1-15-77	4-15-77	90	criminal trespassing	dismissed
12-14-76	4-13-77	120	receiving and concealing stolen property	criminal trespass.
10-28-76	-	-	possession of marijuana	dismissed
Average:		61.71		

APPENDIX IV

* CLIENTELE OF PUBLIC DEFENDER

(CASES CLOSED BY MONTH)

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Criminal History</u>	<u>Drug History</u>	<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Employment</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Student Status</u>	<u>Education</u>
<u>July</u>								
1	3	-	6	20	-	-	-	-
1	3	-	6(11)	23	-	-	-	-
1	3	-	7(11)	23	-	-	-	-
1	3	-	-	23	-	-	-	-
1	3	-	6(10)	20	-	-	-	-
1	3	-	7(12)	-	-	-	-	-
1	3	-	7(11)	20	30	-	-	-
1	-	-	7(14)	20	30	-	-	-
1	3	-	7(12)	20	30	-	-	-
1	3	-	7(10)	20	31	-	-	-
1	3	-	7(12)	20	31	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	-	6(10)	20	-	-	-	-
<u>August</u>								
1	3	-	9	20	32	36	57	60
1	3	-	8(11)	20	33	35	56	60
1	-	-	6(10)	20	31	39	56	63
1	3	-	(11)	20	30	36	56	61
1	3	-	7(12)	22	30	36	56	60
1	3	-	7(11)	-	30	38	56	63
1	3	-	7(12)	22	31	37	56	60
1	-	-	7(11/13)	20	31	36	56	61
1	3	-	6(10)	20	31	37	56	61
1	3	-	6(10)	23	30	-	56	63
<u>September</u>								
1	3	-	7(11/12)	-	30	35	57	60
2	-	-	8(13)	20	32	37	58	62
1	3	-	9(10)	21	31	36	56	61
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>October</u>								
1	3	-	7(11/12)	-	31	37	56	61
1	3	6-6-3-2	7(11/12)	21	30	38	56	61
-	3	2-2-2-1	6(10)	22	31	37	56	61
1	3	-	6(10)	20	32	37	56	61
2	3	0	6(10)	20	31	37	56	61
2	3	-	6(10)	21	30	37	56	60
1	3	-	6(10)	20	30	37	56	61
1	3	-	6(10)	23	30	37	56	61
1	4	-	6(10)	20	31	37	56	61
1	4	-	6(10)	20	31	37	56	61
1	4	2-2-1-1	6(10)	21	32	37	56	61
1	3	0-2-2-1	7(12)	20	30	36	56	61
1	3	-	7(11)	20	30	36	59	60

* See Appendix I for Key

APPENDIX IV (Con't.)

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Criminal History</u>	<u>Drug History</u>	<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Employment</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Student Status</u>	<u>Education</u>
<u>November</u>								
1	3	3-3-0-0	6(10)	21	32	36	56	60
1	3	4-0-0-0	7(11)	20	30	37	56	61
1	3	2-0-1-1	6(10)	20	32	36	56	60
1	3	-	8(11)	21	32	37	56	60
<u>December</u>								
1	3	-	8(12)	21	31	37	56	61
2	3	-	8(12)	21	30	35	56	61
1	3	-	8(11)	20	30	37	56	61
1	3	-	7(12)	20	32	37	57	63
1	3	-	6(10)	20	31	37	56	61
1	3	-	8(11)	21	30	37	56	60
2	4	3-2-0-1	6(10)	21	30	35	56	60
1	3	-	8(12)	20	31	37	56	63
<u>January</u>								
1	3	-	8(11)	20	31	37	56	61
1	3	-	9	21	30	5	56	64
1	5	-	7(12)	25	31	37	56	51
1	4	-	9	21	30	36	56	60
-	4	-	6(16)	20	32	37	56	61
1	3	1-0-0-1	9(16)	22	30	36	56	61
1	3	-	7(12)	20	32	37	57	63
<u>February</u>								
1	5	-	8(11)	20	30	36	56	60
1	3	0-0-0-0	-	20	30	39	56	63
2	4	-	8(11)	23	31	37	56	61
2	3	3-0-0-0	6(10)	21	30	36	56	60
1	3	-	8(12)	20	30	36	56	61
2	3	-	8(12)	20	30	37	56	61
1	3	-	6(16)	20	32	36	56	61
1	3	-	7(11)	21	31	38	56	60
1	3	-	8(12)	20	30	36	56	61
1	3	-	8(11)	21	30	38	56	60
1	3	-	8(12)	20	30	35	59	60
1	3	-	6(16)	21	31	37	56	61
<u>March</u>								
1	3	-	7(11)	20	30	36	59	60
1	-	-	7(12)	20	30	36	56	61
1	4	-	6(10)	21	32	37	56	61
1	-	-	6(10)	20	31	36	56	61
1	-	-	6(10)	20	31	37	56	61

APPENDIX IV (Con't.)

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Criminal History</u>	<u>Drug History</u>	<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Employment</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Student Status</u>	<u>Education</u>
<u>April</u>								
2	3	-	7(12)	23	31	38	56	61
2	3	-	7(12)	20	31	37	56	61
1	3	1-0-0-0	6(10)	23	-	-	56	60
-	-	-	6(10)	20	31	37	56	60
1	4	-	6(10)	23	31	37	56	60
1	3	-	7(12)	20	31	37	56	61
1	3	-	7(12)	20	30	37	56	61
1	3	7-7-2-1	6(10)	21	30	36	56	60
2	3	-	6(10)	23	30	37	56	61
1	3	-	9	-	31	36	56	60
1	3	-	8(12)	20	32	37	58	63

