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LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

On behalf of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC), I am pleased to offer the 2019 Annual Report of the Illinois Courts. The Report contains a summary of the day-to-day operations of the Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Courts, and highlights - in addition to the judges - the court managers, committees, the AOIC and other justice partners who carry out the work of the third branch of government. Also highlighted are some of the major initiatives undertaken and implemented in 2019. The Supreme Court and the dedicated employees of the Illinois court system were responsible for many accomplishments in 2019, including development of the first-ever statewide strategic agenda for the judicial branch, measures to enhance access to justice, and continued commitment to e-business initiatives, pretrial reform and judicial education.

The Report contains an overview of the state and local funding required for the operation of our court system and current information on the judicial officers and employees who provide the people of Illinois with a court system that fairly and impartially administers justice and efficiently resolves disputes. The Report also contains court data charts regarding the more frequently requested/viewed statistics from the Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Courts. Additional court data from each appellate district, circuit and county is available at www.illinoiscourts.gov/SupremeCourt/AnnReport.asp.

The AOIC acknowledges with appreciation the clerks of the Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Courts for their continued support, commitment and cooperation in compiling and providing the data published in this Report. I also thank the AOIC staff, particularly the Court Services Division and the Office of Communications and Public Information, for the countless hours that are invested in the preparation of this Report. The Annual Report reflects the efforts and dedication of the individuals who comprise our judiciary, non-judicial staff and justice stakeholders who strive to advance fair, efficient and affordable justice to all in Illinois.

I hope that this Report serves as a valuable tool in understanding the work and function of our state’s justice system. I invite you to explore the Illinois Supreme Court’s website at www.illinoiscourts.gov for the most current information concerning the Illinois courts and court partners who comprise the judicial branch of government.

Sincerely,

Marcia M. Meis
Director
Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts
A MESSAGE FROM CHIEF JUSTICE ANNE M. BURKE

I am honored to present the 2019 Annual Report of the Illinois Courts. I join with my colleagues on the Illinois Supreme Court to inform the public of the Court’s ongoing efforts to promote efficiency, fairness and judicial transparency. The Illinois Supreme Court, assisted by the dedicated staff of our Administrative Office and the judges and staff members serving our entire court system, works to uphold individual rights and liberties, to promote the impartial interpretation of the law, and to deliver equal justice in all matters brought before our courts.

To reduce cost and help the environment, printed copies of the Annual Report of the Illinois Courts will no longer be distributed. This will also allow for more frequent statistical updates on the Court’s website as the Court now publishes quarterly statistical updates from the Circuit Courts in the following categories: Civil and Domestic Relations Caseload Statistics by County, Criminal and Quasi-Criminal Caseload Statistics by Court, and Juvenile Caseload Statistics by County.

These are available on the Court’s website at http://illinoiscourts.gov/CircuitCourt/CCStats.asp.

During 2019, the Court continued its active involvement in the efforts to enhance the judicial branch’s relationship with the other branches of state government and with the public we serve. The Court hosted a Law School for Legislators event to familiarize new legislative members with the operations of the Judicial Branch. There was also a special session of oral arguments during the September Term at Lewis & Clark Community College in Godfrey.

I will highlight below some of the judicial branch’s major accomplishments in 2019. In the upcoming year, my colleagues and I will continue our pursuit of ways to improve the Illinois court system.

LAW SCHOOL FOR LEGISLATORS

The Illinois Supreme Court hosted ‘Law School for Legislators’ on March 13, 2019, with all seven Supreme Court Justices and leadership and new members of the Illinois House of Representatives and Senate in attendance. The event, held at the Illinois Supreme Court Building in Springfield, was intended to familiarize the legislative branch with court operations and to foster communication, cooperation and coordination between the legislative and judicial branches. Video from the event is available on the Supreme Court’s website here.

MAKING COURT COSTS MORE MANAGEABLE

The Illinois Supreme Court adopted multiple changes to the assessment system by which fees, fines, and other court costs are paid by civil and criminal case litigants. These changes are a result of Public Act 100-0987, which was passed by the legislature in 2018 in order to simplify the imposition, collection, and distribution of court assessments. The changes include Civil Assessment Schedules as well as fee waivers in amended Rule 298 and new Rule 404.
Changes to the assessment system were proposed by the 15-member Statutory Court Fee Task Force, a bipartisan body of judges, retired judges, legislators, circuit clerks, and members of the private bar from across the state. In a wide-ranging study, the Task Force found that a large number of filing fees on litigants in civil cases and court costs on defendants in criminal cases result in excessive financial impact on citizens, particularly those near poverty. It was additionally discovered that assessments could be significantly inconsistent from county to county even for the same type of proceedings.

The amendment to Rule 298 expands the existing civil fee waiver provision to allow partial waivers for litigants who may not qualify for a full waiver. New Rule 404 creates similar full and partial fee waivers for criminal defendants.

PRETRIAL PRACTICES COMMISSION HOSTS PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Pretrial Practices hosted a series of public hearings as it works towards its final report and recommendations. The Commission released its preliminary report concerning pretrial reform in the Illinois criminal justice system in December 2018. The public hearings were held April 22 in Springfield, May 6 in Champaign/Urbana, June 17 in Chicago and June 24 in Freeport.

Testimony was heard from dozens of citizens from all walks of life. Video from the hearings is available on the Supreme Court website here.

JUDICIAL BRANCH FUNDING GETS FIRST INCREASE IN 5 YEARS

After five years of flat funding, the Judicial Branch received an increase following the signing of the Fiscal Year budget by Governor J.B. Pritzker. The increase came following a concerted effort by the Illinois Supreme Court, AOIC and Chief Judges to educate lawmakers on the importance of fully funding probation services.

Chief Justice Karmeier issued the following statement: “On behalf of the entire court, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the General Assembly and the Governor for their willingness to confront the growing financial problems faced by the Judicial Branch and to do so in a concrete and constructive way. After five years of flat appropriations and rising expenses, most of which were mandated by law and beyond our control, the court was quickly losing its ability to adequately carry out its core Constitutional and statutory responsibilities as the third branch of government. Our obligation to reimburse counties for critical probation services was particularly strained. The Judicial Branch appropriation for the Fiscal Year 2020 promises to turn that situation around and, in the end, actually save taxpayers money.”
cases of People v. Morger and Dew-Becker v. Andrew Wu. Students lined up to ask questions of the participating attorneys following the arguments, which were livestreamed statewide.

ILLINOIS JUDICIAL CONFERENCE UNVEILS 3-YEAR STRATEGIC AGENDA

The Illinois Judicial Conference (IJC) unveiled its Strategic Agenda for the Illinois Judicial Branch on October 2. The IJC has created a mission statement, vision statement and core values for the Branch, along with strategic goals and the strategies designed to achieve them. The Strategic Agenda will serve as a guide for the future of the Branch as it begins the implementation phase. The mission of the Branch will be “to protect the rights and liberties of all by providing equal access to justice, resolving disputes, and upholding the rule of law pursuant to the powers and duties entrusted to us by the Illinois Constitution.”

The vision of the Branch is “to be trusted and open to all by being fair, innovative, diverse, and responsive to changing needs.” The IJC also adopted an Operational Plan to guide a group of task forces in pursuing the established strategic initiatives.

ILLINOIS COURTS RECEIVED $100,000 GRANT FROM JUSTICE FOR ALL PROJECT

The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts announced in October that it will receive a $100,000 grant from the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) as part of the Justice for All (JFA) project. The Illinois Courts’ Access to Justice Commission (ATJ) will use the funds to support a strategic action planning effort to expand access to justice in Illinois. JFA grants, which are funded by The JPB Foundation, The Public Welfare Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, and Open Society Foundations, were created in an effort to implement two advanced resolutions: meaningful access to effective assistance for essential civil legal needs and for traditional and non-traditional stakeholders to collaborate to develop a comprehensive approach to achieve meaningful access to justice.

REMOTE VIDEO PILOT PROGRAM ANNOUNCED FOR COOK COUNTY CIRCUIT COURTS

The Circuit Court of Cook County and the Illinois Supreme Court Access to Justice Commission announced a partnership on November 21 that will allow individuals to appear for cases remotely in three different Divisions of the Cook County Circuit Courts. The Remote Video Pilot program is scheduled to run through November 30, 2020. Two judges from each of the Chancery, County, and Domestic Relations Divisions will oversee the use of remote video in their courtrooms.

CONCLUSION

The accomplishments detailed above represent only a few of the initiatives undertaken by the Illinois Courts in 2019. I encourage you to review the 2019 Annual Report, which provides further information about the functions and activities of the judicial branch.

On a final note, I would like to offer my sincere appreciation to everyone in the judicial branch who helped make 2019 a productive year. It takes a lot of dedication and hard work to make the Illinois court system operate with a high level of integrity and efficiency. I look forward to another year of achievement and improvements in our courts.

Anne M. Burke
Chief Justice
Illinois Supreme Court
The Illinois Judicial Conference (IJC) unveiled its Strategic Agenda for the Illinois Judicial Branch (Branch) through the year 2022. The IJC has created a mission statement, vision statement and core values for the Branch, along with strategic goals and the strategies designed to achieve them. The Strategic Agenda will serve as a guide for the future of the Branch as it begins the implementation phase.
“Change is coming so fast from ever-advancing technology, shifting demographics and economic uncertainty that the Judicial Branch could no longer be reactive to the challenges facing the administration of justice. This Strategic Agenda helps us anticipate and prepare for the future,” Chief Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier said. “My colleagues and I commend the members of the Conference for the hard work they put into this plan and for the continuing work that lies ahead.”

The mission of the Branch will be “to protect the rights and liberties of all by providing equal access to justice, resolving disputes, and upholding the rule of law pursuant to the powers and duties entrusted to us by the Illinois Constitution.”

The vision of the Branch is “to be trusted and open to all by being fair, innovative, diverse, and responsive to changing needs.”

“It has been a joy to work with so many creative individuals from throughout the court system who are dedicated to making the Illinois Judicial Branch the very best that it can be,” AOIC Director Marcia M. Meis said. “This plan gives the Branch a heightened focus on how to best deliver justice throughout the state. The implementation phase will start in the coming months and will put these ideas into action.”

THE MISSION OF THE BRANCH WILL BE

“to protect the rights and liberties of all by providing equal access to justice, resolving disputes, and upholding the rule of law pursuant to the powers and duties entrusted to us by the Illinois Constitution.”

THE VISION OF THE BRANCH IS

“to be trusted and open to all by being fair, innovative, diverse, and responsive to changing needs.”

THE CORE VALUES OF THE BRANCH ARE:

FAIRNESS
Impartial in our actions, decisions, and treatment of all.

ACCOUNTABILITY
Responsible and answerable for our conduct and performance, and transparent in the use of public resources.

INTEGRITY
Honest, trustworthy, and committed to the highest ethical and professional standards.

RESPECT
Treat all with dignity, courtesy, and understanding.
THE STRATEGIC GOALS OF THE BRANCH ARE TO PROVIDE:

1. Accessible justice & equal protection under the law.
2. Procedural fairness, timeliness, & operational efficiency.
3. Professionalism & accountability throughout the judicial branch.
4. Understanding of & confidence in the judicial branch.
5. Sufficient funding & effective use of judicial branch resources.

The full strategic agenda and IJC roster are available here.

“It is very positive that the Judicial Branch is involved in strategic planning. This is happening because of the leadership provided by the Chief Justice and the Director of the AOIC,” said retired Justice S. Gene Schwarm, who served as Strategic Planning Project Manager. “A cornerstone of strategic planning is open communication from top to bottom and vice versa. Reconstituting the Judicial Conference into a smaller, more diverse group has allowed many voices to be heard.”

The IJC, which crafted the strategic agenda, is comprised of 29 voting members: 15 judges and 14 non-judges, with the Chief Justice serving as Chair. The judicial members include a second member of the Supreme Court, as well as judges from all levels and geographic areas of the state appointed either by nature of their position or individually selected by the Supreme Court. The IJC non-judicial members include the Director of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts and 13 other justice partners selected by the Court from the following categories: court clerks, court administrators, attorneys and public members.

© 2019 Developed by the Illinois Judicial Conference with assistance from the State Justice Institute.
JANUARY 15
The Illinois Supreme Court received a high-quality reproduction of a famous Abraham Lincoln photograph. The photograph was taken in Springfield by well-known photographer Alexander Hesler on June 3, 1860, for Lincoln’s 1860 presidential campaign. Historians consider Hesler’s portrait one of the best taken of Lincoln during his pre-presidential years. The permanent installation is made possible by donations from the Illinois Judges Association, the Illinois State Bar Association and their respective foundations – the Illinois Judges Foundation and the Illinois Bar Foundation.

FEBRUARY 22
The Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice held the Law Student Leaders Summit in Chicago. Over 50 law school students from the nine law schools in Illinois were in attendance to hear from speakers from across the legal spectrum.
MARCH 19
The Illinois Supreme Court hosted ‘Law School for Legislators’ with all seven Supreme Court Justices and leadership and new members of the Illinois House of Representatives and Senate in attendance. The event, held at the Illinois Supreme Court Building in Springfield, was intended to familiarize the legislative branch with court operations and to foster dialogue of communication, cooperation and coordination between the legislative and judicial branches.

APRIL 22

APRIL 29–30
The Appellate Court Conference was held in Lombard. Justice Mary Jane Theis delivered the conference address and 2nd District Appellate Justice Donald C. Hudson provided the welcome and overview as Chair of the Appellate Court Administrative Committee.
MAY 6
The Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Pretrial Practices hosted the second in a series of public hearings in Urbana at the ILEAS Training Center. The hearing was held to receive the comments of individuals, organizations and entities interested in voicing their opinions on pretrial reform.

JUNE 6–7
The Biennial Juvenile Conference was held in Oak Brook. The Conference brings together stakeholders throughout the state to discuss and develop strategies to better ensure that the experiences of youth in the child protection and juvenile justice systems are consistent with the core principles of Procedural Fairness.

JUNE 17
A hearing hosted by the Illinois Supreme Court’s Pretrial Practices Commission was held in Chicago at the Michael A. Bilandic Building. Individuals, organizations, and entities were present to voice their opinions and provide information on pretrial reform in Illinois.
JULY 31
The Illinois Supreme Court swore in Judge Mary Ellen Coghlan as an Appellate Court Justice in the First District. Judge Coghlan was assigned to fill the opening created by the retirement of Appellate Justice Mary Anne Mason. Judge Coghlan was first appointed to the bench in 1995, and was elected to six-year term in 1996. She was subsequently retained for six-year terms in the November, 2002, 2008 and 2014 elections.

AUGUST 20
The members of the Illinois JusticeCorps took an oath and were sworn in by Justice Mary K. Rochford. This program places college students, recent graduates and other volunteers in courthouses throughout the state to help the growing number of litigants appearing in court every day without lawyers.

SEPTEMBER 15
The Drake Hotel in Chicago was the site of the 2019 Joint Conference of the Supreme Court of Illinois Judicial College and the American Judges Association during the week of September 15. Judges from both organizations gathered for strategic meetings and educational sessions. Chicago Mayor Lori Lightfoot addressed the attendees in Illinois.
SEPTEMBER 18
The Illinois Supreme Court left the Illinois Supreme Court Building behind for a day to hear oral arguments in front of over 500 students and teachers at Lewis & Clark Community College in Godfrey. The Supreme Court heard arguments on September 18 in the cases of People v. Morger and Dew-Becker v. Andrew Wu. Students lined up to ask questions of the participating attorneys following the arguments, which were livestreamed statewide.

OCTOBER 26
Justice Anne M. Burke officially became Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court. She began a three-year term, succeeding Lloyd A. Karmeier, whose tenure as Chief Justice ended on Oct. 25, 2019. Chief Justice Burke is the third woman to serve as Chief Justice, following the late Mary Ann McMorrow and current Justice Rita B. Garman.

NOVEMBER 7
Justices of the Illinois Supreme Court and the Illinois Appellate Court administered the attorney’s oath to approximately 1,459 new attorneys at five separate locations across the state.

DECEMBER 9
The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts hosted New Judge Orientation during the week of December 9 in Chicago. Approximately 50 new judges attended the seminar, which provides intensive education and training, and featured a workshop at the Art Institute of Chicago.
JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court is the state’s highest court; it also supervises and administers the state’s judicial system. The state is divided into five judicial districts, with three justices elected from the first district (Cook County) and one justice elected from each of the other four districts. Justices are elected in partisan elections for 10 years and may be retained in office for additional terms of 10 years. A chief justice is elected by the other justices for a term of three years.
CHIEF JUSTICE ANNE M. BURKE

Place of birth / Chicago
Hometown / 1st District
Education / Chicago Kent College of Law
Joined the court / Appointed in 2006, elected in 2008
Notable / Founded the Special Olympics in 1968 while working for the Chicago Park District

JUSTICE ROBERT R. THOMAS

Place of birth / Rochester, N.Y.
Hometown / 2nd District
Education / Loyola University School of Law
Joined the court / Elected in 2000
Notable / Academic All American for the University of Notre Dame football team, played for the Chicago Bears and created the Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism during his term as Chief Justice

JUSTICE THOMAS L. KILBRIDE

Place of birth / LaSalle
Hometown / 3rd District
Education / Antioch School of Law, Washington, D.C.
Joined the court / Elected in 2000
Notable / Led initiatives on e-filing, access to justice and cameras in the courts as Chief Justice from 2010-2013

JUSTICE RITA B. GARMAN

Place of birth / Aurora
Hometown / 4th District
Education / University of Iowa College of Law
Joined the court / Appointed in 2001, elected in 2002
Notable / Has served at every level of the judiciary – associate judge, circuit judge, Appellate Justice, Supreme Court Justice, Supreme Court Chief Justice
JUSTICE LLOYD A. KARMEIER

Place of birth / Washington County
Hometown / 5th District
Education / University of Illinois
Joined the court / Elected in 2004
Notable / Clerked for Illinois Supreme Court Justice Byron O. House and U.S. District Court Judge James L. Foreman

JUSTICE MARY JANE THEIS

Place of birth / Chicago
Hometown / 1st District
Education / University of San Francisco School of Law
Joined the court / Appointed in 2010, elected in 2012
Notable / Has a passion for judicial education and has served as chair of both the Committee on Judicial Education and Committee on Judicial Conduct and is the Supreme Court Liaison to the Board of Trustees of the Illinois Judicial College

JUSTICE P. SCOTT NEVILLE, JR.

Place of birth / Chicago
Hometown / 1st District
Education / Washington University School of Law
Joined the court / Appointed in 2018
Notable / Co-founded the Alliance of Bar Associations, a group dedicated to promoting diversity, equality, and fairness in judicial evaluations. During his tenure as President of the CCBA, he also started the “In Court Referral Program” and established the CCBA Hall of Fame
The Clerk of the Supreme Court is appointed by the Court, reports to the Court and serves at the Court’s pleasure. The Clerk is the Court’s principal case processing and records manager who operates the office through a staff of specialized deputies, and by planning, developing, and implementing policies and procedures necessary to execute the responsibilities of the office. The office has existed since circa 1818 and supports the Court in the exercise of its statewide jurisdiction, authority to regulate the practice of law in Illinois, and supervisory authority over the courts in the state.

In its case management capacity, the Clerk’s Office maintains four distinct automated dockets, executing all associated processes, to ensure compliance with Supreme Court Rules and to ensure that cases are effectively monitored and scheduled, from initiation to issuance of mandates and final orders as appropriate. The general docket unit of the office supports the Court’s primary docket. The miscellaneous record docket consists primarily of attorney matters. The miscellaneous docket consists of conviction-related cases filed by pro se incarcerated litigants and provides a forum without compromising standard filing requirements. The proposed rule docket was developed and functions consistent with the mandate of Supreme Court Rule 3. E-filing of Court documents began in 2012 on a pilot basis for certain cases on the general docket and was expanded in 2013 to permit e-filing in all cases on the Court’s general and miscellaneous record dockets. Beginning July 2017, mandatory e-filing of civil cases in the Illinois Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Courts was established through a single, centralized electronic filing manager (EFM), called eFileIL and included integration with each court’s case management system.

In its record management capacity, the Clerk’s Office maintains the Court’s active and closed files and permanent records, dating to 1818, including historically significant documents which are housed and preserved in the State Archives by agreement, and through an agreement with State Archives oversees the conversion of paper documents to microfilm, a more stable medium.

The Clerk’s Office registers and renews professional service corporations and associations, and limited liability companies and partnerships engaged in the practice of law. In October 2012, the Supreme Court announced an e-renewal process beginning with the 2013 renewal year, that gave law firm entities the option to electronically renew their annual registration and pay the $40 renewal fee electronically. In the sixth year of this e-initiative, approximately 82% of law firm entities chose to electronically renew. The Clerk’s Office is also responsible for maintaining the roll of attorneys, which includes the licensing process, and issuance of law licenses; files judicial financial disclosure statements required of state court judges. Beginning in March 2019, state court judges were offered an electronic option to file their annual statement of economic interests. The Office also compiles, analyzes, and reports statistics on the Supreme Court’s caseload and other activity, as reflected in the accompanying statistical summary and narrative for 2019.

The Clerk’s Office provides information to the public at large and the practicing bar and has working relationships with other courts and judicial branch offices, Supreme Court agencies, and state and county departments.
MARSHAL OF THE SUPREME COURT
JIM CIMAROSSA

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.

SUPREME COURT CHIEF INTERNAL AUDITOR
JOHN BRACCO

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 RESEARCH DIRECTOR
JOHN ROBINSON

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

SUPREME COURT LIBRARIAN
GEOFFREY P. PELZEK

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.

REPORTER OF DECISIONS
JACOB JOST

The Reporter of Decisions directs a staff that publishes opinions of the supreme and appellate courts in the Official Reports. Employees verify case citations, compose attorney lines, and edit opinions for style and grammar. The Reporter is also responsible for publication of the Illinois Supreme Court Rules and preparation of the Style Manual for the Supreme and Appellate Courts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPREME COURT FILED</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Legislative Leaders:

I am pleased to provide the Annual Report of the activities for the 2019 Illinois Judicial Conference as required by Article VI, Section 17, of the Illinois Constitution of 1970. In keeping with this Constitutional mandate, Illinois Supreme Court Rule 41 creates the Illinois Judicial Conference and charges the Conference with considering the work of the courts and suggesting improvements in the administration of justice.

Following the inaugural meeting of the new Illinois Judicial Conference (IJC) in November 2018, the IJC devoted most of 2019 to a strategic planning process that resulted in crafting mission and vision statements, and a set of core values for the judicial branch. The IJC also identified five strategic goals to be addressed in a three-year Strategic Agenda, together with strategies designed to achieve each of these strategic goals. On October 2, 2019, the IJC unveiled the Supreme Court’s Strategic Agenda, which was developed by the IJC and approved by the Court. I am pleased to convey that the Strategic Agenda will serve as a guide for the future of the Illinois Judicial Branch as it begins the implementation phase in 2020. This report includes a detailed explanation of the IJC’s work on developing the Strategic Agenda.

This report also includes a summary of several Supreme Court decisions from the past year that are offered for the General Assembly’s consideration. In offering these cases, the Court is mindful of the distinct 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 cases for your consideration and look forward to the General Assembly’s continued responsiveness and support.

On behalf of the Court, I respectfully submit the Supreme Court’s Annual Report to the Legislative Leaders of the General Assembly on the 2019 Illinois Judicial Conference. This report is also available to the other members of the General Assembly on the Supreme Court’s website at www.illinoiscourts.gov.

Respectfully,

Anne M. Burke
Chief Justice
Supreme Court of Illinois
Article VI, Section 17, of the Illinois Constitution mandates that the Illinois Supreme Court convene an annual Judicial Conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice. Illinois Supreme Court Rule 41 implements this constitutional requirement by defining the duties and the membership of the Illinois Judicial Conference.

Prior to Conference Year 2018, the Court approved a plan to transition the existing Judicial Conference to a structure focused on long-term statewide strategic planning for the judicial branch. In the fall of 2018, the Court amended Supreme Court Rule 41 to reconstitute the Judicial Conference from its subject-matter committees to a smaller, active strategic planning and policy body that included judges and non-judges working in and with the judicial branch.

During Conference Year 2019, the newly reconstituted Judicial Conference was devoted to the development phase of a strategic planning initiative, culminating with the drafting of a Strategic Agenda for the Illinois Judicial Branch. The Judicial Conference convened three times during the conference year, including a multi-day session. The meetings were facilitated by Hon. S. Gene Schwarm, retired Illinois Appellate Court Justice, as well as Strategic Planning Project consultant, Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivy. The strategic planning process included drafting and administering a statewide survey gathering feedback and suggestions from judicial officers, judicial branch employees, justice partners, and external stakeholders to help shape the future direction, goals, and strategic priorities of the judicial branch. The responses to the survey indicated that the three biggest challenges/issues facing the court system in the next three years are (1) need for/access to treatment services, (2) limited funding and/or disparity of resources and (3) technology in the court system. In addition to the survey, the Judicial Conference reviewed internal and external trends affecting the judicial branch and assessed future implications of those trends. The Judicial Conference also engaged in an organizational “SWOT” assessment analyzing the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for the judicial branch. After careful thought and much deliberation, the Judicial Conference crafted mission and vision statements and a set of core values (fairness, accountability, integrity and respect) for the judicial branch.

On October 2, 2019, the Strategic Agenda, which was developed by the Judicial Conference and approved by the Court, was unveiled. The Strategic Agenda identified five strategic goals to be addressed over the next three-years. The five strategic goals were identified as (1) accessible justice/equal protection under the law, (2) procedural fairness, timeliness and operational efficiency, (3) professionalism/accountability throughout the judicial branch, (4) understanding of/confidence in the judicial branch, and (5) sufficient funding/effective use of judicial branch resources. Each strategic goal included several strategic initiatives to be implemented and aimed at achieving each goal. Subsequent to the unveiling of the Strategic Agenda, it has been distributed to each Illinois judge, reviewing court and circuit clerk, trial court administrator and probation director in the state. Copies were also provided to each state legislator, members of the Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators, the ISBA, the Dean
at every Illinois law school, and executive directors at legal aid providers. Additionally, each Illinois chief judge was advised to contact the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts if they wish to share a copy with local stakeholders (i.e. states 2 attorney’s, public defenders, board members, etc.). For a wider audience, the Strategic Agenda is available on the Court’s website.

Implementation of strategies to achieve each strategic goal will allow judicial officers and justice partners to come together to think beyond day-to-day problems. These discussions will be across myriad issues, including case management practices, the allocation and use of limited resources, improving and expanding on the collection of court data, sustaining internal and external cooperation and collaboration to improve the delivery of justice, and improving service to the public. Crucial next steps with the implementation phase of the Strategic Agenda was the assignment of 15 defined strategic initiatives to existing Supreme Court Commissions, Conference of Chief Circuit Judges or newly established Judicial Conference Task Forces.

The Supreme Court approved creating eight new Judicial Conference Task Forces with 10-12 judicial and non-judicial members to serve on these task forces. Each task force has a designated chair, vice-chair and staff from the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC), assigned as a member or support person. The Judicial Conference leadership convened all chairs, vice-chairs and AOIC staff serving on these various entities to further explain their charge and process. Following that meeting, it is anticipated that in Conference Year 2020 each entity will meet on a schedule determined by the chair and that each chair will report that entity’s progress back to the Judicial Conference at the Judicial Conference meetings in 2020.

Justice Schwarm (ret.), as Project Coordinator for the Judicial Conference Strategic Agenda, and Dr. Wagenknecht-Ivy, as Strategic Agenda Project Consultant, will continue to help guide the implementation process throughout Conference Year 2020.

As evidenced by the development of the Strategic Agenda for the judicial branch, the scope of work undertaken by the Judicial Conference will continue during the implementation phase. As such, the Judicial Conference will continue to honor its constitutional mandate and remain steadfast in its goal of improving the administration of justice in Illinois.
Defendants in two cases were charged with unlawful use of weapons (720 ILCS 5/24-1(a)(4)(West 2016)), which provides, in part, that it is unlawful for a person to possess or carry a stun gun or Taser in a vehicle or in public places. The circuit court held that this provision was unconstitutional under the Second Amendment. The Supreme Court affirmed that section 24-1(a)(4) was facially unconstitutional on the basis that section 24-1(a)(4) was a complete ban on carrying a stun gun or Taser in public and the Second Amendment applies to all bearable arms including stun guns and Tasers. In so holding, the Court noted that stun guns and Tasers do not fall under the Firearm Concealed Carry Act (430 ILCS 66/10) because a concealed carry license cannot be issued for a stun gun or Taser.

In this case, the minor son of a deceased father, whose death was caused by a drug overdose, sought damages against the estate of the deceased drug dealer who sold the son’s father the illegal drugs by citing the Drug Dealer Liability Act (Act) (740 ILCS 57/25(b)(2)(West 2016)). Defendant filed a motion to dismiss on the grounds that the Act violates the due process clauses of both the federal and state constitutions by imposing an irrebuttable presumption of causation that has no rational connection between defendant’s knowing participation in the illegal drug market and causation of the user’s injuries. The trial court found section 25(b)(2) of the Act unconstitutional. The Supreme Court held section 25(b)(2) to be unconstitutional as it violates due process. The Court determined that the legislative purpose of the Act was legitimate but that the Act did not bear a reasonable relationship to the legislative purpose. Because section 25(b)(2) imposes liability on persons having no connection to or nexus with the drug use, it is unreasonable and arbitrary.

Plaintiff worked as a lobbyist for the Illinois Federation of Teachers for many years, worked for one day as a substitute teacher in 2007 after obtaining a substitute teaching certificate, and obtained a pension from the Teachers Retirement System (TRS). This pension was permissible as a result of the enactment of Public Act 94-1111, which allowed service credit in the TRS for union work prior to becoming a teacher. Plaintiff contributed nearly $200,000 to the system for his union service and met the requirements for obtaining service credit in the TRS. However, following public criticism, Public Act 97-651 was enacted into law in 2012 and retroactively repealed the section that had allowed plaintiff service credit in the TRS. The Supreme Court held that the 2012 legislation was unconstitutional because it violated the pension protection clause in the Illinois Constitution, which prohibits reversing public pension benefits that were previously promised.
PEOPLE V. CLARK, 2019 IL 122891
(JUNE 6, 2019)

Defendant successfully completed inpatient treatment, and her bond was modified to allow her to enter a halfway house, providing extended residential care following substance abuse treatment. The bond modification provided that if she was released or discharged from the halfway house for any reason, she was to immediately return to the custody of the jail. Defendant left the halfway house but did not report directly to the jail and her probation was revoked. After being sentenced to prison time on the underlying burglary and credit card convictions, the State also charged defendant with the offense of escape, pursuant to 720 ILCS 5/31-6(a)(West 2014) of the Criminal Code. At trial, defendant argued that her bail bond violation did not constitute escape. The trial court convicted her of escape. The appellate court reversed, finding that the failure to report did not constitute an escape because she was not in custody while on bond awaiting sentencing. The Supreme Court reversed the appellate court and affirmed the conviction. The Court determined that, by the statute’s plain language, custody is not an element of escape by failing to report. The Court further determined that it was within the discretion of the prosecutor to charge defendant with escape rather than with violation of bond. As a final matter, the Court encouraged the General Assembly to review and revise section 31-6(a) if the Court’s construction was not as the legislature intended.

COUNTY OF WILL ET AL. V. THE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD, 2019 IL 122798
(JUNE 20, 2019)

At issue in this case is a 2010 amendment to the Illinois Environmental Protection Act (415 ILCS 5/1) (West 2010), which directed the Pollution Control Board (the Board) to adopt rules for the use of clean construction or demolition debris (CCDD), as well as uncontaminated soil, as fill materials at clean construction or demolition debris fill operations. The legislation also stated that the rules must include “standards and procedures necessary to protect groundwater.” The Board ultimately required strong “front-end” testing and certain requirements for the debris and soil, but not “back-end” groundwater monitoring in the rules they promulgated and were challenged by the EPA and Will County. The appellate court affirmed the Board. The Supreme Court affirmed, rejecting the contention that not requiring groundwater monitoring was an arbitrary and capricious action by the Board. The Court reasoned that determining how best to provide and maintain a healthy environment in the State is the responsibility of the General Assembly and the Board. The Court encouraged the legislature to direct the Board to adopt a groundwater monitoring program for CCDD and uncontaminated soil fill sites if it believes the Board’s requirements run counter to the mandate to protect groundwater.
**Nichols v. Fahrenkamp, 2019 IL 123990 (June 20, 2019)**

Plaintiff sued her mother over claims that parts of settlement funds received from a car accident plaintiff had been in as a minor were used for her mother’s benefit. The trial court ruled in plaintiff’s favor but found her mother not liable for the entire amount because the guardian *ad litem* that had been appointed at the time had approved the estimates and expenditures. Plaintiff brought a lawsuit against defendant, as guardian *ad litem* for plaintiff, alleging legal malpractice for those approvals, while defendant held that he was not liable for any negligence due to quasijudicial immunity. The trial court ruled in favor of defendant and granted summary judgment in his favor. The appellate court reversed. The Supreme Court reversed the appellate court and affirmed the judgment of the circuit court. The Court held that court-appointed guardians *ad litem* are protected by quasi-judicial immunity provided that the functions actually performed are consistent with that of a witness and not an advocate. The Court also urged the General Assembly to consider reviewing the Probate Act and Marriage Act to ensure consistent use of the phrase “guardian *ad litem*”.

**People v. Johnson, 2019 IL 123318 (August 1, 2019)**

In this case, defendant was convicted of burglary in a Walmart store during store hours. On appeal, defendant challenged whether his act of shoplifting could be prosecuted as burglary as opposed to retail theft, arguing that the Supreme Court’s recent decision in People v. Bradford, 2016 IL 118674 also extended to “unlawful-entry burglary” and precluded all shoplifting-as-burglary prosecutions. The appellate court reversed the conviction. The Supreme Court reversed the judgment of the appellate court, holding that the act of shoplifting could be prosecuted as burglary as opposed to retail theft. The Court relied on the legislative history surrounding the enactment of retail theft and concluded that it did not show any intent to do away with prosecution of shoplifting as unlawful-entry burglary.

**People v. Morger, 2019 IL 123643 (November 21, 2019)**

Defendant, who was convicted of aggravated criminal sexual abuse and criminal sexual abuse, was sentenced to four years’ probation, including a prohibition against accessing social networking websites. Defendant challenged the probationary condition of section 5-6-3(a)(8.9) of the Unified Code of Corrections (730 ILCS 5/5-6-3(a)(8.9) (West 2016)), which placed on defendant a “complete ban on accessing social networking websites” as being unreasonable and unconstitutional under the First Amendment. The appellate court rejected this argument. The Supreme Court held that when deciding the propriety of a condition of probation, the overriding concern is reasonableness; where a constitutional right is involved, the condition must be narrowly drawn. The Court found that the complete ban from social media was not narrowly drawn, in part because the offense did not involve social media use, there were other conditions that served rehabilitative purposes, and the ban’s protective value did not manifestly outweigh the probationer’s constitutional rights. The Court therefore found section 5-6-3(a)(8.9) of the Code to be overbroad and unconstitutional.
**LAKEWOOD NURSING AND REHABILITATION CENTER, LLC V. THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH ET AL., 2019 IL 124019 (NOVEMBER 21, 2019)**

In this case, a resident of the Lakewood Nursing and Rehabilitation Center was facing transfer or discharge over non-payment when the resident requested that the Department of Public Health (Department) hold a hearing. Section 3-411 of the Nursing Home Care Act (Act) (210 ILCS 45/3-411)(West 2012) states that the hearing “shall” be conducted “not later than 10 days” after the resident’s request and requires that a decision be rendered within 14 days after the request. The circuit court interpreted section 3-411 as directory such that the Department did not violate the statutory time requirements, but the appellate court reversed based on a mandatory interpretation of the word ‘shall,” holding that the Department lost jurisdiction over the involuntary discharge of the resident because it had not held a hearing within 10 days of her hearing request. The Supreme Court reversed the judgment of the appellate court and affirmed the judgment of the circuit court, concluding that the Department was not precluded from conducting a hearing beyond the 10-day time period. The Court held that section 3-411 of the Act is directory because there was no indication in the statute that the legislature intended to deny authority and prohibit further action in the case of noncompliance and because the rights of nursing home residents will not be generally injured by a directory construction.

**PEOPLE V. EUBANKS, 2019 IL 123525 (DECEMBER 5, 2019)**

Defendant in this case was convicted of, among other offenses, aggravated driving under the influence (DUI) for a 2009 hit and run that left a woman dead and her son seriously injured. On appeal, the appellate court reversed the aggravated DUI conviction as section 11-501.2(c)(2) of the Illinois Vehicle Code (625 ILCS 5/11-501.2(c)(2) (West 2008)) was held facially unconstitutional because it permits compelled chemical testing without a warrant. The Supreme Court held that section 11-501.2(c)(2), which allows search only where there is probable cause to believe the individual is under the influence and there was a motor vehicle accident causing personal injury or death, is simply a “codified exigency” which will almost always be constitutional. Because it can be constitutionally applied in most instances, the statute is not facially unconstitutional. However, the Court did hold that it is unconstitutional as applied to defendant’s case. The Court reasoned that, given the passage of more than seven hours from arrest to blood draw, and nearly eight-and-a-half hours from arrest to urine collection, there was no reasonable belief by law enforcement that seeking a warrant would have interfered with other pressing duties.
### SUPREME COURT COMMITTEES

**STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE COURT AND CHAIRPERSONS DURING 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair/Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appellate Court Administrative Committee</td>
<td>Justice Mary Jane Theis, liaison officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellate Justice Donald C. Hudson, Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Registration &amp; Disciplinary Commission</td>
<td>David F. Rolewick, Esq., Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier, liaison officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Board - Claire A. Manning, Esq., Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill W. Landsberg, Esq., Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Admissions to the Bar</td>
<td>Andrew M. Raucci, Esq., President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy K. Johnson, Esq., Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Anne M. Burke, liaison officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Character and Fitness</td>
<td>Eileen L. Furey, Esq., Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Storino, Esq., Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First Judicial District)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Pcolinski, Jr., Esq., Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Baroni, Esq., Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Second Judicial District)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis J. Baron, Esq., Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David B. Collins, Esq., Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Third Judicial District)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Committee on Jury Instructions in Civil Cases                              | A. Clay Cox, Esq., Chair                                                        |
|                                                                          | Elizabeth A. Robb, Esq., Vice-Chair                                              |
| (Fourth Judicial District)                                                | David L. Piercy, Esq., Chair                                                     |
|                                                                           | Beth A. Bauer, Esq., Vice-Chair                                                  |
| (Fifth Judicial District)                                                  | Justice Robert R. Thomas, liaison officer                                       |

| Committee on Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases                           | Adrian E. Harless, Esq., Chair                                                   |
|                                                                          | Elizabeth A. Kaveny, Esq., Vice-Chair                                             |
|                                                                           | Professor Nancy S. Marder, Reporter                                              |
|                                                                           | Justice P. Scott Neville, Jr., liaison officer                                  |

| Committee on Professional Responsibility                                  | Michael A. Scodro, Esq., Chair                                                   |
|                                                                          | Raylene DeWitte Grischow, Esq., Vice-Chair                                       |
|                                                                           | Justice Anne M. Burke, liaison officer                                           |

| Judicial Mentor Committee                                                  | Judge Michael A. Kramer, Status Member                                           |
| (Chairperson of Chief Judges’ Conference)                                 |                                                                                  |
| Judge Susan Clancy Boles, Status Member                                    | (Vice-Chairperson of Chief Judges’ Conference)                                  |

| Legislative Committee of the Supreme Court of Illinois                    | Judge James P. Flannery, Jr., Chair                                              |
|                                                                          | Appellate Justice Mary K. O’Brien, Vice-Chair                                    |

| Minimum Continuing Legal Education Board                                  | Michele M. Jochner, Esq., Chair                                                  |
|                                                                          | Patrick B. Mathis, Esq., Vice-Chair                                              |
| Chief Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier, liaison officer                         |                                                                                  |

| Special Supreme Court Advisory Committee for Justice and Mental Health Planning | Appellate Judge Kathryn E. Zenoff, Chair                                         |
|                                                                                  | Justice Mary Jane Theis, liaison officer                                         |

| Supreme Court Committee on Juvenile Courts                                | Judge Andrea M. Buford, Chair                                                    |
Special Supreme Court Committee on Judicial Conduct
Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice
Appellate Judge Mary K. Rochford, Chair
Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, Liaison Officer.

Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism
Martin V. Sinclair, Chair
James L. DeAno, Esq., Vice-Chair
Justice Robert R. Thomas, Liaison Officer

Supreme Court Committee on Equality
Judge Joseph G. McGraw, Chair

Supreme Court Committee on Illinois Evidence
Warren D. Wolfson, Esq., Chair
Appellate Judge Robert L. Carter, Vice-Chair
Justice P. Scott Neville, Jr., Liaison Officer

Supreme Court e-Business Policy Advisory Board
Judge David Hylla, Chair
Supreme Court e-Business Technical Committee
Judge Val Gunnarsson, Chair

Supreme Court Judicial Performance Evaluation Committee
Appellate Judge Michael J. Burke, Chair
Justice Mary Jane Theis, Liaison Officer

Supreme Court Language Access Advisory Board
Supreme Court Probation Policy Advisory Board
Rosemarie Gray, Esq., Chair
Daniel Hunt, Esq., Vice-Chair

Supreme Court Rules Committee
Judge John C. Anderson, Chair
Antonio M. Romanucci, Esq., Vice-Chair
Professor Keith H. Beyler, Esq., Reporter
Professor Jo Desha Lucas, Esq., Emeritus
Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, Liaison Officer
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, 2019, judicial salaries, as determined by the legislature, were: Supreme Court justices, $240,016; appellate court judges, $225,900; circuit court judges, $207,291; and associate judges, $196,926. The state also pays for support staff of supreme and appellate court judges, staff in other units of the supreme and appellate courts, 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 Calendar Year 2019, the arbitration filing and rejection fees collected amounted to $4,227,284.62.

State funding for probation and court services departments covers approximately 3,100 probation and court services personnel, for which the counties receive full and partial salary reimbursement on a monthly basis. For the first time in over thirty (30) years, the statutorily mandated full funding level was appropriated to fund eligible probation services positions.

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.
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 2019, the total number of full-time employees in all 102 circuit clerk offices was 3,048, assisted by a total of 157 part-time employees. The cost of operating all circuit clerks’ offices totaled $215,994,087 in 2019.

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 2019 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.

Court Document Storage Fund: is used for any costs relative to the storage of court records.
$26,516,990

Court Automation Fund: is used to establish and maintain automated systems for keeping court records.
$26,723,527

County Law Library Fund: helps defray the costs of maintaining a law library in the county for judges, attorneys, and the public.
$9,058,750

County Fund To Finance the Court System: is available from fees collected by circuit clerks to help finance the court system in the county.
$5,957,679

Circuit Court Clerk Operations and Administrative Fund: is used to offset costs incurred for collection and disbursement of State and local funds.
$4,594,438

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 the State Comptroller’s offset system. At the end of FY19, there were 5 claims due and payable, totaling $21,190.93.
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 2019 by circuit clerks are listed below:

**Child Support and Maintenance:** Court ordered payments collected and distributed by Circuit Clerks and the State Disbursement Unit.

$1,088,643,531

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

$2,957,686

**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.

$6,068,142

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

$2,386,148

**Traffic and Criminal Conviction Surcharge:** An additional penalty imposed in traffic and criminal cases is used for training of law enforcement and correctional officers.

$2,957,819

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

$2,964,221
Illinois 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 below, 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-four circuits. Each circuit is located in one of five appellate court districts. Cases enter the 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.
The path a case may follow in the process from start to finish can be complicated. The diagram, to the right, demonstrates, in general terms, how cases proceed through the state court system.

**SUPREME COURT**
- certain cases from appellate court or circuit courts
- 1,942 new cases filed in 2019

**APPELLATE COURT**
- five districts
- appeals from circuits and Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission
- may review cases from administrative agencies
- 5,785 new cases filed in 2019

**CIRCUIT COURT**
- 24 circuits for 102 counties
- 1 to 12 counties per circuit
- hears most cases
- may review cases from administrative agencies
- 2.3 million new cases filed in 2019

**ARBITRATION PANELS**
- panels of 3 attorneys – impartial finders of fact and law
- law suits of $30,000 or less in Cook and $50,000 or less in Boone, DuPage, Ford, Henry, Kane, Madison, McHenry, McLean, Mercer, Rock Island, St. Clair, Whiteside, Will and Winnebago Counties

**CIRCUIT CLERK**
- one clerk per county (102)
- cases enter the court system in this office
- court's official record keeper
- collect fines, fees and costs, distributing all amounts to various agencies
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 trial courts, 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 these committees can be found within this report. The Supreme Court also makes appointments to other committees, commissions, and boards as listed to 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 their duties. The staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts supports 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, research director, marshal, librarian and their staffs. Each support unit is described within this report.

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 a research director and their staffs appointed by the appellate judges. Appeals enter the clerk’s office, where deputy clerks assign each 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 non-compliant 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 record-keeping 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.

JUDICIAL INQUIRY BOARD

The Supreme Court appoints two judges to the Board, the governor also appoints four non-lawyers and three lawyers, which receives and investigates complaints against judges and prosecutors and brings 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.
Each circuit is administered by a chief judge who is elected by vote of the circuit court judges of that circuit. The chief circuit 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 documents, maintain complete records of all cases, and maintain records of money received and disbursed related to these cases.
**APPELLATE COURTS**

Except for those cases appealed directly to the Supreme Court, a person has the right to request a review of a circuit court judge’s decision by the Appellate Court.

The Appellate Court is organized into five districts. The first meets in Chicago, second in Elgin, third in Ottawa, fourth in Springfield, and the fifth in Mt. Vernon.

Each district can have one or more divisions. There are six divisions in the first district and one in each of the other four. The Supreme Court assigns judges to the various divisions. The presiding judge of each division assigns judges to panels of three to hear appeals.

The number of appellate court judgeships, currently fifty-four, is determined by the legislature. The Supreme Court can assign additional circuit, appellate or retired judges temporarily to any district. Judges are elected by voters in each district for ten-year terms, and may be retained for additional ten-year terms. Each judge has a support staff of two law clerks and a secretary.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIL &amp; CRIMINAL CASELOADS</th>
<th>CIVIL FILED</th>
<th>CIVIL DISPOSED</th>
<th>CRIMINAL FILED</th>
<th>CRIMINAL DISPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>2,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>2,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>2,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>4,253</td>
<td>3,311</td>
<td>3,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL CASELOAD* ALL CASE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>6,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>6,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6,835</td>
<td>7,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7,452</td>
<td>7,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases**

*Beginning in 2017, totals do not include Illinois Worker’s Compensation Commission Cases*
**APPELLATE COURT ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

**Annual Meeting:** The Appellate Court held its annual meeting on April 29, 2019 with the Honorable Joy V. Cunningham (First District Appellate Court) serving as the Honorary Chair of the 2019 Annual Meeting. Fifty-two appellate justices were in attendance. Pursuant to Article VI, Section 15(e) of the Illinois Constitution, the Illinois Appellate Court selects two appellate justices to serve as regular members and three appellate justices to serve as alternative members of the Illinois Courts Commission. For the remainder of 2019, the Honorable Margaret Stanton McBride (First District Appellate Court) and the Honorable Mary K. O’Brien (Third District Appellate Court) were approved to serve as regular members, and the Honorable Mary S. Schostok (Second District Appellate Court), the Honorable Thomas M. Harris (Fourth District Appellate Court), and the Honorable Melissa Chapman (Fifth District Appellate Court) were approved to serve as alternate members. The Honorable Susan F. Hutchinson (Second District Appellate Court) was elected to serve as Honorary Chair of the 2020 Annual Meeting of the Appellate Court to be held October 28, 2020.

**Administrative Committee:** The Appellate Court Administrative Committee was created to study and recommend improvements to the Illinois Appellate Court. Additionally, the Committee plans the Annual Meeting of the Appellate Court and develops the curriculum for the annual Appellate Court Conference. The 2019 Conference was held on April 29-20, 2019 in Lombard. Fifty-two justices were in attendance along with the Clerks and Legal Research Directors of the Supreme and Appellate Courts, appellate court law clerks and legal staff, and the Office of the Reporter of Decisions. A total of 184 participants attended over the two days of the Conference. The Conference address was delivered by the Honorable Mary Jane Theis, Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois. Conference topics included presentations on Standards of Review, Judicial Federalism, Trending Issues in the Appellate Courts, Civil and Criminal Law Updates, and the Reader Expectations Approach Writing Workgroup. The Honorable Donald C. Hudson (Second District Appellate Court) serves as Chair of the Appellate Court Administrative Committee. The Honorable Mary Jane Theis, Justice, Supreme Court of Illinois, serves as the Supreme Court liaison to the Appellate Court Administrative Committee.
## FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

**FIRST DISTRICT — CHICAGO**  
**MICHAEL A. BILANDIC BUILDING**  
*(Formerly State of Illinois Building)*  
160 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 793-5600  

Thomas D. Palella, *Clerk*  
Kathleen Warnick, *Research Director*  

Circuit Court of Cook County  
District Population: 5,150,233

### CIVIL & CRIMINAL CASELOADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil Filed</th>
<th>Civil Disposed</th>
<th>Criminal Filed</th>
<th>Criminal Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1,534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases**

### TOTAL PENDING CASELOAD*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beginning in 2017, totals do not include Illinois Worker’s Compensation Commission Cases
APPELLATE JUDGES

DIVISION I
John C. Griffin, Presiding Judge
Michael B. Hyman*
Daniel J. Pierce*
Carl A. Walker*

DIVISION II
James G. Fitzgerald Smith, Presiding Judge
Terrence J. Lavin
Aurelia Pucinski
Mary Ellen Coghlan*

DIVISION III
David W. Ellis, Presiding Judge
Margaret S. McBride
Nathaniel R. Howse, Jr.
Cynthia Y. Cobbs*

DIVISION IV
Robert E. Gordon, Presiding Judge*
Bertina E. Lampkin
Jesse G. Reyes
Eileen O’Neill Burke

DIVISION V
Thomas E. Hoffman, Presiding Judge
Shelvin Louise Marie Hall
Mary K. Rochford
Mathias W. Delort

DIVISION VI
Mary L. Mikva, Presiding Judge*
Joy V. Cunningham
Maureen E. Connors+
Sheldon A. Harris

+Chair: Executive Committee; ++Vice-Chair; *circuit judge assigned to appellate court
### SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

#### SECOND DISTRICT — ELGIN

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

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

District Population: 3,194,413

---

#### CIVIL & CRIMINAL CASELOADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIVIL FILED</th>
<th>CIVIL DISPOSED</th>
<th>CRIMINAL FILED</th>
<th>CRIMINAL DISPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases**

---

#### TOTAL PENDING CASELOAD*  
**ALL CASE CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beginning in 2017, totals do not include Illinois Worker’s Compensation Commission Cases
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, CONTINUED

APPELLATE JUDGES

Joseph E. Birkett, Presiding Judge
Michael J. Burke
George Bridges
Donald C. Hudson*
Susan Fayette Hutchinson
Ann Brackley Jorgensen
Robert D. McLaren
Mary S. Schostok
Kathryn E. Zenoff*

*Circuit judge assigned to appellate court

CIRCUITS

15th (Carroll, Jo Daviess, Lee, Ogle & Stephenson)
16th (Kane)
17th (Boone & Winnebago)
18th (DuPage)
19th (Lake)
22nd (McHenry)
23rd (DeKalb & Kendall)
### CIVIL & CRIMINAL CASELOADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIVIL FILED</th>
<th>CIVIL DISPOSED</th>
<th>CRIMINAL FILED</th>
<th>CRIMINAL DISPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases**

### TOTAL PENDING CASELOAD\(^*\) ALL CASE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)Beginning in 2017, totals do not include Illinois Worker’s Compensation Commission Cases
APPELLATE JUDGES

- Daniel L. Schmidt, Presiding Judge
- Robert L. Carter
- William E. Holdridge
- Tom M. Lytton
- Mary W. McDade
- Mary K. O’Brien
- Vicki Wright

CIRCUITS

- 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 (Iroquois & Kankakee)

* Circuit judge assigned to appellate court
### CIVIL & CRIMINAL CASELOADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil Filed</th>
<th>Civil Disposed</th>
<th>Criminal Filed</th>
<th>Criminal Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases

### TOTAL PENDING CASELOAD* ALL CASE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beginning in 2017, totals do not include Illinois Worker’s Compensation Commission Cases
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT, CONTINUED

APPELLATE JUDGES

Lisa Holder White, Presiding Judge
Peter C. Cavanagh
Craig H. DeArmond*
Thomas M. Harris
James A. Knecht
Robert J. Steigmann
John W. Turner

CIRCUITS

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)

*Circuit judge assigned to appellate court
## FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

### FIFTH DISTRICT — MT. VERNON

14th & Main Street  
Mt. Vernon, IL 62864  
(618) 242-3120

John J. Flood, Clerk  
Michael D. Greathouse, Research Director

District Population: 1,270,953

### Civil & Criminal Case Loads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil Filed</th>
<th>Civil Disposed</th>
<th>Criminal Filed</th>
<th>Criminal Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases**

### Total Pending Case Load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beginning in 2017, totals do not include Illinois Worker’s Compensation Commission Cases*
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT, CONTINUED

APPELLATE JUDGES

Thomas M. Welch, Presiding Judge
John B. Barberis, Jr.
Mark M. Boie*
Judy Lynn Cates
James R. Moore
David K. Overstreet
Milton S. Wharton

CIRCUITS

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)

*Circuit judge assigned to appellate court
In Illinois, the circuit court is the court of original jurisdiction. There are twenty-four judicial circuits in the state. Six are single county circuits (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry and Will) and the remaining eighteen circuits comprise as few as two and as many as twelve counties each.

Except for redistricting of the general assembly and ruling on the ability of the governor to serve or resume office, the circuit court has jurisdiction for all matters properly brought before it. The circuit court shares jurisdiction with the Supreme Court to hear cases relating to revenue, mandamus, prohibition, and habeas corpus. If the Supreme Court chooses to exercise its authority in a case of these types, the circuit court loses jurisdiction. The circuit court is also the reviewing court for certain state agency administrative orders. There are two types of judges in the circuit court: circuit judges and associate judges. Circuit judges are elected for a six year term and may be retained by voters for additional six year terms. They can hear any circuit court case. Circuit judges are initially elected either circuit-wide, from the county where they reside or from a sub-circuit within a circuit, depending on the type of vacancy they are filling. Associate judges are appointed by circuit judges of that circuit, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 39, for four-year terms. An associate judge can hear any case, including criminal cases punishable by a prison term of one year or more (felonies) if the associate judge receives special authorization by the Supreme Court. Circuit judges in a circuit elect one of their members to serve as chief circuit court judge. The chief circuit judge has general administrative authority in the circuit, subject to the overall administrative authority of the Supreme Court. The chief judge can assign cases to general or specialized divisions within the circuit.

**CIRCUIT COURT ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

The Conference of Chief Circuit Judges is comprised of the chief circuit judges from the twenty-four judicial circuits. Since May 2019, Judge Michael D. Kramer, Chief Judge of the Twenty-First Judicial Circuit, was elected by his peers to serve as Chair of the Conference, succeeding Judge David A. Hylla. Judge Susan Clancy Boles continued to serve as Vice-Chair. The Conference meets regularly to discuss issues related to the administration of justice in the circuit courts and other matters referred to the Conference by the Supreme Court. The Administrative Office serves as secretary to the Conference.

**Conference Committees and Activities:** The Conference has several established committees which address particular issues, and provide information and recommendations. Conference Committees active during 2019 include the Article V Committee; Associate Judge Vacancy Committee; Children and Families Committee; Court Performance Metrics Committee; Criminal Procedure Committee; Evidenced-Based Pretrial Practices Committee; Executive Committee; Orientation Committee. From time to time, the Conference may establish an ad hoc or special committee convened to study specific short-term subject matter such as the Conference’s Ad Hoc Committee on ICE Activity in Courthouses or the Special Committee to Review Standardized Forms.

These committees of the Conference considered topics in several areas. Early in the year, the Orientation Committee, along with staff from the Administrative Office, met with and provided six new Chief Circuit Judges with...
information and tools to help guide them in their new administrative role. The Associate Judge Vacancy Committee completed their work on making recommendations for appropriate questions and information required for the Associate Judge application. The Criminal Procedure Committee worked with a variety of stakeholders to create a new sentencing order that takes the new financial requirements of the Criminal Traffic and Assessment Act into consideration. The Evidence-based Pretrial Practices Committee continued to discuss and review questions received relating new bail reform legislation and worked closely with the Supreme Court Commission on Pretrial Practices. The Court Performance Metrics Committee surveyed courts and worked with case management systems on the amount of post-judgment activity and found a large amount of judicial work that goes unreported. Ongoing throughout the year, the Committee to Review Standardized Forms sought review of many draft standardized court forms developed for use by the Commission on Access to Justice designed to aid self-represented litigants navigate the justice system. The Article V Committee reviewed and recommended amendments to several Article V rules as a result of new legislation and to conform to the new Criminal and Traffic Assessment Act. The Executive Committee continued to review policies, issues and budget related to court reporting services; while the Children and Families Committee worked to review a new order for use in Juvenile Abuse cases. The Technology Committee provided input on the Supreme Court’s Remote Access Policy and accepted a charge to the Conference from the Judicial Conference regarding technology inventory and standards. All of the many Conference committees continued to monitor and analyze new legislation, Supreme Court rules and policies relevant to the committee’s focus and the administration of justice in the trial courts as it is introduced and adopted.

Presentations to the Conference: In the interest of furthering the knowledge and skills of its members, the Conference hosted a variety of guest presentations focused on judicial and trial court issues. For example, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Judicial Education presented to the Conference regarding the Illinois Judicial College’s efforts to assess and improve circuit judge education, AOIC staff in the Access to Justice Division presented on SB 1504 and fee waiver provisions for civil and criminal cases in light of the Criminal Traffic Assessment Act, the Chair of the Special Supreme Court Advisory Committee for Mental Health and Justice Planning discussed updating the problem solving court standards to address
access to justice, recertification and specialized training, the Interim Director of DCFS gave an update on the department’s initiatives, particularly in light of the forthcoming Family First Prevention Services Act, the Chair of the Supreme Court Committee on Equality and a University of Illinois researcher discussed implicit bias and the work being done on a judicial decision-making study, and the Conference heard a presentation regarding the rules and organizations designed to assist in their administrative responsibilities in assisting judges who fail to perform their duties or engage in some level of misconduct.
For several years, one of the growing challenges in courts across the country is the number of self-represented litigants (SRLs).

As the courts continue to encounter SRLs, courts are responding by improving processes and establishing innovative programs that enhance access to justice and make courts more user-friendly. Some innovations in Illinois include: legal self-help centers located inside courthouses, simplifying and standardizing court forms, developing guides and instructions on how to navigate the court system, using internet technologies to increase access and make legal information available to SRLs, development of a policy to assist court clerks and court staff on the types of guidance that they are able to offer to SRLs, and creation of a statewide network of SRL Coordinators.

Starting in 2015, the AOIC began seeking court case data from Circuit Courts on the number of SRL individuals involved in trial level civil cases. This was intended to help identify the prevalence of SRLs utilizing Illinois courts, and in which types of civil cases is SRL participation the greatest. Identification of these factors helps the AOIC to better tailor its resources and services to this population in our state. In 2017, the AOIC changed the measure and asked for the number of cases involving SRLs rather than the total number of SRL individuals. These measures were taken at two points: the filing of a new case and the disposition of a case.

In 2019, the AOIC started collecting SRL data in civil cases in the Appellate Courts at the time of filing a Notice of Appeal. We understand during the life of an appeal that some litigants may become represented by counsel while others’ counsel may withdraw, however, this data point illustrates the numbers of litigants starting an appeal without the assistance of an attorney.

There are many barriers to receiving accurate data. At the Circuit Court level, each individual county submits reports based of their Case Management System and how they respectively classify cases. Multiple counties across Illinois reported having zero or very few SRLs involved in cases, yet anecdotally report seeing SRLs frequently. We believe the overall data is inaccurate and Circuit Court numbers should be read as the minimum number of SRL involved cases across the state. The Appellate Court SRL data should be accurate and was verified to ensure only civil cases were counted.

The 2019 data collection in Circuit Courts revealed the following:

» SRLs filed about 90,000 civil cases, most commonly in Orders of Protection, Family/Dissolution, Miscellaneous Remedy, and Probate;
» 62% of new cases filed by SRLs were filed by traditional means while 38% of the new cases filed by SRLs were filed through the newly mandatory e-filing system.

» Over 130,000 cases were closed in 2019 with at least one SRL appearing, most frequently in Orders of Protection, Family/Dissolution, Mental Health, Miscellaneous Remedy, and Small Claims cases;
» Both the plaintiff and defendant were self-represented in over 30,000 cases, most frequently in Order of Protection and Family/Dissolution cases; and
» Defendants are more frequently self-represented than plaintiffs.

The 2019 data collection in Appellate Courts revealed the following:

» 41% of civil appeals filed statewide are filed by SRLs.

» Of the civil appeals filed by SRLs, the following percentages show where those cases were filed:
  » 41% in the First Appellate District
  » 42% in the Second Appellate District
  » 40% in the Third Appellate District
  » 43% in the Fourth Appellate District
  » 43% in the Fifth Appellate District
The AOIC collects data on interpreter usage in circuit courts by the number of “court events” and by the type of interpreter used in civil, criminal, and court-annexed proceedings.

The type of interpreters include: sign language, certified, qualified or registered foreign language interpreters listed on the AOIC Court Interpreter Registry (“Registry”); unregistered interpreters; or remote interpreters present via phone or video conference. To be listed on the Registry, interpreters must complete training and pass exams testing language proficiency and interpreting skills.

The statewide report (figure 1) illustrates the 2019 data on interpreter usage. Spanish is by far the language of highest need, with 91% of interpreted proceedings in Spanish (108,076 court events). The other most frequently requested languages are Polish (3%), Sign Language (1%), Arabic (1%), Russian (0.5%), Vietnamese (0.29%) and Korean (0.26%). In 2019, 78% of interpreters were assigned for criminal and traffic cases, while 18% were assigned for civil cases. Court-annexed proceedings, which include arbitration, mediation, and probation contacts, comprised 4% of interpreted proceedings.
In 2019, we see a continuing upward trend of courts using interpreters appearing on the Registry. In 2016 the rate was 33%, increasing to 50% in 2017, and in 2018 and 2019 66% of interpreters used in court appear on the Registry. We hope to see this number continue to increase over the years, as interpreters that do not appear on the Registry have not been assessed for language proficiency or interpreting skills.

Due to limited availability of interpreters in certain parts of the state, or availability of interpreters for certain languages, several courts use remote interpreting services and technology to increase access to interpreters. In 2019, 1,191 court events utilized a remote interpreter over phone or video. The AOIC is exploring the use of remote video technology in six counties – Cook, Winnebago, Rock Island, McLean and Champaign- to pilot its use and examine whether technology can improve access to interpreters across the state.

Note: Data excludes Lake County.

**Figure 1**

- **Interpreted Languages**
  - Spanish: 91%
  - Polish: 3%
  - Sign: 1%
  - Other: 5%

- **% of Interpretations by Court Type**
  - Civil: 18%
  - Annexed: 4%
  - Criminal: 78%

- **% of Interpretations by Interpreter Type**
  - Reg: 66%
  - Unreg: 20%
  - Cert: 14%
CASE CATEGORIES

CIVIL
Law and Law Magistrate for monetary damages over $10,000; Arbitration; Small Claims; Chancery (e.g., title to real property and injunctions); Miscellaneous Remedy (e.g., review of decisions of administrative bodies, habeas corpus matters, and demolition); Mental Health (e.g., commitment and discharge from mental facilities); Probate (e.g., estates of deceased persons and guardianships); 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).

DOMESTIC RELATIONS
Adoption and Family (e.g., proceedings to establish parent-child relationship and actions relating to child support); Dissolution (e.g., divorce, separate maintenance, and annulment); Order of Protection (petition for order of protection, civil no contact order, firearms restraining order, and stalking no contact order filed separately from an existing case).

CRIMINAL
Felony (e.g., penalty of at least one year in prison); Misdemeanor and DUI (Driving Under the Influence).

QUASI-CRIMINAL
Traffic (excluding parking tickets), Conservation, Ordinance, and Civil Law.

JUVENILE
Abuse and Neglect, Delinquency, and Other (e.g., a minor who requires authoritative intervention)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIVIL</strong></td>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>413,418</td>
<td>415,504</td>
<td>444,288</td>
<td>429,649</td>
<td>436,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>16,005</td>
<td>17,822</td>
<td>26,534</td>
<td>24,162</td>
<td>22,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>407,763</td>
<td>422,038</td>
<td>441,541</td>
<td>576,457</td>
<td>453,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearance Rate %</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>127.0%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Pending</td>
<td>628,456</td>
<td>627,913</td>
<td>614,766</td>
<td>590,596</td>
<td>731,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMESTIC</strong></td>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>120,461</td>
<td>121,789</td>
<td>130,368</td>
<td>140,416</td>
<td>144,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONS</td>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>120,859</td>
<td>117,327</td>
<td>114,893</td>
<td>133,708</td>
<td>140,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearance Rate %</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Pending</td>
<td>108,806</td>
<td>127,839</td>
<td>123,282</td>
<td>111,621</td>
<td>107,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUVENILE</strong></td>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>19,019</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>19,029</td>
<td>19,943</td>
<td>21,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>15,562</td>
<td>16,377</td>
<td>19,716</td>
<td>20,914</td>
<td>22,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearance Rate %</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>102.5%</td>
<td>103.9%</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Pending</td>
<td>52,850</td>
<td>49,863</td>
<td>49,835</td>
<td>50,991</td>
<td>53,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRIMINAL</strong></td>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>272,657</td>
<td>263,118</td>
<td>263,513</td>
<td>280,385</td>
<td>320,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>6,192</td>
<td>5,821</td>
<td>5,209</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>5,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>219,116</td>
<td>210,900</td>
<td>216,452</td>
<td>272,060</td>
<td>326,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearance Rate %</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Pending</td>
<td>393,608</td>
<td>327,951</td>
<td>327,178</td>
<td>219,204</td>
<td>206,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUASI-CRIMINAL</strong></td>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>1,493,472</td>
<td>1,586,864</td>
<td>1,671,314</td>
<td>1,661,619</td>
<td>1,784,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>17,449</td>
<td>17,892</td>
<td>17,161</td>
<td>17,282</td>
<td>19,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>1,335,810</td>
<td>1,401,695</td>
<td>1,581,583</td>
<td>1,624,848</td>
<td>1,765,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearance Rate %</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Pending</td>
<td>1,814,882</td>
<td>1,639,547</td>
<td>1,433,934</td>
<td>1,337,169</td>
<td>1,291,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATEWIDE</strong></td>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>2,319,027</td>
<td>2,404,775</td>
<td>2,528,512</td>
<td>2,532,012</td>
<td>2,707,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>41,042</td>
<td>43,003</td>
<td>50,342</td>
<td>49,090</td>
<td>49,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>2,099,110</td>
<td>2,168,337</td>
<td>2,374,185</td>
<td>2,627,987</td>
<td>2,708,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearance Rate %</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End Pending</td>
<td>2,998,602</td>
<td>2,773,113</td>
<td>2,491,995</td>
<td>2,309,581</td>
<td>2,390,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

RICHARD J. DALEY CENTER

Timothy C. Evans, Chief Judge
50 W. Washington St., Suite 2600
Chicago, IL 60602
Circuit Population: 5,150,233

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>853,539</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td>671,821</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>1,657,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>940,753</td>
<td>13,581</td>
<td>737,147</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>1,463,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,004,474</td>
<td>22,332</td>
<td>885,632</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>1,105,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,015,097</td>
<td>20,926</td>
<td>1,077,686</td>
<td>104.0%</td>
<td>1,158,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,082,598</td>
<td>19,952</td>
<td>1,053,244</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>1,108,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIRCUIT JUDGES

Martin S. Agran
James L. Allegretti
John M. Allegretti
Erin H. Antonietti
Marina E. Ammendola
Mauricio Araujo
Edward A. Arce
Robert Balanoff
Michael B. Barrett
Ronald F. Bartkowicz
Fredrick H. Bates
Steven James Bernstein
Samuel J. Betar III
Tiana Blakely
Carl B. Boyd
Daniel P. Brennan
Margaret A. Brennan
Tommy Brewer
Lloyd James Brooks
Janet Adams Brosnahan
Mary M. Brosnahan
James R. Brown
Andrea M. Buford
Kathleen Marie Burke
Charles Burns
Thomas J. Byrne
John P. Callahan, Jr.
Diane Gordon Cannon
Thomas J. Carroll
Joel Chupack
Elizabeth Giaccia-Lezza
Michael R. Clancy
Jeanne Cleveland
Bonita Coleman
H. Yvonne Coleman
Ann Finley Collins
Ann Collins-Dole
Alison C. Conlon
Donna L. Cooper
Patrick K. Coughlin
Kevin P. Cunningham
John J. Curry, Jr.
Thomas M. Cushing
Paula M. Daleo
Colleen Reardon Daly
Adrienne E. Davis
Eulalia De La Rosa
Daniel R. Degnan
Kent Delgado
Anna Helen
Demacopoulos
Sondra N. Denmark
James T. Derico, Jr.
Grace G. Dickler
Daniel P. Duffy
John H. Ehrlich
Jerry A. Esrig
Patricia M. Fallon
Peter A. Felice
Rossana P. Fernandez
Kathy M. Flanagan
James P. Flannery, Jr.
Ellen L. Flannigan
Michael A. Forti
Beatriz Frausto-Sandoval
Carolyn J. Gallagher
Daniel J. Gallagher
John T. Gallagher
William G. Gamboney
Celina G. Gamrath
Vincent M. Gaughan
James J. Gavin
Michael P. Gerberg
Aleksandra Gillespie
Megan E. Goldish
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, CONTINUED
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

CIRCUIT JUDGES CONT.
Martin P. Moltz
Thomas R. Mulroy
James M. Obblish
Margaret M. Ogarek
Marcia B. Orr
Michael F. Otto
Donald D. Panarese, Jr.
Joseph D. Panarese
Luciano Panici
Kathleen Ann Panozzo
Linda J. Pauel
Alfred J. Paul
Angela M. Petrone
Michele M. Pitman
Dennis J. Porter
Carolyn Quinn
Jeanne M. Reynolds
Elizabeth Loredo Rivera
Edward Robles
Lori Rosen
Steven Jay Rosenblum
Stanley J. Sacks
Bernard J. Sarley
Naomi H. Schuster
Joseph M. Sconza
Robert E. Senechalle, Jr.
Terrence V. Sharkey
Darryl B. Simko
David A. Skryd
James E. Snyder
Patrick T. Stanton
Domenica A. Stephenson
Marita C. Sullivan
Sanjay T. Tailor
Sybil C. Thomas
Daniel A. Trevino
Mary S. Trew
Franklin U. Valderrama
Rena M. Van Tine
Gregory P. Vazquez
Peter J. Vilkelis
Steven M. Wagner
Allen P. Walker
Neera Walsh
Jeffrey L. Warnick
James A. Wright
William Yu
CIRCUIT COURTS

FIRST CIRCUIT
Fifth Appellate District
Williamson County Courthouse
James R. Williamson, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 204,953
Alexander (Cairo)
Jackson (Murphysboro)
Johnson (Vienna)
Massac (Metropolis)
Pope (Golconda)
Pulaski (Mound City)
Saline (Harrisburg)
Union (Jonesboro)
Williamson (Marion)

SECOND CIRCUIT
Fifth Appellate District
Jefferson County Justice Center
Thomas Joseph Tedeschi, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 190,443
Crawford (Robinson)
Edwards (Albion)
Franklin (Benton)
Gallatin (Shawneetown)
Hamilton (McLeansboro)
Hardin (Elizabethtown)
Jefferson (Mount Vernon)
Lawrence (Lawrenceville)
Richland (Olney)
Wabash (Mount Carmel)
Wayne (Fairfield)

THIRD CIRCUIT
Fifth Appellate District
Madison County Courthouse
William A. Mudge, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 279,392
Bond (Greenville)

Photo provided by Michele Longworth
Photo provided by Amy Dawn Whitlock
FIRST CIRCUIT JUDGES

FIRST CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Casey Bloodworth, Ralph R. Bloodworth, III, Tyler R. Edmonds, Michael A. Fiello, Jeffrey A. Goffinet, Todd D. Lambert, Brian D. Lewis

SECOND CIRCUIT JUDGES

SECOND CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Jerry Crisel, Thomas J. Dinn, III, Kimbara G. Harrell, Sonja L. Ligon, Evan Lee Owens, Mark Shaner

THIRD CIRCUIT JUDGES
Christopher Bauer, David W. Dugan, David Hylla, Kyle Napp, Dennis R. Ruth, Sarah D. Smith, Richard L. Tognarelli

THIRD CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>66,348</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60,045</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>143,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>64,166</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59,587</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>139,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>69,558</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64,359</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>136,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>68,696</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63,315</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>133,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>74,349</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70,601</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>129,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>32,422</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29,669</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>49,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>33,217</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31,141</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>47,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>37,140</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35,034</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>46,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>36,568</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35,063</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>45,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38,063</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37,300</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>45,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>74,228</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>69,087</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>77,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>75,198</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>71,693</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>74,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>76,042</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>72,569</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>68,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75,704</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>73,388</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>65,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>79,712</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>77,234</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>62,616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jasper County Courthouse

FOURTH CIRCUIT
Fifth Appellate District
Fayette County Courthouse
Kimberly G. Koester, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 235,257
Alexander (Cairo)
Christian (Taylorville)
Clay (Louisville)
Clinton (Carlyle)
Effingham (Effingham)
Fayette (Vandalia)
Jasper (Newton)
Marion (Salem)
Montgomery (Hillsboro)
Shelby (Shelbyville)

Edgar County Courthouse

FIFTH CIRCUIT
Fourth Appellate District
Vermilion County Courthouse
Mitchell Shick, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 169,747
Coles (Charleston)
Cumberland (Toledo)
Edgar (Paris)
Vermilion (Danville)

Champaign County Courthouse

SIXTH CIRCUIT
Fourth Appellate District
Moultrie County Courthouse
Karle E. Koritz, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 364,008
Champaign (Urbana)
DeWitt (Clinton)
Douglas (Tuscola)
Macon (Decatur)
Moultrie (Sullivan)
Piatt (Monticello)
CIRCUIT COURTS, CONTINUED

FOURTH CIRCUIT JUDGES

FOURTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Jeffrey A. DeLong, James J. Eder, Jeffrey Marc Kelly, Allan F. Lolie, Jr., Christopher W. Matoush, Kevin S. Parker, Ericka Sanders

YEAR FILED REINSTATED DISPOSED CLEARANCE RATE % PENDING
2019 43,908 171 42,398 96.2% 37,346
2018 43,562 304 43,905 100.1% 37,585
2017 50,135 112 47,513 94.6% 38,729
2016 47,440 86 46,236 97.3% 36,903
2015 48,403 75 45,610 94.1% 37,133

FIFTH CIRCUIT JUDGES

FIFTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Brian L. Bower, Derek Girton, Mark S. Goodwin, David W. Lewis, Karen E. Wall

YEAR FILED REINSTATED DISPOSED CLEARANCE RATE % PENDING
2019 30,808 66 24,396 79.0% 62,428
2018 29,544 2 23,339 79.0% 58,072
2017 31,085 5 26,192 84.2% 53,884
2016 32,994 0 29,272 88.7% 50,945
2015 32,595 4 29,441 90.3% 50,755

SIXTH CIRCUIT JUDGES

SIXTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Anna M. Benjamin, Phoebe S. Bowers, James R. Coryell, Adam M. Dill, Rodney S. Forbes, Jeffrey S. Geisler, Ronda D. Holliman, Erick F. Hubbard, John R. Kennedy, Brett Olmstead, Gary Webber

YEAR FILED REINSTATED DISPOSED CLEARANCE RATE % PENDING
2019 63,786 1,331 60,536 93.0% 72,253
2018 63,725 1,258 60,869 93.7% 68,945
2017 59,498 1,143 56,122 92.5% 66,578
2016 64,140 935 64,806 99.6% 63,826
2015 67,626 977 68,434 99.8% 67,122
SEVENTH CIRCUIT
Fourth Appellate District
Sangamon County Courthouse
Eric S. Pistorius, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 312,949
Greene (Carrollton)  Morgan (Jacksonville)
Jersey (Jerseyville)  Sangamon (Springfield)
Macoupin (Carlinville)  Scott (Winchester)

EIGHTH CIRCUIT
Fourth Appellate District
Adams County Courthouse
John Frank McCartney, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 136,783
Adams (Quincy)  Mason (Havana)
Brown (Mount Sterling)  Menard (Petersburg)
Calhoun (Hardin)  Pike (Pittsfield)
Cass (Virginia)  Schuyler (Rushville)

NINTH CIRCUIT
Third Appellate District
McDonough County Courthouse
David L. Vancil, Jr., Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 154,919
Fulton (Lewistown)  Knox (Galesburg)
Hancock (Carthage)  McDonough (Macomb)
Henderson (Oquawka)  Warren (Monmouth)
CIRCUIT COURTS, CONTINUED

SEVENTH CIRCUIT JUDGES
John Belz, Ryan M. Cadagin, David R. Cherry, James W. Day, Kenneth R. Deihl, Adam Giganti, Raylene Grischow, John M. Madonia, Gail L. Noll, Christopher E. Reif, April G. Troemper

SEVENTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Jennifer M. Ascher, Rudolph M. Braud, Jr., Dwayne A. Gab, Jack D. Davis II, Colleen R. Lawless, Matthew J. Mauer, Joshua A. Meyer, Chris Perrin, Karen S. Tharp, Jeffery E. Tobin

EIGHTH CIRCUIT JUDGES

EIGHTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Holly J. Henze, Roger B. Thomson, Kevin D. Tippey, Debra L. Wellborn, John C. Wooleyhan

NINTH CIRCUIT JUDGES
Bruce C. Beal, Heidi A. Benson, Raymond A. Cavanaugh, Rodney G. Clark, Thomas B. Ewing, William E. Poncin, Scott Shipplett, James R. Standard, Emily Sutton

NINTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
James G. Baber, Nigel D. Graham, Curtis S. Lane, William A. Rasmussen

YEAR | FILED | REINSTATED | DISPOSED | CLEARANCE RATE % | PENDING
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2019 | 71,635 | 51 | 83,092 | 115.9% | 90,700
2018 | 75,641 | 51 | 88,113 | 116.4% | 86,583
2017 | 77,151 | 32 | 82,957 | 107.5% | 81,937
2016 | 75,513 | 43 | 77,602 | 102.7% | 82,993
2015 | 76,510 | 48 | 77,395 | 101.1% | 88,376

YEAR | FILED | REINSTATED | DISPOSED | CLEARANCE RATE % | PENDING
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2019 | 27,492 | 24 | 26,024 | 94.6% | 22,563
2018 | 28,509 | 23 | 27,396 | 96.0% | 21,597
2017 | 28,676 | 10 | 27,457 | 95.7% | 20,695
2016 | 28,239 | 14 | 27,906 | 98.8% | 19,689
2015 | 28,356 | 23 | 28,301 | 99.7% | 19,438

YEAR | FILED | REINSTATED | DISPOSED | CLEARANCE RATE % | PENDING
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2019 | 29,022 | 12 | 28,580 | 98.4% | 26,465
2018 | 30,006 | 5 | 30,494 | 98.3% | 26,043
2017 | 32,881 | 5 | 31,280 | 95.1% | 25,605
2016 | 30,657 | 32 | 31,528 | 102.7% | 24,827
2015 | 30,636 | 15 | 29,378 | 95.8% | 25,379
CIRCUIT COURTS, CONTINUED

**TENTH CIRCUIT**
Third Appellate District
Peoria County Courthouse
Paul P. Gilfillan, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 333,501

- Marshall (Lacon)
- Peoria (Peoria)
- Putnam (Hennepin)
- Stark (Toulon)
- Tazewell (Pekin)

**ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**
Fourth Appellate District
McLean County Law & Justice Center
Mark A. Fellheimer, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 287,203

- Ford (Paxton)
- Livingston (Pontiac)
- Logan (Lincoln)
- McLean (Bloomington)
- Woodford (Eureka)

**TWELFTH CIRCUIT**
Third Appellate District
Will County Courthouse
Richard C. Schoenstedt, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 690,743

- Will (Joliet)

*THE NEW WILL COUNTY COURTHOUSE WILL OPEN IN 2020.*
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### Tenth Circuit Judges

Christopher R. Doscotch, Bruce P. Fehrenbacher, Katherine S. Gorman, Stephen Kouri, Kevin W. Lyons, James A. Mack, Michael P. McCuskey, Michael D. Risinger, John P. Vespa

### Tenth Circuit Associate Judges


### Eleventh Circuit Judges

Jennifer H. Bauknecht, J. Jason Chambers, John Casey Costigan, Scott D. Drazewski, Charles M. Feeney, Ill, Matthew J. Fitton, Rebecca S. Foley, Scott Kording, Paul G. Lawrence, William A. Yoder

### Eleventh Circuit Associate Judges


### Twelfth Circuit Judges


### Twelfth Circuit Associate Judges


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>61,704</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>60,447</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>46,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>59,119</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>58,334</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>45,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>68,134</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65,671</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>45,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>70,781</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69,675</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>52,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>80,195</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82,060</td>
<td>102.3%</td>
<td>51,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>51,388</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>53,224</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
<td>39,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>55,975</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>56,857</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>41,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>60,379</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>59,550</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>42,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>57,406</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>59,496</td>
<td>101.7%</td>
<td>41,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>59,479</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>59,485</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>43,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>103,251</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>131,007</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>87,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>122,330</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>125,755</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>81,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>126,660</td>
<td>3,757</td>
<td>129,993</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>81,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>126,054</td>
<td>43,743</td>
<td>132,385</td>
<td>102.0%</td>
<td>80,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>137,637</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>143,809</td>
<td>101.5%</td>
<td>83,742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LaSalle County Courthouse

THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT
Third Appellate District
LaSalle County Courthouse
Howard C. Ryan, Jr., Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 192,351
Bureau (Princeton)
Grundy (Morris)
LaSalle (Ottawa)

Henry County Courthouse

FOURTEENTH CIRCUIT
Third Appellate District
Rock Island County Courthouse
Frank R. Fuhr, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 261,404
Henry (Cambridge)
Mercer (Aledo)
Rock Island (Rock Island)
Whiteside (Morrison)

Ogle County Courthouse

FIFTEENTH CIRCUIT
Second Appellate District
Ogle County Courthouse
Robert T. Hanson, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 164,777
Carroll (Mount Carroll)
Jo Daviess (Galena)
Lee (Dixon)
Ogle (Oregon)
Stephenson (Freeport)
### Thirteenth Circuit Judges
Marc Bernabei, Eugene P. Daugherity, Joseph P. Hettel, Troy D. Holland, Robert C. Marsaglia, Lance R. Peterson, Cynthia M. Raccuglia

### Thirteenth Circuit Associate Judges
Karen C. Eiten, Cornelius J. Hollerich, Michael C. Jansz, Sheldon R. Sobol, Michelle Ann Vescogni

### Fourteenth Circuit Judges
Walter D. Braud, James G. Conway, Jr., Clarence M. Darrow, John L. McGehee, Kathleen Mesich, Jeffrey W. O’Connor, Terence M. Patton, Patricia A. Senneff, Stanley B. Steines, Linnea E. Thompson, Mark A. VandeWieler

### Fourteenth Circuit Associate Judges
Thomas C. Berglund, Gregory George Chickris, Peter Church, James F. Heuerman, Norma Kauzlarich, Theodore G. Kutsunis, Clayton R. Lee, Dana R. McReynolds, Carol Penuic, Richard A. Zimmer

### Fifteenth Circuit Judges

### Fifteenth Circuit Associate Judges
John J. Kane, Theresa M. Friel Draper, Matthew Klahn, Clayton L. Lindsey, David M. Olson, John C. Redington, Glenn R. Schorsch, Kevin J. Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>33,763</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>33,191</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>20,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35,295</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>35,384</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>19,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>36,345</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>36,958</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>19,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38,326</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>38,197</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>19,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>40,123</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>39,756</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>19,862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>52,886</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50,045</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>60,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>47,032</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45,425</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>60,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>52,875</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48,340</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>60,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>52,628</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49,797</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>58,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>55,730</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51,896</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>56,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>34,403</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32,875</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>29,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35,058</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33,605</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>27,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>37,405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35,264</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>27,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>37,289</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36,704</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>25,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>35,001</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33,733</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>24,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT
Second Appellate District
Kane County Judicial Center
Thomas Clinton Hull, III, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 532,403
Kane (Geneva)

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT
Second Appellate District
Winnebago County Courthouse
Eugene Doherty, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 336,116
Boone (Belvidere)
Winnebago (Rockford)

EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT
Second Appellate District
DuPage County Courthouse
Daniel P. Guerin, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 922,921
DuPage (Wheaton)
SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT JUDGES
John A. Barsanti, Susan Clancy Boles, Kevin T. Busch, René Cruz, John G. Dalton, Elizabeth Flood, Joseph M. Grady, James R. Murphy, M. Noland, John A. Noverini, Donald M. Tegeler, Robert K. Villa

SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT JUDGES

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
Stephen E. Balogh, Ronald A. Barch, Joseph J. Bruce, Jennifer J. Clifford, John T. Gibbons, Mary Linn Green, Donna R. Honzel, Francis M. Martinez, Philip J. Nicolosi, Steven L. Nordquist, Debra D. Schafer, Donald P. Shriver, Ryan Swift, Robert R. Wilt, John H. Young

EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT JUDGES

EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES
CIRCUIT COURTS, CONTINUED

Lake County Courthouse

NINETEENTH CIRCUIT
Second Appellate District
Lake County Courthouse
Jay W. Ukena, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 696,535
Lake (Waukegan)

Washington County Courthouse

TWENTIETH CIRCUIT
Fifth Appellate District
St. Clair County Building
Andrew J. Gleeson, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 360,908
Monroe (Waterloo)
Perry (Pinckneyville)
Randolph (Chester)
St. Clair (Belleville)
Washington (Nashville)

Kankakee County Courthouse

TWENTY-FIRST CIRCUIT
Third Appellate District
Kankakee County Courthouse
Michael D. Kramer, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 136,976
Iroquois (Watseka)
Kankakee (Kankakee)
### Nineteenth Circuit Judges

Christen L. Bishop, James K. Booras, Valerie Boettle Ceckowski, Mitchell L. Hoffman, Mark L. Levitt, Jorge L. Ortiz, Victoria A. Rossetti, Joseph V. Salvi, Daniel B. Shanes, Charles W. Smith, Patricia Sowinski Fix, Christopher Stride, Diane E. Winter

### Nineteenth Circuit Associate Judges


### Twentieth Circuit Judges


### Twentieth Circuit Associate Judges


### Twenty-First Circuit Judges

Adrienne W. Albrecht, Thomas W. Cunnington, Kathy Bradshaw Elliott, Clark E. Erickson, Michael J. Kick, James B. Kinzer

### Twenty-First Circuit Associate Judges

William S. Dickenson, JoAnn Imani Drew, Ronald J. Gerts, Michael Sabol, Scott Sliwinski

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>123,015</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>128,433</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
<td>37,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>127,130</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>131,524</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>38,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>135,107</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>137,986</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>39,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>134,203</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>142,748</td>
<td>102.6%</td>
<td>37,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>149,127</td>
<td>5,134</td>
<td>156,097</td>
<td>101.2%</td>
<td>41,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>76,113</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>74,471</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>123,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>75,783</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>75,229</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>71,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>79,397</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>83,722</td>
<td>105.1%</td>
<td>70,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>81,178</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>88,697</td>
<td>108.9%</td>
<td>75,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>91,583</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>106,780</td>
<td>116.3%</td>
<td>82,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>27,324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,868</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>72,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>27,607</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,014</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>64,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>28,601</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,882</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>58,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27,668</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,903</td>
<td>100.8%</td>
<td>55,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>28,375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,896</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
<td>56,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIRCUIT COURTS, CONTINUED

McHenry County Courthouse
TWENTY-SECOND CIRCUIT
Second Appellate District
McHenry County Government Center
James S. Cowlin, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 307,774
McHenry (Woodstock)

DeKalb County Courthouse
TWENTY-THIRD CIRCUIT
Second Appellate District
DeKalb County Courthouse
Robert P. Pilmer, Chief Judge
Circuit Population: 233,887
DeKalb (Sycamore)
Kendall (Yorkville)

Photo provided by Amy Dawn Whitlock
**TWENTY-SECOND CIRCUIT JUDGES**

Michael J. Chmiel, Tiffany E. Davis, Michael W. Feetterer, David R. Gervais, Mark R. Gerhardt, Justin M. Hansen, Robert A. Wilbrandt, Jr.

**TWENTY-SECOND CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES**

Joel D. Berg, Michael E. Coppedge, Kevin G. Costello, Mark R. Facchini, Christopher M. Harmon, Jeffrey L. Hirsch, Jennifer L. Johnson, Suzanne C. Mangiamele, Thomas A. Meyer, Mary H. Nader, Robert J. Zalud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>54,357</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>57,598</td>
<td>102.1%</td>
<td>16,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>58,229</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>60,156</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>17,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>55,913</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>58,214</td>
<td>100.6%</td>
<td>16,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>57,576</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>59,997</td>
<td>100.8%</td>
<td>16,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>59,374</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>62,049</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
<td>17,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>CLEARANCE RATE %</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>28,892</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>29,237</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>20,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>32,208</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>33,515</td>
<td>100.8%</td>
<td>20,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>33,568</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>34,699</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>20,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34,717</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>37,100</td>
<td>103.2%</td>
<td>20,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38,199</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>40,386</td>
<td>102.2%</td>
<td>21,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TWENTY-THIRD CIRCUIT JUDGES**

Melissa S. Barnhart, Thomas L. Doherty, Jody P. Gleason, Stephen L. Krentz, R. Matekaitis, Robert P. Pilmer, Robbin J. Stuckert, Bradley J. Waller

**TWENTY-THIRD CIRCUIT ASSOCIATE JUDGES**

Marcy L. Buick, John McAdams, Philip G. Montgomery, Joseph C. Pedersen, Joseph R. Voiland
The **AOIC Executive Office** is comprised of the Administrative Director, Deputy Director, and other legal and administrative staff. Under the Administrative Director’s leadership, the Executive Office is responsible for reviewing, approving, coordinating and guiding operations of the Administrative Office’s seven divisions and serves as a central resource for a wide range of operational issues that impact the administration of the Illinois judicial branch.

The Executive Office, on behalf of the Supreme Court, manages and coordinates communications with court stakeholders, as well as state officials and agencies, on matters that impact the Illinois Courts and the justice system. One of the major duties performed for the Supreme Court is the consideration of non-routine administrative matters presented during each Court term. The Administrative Director prepares and presents agenda issues to the Court for discussion and deliberation to assure that the business of the judicial branch is thoroughly and timely managed. Agenda items approved by the Court for action are then implemented by the Director through the Executive Office.

The Executive Office plans and coordinates Administrative Office staff support for Supreme Court Committees and the Illinois Judicial Conference. Effective October 1, 2018, the Judicial Conference was reconstituted to focus on strategic planning for the judicial branch. Specifically, the Judicial Conference was reconstituted as a smaller, more active body to create and implement a long-term statewide Strategic Agenda for the judicial branch. On October 2, 2019, the Judicial Conference unveiled the Supreme Court’s Strategic Agenda, which was developed by the Judicial Conference and approved by the Court. The Strategic Agenda will serve as a guide for the future of the Illinois Judicial Branch as it begins the implementation phase in 2020 through the creation of several task forces. The Administrative Director assigns senior level staff to assist the Judicial Conference with its mandate. The recommendations flowing from the Judicial Conference to the Supreme Court will relate to the improvement of the administration of justice in Illinois.

In its administration of Supreme Court Rule 39 (Appointment of Associate Judges), the Executive Office conducted the election of
58 associate judges in 21 of Illinois’ 24 judicial circuits during 2019. Also, as provided by Rule 39, the Executive Office is responsible for managing the quadrennial reappointment process for Illinois’ more than 400 associate judges, which was held in 2019. Other matters administered through the Executive Office include applications for licenses issued to law students seeking to provide limited legal representation under Supreme Court Rule 711.

The Executive Office’s activities and responsibilities include securing and tracking legal representation through the Office of the Attorney General for members of the judicial branch named in a civil case or controversy arising out of the performance of their official judicial 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. All vendor contracts generated by the Administrative Office and state judicial branch managers for use in securing goods and services are reviewed and approved by the Executive Office.

The Executive Office also oversees the Logistics/Property Control Unit. This unit serves as the central distribution and shipping center for the Administrative Office; produces print quality manuals, brochures, and publications; maintains inventories of office supplies; and coordinates the transfer of equipment and furniture among judicial branch offices. Finally, it is responsible for maintaining the physical inventory of all state-owned judicial branch property and ensures that judicial branch property is accurately recorded and bears the proper identification tag.

The Executive Office provides secretariat services to the Illinois Courts Commission, which includes 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. Finally, Executive Office staff prepares and executes grants which provide for programming funded through the Lawyers’ Assistance Program Act.

**JUDICIAL COLLEGE**

The Illinois Supreme Court established the Illinois Judicial College January 1, 2016 to provide continuing education and professional development opportunities to strategic Judicial Branch justice partners in a manner consistent with offerings developed for Illinois judges. The Court, in its recognition that Illinois judges serve the public in coordination with many Judicial Branch professionals, envisioned a comprehensive continuing education structure with common goals, objectives and learning strategies.

The Illinois Judicial College is governed by a nine-member Board of Trustees (Board) of Illinois judges from across the State, the Director of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts and one Supreme Court Justice.
Current Board members, the Honorable Daniel B. Shanes, 19th Cir., Chair, the Honorable Christy W. Solverson, 1st Cir., Vice Chair, the Honorable Cynthia Y. Cobbs, 1st App. Dist., Honorable Thomas M. Donnelly, the Honorable Robert F. Harris, Circuit Court of Cook County, the Honorable Ronda Holliman, the Honorable Lisa Y. Wilson, 10th Cir., and ex officio members, the Honorable Mary Jane Theis, Justice, Supreme Court of Illinois, and Marcia M. Meis, Director, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. Board members serve as liaisons to the six Illinois Judicial College Committees on Circuit Court Clerk Education, Judicial Branch Education, Judicial Education, Guardian ad Litem Education, Probation Education and Trial Court Administrator Education, who each develop comprehensive education plans, competency-based curricula and courses for Illinois Judges and justice partners serving the Illinois Judicial Branch. To facilitate this work, over 100 judges and justice partners have been appointed by the Supreme Court of Illinois to these six Committees, in addition to subject matter experts and professionals from across the state who have volunteered to aid Judicial College Committees, and approved by the Board as non-Judicial College Committee Workgroup members. This concerted collaborative effort of Committee appointees, staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts and Committee volunteers, under the auspices of the Board and the Supreme Court, is crucial to the task of planning, developing and delivering relevant professional development and courses in-person and online covering professional responsibility, substantive and procedural topics, in addition to courses that embrace the Court’s advance of deliberative decision making and core principles.

In May 2019, the Administrative Director, Marcia Meis, created, with the Court’s approval, a Judicial College Division within the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts to aid the Board of Trustees and the Judicial College Committees in their charge.

**OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS & PUBLIC INFORMATION**

The Office of Communications and Public Information manages internal and external communications, including media relations and public information, for the Illinois Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts.

The Office coordinates the Court’s social media communications and responds to media
inquiries, issues press releases regarding the Court’s adjudicative and administrative actions, and serves as a resource for trial courts implementing the Court's Policy for Extended Media Coverage. The Office also coordinates with the Illinois Supreme Court's Boards and Commissions, the Illinois Judicial College, and other entities to advance outreach efforts.

The Office produces two newsletters. The **Media Monitor** is sent out each morning (Monday-Friday) to all judges and key judicial branch staff. It is a summary of relevant media clips intended to keep readers informed about Court-related news. **Illinois Courts Connect** is published the last Wednesday of each month. It goes out to a broader audience, including the media and public, and contains Court news for that particular month. Current and past issues are available online at [illinoiscourts.gov/Media/enews/default.asp](http://illinoiscourts.gov/Media/enews/default.asp)

**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION**

The **Administrative Services Division** provides technical and administrative support services to the judicial branch through its three operational units; the Payroll/Benefits Unit, the Accounting Unit, and the Budget Unit.

The Payroll/Benefits Unit maintains all payroll records for current state-paid judicial branch employees as well as records for all previous judicial branch offices and employees. Staff of this unit work with the Office of the Comptroller to produce both monthly and semi-monthly payrolls for over 1,500 current judicial branch employees. Payroll/Benefits Unit staff interact with representatives of both the Judges’ Retirement System and the State Employees’ Retirement System to ensure continued benefits for judicial branch officers and employees. Payroll/Benefits Unit staff also coordinate the state’s varied employee benefit programs, including health, dental, and life insurance.

The Accounting Unit consistently and accurately 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 the Comptroller’s Office to reconcile payment information needed to facilitate the payment of judicial branch bills.

In addition to overseeing procurement activities, the Budget Unit produces highly technical and analytical financial reports used by judicial branch managers and the Administrative Director. These reports track daily spending, contractual obligations, and projected spending needs. This unit also prepares the comprehensive documentation utilized in the development and implementation of the annual judicial branch budget.

**ACCESS TO JUSTICE DIVISION**

The **Access to Justice Division** was established in January 2014. The Access to Justice Division’s objective is to help the legal system efficiently deliver outcomes that are fair and accessible to all court users, particularly to those who are low-income and vulnerable. The Access to Justice Division also supports the work of the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice (ATJ Commission), and works collaboratively with the ATJ Commission and its subcommittees to promote access to justice within the Illinois courts. Moreover, Access to Justice Division staff work closely with the other Divisions of the Administrative Office and with other Access to Justice system stakeholders to improve the justice delivery systems that serve low-income, limited English proficient, self-represented and vulnerable litigants.

The Access to Justice Division’s current priorities include: (1) developing statewide standardized forms for simpler civil legal problems and basic procedural functions;
(2) providing language access services and support to assist state courts in addressing language barriers and improving interpreter services; (3) developing training materials and education programs for courts, clerks and other judicial stakeholders to assist with interacting with self-represented litigants and limited English proficient parties and witnesses; (4) developing statewide appellate resources for self-represented litigants; and (5) expanding statewide collaboration, research, and analysis to aid in the development of innovative strategies to close the gap between the need for and the availability of quality legal assistance.

Standardized Forms

The Access to Justice Division partners with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Forms Committee (Forms Committee) and its various subcommittees to develop standardized, simplified forms that—once promulgated by the Forms Committee—must be accepted by state courts. Litigants who use the statewide standardized forms will be able to solve basic legal problems without the assistance of an attorney. At present, the Division is supporting the work of 13 subcommittees developing forms in appellate, criminal records relief for adults and juveniles, family law, eviction, mortgage foreclosure, name change, orders of protection, small claims, civil asset forfeiture, civil procedures, criminal procedures, and guardianship. Before finalizing any forms, drafts are sent to public user testing, reviewed by both the substantive subcommittee and the full Forms Committee, posted on the Court’s website for public comment, shared with chief circuit judges for feedback and notice is provided to circuit and appellate court clerks and bar associations statewide.

Language Access

The Access to Justice Division’s language access efforts seek to promote initiatives and reforms to serve the growing number of people with limited English proficiency (LEP) participating in legal proceedings in state court. The Division also works with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Language Access Committee to develop statewide standards and policies for courts and judges, and resources for LEP litigants. In 2014, the Court adopted the Illinois Supreme Court Language Access Policy and Code of Interpreter Ethics, which state that Illinois courts should provide interpreters for LEP litigants and witnesses in all civil and criminal proceedings and court-annexed proceedings. In support of the Court’s Language Access Policy, the Access to Justice Division administers a robust interpreter certification program. Foreign language and sign language interpreters that complete certification requirements are
listed on the AOIC Court Interpreter Registry, which currently has 372 certified interpreters in 33 languages. In 2015, only 25% of state court interpretations used interpreters on the Registry. In 2018, this number increased to 66%.

Training Materials and Educational Programs

The Access to Justice Division works with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Court Guidance and Training Committee (Court Guidance and Training Committee) to develop and maintain training materials and educational programs on access to justice issues. In 2019, the Access to Justice Division conducted training for clerks, court staff, and justice partners like public libraries in many individual counties focusing on the distinction between legal information and legal advice. During each of these trainings, there was additional discussion of how assisting with e-filing information falls on that spectrum. We developed and then distributed a desk card for clerks and court staff and a bench card for judges about the changes to the fee waiver statute creating partial fee waivers and a waiver option for criminal assessments. The Access to Justice Division was also involved in planning several multi-disciplinary access to justice trainings for the 2020 Judicial Education Conference on language access, self-represented litigants, and fee waivers.

Appellate Resource Program

The Access to Justice Division’s Appellate Resource Program seeks to assist self-represented litigants in civil appeals throughout the state. Since the AOIC hired a Senior Program Manager in 2017 to oversee the initiative, the division has worked with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Appellate Committee, Appellate Court Administrative Committee, as well as appellate clerks and research directors from all appellate districts to develop self-help materials. The Access to Justice Division updated the ATJ Commission’s Appellate Self-Help Guide to reflect current law and e-filing requirements. In addition, a dedicated self-help page was launched on the Illinois Courts’ website. It features detailed resources to assist SRLs in civil appeals, such as a comprehensive FAQ section, e-filing manuals, a simplified process overview, and links to resources throughout the state to help litigants navigate an appeal. In March 2019 the Access to Justice Division launched a pilot project in the First Appellate District to assist SRLs with their civil appeal. After this pilot, The Access to Justice Division expects to better understand questions litigants have about the civil appellate process, barriers to completing their appeal, and to obtain more specific data on outcomes. This data will then be used to better inform stakeholders and to create additional self-help materials. Finally, the program is partnering with the Public Interest Law Initiative to launch a virtual help desk for civil appeals. Low-income litigants with a legal problem can submit their questions through the website and have them answered by a lawyer. This is be the first-ever appellate help desk for SRLs in Illinois and it is expected to launch in September 2020.

Statewide Collaboration

The Access to Justice Commission seeks to create, maintain, and support a statewide network of court partners focused on serving self-represented litigants. This endeavor started with Illinois JusticeCorps, which was first piloted in 2009 and expanded to cover more jurisdictions. Currently, the program serves 13 courthouses in 11 judicial circuits. In 2017, we launched the Self-Represented Litigant Coordinator (Coordinator) grant program. Coordinators serve as a bridge, linking their courthouses with others throughout the state to share ideas, develop new resources, and establish programs for assisting self-represented and limited English proficient litigants. In 2019, we had representatives from 17 of the 24 judicial circuits.
circuits participate in the network.

**COURT SERVICES DIVISION**

The **Court Services Division** is organized into multiple working groups (the Courts, Children and Families Unit; the Special Programs Unit; and the Recordkeeping and Technology Unit) and is involved in a diverse and wide range of activities and projects affecting judges, circuit clerks, court administrators and other components of the judicial branch of government. The Division is responsible for staffing a variety of Supreme Court committees or boards, the Judicial Conference, and the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges. The Division also serves as the primary liaison for the Supreme Court’s Peer Judge Mentoring Program, Judicial Performance Evaluation Program; and processes court requests for a judicial assignment outside the original court jurisdiction, as well as requests for the reimbursement of claims for persons subject to the Sexually Violent Person’s Commitment Act. Staff within Court Services frequently interacts and collaborates with several other divisions at the Administrative Office on a wide array of topics of interest to the operations of the Illinois courts, including serving as staff on multiple Standing Committees of the Illinois Judicial College.

In 2019, the Program Unit underwent a slight name change to further reflect its diverse nature of assigned programs and projects. The **Special Programs Unit** staff was assigned as liaison for the Supreme Court Committee on Illinois Evidence. Throughout the year, the Committee worked on draft amendments to several Illinois Rules of Evidence: Rule 613 – Prior Statements of Witnesses; Rule 901 – Requirement of Authentication or Identification; and Rule 1101 – Applicability of Rules. The proposed amendments were adopted by the Court and effective in September.

With the sunsetting of the Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee last year, SPU staff have taken a more proactive role in overall guidance and oversight of mandatory arbitration programs. Staff have begun in-person visits to each arbitration center, as well as a review of each program's local rules. In addition, staff responded to a comprehensive audit conducted on each of the 16 programs; there were ultimately no material audit findings.

Throughout the year, SPU staff continued to serve in an advisor role to the Illinois Judicial College’s Trial Court Administrator Education Committee. Staff took part in several professional development workshops throughout the year, designed to assist the Committee in acquiring the skills needed to effectively develop and/or teach a course. Subsequently, the Committee developed a three-year educational curriculum that was approved by the College’s Board of Trustees and will begin course offerings in March 2020.

The **Courts, Children and Families Unit (CCFU)** oversees the administration of the federally-funded statewide Court Improvement Program (CIP). The unit works to support the mission, vision, and core values of Illinois’ CIP of ensuring safety and stability for children and families involved in child abuse and neglect proceedings by managing the programmatic and fiscal components of three grant awards (Basic, Data and Training). In the past year, the CCFU continued to develop the foundation and infrastructure for improved court practices in child protection cases by concentrating its efforts on addressing timely permanency in Illinois, continuing the Child Protection Data Courts Project, and collaborating with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services on the Child and Family Services Review Program Improvement Plan and implementation of the Family First Prevention and Services Act. In addition to providing continuation funding for long-term projects, including the Family Advocacy Clinic at the University of Illinois School of Law and the Juvenile Justice Clinic at Southern Illinois University, the CIP funded new projects aimed at enhancing representation for children. The Manager of the CCFU also serves as staff and an advisor to the Illinois Judicial College Standing Committee on Guardians ad Litem Education (GALE) and the Supreme Court Committee on Juvenile Courts.
Child Protection Data Courts Project (CPDC)

Through the CPDC Project, the CCFU continued to collect and analyze child protection court performance measures, demographic information and case characteristics in child abuse and neglect cases. Currently, ten counties collect CPDC Project data. The CPDC Project sites track case demographic information as well as 18 of 30 nationally recognized child protection court performance measures. The project sites are implementing action plans developed, by each county, based on the collected performance measure data that includes a project initiative with goals, action items, responsibilities, timelines, and outcome measures.

Collaboration with the Illinois Department of Child and Family Services (IDCFS):

In 2019, the CCFU continued its’ working relationship with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (IDCFS) by assisting with the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plan (PIP) development. The onsite review occurred in spring 2018 and developed court related interventions for the Program Improvement Plan (PIP) aimed at addressing compliance issues identified during the CFSR. Lastly, several representatives of IDCFS are members of the Court Improvement Program Advisory Committee.

Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) Implementation

FFPSA, enacted in February 2018, shifts the focus of child protection to include prevention services. Beginning Oct. 1, 2019, Title IV-E funding can be used for evidence-based prevention services if doing so allows the child to remain safely in the home. In addition, FFPSA seeks to curtail the use of congregate or group care for children, and instead places a new emphasis on family foster homes. Reimbursement will only occur for Qualified Residential Placement Programs (QRTP). Justice partners created forms for the court to use when making required findings approving or disapproving of placement in the QRTP. The CIP will be providing training for judges and attorneys in 2020 on the FFPSA.

The Recordkeeping & Technology Unit (RTU) provided an array of guidance and technical support services to courts and circuit clerks in 2019. RTU staff, as members of the Illinois Association of Court Clerk’s (IACC) Oversight Board, continued to work with the IACC in development of educational programs for circuit clerks and their staff, as well as coordinating the New Circuit Clerk Mentor Program. RTU further staff served as staff and advisors to the Illinois Judicial College Standing Committee on Circuit Court Clerk Education (CCCE). In 2019, the CCCE reviewed results of the needs assessment conducted in 2018, developed a Comprehensive Education Plan, and continued the process of developing a 3-year curriculum and associated courses. In preparation of Education Conference 2020, RTU staff began working with the Judicial Education Division to plan multi-disciplinary sessions to be held as part of the ongoing expansion of education opportunities available to court clerks and other justice partners.

The Manual on Fines and Fees, maintained by the RTU, includes more than 300 statutory citations and Supreme Court Rule references regarding the collection and distribution of fines, fees, penalties, restitution, assessments, surcharges and costs which may be applied to cases in Illinois. With the enactment of the Criminal and Traffic Assessment Act in 2018 (Public Act 100-0987, effective July 1, 2019), staff began to disseminate information regarding the systematic and procedural changes at the circuit court level resulting from the Act. RTU staff also serves as liaison to the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges Ad Hoc Committee on Article V Rules, which provides
recommendations of updates to the Article V Rules, Uniform Citation Forms, and Electronic Citation Forms, as may be necessary.

The Illinois Supreme Court’s Order directing statewide mandatory electronic filing in civil cases took effect on January 1, 2018, and via eFileIL, the Supreme Court’s Electronic Filing Manager (EFM), the RTU provided guidance to courts in their implementation of new civil e-filing code configurations. In addition, the Supreme Court implemented a statewide system called re:SearchIL effective July 1, 2018, which is a document repository where users can remotely access case information in a single place, across jurisdictions, regardless of which case management system used. The RTU further continues to assist local circuit courts with implementation, facilitates information sharing, and provides detailed and subject matter expertise for all other electronic business programs.

The Unit continues to provide assistance and oversight in regards to the Supreme Court’s General Administrative Order on Recordkeeping in the Circuit Courts and instructions in the Manual on Recordkeeping, as well as managed and updated the Offense Code Table (OFT), which contains the coded listing of all criminal offenses reportable to four recipient state agencies through the Automated Disposition Reporting (ADR) Program. Additionally, RTU staff collected, compiled, and published quarterly and annual statistical information for the 2018 Statistical Summary by the clerks of the supreme, appellate, and circuit courts, and other divisions of the Supreme Court and Administrative Office.

Annually, the RTU monitors the filing of the circuit clerks’ financial audits, compiled and distributed the Applicable Legal Requirements to auditors for their compliance testing, and disseminated updated auditing guidelines to county boards and circuit clerks; and provided certified merged jury lists and Petit and Grand Juror Handbooks to all 102 counties, as requested.

Lastly, the RTU has provided support to the Illinois Judicial Conference’s Court Data and Performance Measures Task Force, which is undertaking the significant task of updating the Manual on Recordkeeping and making recommendations to the Judicial Conference on appropriate performance measures and reporting.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION

The Human Resources Division provides employee and labor relations support to state-paid judicial branch employees and managers. Among other duties, Division staff maintain
comprehensive attendance and leave records for all judicial branch personnel covered by the Supreme Court’s Leave of Absence Policies and assist individuals with questions regarding the Supreme Court’s personnel policies. Staff also work with judicial branch employees and managers in administering the judicial branch’s classification and compensation plan, as well as assisting judicial branch managers in the recruitment and selection process. Additionally, the Division is responsible for EEOC reporting and dissemination of economic interest statements required under Supreme Court Rule 68.

The Division’s labor attorneys negotiate collective bargaining agreements state-wide on behalf of chief circuit judges and circuit clerks. The Division is called upon to offer advice relative to employee and labor matters to assure appropriate actions that are just and in compliance with the negotiated agreements, common law rules of the workplace, and federal and state statutes.

**JUDICIAL EDUCATION DIVISION**

The Judicial Education Division identifies, coordinates, designs and develops judicial education curricula and resources for the benefit of Illinois judges. The Division, on behalf of the Supreme Court of Illinois, aids the Illinois Judicial College Committee on Judicial Education in the development of judicial education programs and resources. The Division also assists the Committee on Judicial Education in its collaborative efforts with the Judicial College Committees on Probation Education, Circuit Court Clerk Education, Trial Court Administrator Education, Guardian ad Litem Education and Judicial Branch Staff Education; the Special Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Justice and Mental Health Planning; Judicial Mentor Committee; Appellate Court Administrative Committee; Access to Justice Commission; Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism; and the Supreme Court Committee on Equality in the development of competency-based, multi-disciplinary courses intended to embrace ethical, substantive, decision making and leadership competencies desired of the profession.

In 2019, elective and mandatory programs were offered to Illinois judges, including New Judge Seminar and the Biennial Juvenile Conference. Each newly elected or appointed judge is required to attend the first available New Judge Seminar following election or appointment to the bench. The Division also manages the logistics of the New Judge Mentoring program in coordination with the Judicial Mentor Committee, facilitating the pairing of experienced new judge mentors with new associate and circuit judges, and minimum contacts between mentors and mentees throughout the one-year mentoring assignment. The Biennial Juvenile Conference is a multi-disciplinary program bringing together juvenile delinquency and child protection judges, guardians ad litem, and juvenile probation and detention professionals to develop strategies to address new and ongoing challenges facing the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

The Judicial Education Division facilitates judicial access to resources designed exclusively for judges, and manages the annual peer review, editing and publication of Illinois Judicial Benchbooks. Benchbook production is a collaborative effort of the Judicial Education Division and the Illinois Judicial College Committee on Judicial Education Benchbook Editorial Board and the individual benchbook teams of law school professors, judicial editors and judicial peer reviewers who serve on the writing teams. The 2019 Benchbook series included: Civil Law and Procedure; Criminal Law and Procedure; DUI/Traffic; Domestic Violence; Evidence; Family Law and Procedure; Juvenile Law; Mortgage Foreclosure and the Illinois Manual on Complex Civil Litigation and the Illinois Manual on Complex Criminal Litigation.

**JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SERVICES (JMIS) DIVISION**

The Judicial Management Information Services (JMIS) division is one of ten divisions / offices in the AOIC. At the direction of the Supreme Court and Administrative Director, JMIS provides technology to the Illinois Supreme Court, Appellate Courts, reviewing court supporting units, and the AOIC. JMIS coordinates the Court’s statewide digital recording initiative, which provides digital
audio and video recording systems in the Supreme, Appellate, and Circuit Courts. JMIS is also involved in managing the Court’s statewide e-filing initiative (eFileIL – http://efile.illinoiscourts.gov), central document repository called re:SearchIL (http://research.illinoiscourts.gov), and facilitates statewide remote hearings using Zoom and related technologies.

JMIS is staffed by 21 professionals consisting of five groups organized to respond to specific technologies and support for court initiatives. JMIS’ IT Security group manages the Courts’ cybersecurity systems, including numerous firewalls, account administration, and local network policies in more than 30 offices throughout the state. The Hardware / Software group manages server applications, desktop and laptop computers, peripherals, and productivity software. The Hardware / Software group is also responsible for the installation and support of the digital recording systems in the Supreme Court (2 courtrooms), Appellate Court (6 courtrooms) and Trial Courts (more than 401 courtrooms). JMIS’ Internet Services group is responsible for the design and upkeep of the Court’s website (www.illinoiscourts.gov), where approximately 40,000 visitors access the website each month. In conjunction with the Supreme Court Communication Office, the Court’s Twitter account (@illinoiscourts), broadcasts events and information to more than 8,600 followers. The User Services group staffs JMIS’ Help Desk, supports telecommunication services and phones (land and cellular lines), and coordinates asset tracking of the Court’s technology equipment. The Application Group is responsible for the design and enhancements to approximately fifteen enterprise database applications written in the Oracle or Progress database and programming languages.

PROBATION SERVICES DIVISION

The Probation Services Division provides services to the Chief Judges and their probation staff in Illinois’ 24 Judicial Circuits. The Probation and Probation Officer’s Act, at 730 ILCS 110/15(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 the State, and otherwise carry out the intent of this Act.” Consistent with its statutory responsibility, the mission of the Probation Services Division is to enhance the capacity of the community corrections system in order to reduce offender recidivism and create safer communities. In carrying out this mission, the Division’s training, monitoring, standards setting, and technical assistance activities extend to all aspects of the administration and operation of the 69 local probation departments or districts.
that serve Illinois’ 102 counties. All 16 juvenile detention centers are administered by the circuit courts.

As the primary communication link between the Division and probation and court services departments, Division employees play an integral role in achieving its mission and statutory mandates through teamwork, adopting a solution focused approach, and demonstrating professionalism. The Division is currently staffed by 27 employees (plus 1 vacancy), with office sites in Springfield and Chicago, and is comprised of operational units: Field Operations; Training and Juvenile Justice; Data, Eligibles, and Reimbursement Vouchering Program; and Interstate Compact/Intrastate Transfer. Additionally, there are two specialized programs, Problem-Solving Courts and Pretrial Services.

Pursuant to statute, Division responsibilities include the administration of state salary reimbursement to counties for probation and detention services; review and approval of local departments’ annual probation plans; collection and analysis of statewide probation data; administration of probation employment and compensation standards; employment eligibility lists; development and implementation of evidence-based practices (EBP); monitoring and evaluation of probation programs and operations; administration of the interstate compact for adult and juvenile probationers transferring into and out of the state; design and delivery of basic and advanced training for probation and detention personnel; and staff support to circuit courts to improve the administration and operation of probation services in Illinois. During 2019, staff reviewed 1219 applications for eligibility for employment/promotion. Of those reviewed, 1092 were determined as meeting the eligibility requirements for employment or promotion as a probation/detention officer in Illinois. Additionally, Division staff review, compile and analyze monthly statistical data submitted by probation and court services departments to assist in policy and decision-making. Quality assurance, validity and reliability, and outcome measures continue to be Division priorities with particular emphasis on risk assessment, case planning and supervision, and targeted interventions for higher risk offenders.

In 2019 four major projects/priorities continued to guide the work of the Division personnel: 1) Training and certification reviews of problem-solving court operational and certification standards; 2) Work with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Pretrial Practices 3) Implement and begin to train over 2,500 adult and juvenile probation officers in new Risk Assessments; 4) Developing and promulgating new adult and juvenile probation supervision standards which were effective January 1, 2019.

Division staff, with the guidance and assistance of the Special Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Justice and Mental Health Planning, created Problem-Solving Court Standards and a certification process for Illinois’ 109 problem-solving courts. Collaborative efforts with local problem-solving court teams concentrated on the certification process during 2018. Division staff will continue conducting site visits to
local problem-solving courts to offer technical assistance and support to these teams. Future multi-disciplinary training for problem-solving court team members will remain a priority. In 2019 this group also established a recertification process for the Illinois problem-solving courts. The recertification process begins in 2020.

Division staff also will continue the ongoing implementation of EBP through interaction with departments to develop basic and advanced knowledge through skill-based training for adult and juvenile probation officers, juvenile detention officers, supervisors and department managers. Follow-up training and technical assistance on both adult and juvenile offender risk assessment and effective case management strategies will also continue throughout the state.

The Division’s Interstate Compact Unit staff oversees the transfer of adult felony and qualifying misdemeanor probation cases and juvenile probation cases between states consistent with the national rules set forth by the Interstate Commission on Adult Offender Supervision (ICAOS) and the Interstate Commission for Juveniles (ICJ). As of December 31, 2019, a total of 6,400 (3,878 outgoing; 2,522 incoming) adult probation compact cases were under active supervision. The Compact Unit’s staff also coordinated the transfer of 1,049 juvenile probation cases. Besides oversight of adult and juvenile transfers, the Compact Unit’s staff continuously provides extra information and support to probation officers regarding ICAOS and ICJ through training and responses to email queries addressing questions about the transfer process.

Throughout 2019, the Division convened several planning and special focus committees and workgroups comprised of probation and court services officers, supervisors or managers. The purpose of these committees and workgroups is to collaborate with probation and juvenile detention personnel in the design and implementation of training events, or to provide expertise and practical application feedback on programming, policy and standards development, and other initiatives. Division staff also continued to serve as liaison to the Supreme Court Probation Policy Advisory Board with the purpose of: 1) Advising the AOIC on policy matters and programming in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of Illinois’ probation and court services departments; 2) Providing a formal venue for communication, review, analysis and exchange of information; and 3) Identifying opportunities, resources and strategies to advance the probation profession’s mission. Membership of the Board is comprised of probation and court services managers representing all five of Illinois’ appellate court districts. Advisement was provided on myriad policies, including Probation Supervision Standards, training, intrastate transfers and detention.
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**FILINGS**

- Grand Total
- General Docket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>General Docket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>1,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISPOSITIONS**

- Grand Total
- General Docket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>General Docket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>1,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1: Summary of Case Filings and Final Dispositions / Supreme Court of Illinois / 2015-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FILINGS</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL GENERAL DOCKET</th>
<th>DIRECT APPEALS BY RIGHT (A)</th>
<th>CERTIFICATES OF IMPORTANCE (B)</th>
<th>DIRECT APPEALS BY PERMISSION (C)</th>
<th>PETITIONS FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL (D)</th>
<th>ORIGINAL ACTION MOTIONS (E)</th>
<th>ATTORNEY DISC. CASES ON GENERAL DOCKET</th>
<th>OTHER GENERAL DOCKET (F)</th>
<th>TOTAL MIS. RECORD (G)</th>
<th>TOTAL MIS. DOCKET (H)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Appeals directly from the circuit court: Statutes held invalid (Rules 302(a) and 603). (b) Certification of case by Appellate Court under Rule 316. (c) Rule 302(b) motions “Dispositions” do not include motions allowed in a given year unless entire case disposed of in that same year. (d) “Dispositions” do not include petitions allowed in a given year unless entire case disposed of in that same year. (e) Motions filed under Rule 381 (mandamus, prohibition, habeas corpus), Rule 382 (legislative redistricting/ability of governor to serve or resume office), Rule 383 (supervisory authority), Rule 384 (motions to transfer & consolidate multicircuit actions). “Dispositions” do not include motions allowed in a given year unless entire case disposed of in that same year. (f) “Filings” include, for example, motions for appeal bond, motions to stay (Rule 305), certification of questions of state law from certain federal courts (Rule 20). Beginning year 2017, Rule 384 filings and dispositions are reported in column “Original Action Motions”. “Dispositions” also may include allowed petitions for leave to appeal which were not completely disposed of in the year in which the petition was filed (see footnote (d)), including dismissals. (g) The Miscellaneous Record consists primarily of attorney matters, including disciplinary cases, motions for restoration to active status (Rule 759), petitions to change name on roll of attorneys, bar admission motions, and law firms seeking leave to register/renew under Rule 721. (h) Cases are filed on the Miscellaneous Docket when papers tendered by pro se prisoners do not conform to Supreme Court Rules.
MAP OF APPELLATE AND SUPREME COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

APPELLATE COURT DIRECTORY

1 FIRST DISTRICT
160 North LaSalle
Room S 1400
Chicago 60601
312-793-5484
Thomas D. Palella, Clerk

2 SECOND DISTRICT
160 North LaSalle
55 Symphony Way
Elgin 60120
847-695-3750
Robert J. Mangan, Clerk

3 THIRD DISTRICT
1004 Columbus Street
Ottawa 61350
815-434-5050
Barbara Trumbo, Clerk

4 FOURTH DISTRICT
Waterways Building
201 W. Monroe Street
Springfield 62794
217-782-2586
Carla Bender, Clerk

5 FIFTH DISTRICT
14th & Main Streets
Mt. Vernon 62864
618-242-3120
John J. Flood, Clerk
# Caseload Summaries by District

## Appellate Court - Calendar Year 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellate District</th>
<th>Type of Case</th>
<th>Number of Cases Pending January 1, 2019</th>
<th>Number of Cases Filed During 2019</th>
<th>Number of Cases Reinstated</th>
<th>Number of Cases Disposed</th>
<th>Number of Cases Disposed by Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Number of Cases Disposed by Rule 23 Order</th>
<th>Number of Cases Disposed By Summary Order</th>
<th>Number of Cases Disposed Without Opinion, R23 or Sum. Ord.</th>
<th>Number of Cases Pending December 31, 2019</th>
<th>Inventory Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>-377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>-321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Beginning in 2017, Illinois Workers’ Compensation case statistics are no longer referenced.

* Due to reporting software computations; there are small variances in the number of cases pending on January 1, 2019 when compared to the number of cases pending on December 31, 2018, as well as, minor reconciliation differences in the number of cases pending on December 31, 2019.
APPELLATE COURTS OF ILLINOIS FIVE-YEAR TRENDS

TOTAL CASELOAD - TOTAL CASES*

FIRST DISTRICT - TOTAL CASES**

*Beginning in 2017, totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases.

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases.
SECOND DISTRICT - TOTAL CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases.

THIRD DISTRICT - TOTAL CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases.
FOURTH DISTRICT - TOTAL CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIFTH DISTRICT - TOTAL CASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals do not include Illinois Workers’ Compensation Commission Cases.
DEFINITION OF CASE CATEGORIES

CIVIL CATEGORY

AR
An Arbitration case number shall be assigned to every arbitration-eligible case at the time it is filed. NOTE: This case category shall be used only by counties that have initiated Mandatory Arbitration as defined by Supreme Court Rules 86 through 95.

CH
A Chancery case number shall be assigned to a complaint for equitable relief in matters such as foreclosures, trusts, and title to real property.

ED
An Eminent Domain case number shall be assigned to proceedings involving compensation to an owner for property taken for public use.

L
A Law case number shall be assigned to tort, contract, and a variety of other actions in which the damages sought are $50,000 or less.

LM
A Law Magistrate case number shall be assigned to tort, contract, and a variety of other actions in which the damages sought are $50,000 or less.

MC
Each Municipal Corporation shall have one permanent case number and file folder for routine matters to be considered by the court. This file will contain such matters as organization, appointment of officers, approval of bonds, and routine orders confirming annexation.

MH
A Mental Health case number shall be assigned to proceedings involving commitment, discharge, or restoration to legal status.

MR
A Miscellaneous Remedy case number shall be assigned to complaints seeking review of administrative decisions (other than of a tax commission) and a variety of other actions that include change of name, habeas corpus, and extradition.

P
A Probate case number shall be assigned to estates of decedents and guardianship matters.

SC
A Small Claim case number shall be assigned to “... a civil action based on either tort or contract for money not in excess of $10,000, exclusive of interest and costs, or for the collection of taxes not in excess of that amount” (Supreme Court Rule 281.)

TX
A Tax case number shall be assigned to the annual tax sale and a variety of other actions relating to the collection of taxes. Petitions for tax deeds and objections are part of the annual tax sale proceeding and will be assigned sub-numbers of the annual tax sale case number.
## Definition of Case Categories, Continued

### Domestic Relations Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD</strong></td>
<td>An Adoption case number shall be assigned to every adoption case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>A Dissolution case number shall be assigned to a complaint for dissolution of marriage, annulment, or separate maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>A Family case number shall be assigned to a variety of matters including proceedings to establish the parent-child relationship, notice to putative fathers, and certain actions relating to child support. NOTE: Petitions for orders of protection filed as separate cases are filed under the OP category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OP</strong></td>
<td>An Order of Protection case number shall be assigned to any petition for an order of protection, civil no contact order, firearms restraining order, and stalking no contact order that is filed separately from an existing case. NOTE: If it is the practice of a county or circuit not to file orders of protection in existing criminal or civil cases, that practice may be continued and all petitions for orders of protection should be given an OP number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Juvenile Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>A Juvenile case number shall be assigned to any proceeding initiated under the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 (705 ILCS 405/1-1 et. seq.) except those defined by the JA and JD categories below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JA</strong></td>
<td>A Juvenile Abuse and Neglect case number shall be assigned to all cases involving a neglected or abused minor as defined by the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 (705 ILCS 405/2-3(1) and (2)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JD</strong></td>
<td>A Juvenile Delinquency case number shall be assigned to all cases involving a delinquent minor as defined by the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 (705 ILCS 405/5-105).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRIMINAL CATEGORY

CF
A Felony case number shall be assigned when a complaint, information or indictment is filed in which at least one count charges a felony.

CM
A Misdemeanor case number shall be assigned when a case is filed in which the most serious charge carries a penalty of less than one year imprisonment.

DT
A Driving Under the Influence case number shall be assigned to any case charging a violation of a statute, ordinance, or regulation governing driving under the influence of alcohol, other drug, or combination thereof.

QUASI-CRIMINAL CATEGORY

TR
A Traffic case number shall be assigned to any case defined by Supreme Court Rule 501(f), except DUI cases. Note that a violation of a traffic ordinance as defined by Rule 501(f) is given a TR number.

OV
An Ordinance Violation case number shall be assigned to any case in which violation of a local ordinance is charged. However, violation of a traffic ordinance as defined by Supreme Court Rule 501(f) shall be given a TR or DT number, as appropriate.

CL
A Civil Law case number shall be assigned to all cases for civil law violations charged under paragraph (a), Section 4 of the Cannabis Control Act (720 ILCS 550/4(a)), or Paragraph (c), Section 3.5 of the Drug Paraphernalia Control Act (720 ILCS 600/3.5(c)). In accordance with Supreme Court Rule 589, each Uniform Civil Law Citation form shall be assigned a separate case number.
## Caseload Summaries by Circuit
### Calendar Year 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCUIT</th>
<th>BEGIN PENDING</th>
<th>NEW FILED</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>DISPOSED</th>
<th>END PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>139,311</td>
<td>66,348</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60,045</td>
<td>143,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>47,311</td>
<td>32,422</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29,669</td>
<td>49,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>72,396</td>
<td>74,228</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>69,087</td>
<td>77,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>37,585</td>
<td>43,908</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>42,398</td>
<td>37,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>58,072</td>
<td>30,808</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24,396</td>
<td>62,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>68,945</td>
<td>63,786</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>60,536</td>
<td>72,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>86,583</td>
<td>71,635</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83,092</td>
<td>90,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>21,597</td>
<td>27,492</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26,024</td>
<td>22,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>26,043</td>
<td>29,022</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28,580</td>
<td>26,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>45,514</td>
<td>61,704</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>60,447</td>
<td>46,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>41,689</td>
<td>51,388</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>53,224</td>
<td>39,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>81,942</td>
<td>130,251</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>131,007</td>
<td>87,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>19,375</td>
<td>33,763</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>33,191</td>
<td>20,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>60,520</td>
<td>52,886</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50,045</td>
<td>60,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>27,994</td>
<td>34,403</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32,875</td>
<td>29,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>118,521</td>
<td>102,151</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>73,652</td>
<td>66,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>88,639</td>
<td>71,288</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>70,210</td>
<td>85,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>53,702</td>
<td>178,304</td>
<td>10,819</td>
<td>190,204</td>
<td>52,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>38,743</td>
<td>123,015</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>128,433</td>
<td>37,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>71,136</td>
<td>76,113</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>74,471</td>
<td>123,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>64,429</td>
<td>27,324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,868</td>
<td>72,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>17,067</td>
<td>54,357</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>57,598</td>
<td>16,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>20,267</td>
<td>28,892</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>29,237</td>
<td>20,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstate Total</td>
<td>1,307,381</td>
<td>1,465,488</td>
<td>28,819</td>
<td>1,427,289</td>
<td>1,340,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County</td>
<td>1,463,995</td>
<td>853,539</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td>671,821</td>
<td>1,657,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>2,771,376</td>
<td>2,319,027</td>
<td>41,042</td>
<td>2,099,110</td>
<td>2,998,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit</td>
<td>NUMBER OF COUNTIES</td>
<td>2019 CENSUS POPULATION ESTIMATE</td>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES FILED DURING 2019 **</td>
<td>NUMBER OF JUDGES</td>
<td>NUMBER OF CASES FILED PER JUDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>204,953</td>
<td>66,348</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>190,443</td>
<td>32,422</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>279,392</td>
<td>74,228</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>235,257</td>
<td>43,908</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>169,747</td>
<td>30,808</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>364,008</td>
<td>63,786</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>312,949</td>
<td>71,635</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>136,783</td>
<td>27,492</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>154,919</td>
<td>29,022</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>333,501</td>
<td>61,704</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>287,203</td>
<td>51,388</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>690,743</td>
<td>130,251</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192,351</td>
<td>33,763</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>261,404</td>
<td>52,886</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>164,777</td>
<td>34,403</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>532,403</td>
<td>102,151</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>336,116</td>
<td>71,288</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>922,921</td>
<td>178,304</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>696,535</td>
<td>123,015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>360,908</td>
<td>76,113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136,976</td>
<td>27,324</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>307,774</td>
<td>54,357</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>233,887</td>
<td>28,892</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNSTATE TOTAL</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7,505,950</td>
<td>1,465,488</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOK COUNTY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,150,233</td>
<td>853,539</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TOTAL</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12,656,183</td>
<td>2,319,027</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average number of sitting Circuit Judges
** Total of all cases in all categories: Civil; Domestic Relations; Criminal; Quasi-Criminal; and Juvenile.
The 2016 spike in civil case closures is due to a mass closure of over 208,703 Law Non-Jury < $50,000 cases in Cook County in 2016, which is approximately 100,000 more cases than the prior year's average of total case closures for this specific case type.
FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE VISIT ILLINOISCOURTS.GOV