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1981 Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project Study

In November, 1980, the Judicial Center of San Juan, Puerto Rico, established a Court Delay Reduction Project known locally as the "Projecto de Aceleracion de Casos" (P.A.C.).

The initial Project was implemented to reduce delay in the Criminal Superior Courts; however, in February, 1981, the Project was extended to the Civil Superior Court.

In April, 1981, the Honorable Rene Arillaga Belendez, Administrative Judge of the San Juan Superior Court, who was the driving force behind the delay reduction efforts, requested assistance from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's (LEAA) Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project. The request was to review the newly implemented Project, assess its impact on the system, and conduct a one-day seminar for non-Project-involved judges, thus providing information necessary to expand delay reduction techniques to other judicial centers in Puerto Rico.

Mr. James Lynch of Washington, D.C., and Mr. Ruben Carrerou of Miami, Florida, were assigned to Judge Belendez's request. Their report, submitted in November, 1981, included a detailed description of both the Criminal and Civil Case Delay Reduction Programs. It included recommendations in the following areas:

a. The need for an adequate monitoring system;

b. Improved communication and information systems;

c. Enhancement of the present file removal and tracking system;

d. Implementation of a continuance form to monitor the use of continuances and the reasons for such requests; and,

e. The use of a data collection card.

The consultants felt that the Project lacked an adequate case monitoring and evaluation system. Recommendations were made for the implementation of a basic manual system to monitor both the Criminal and Civil Court Delay Reduction Projects. The package consisted of several data gathering forms and techniques which would generate the necessary reports and would serve both as an information and an evaluation tool.

The evaluation and data collection package was simple in nature, but essential if any type of realistic evaluation of the Project was to be conducted at a later date.
The San Juan Court Delay Reduction Project started out in several courts and was later implemented in all Superior Courts in San Juan, both Criminal and Civil Superior Courts.

1987 Adjudication Technical Assistance Project Study

In January, 1986, the Court Delay Reduction Project was extended to the Bayamon and Ponce Judicial Regions. (See Attachments section for exact locations). Part of the extension, and perhaps the most significant change in the local culture of the judiciary, was the implementation of two special courts which conduct business from 12:00 Noon to 5:30 P.M. and from 6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M.

Recently, Mr. Alfredo Rivera Mendoza, Director of Planning and Management of the Office of Court Administration, requested technical assistance from the EMT Group's Adjudication Technical Assistance Project; a Project of the Bureau of Justice Assistance. Specifically, Mr. Mendoza requested assistance in the following areas:

a. Preparation of an appropriate methodology for the evaluation of the two special courts in the Ponce and Bayamon Judicial regions; and,

b. Provision of documentation of experiences from other jurisdictions which have recently developed methodologies to evaluate court delay reduction programs.

The EMT Group contacted the Southeastern Region Office of the National Center for State Courts, which has had a long involvement with court system improvement efforts in Puerto Rico, and invited it to join in the work of this assignment. On September 1, 1987, Mr. James R. James, Regional Director of the Southeastern Region Office, conducted a problem definition visit to the Office of Court Administration of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

As a result of Mr. James' visit, it was determined that Mr. James should return to Puerto Rico, along with two other consultants, in order to fulfill the Administrative Office's request for technical assistance. The EMT Group and the National Center for State Courts assembled a team to meet with Mr. Mendoza and his staff on November 12 and 13, 1987. The consulting team was composed of Mr. James R. James and Mr. Gerald Kuban of the National Center for State Courts, and Mr. Ruben Carrerou, Executive Assistant to the Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, Miami, Florida.
II. OVERVIEW

As mentioned in the introduction, Mr. Alfredo Rivera Mendoza requested assistance from the EMT Group and the National Center for State Courts in the following area:

"To provide assistance in developing a methodology to evaluate the effectiveness of the newly implemented courts in the Judicial Centers of Ponce and Bayamon."

(See Attachments section for a detailed description of the Project.)

The consulting team was sent to Puerto Rico to provide preliminary on-site assistance and to prepare a report outlining the proposed methodology to be used in evaluating the Ponce and Bayamon special courts.

On November 12th, Mr. Carrerou met with the San Juan Planning Staff. Present at the meeting were, Mr. Alfredo Rivera Mendoza, Director of the Planning Department; Mrs. Norma Acevedo, Divisional Planning Chief; Mrs. Myriam Gonzales Torres, Planning Specialist; Mrs. Magali Urellana, Planning Specialist; Miss Rosa Santiago, Planning Specialist; Mr. Erbin Pagan, Chief Analyst; Miss Martiza Ortiz, Analyst; Mrs. Carmen Leguerre, Chief of Data Processing; and Mr. Juan Panicce, Statistician.

Mrs. Norma Acevedo is presently in charge of the Planning Unit which will be evaluating the Ponce and Bayamon Courts. She is assisted by Mrs. Myriam Torres, Mrs. Magali Urellana and Miss Rosa Santiago.

During the course of the day, several issues surfaced and were addressed individually by the consultants:

a. What is the best way to evaluate a project that has already been implemented without a proper tracking and evaluation plan?

b. How can a tracking instrument be initiated at the tail-end of the pilot project?

c. What data needs to be collected and analyzed, and for what period of time?

d. What type of report should be generated and how frequently?

e. Who should be involved in the evaluation process?

f. What is the proper way of evaluating a project and how can you insure proper data collection?

g. How do you deal with negative reactions to the implementation of the project?

h. What are the benefits of early planning and continued evaluation?
i. What are the benefits of maintaining proper information on continuances and, how is this best accomplished?

j. What are the benefits of maintaining a case aging report?

k. How do you prepare a proper questionnaire, and what is the best way of testing it and conducting it?

l. After the evaluation is completed, what is the most effective way of convincing the using agencies and participants of the department’s recommendations?

m. What are the consequences when there is a deviation from the original criterion? How does it impact the evaluation process?

Each of the above items were discussed fully by the consultant team and the Planning Staff. Many of the points raised were answered to everyone’s satisfaction. Other areas of interest are addressed in greater detail later in the report.

The staff were also interested in procuring information in the following areas:

a. Examples of evaluation systems in other jurisdictions;

b. Information on the median days of dispositions in all types of cases;

c. Sample forms on: Case Management, Case Summary, and Case Aging Reports; and,

d. Information on the use of backup judges to reduce backlog and delay.

On November 13th, the consulting team met with the local Planning Staff and continued discussion of the items mentioned above.

During the morning session, several items of interest were identified and discussed with the Planning Staff: how to determine median days of disposition, how to implement a court delay reduction project (see Attachments Section), and what techniques for proper data gathering are available.

It is the intent of this report to provide the following information to the San Juan Planning Department in an effort to facilitate and guide their evaluation process:

- Identify areas needing immediate attention;

- Provide guidance to evaluate projects;

- Design evaluation instruments, along with samples of charts and reports; and,

- Provide samples of Delay Reduction Programs.
III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning and Evaluation Staff in Puerto Rico is faced with a challenging and interesting situation. Their primary and most pressing issue is the evaluation of the two special Superior Courts, one in the Ponce Judicial Region and the other in the Bayamon Judicial Region. Both of these courts have implemented case delay reduction techniques similar to those already in effect in the San Juan Judicial Region. The only difference is that these two courts operate in the afternoon and evening hours.

The task of the Planning and Evaluation Staff is further complicated by the facts that statistics are not readily available, the Project's parameters were changed in midstream, and the project evaluation must be done by February 1988.

The evaluation of the two special courts should include the measurement of case delay and backlog reduction, the degree of fulfillment of the Project's initial goals and objectives, and the impact on the overall effectiveness of the justice system.

In order to measure the operational success of the two courts, the following must be considered:

a. Have the Project's goals and objectives been clearly defined?

b. Has a back-to-back project and evaluation system been developed and implemented?

c. Have the necessary statistics been identified and are they being collected?

d. Has a proper instrument for data collection been put into use? and,

e. Has a similar court been identified for comparison purposes and, if so, are proper statistics being kept on it?

Statistical information is crucial to the proper evaluation of a system; not only must a good planning effort be devoted to a new project, but equally important is the proper and careful planning of the evaluation process. We must think of the evaluation process and actual project as two parallel systems, one cannot exist without the other. (See Figure 1).

When the actual project and the evaluation system go hand-in-hand, early and timely analysis can be made, thus facilitating the decision-making process on whether to make changes or make the sometimes painful decision to stop and start from scratch. Without these tools, planners may be asking for trouble.
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION PROCESS

Phase one = Implementation
Phase two = Project initiation
Phase three = Project review
Phase four = Project adjustment

FIGURE ONE
FINDING:
Both in the Ponce and Bayamon Special Courts, a Case Control Card was introduced to gather statistics. (See Figure 2.) It would seem that the data being collected is adequate; however, it was not clear whether information on continuances was readily available.

RECOMMENDATION:
Implement the Continuance Form recommended in the 1981 study. (See Figures 3 and 4.) All cases studied should have a Continuance Form filled out, if comparisons are to be made.

FINDING:
The case control data cards mentioned above are maintained by clerks' personnel and kept at the respective locations. The cards are not always maintained up-to-date and are not readily available to those in charge with the responsibility of evaluating the project.

RECOMMENDATION:
Have the cards brought up to date, even if it requires the assignment or the hiring of temporary personnel. The information contained in these cards is crucial if an accurate evaluation of the special courts is to be achieved. Have copies made of the cards and submit them to the Planning Staff; this will facilitate the evaluation process and insure the proper maintenance of the cards.

FINDING:
It was noted that the Planning Department was not monitoring the data collection process of the two special courts.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Department should assign one person to conduct regular visits to each of the test locations. This will insure proper data collection and will assure the clerk's personnel of the importance of the project, just by the fact that someone is there and is responsive to their efforts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Acusado:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Defenso imputado:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Causa probable para arresto: día ___ mes ___ año ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. En ausencia</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. En presencia</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fecha del arresto: día ___ mes ___ año ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Firma: Cuantía:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Se Preso: día ___ mes ___ año ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Se Devolvió: día ___ mes ___ año ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Núm. caso V.P:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7. Señalamiento Vista Preliminar: Suspensiones: *
|   día ___ mes ___ año ___  ☐  ☐  ☐ |
|   día ___ mes ___ año ___  ☐  ☐  ☐ |
|   día ___ mes ___ año ___  ☐  ☐  ☐ |
|   a. Determinación causa para acusar: día ___ mes ___ año ___ |
|   b. Juez que determina causa: |
|   c. Renuncia a Vista Preliminar: día ___ mes ___ año ___ |

---

**MOVIEMIENTO DEL EXPEDIENTE (Control fuera de Secretaría)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fecha (Salida)</th>
<th>Indique Acción</th>
<th>Juez</th>
<th>Fecha (Entradas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>día ___ mes ___ año</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>día ___ mes ___ año</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>día ___ mes ___ año</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* F: Fiscal; D: Defensor; T: Tribunal

---

**FIGURE TWO**
The People of Puerto Rico  

Vs.  

Defendant  

****************************** 

MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE 

Filed by:  □ District Attorney  □ Defense Counsel 

Scheduled Event:  □ Preliminary Hearing  □ Arraignment  □ Trial  □ Other 

Reason for Requested Delay:  

District Attorney:  

□ 1. Assigned prosecutor not ready  
□ 2. Assigned prosecutor not available  
□ 3. Police witness not available  
□ 4. Other witness not available  
□ 5. Lab report not available  

Defense:  

□ 6. Defense counsel not ready  
□ 7. Defense counsel not available  
□ 8. Witness not available  
□ 9. Defendant not present  

Court:  

□ 10. Judge not available  
□ 11. Prisoner not available  
□ 12. Courtroom not available  

As an officer of the Court, I represent that the reason checked or given is the true reason. 

□ Granted  □ Denied  

Continued to:  

Judge  Date  

New Trial Date (if necessary)  

District Attorney  Defense Counsel  

FIGURE THREE
REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE

This case is now set for:  
[ ] Status Hearing  [ ] Trial  
[ ] Pre-trial  [ ] Other

on the ___ day of _______, 19___, and the ___ plaintiff  ___ defendant
respectfully requests that this matter be reset for the ___ day of _______, 19___,
for the following reason:

PLAINTIFF  
[ ] 1. Counsel not ready
[ ] 2. Counsel not available
[ ] 3. Witness not available
[ ] 4. Plaintiff not available
[ ] 5. Discovery could not be completed

DEFENDANT  
[ ] 6. Counsel not ready
[ ] 7. Counsel not available
[ ] 8. Witness not available
[ ] 9. Defendant not available
[ ] 10. Discovery could not be completed

As an officer of the Court, I represent that the reason checked or given is the
true reason.

__________________________
Attorney

CLERK USE ONLY

Continued because:  
[ ] 11. Judge not available
[ ] 12. Courtroom not available

Court:  [ ] Granted  [ ] Denied this ___ day of _______, 19___
Continued to _______ for [ ] Status Hearing  [ ] Pre-trial  [ ] Trial
New Trial Date (if necessary)  ___________  ___________

Judge  Date

on: Court Docket, Statistics, Plaintiff Counsel, Defendant Counsel.
FINDING:

Case aging reports were not being maintained regularly at either of the two test locations. The information contained in these reports is a true indicator of the courts' effectiveness and efficiency. It is a must if true control is to be achieved.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review all open cases in both special courts and maintain a case aging report. Provide monthly summaries to each respective judge. Use the form recommended in the 1981 study. (See Figure 5).

FINDING:

A comparative monthly analysis is necessary in order to measure the effectiveness of the new system over the old. This may be accomplished by reviewing and analyzing similar courts or comparing it to national averages.

RECOMMENDATION:

Two courts need to be selected, one from Bayamon and one from Ponce. If this is not feasible, then the courts from the San Juan Judicial Center should be selected. These courts should have approximately the same type and number of filings, and should have as many jurisdictional similarities as possible. Their track record for a six-month period needs to be analyzed and compared to the two special courts. A case aging report should also be maintained for these two courts, and should be used as a comparison tool.

FINDING:

In the two test locations, variables have been introduced that will skew the data and therefore the evaluation results. The addition of the civil cases to the court in Ponce in July-September, 1987, and the rotation of judges among court locations during the test period are these variables.

RECOMMENDATION:

If additions are made to a court's caseload during the test period, such additions should be consistent for the entire time period during which the court is being evaluated for delay reduction efforts. For a present evaluation, the staff needs to identify and evaluate all like variables.
### CIVIL REPORT

**Age of Pending by Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division: ________</th>
<th>Days From Filing</th>
<th>0-90</th>
<th>91-180</th>
<th>181-270</th>
<th>271-360</th>
<th>361 Over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting Status Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting Pre-Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRIMINAL REPORT

**Pending Cases Report for Month Of: ________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Pending</th>
<th>Inactive Pending</th>
<th>Active Pending</th>
<th>0-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-45</th>
<th>46-60</th>
<th>61-60</th>
<th>90+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Divisions
FINDING:

Another factor that needs to be considered in determining the efficiency of a court is the pending case status. By comparing the status of pending cases, the planning team can determine how advanced in terms of case disposition the special courts are compared to non-participating courts. It was not clear whether actual summaries of case status were being kept and analyzed by the planning team.

The planning staff should have at its disposal a summary of both the special courts and several non-participating courts. The statistics should reflect the stage of the cases; (e.g., how many are at the summons stage, the answer stage, discovery stage, etc.). Similar statistics should be available on criminal cases with the addition of the Fallout Chart. (See Figure 6). A Fallout Chart will give the planners a clear view of where the cases leave the system and how many remain to be tried. Should more than 5% of the criminal filings reach the trial stage, the system needs to be reviewed.

After all the available information is gathered from all the techniques mentioned, the following data can be compiled and analyzed:

a. number of cases filed;
b. number of cases disposed;
c. number of cases pending;
d. age of pending cases;
e. comparison of continuance practices;
f. the stage of every case; and,
g. an idea of the efficiency of the criminal system.

(See Charts and Evaluation Instruments section for samples of comparative reports and charts.)

This information will provide a basis for evaluating the performance of the two special courts. If this information should reveal greater efficiency in the two special courts, then the Planning Staff can further analyze the reasons why. Following are a few examples:

a. greater availability of witnesses and litigants;
b. improved working conditions;
c. less hectic atmosphere;
d. better control; and,
e. improved facilities management.

Whatever the reasons and whatever the results, these simple answers will give the administrator the first tool which can then be used to evaluate the success or failure of the Project. It will also provide a solid foundation that will assist the Court in determining where it has been, where it is, and where it is heading.
Cases will fallout at the different stages, if more than 5% go to trial, the system needs to be analyzed.

**Figure Six**
By having these tools, the manager can decide what deviations or alterations are necessary in order to achieve the ultimate objective.

FINDING:

Sooner or later the question of financial soundness will surface. Are the special courts financially sound and can they continue under present budget allocations?

It is the understanding of the consultants that an initial grant was used to finance the two special courts. It is further understood that the grant has expired and local funds are or will be used to continue the project.

As in all pilot projects, if operational feasibility is affirmed, financial feasibility must also be affirmed. The lack of financial resources can bring the best and most successful project to an abrupt end.

There is a need to evaluate and compare the cost-effectiveness of the special courts. It would seem that financial records are readily available for both the test courts and others of similar jurisdiction.

RECOMMENDATION:

Financial comparisons should be made and cost and feasibility reports should be prepared. These reports will be extremely valuable should they prove that the special courts are not only efficient, but cost-effective as well.
IV. PERCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

When a new project containing unusual parameters is introduced to a well-established system, input from all the participants should be compiled and analyzed, before, during, and at the completion of the project.

The best and most effective way of conducting perceptual analysis is by using questionnaires and conducting personal interviews.

A questionnaire can be a very effective instrument when designed and tested properly. Following are a few common sense suggestions which will assist in the preparation and implementation of a questionnaire.

a. Do not ask personal questions;
b. If the questionnaire is to remain anonymous, do not ask questions which can make it seem otherwise;
c. Limit your questions to those relevant to the Project;
d. Make the questionnaire as short as possible, as people tend to shy away from long questionnaires;
e. Always test the questionnaire with people outside your department;
f. Do not expect to receive 100% return;
g. Always send clear instructions on how to fill out the questionnaire and where to return it; and,
h. If financially possible, send a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of the questionnaire, or have someone pick them up.

If the questionnaire efforts do not provide adequate results, personal interviews are the next best thing. Following are a few tips in conducting personal interviews:

a. Make an appointment and do not be late;
b. Tell the interviewee exactly how long the interview will last;
c. Whenever possible, precede your appearance by a letter detailing the process and the reasons for the interview;
d. Assure the people being questioned that the questionnaire is anonymous. Under no circumstances break this trust; if you do, your credibility can be irreparably compromised; and,
e. Take the questionnaire with you and stick to the questions in the questionnaire.
When conducted properly, the combination of questionnaire and personal interviews will give the Planning/Evaluation Staff a very good cross section of the perception of the program participants, such as judges, attorneys, court personnel, litigants, and the public.
V. SUMMARY

It is evident that the judicial administrators in Puerto Rico are individuals truly dedicated to their work. This is evidenced by their efforts in trying to reduce delay and improve the courts' responsiveness to the people of Puerto Rico. This is a true testament to their commitment to their judicial system.

The implementation of the Case Delay Reduction Projects in the San Juan, Ponce and Bayamon Judicial Centers is a step in the right direction. The Planning Staff in Puerto Rico should undertake an even more aggressive attitude in procuring and disseminating information. The suggested Manual Case Monitoring System submitted by the consulting team in 1981 has been reproduced in its entirety and it is included in the Attachment Section of this report. Reports should be prepared periodically and disseminated to the proper parties on a timely basis. Judges should know at all times how well they are doing in disposing of their cases. The Administrative Judge should have reports on all judges at all times.

Since the Planning Staff are limited in the amount of time in which to prepare a complete evaluation of the Bayamon and Ponce special courts, they need to focus their efforts on what is readily available and feasible. The Planning Staff should refer to the Findings and Recommendations section of this report and implement as many techniques as possible. Following are some of the most important:

a. Make sure the data control cards are being kept up to date;
b. Collect as much data as possible on the special courts;
c. Collect as much data as possible on similar courts that are not on the Project and run a comparative analysis;
d. Conduct personal interviews and prepare questionnaires, if time permits; and,
e. Last, but not least, the staff needs to maintain constant control of the evaluation process by monitoring the special courts on a regular basis.

the study team was impressed with the organization of the Administrative Office and commends Mr. Alfredo Rivera Mendoza for his excellent choice of staff.
VI. ATTACHMENTS
Map of Puerto Rico's Project Locations
Description of the Ponce and Bayamon Projects
Continuance Proposal
Delay Reduction and Special Sessions Project
Fiscal Year 1987-88

Description of Current Situation

In January 1986 the Judicial Branch, by way of experiment, introduced the Delay Reduction and Special Sessions Project in the Ponce and Bayamón Judicial Regions.

This project opened special-schedule courtrooms (from 12:00 to 5:00 and from 6:00 to 8:30 p.m.) in the Ponce and Bayamón Parts of the Superior Court and extended the Delay Reduction Project operating in the San Juan Judicial Region to participating Judicial Regions. The Delay Reduction Project seeks to speed up criminal proceedings by reducing the period of time between interlocutory events. Furthermore, it incorporates mechanisms, such as: simultaneous summons system, pre-trial hearings to determine whether the parties are prepared for discovery, planning of court calendars, and manual information system for case control and follow-up.

During the implementation of the project, certain modifications were authorized to the original proposal in order to adapt it to the particularities of the Ponce and Bayamón regions. These have to do with the terms established between the interlocutory events and the matters to be heard in the courtrooms. With regard to this last point, both courtrooms hear criminal matters and Bayamón also hears civil cases.
The development of this project consolidated several objectives, among them, speeding up case proceedings, easing the load of regular-schedule courtrooms and giving the citizenry more access to the courts.

During the first nine months of operations (January to September 1986) a total of 1,321 criminal cases were assigned to the two special courtrooms. Of this amount, 698 were adjudicated. Furthermore, the Bayamón special courtroom was assigned 448 civil cases and 184 pre-trial hearings on appeal. Of these amounts, 165 and 104, respectively, were adjudicated.¹

Before the special courtroom was opened, the Ponce Part of the Superior Court only had two courtrooms to hear criminal cases, which meant that each courtroom would have had to be assigned 1,280 cases during the period between January and September 1986. During that period, 812 criminal cases were assigned to the special courtrooms, thus freeing each regular courtroom of 406 cases.

The Bayamón Part had five regular criminal courtrooms and each courtroom would have had about 700 cases in the period in question. The special courtroom received 509 criminal cases, which means a reduction of approximately 101 cases per courtroom. On the other hand, the 448 civil cases assigned to the Bayamón special

¹/ During the first three months of the second year of the project (October to December 1986) 438 criminal cases were assigned to the two special courtrooms. Of this amount, 236 were adjudicated. Furthermore, the Bayamón special courtroom was assigned 94 civil cases and 100 pre-trial hearings on appeal. During that period 70 civil cases and 122 pre-trial hearings on appeal were adjudicated.
courtroom, represent a reduction of 112 cases for each one of the four courtrooms dealing with civil cases in general.

Description of the Project

Among the principal objectives of the Judicial Branch is the effective handling of cases in a just, speedy, and inexpensive manner. Underlining the attainment of this objective, we want to continue operating the Delay Reduction and Special Sessions Project in the Ponce and Bayamón Judicial Regions at the same level they are currently operating.

We have proved that the Delay Reduction Project has effectively speeded up proceedings, for which reason we shall continue with the terms laid down, as we indicate below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutory Events</th>
<th>Ponce Judicial Center</th>
<th>Bayamón Judicial Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Investigation to Pre-trial Hearing</td>
<td>15 - 25 days</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trial Hearing to Arraignment</td>
<td>15 - 20 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment to Trial</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to guarantee that the mechanisms and procedures underlying the Delay Reduction Project are complied with, we shall focus our attention on the follow-up and adaptation of
the plan's particular aspects, which include: planning of court calendars, holding pre-trial hearings, and strengthening the information system for case follow-up and control.

The information system consists of a Criminal Case Management Control Card and another card for civil cases. These cards shall contain information of the proceedings in each case for each interlocutory event, settings, continuances, etc., as well as the place where the record is to be found. As part of the project, the use of the control card in the Ponce and Bayamón Judicial Regions will be continued for all criminal cases in which probable cause was found. This includes cases assigned to the special courtrooms, as well as to the regular courtrooms of the participating regions. The civil case Control Card shall be limited to cases assigned to the Bayamón special courtroom.

The personnel of the Offices of the Clerk of both the District and the Superior Courts (including the Special-Schedule Clerk's Office) shall be in charge of filling in the information of the Criminal Card. The personnel of the Special-Schedule Clerk's Office of Bayamón shall be in charge of the Civil Card.

**Supervision of the Project**

To guarantee adequate operation of the project and compliance with federal regulations, two levels of supervision shall continue in effect: one at the regional level and another at the central level.
Regional Administrative Judges and the administrative staff (Executive Directors, Chief Clerks, General Marshals and others) shall see to it that the commitments undertaken by the Judicial Branch with regard to the operations of the special courtrooms are complied with. Also, the Office of Courts Administration (OCA), through its different units, shall establish the necessary controls and shall follow-up and coordinate whatever measures are necessary to meet the proposal's requirements.

Evaluation of the Project

In order to identify difficulties and to make the necessary adjustments to the project for the attainment of the objectives sought, personnel of the Office of Courts Administration shall make periodic visits to the special courtrooms. To follow-up the project it shall also keep in touch with the administrative staff of the Ponce and Bayamón regions.

Quarterly Progress Reports shall be prepared as required by the Federal Agency. These shall include data on the work performed by the special courtrooms, as well as the progress attained, the difficulties and necessary adjustments.

At the end of the year of operations, the project shall be evaluated to see if the objectives drawn were attained.

The control cards used in the participating judicial regions shall provide the information for these evaluations.
Budget

To keep this project at the current level of operation $355,472 will be needed during fiscal year 1987-88. This amount shall exclusively cover the salaries and fringe benefits of the personnel assigned to the special courtrooms (Annex 1). This does not include the expenses incurred by the Judicial Branch for support during the administrative phase of the project, which have been estimated in $92,817 for said year (Annex 2).

The federal grant sought is of $100,000, which amount will enable us to defray great part of the total cost of the basic personnel of the Ponce special courtroom. The $255,472 difference, to be defrayed with state funds, is essentially to absorb the cost of the basic personnel of the other courtroom and the support staff of both courtrooms.
### Table of Positions Created for the Delay Reduction and Special Sessions Project

**Ponce and Bayamón Judicial Centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel per courtroom</th>
<th>Federal Grant</th>
<th>State Grant</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Salary</td>
<td>Employer's Contribution and Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ponce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>11,153</td>
<td>59,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Secretary II</td>
<td>11,152</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>13,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary of</td>
<td>9,804</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>12,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Court Transcriber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary of</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>15,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Court III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Marshal II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Court III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Court I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Marshal II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Marshal I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Marshal I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$81,400</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bayamón</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Secretary III</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Court III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary of</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Court II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Marshal II</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Marshal I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Marshal I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$81,400</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>$162,800</td>
<td>$37,200</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimated Contributions Received from Judicial Branch Units Supporting the Delay Reduction and Special Sessions Project in Fiscal Year 1987-88 (October thru September)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Division</td>
<td>$15,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Division</td>
<td>4,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Division</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Area</td>
<td>7,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor's Office</td>
<td>3,000 a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayamón Judicial Center</td>
<td>48,288 b/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponce Judicial Center</td>
<td>12,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,817 c/</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a/ Cost of the independent audit, based on the cost of recent audits. We do not know the cost of an audit under the single audit act.

b/ Includes $22,308 for the annual rental rate of the space used by the special courtroom.

c/ Does not include rent paid for the space used by the OCA personnel, or other expenses, for example, the judges' travel expenses, mail, materials, etc.
1981 Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project

"Manual Case Monitoring System"
IV. Suggested Manual Case Monitoring Systems

One of the Delay Project's most pressing needs is that of a case monitoring and evaluation system. This need was identified by the lack of a case control system, the absence of hard evaluative data and an expressed need of the Chief Judge for more information on the progress of project activity.

The Chief Judge and the Director of Courts asked the consultants to modify and transfer a simplified manual case monitoring and evaluation system developed for use in the District of Columbia Courts.

The following suggested framework for both the Criminal and Civil Programs should provide a basic manual information system which can be implemented immediately and updated and expanded as the administrators of the system become more comfortable with the reports and as additional needs are identified.

A. The Civil Case Monitoring System

This is a basic system consisting of three forms for collecting the report data and three output reports. The three data collection forms include:

1. A Civil Disposition and Status Card (See Appendix A);
2. A request for Continuance Form (Appendix B); and
3. The Status Hearing Order Form, already implemented in the San Juan project (Appendix C).
The three output reports include:

1. Age of Pending Cases by Status (Appendix D);
2. Monthly Activities Report (Appendix E); and

The elements of information provided by each of the data collection forms include:

1. **DISPOSITION AND STATUS CARD**

   **Identification Elements**
   - Case Number
   - Plaintiff's Name
   - Defendant's Name
   - Division

   **Status Elements**
   - Filing Date
   - Service Date
   - Answer Date
   - Status Hearing Date
   - Counsel's Preliminary Meeting Date
   - Pre-trial Date
   - Trial Date

   **Disposition Elements**
   - Stage and Date or Dismissal
   - Stage and Date of Settlement
   - Trial Date
   - Verdict for Plaintiff or Defendant

   **Age Elements**
   - Age at Disposition (filing to disposition)

2. **STATUS ORDER HEARING**

   **Identification Elements**
   - Case Number
   - Plaintiff's Attorney
   - Defendant's Attorney
   - Status Hearing Date

   **Schedule Elements**
   - Counsel's Preliminary Meeting Date
   - Pre-trial Date
   - Trial Date

   **Court Action Elements**
   - Judge's Signature
3. REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE

Identification Elements
Case Number
Plaintiff's Name
Defendant's Name
Plaintiff's Attorney
Defendant's Attorney
Motion Filed by Event and Date
Scheduled Event and Date

Reasons Elements
Plaintiff's Counsel Not Ready
Plaintiff's Counsel Not Available
Plaintiff's Witness Not Available
Plaintiff Not Available
Defendant's Counsel Not Ready
Defendant's Counsel Not Available
Defendant's Witness Not Available
Defendant Not Available
Discovery Could Not Be Completed
Judge Not Available
Courtroom Not Available

Schedule Elements
New Discovery Completion Date
Continued to Date and Event
New Trial Date

Court Action Elements
Granted
Denied
Judge's Signature and Date

4. Reports

Based on the above data elements, the three following reports can be prepared for whatever period desired, for each division participating in the program and for the composite of divisions participating.

a. Age of Pending Cases by Status. This report should be prepared on a monthly basis and a composite report and each division report should be transmitted to the Chief Judge, the Clerk of the Court, the Director of Courts and each judge participating in the project. The
report should reflect the correct status of all cases pending in the delay project and is an invaluable evaluation tool. An analysis of this report should be performed by the Office of Court Administration and results should be discussed at monthly meetings between all of those receiving the reports. This analysis should provide information as to whether the time frames between events are being complied with and whether an in depth review of reasons for delay is necessary.

b. Activities Report (Monthly). This report should also have the same distribution as the report above. It will provide information on the age of cases disposed and at what stage disposition occurred. It should also provide workload information on the number of hearings and trials held for the previous month.

c. Continuance Report. This report should be prepared at least quarterly. Continuances are a symptom of delay and should assist in pinpointing why delay might be occurring. This report is very basic and could be expanded to include specific reasons for the requested continuance if the Chief Judge feels such an analysis is necessary. This report should be presented to the Chief Judge and the Director of Courts and could be shared with other participants if felt appropriate.

5. Procedures for Implementing and Completing Civil Data Collection Forms and Reports

A Civil Disposition and Status Card should be created for each case assigned to the program and updated each time there is activity with the case. The cards should be chronologically placed in a tickler file box according to file number. At least two file boxes should be
maintained for each division assigned to the project: an active pending file and a closed or disposed file. The separation of disposed cases permits an accurate and timely accounting of the number and age of pending cases. The pending case file cards should be set up in a tickler file form which is divided into increments of 90 days and subdivided by the status of the case awaiting service and answer; awaiting status hearing; awaiting pre-trial; awaiting trial.

Throughout the life of a case, the clerk's office updates the disposition and status card to accurately reflect events scheduled and actions taken. As a case is disposed, the card is completed with date and type of disposition noted and the age of the case of disposition noted. The card is then removed from the "active pending" file and placed in a "closed" file.

The courtroom clerks should also accumulate copies of the division's daily calendar and count the number of status hearings, pre-trial and trials scheduled and held each month.

The information from the status hearing order and continuance forms should assist in the update of the schedule information elements on the Disposition Status Cards.

The Office of Court Administration should play an active role in assisting the Clerk to implement this system and in compiling the data and issuing the reports.

B. The Criminal Case Monitoring System

This is basically the same system as proposed for the Civil Program and consists of two basic forms for collecting the report data: (1) Criminal Case Disposition Card (Form 7); and (2) Motion for Continuance
There are three output reports: (1) Monthly Pending Case Report (Form 9); (2) Continuance Report (Form 10); and (3) Disposition Report by Event (Form 11).

The elements of information provided by each of the data collection forms include:

1. CRIMINAL CASE DISPOSITION CARD

   Identification Elements
   Case Number
   Division Assigned
   Defendant's Name

   Event Elements
   Filing Date
   Preliminary Hearing Date
   Arraignment Date
   Guilty Plea Date
   Jury Trial Date
   Court Trial Date
   Sentence Date

   Inactive Time Elements
   Fugitive/Warrant Issued Date
   Fugitive/Warrant Returned Date
   Mental Exam Ordered Date
   Mental Exam Returned Date
   Total Inactive Days

   Disposition Elements
   Dismissal - Stage/Date
   Plea - Stage/Date
   Trial - Stage/Date
   Verdict
   Sentence Date

   Lapse Time Elements
   Age of Disposition
   Age at Sentence

2. REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE

   Identification Elements
   Case Number
   Defendant's Name
   District Attorney's Name
   Defense Counsel's Name
   Motion Filed by Scheduled Event and Date
Reasons Elements
Assigned Prosecutor Not Ready
Assigned Prosecutor Not Available
Police Witness Not Available
Other Witness Not Available
Lab Report Not Available
Defense Counsel Not Ready
Defense Counsel Not Available
Witness Not Available
Defendant Not Present
Judge Not Available
Prisoner Not Available
Courtroom Not Available

Schedule Elements
Continued to Date and Event
New Trial Date

Court Action Elements
Granted
Denied
Judge's Signature and Date

3. Reports.

Based on the above data elements, the three following reports can be generated:

a. Pending Case Report. This report should be prepared on a monthly basis for individual divisions and in a composite form. They should be sent to the Chief Judge, the Clerk, the Director of Courts and each of the participating divisions. This report, along with Disposition Report by Event, should form the basis of monthly meetings on the Criminal Delay Program status attended by participants from the Court and other agencies, such as the District Attorney and Legal Aid. The report assists in evaluating compliance with the goals established by the program.
b. Disposition Report for Event Type. This report should be prepared monthly for each event type, i.e., preliminary hearing, arraignment, trial. It reflects all cases scheduled, continued and disposed of for that event, including the median age at disposition. This report is invaluable in evaluating program results.

c. Continuance Report. This report is similar to the Civil Continuance Report and should be used for the same purposes. It should be sent to the Chief Judge and Director of Courts on at least a quarterly basis.

4. Procedures For Implementing and Completing Criminal Data Collection Forms and Reports

The procedure for collecting the information and compiling the reports is similar to those in Civil. The Office of Court Administration should work closely with the Clerks in defining the responsibility for collecting and maintaining the data for ease of compilation by the court administration staff.

The Criminal Case Disposition Cards should also be maintained for each division. It should be initiated with the filing of a case and updated daily as events occur. The cards should be chronologically placed in a tickler file box according to file number. At least three file boxes should be maintained for each calendar: (1) active pending; (2) inactive pending, i.e., fugitive, mental exam and diversion program; and (3) closed or disposed cases. This enables an accurate and timely accounting of the number and age of pending cases.
C. **Summary**

This system as presented is basic and simple. The reports are essential to performing any type of realistic evaluation of both the Civil and Criminal Delay Projects. The time on site did not permit sufficient insight as to how the system can be integrated in the clerk's office operations and the procedures for implementation are overly simplified as a result. The Office of Court Administration has indicated a willingness to assist in implementing a manual information system, however, and should work with the clerks in defining responsibilities and procedures to collect this data and compile the reports. The consulting team is willing and receptive to any questions which may arise and stand ready to assist in any way they can with the implementation of this system.

D. **Suggested Forms**

On the following pages, suggested management forms for reporting and analyzing project information are provided.
Form 1

CIVIL DISPOSITION AND STATUS CARD
(Data Collection Form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Plaintiff:</th>
<th>Defendant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>DISPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Filed:</td>
<td>Age at Disposition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Served:</td>
<td>Stage at Dismissal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Answered:</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled Dates:</th>
<th>Stage at Settlement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Status Conference
- Pre-Trial
- Trial

- Counsel's Preliminary Meeting
- Date Tried:

- Pre-Trial
- Date Tried:

- Trial
- Date Tried:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Check box or date scheduled event occurs)</th>
<th>(Date, Finding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Verdict: _____________________________
Form 2
GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Plaintiff

vs.

Defendant

Civil Number: ____________________

About: ____________________

Plaintiff respectfully requests that this matter be reset for the ___ day of ______, 19__, for the following reason:

PLAINTIFF

1. Counsel not ready

2. Counsel not available

3. Witness not available

4. Plaintiff not available

5. Discovery could not be completed

DEFENDANT

6. Counsel not ready

7. Counsel not available

8. Witness not available

9. Defendant not available

10. Discovery could not be completed

As an officer of the Court, I represent that the reason checked or given is the true reason.

Attorney

CLERKS USE ONLY

Continued because:

11. Judge not available

12. Courtroom not available

Date Case Filed: ____________

Court: _______Granted _______Denied this ___ day of ______, 19__

Continued to _______ for _______Status Hearing _______Pre-trial _______Trial

New Trial Date (if necessary) ____________

Judge _______Date _______

cc: Court Jacket, Statistics, Plaintiff Counsel, Defendant Counsel.
FORM 3

General Court of Justice

Court

Court Part

Plaintiff

Civil No.

VS.

About:

Defendant

ORDER

Schedule for Counsel’s Preliminary Meeting,

Pretrial Hearing and Trial

According to this court’s order counsel and this magistrate met and agreed on the procedures which will govern the rest of the proceedings.

Counsel has been ordered to hold a preliminary meeting to prepare a report on it and submit a proposed order for the pretrial on ________________.

Pretrial is scheduled for ________________ in accordance with Rule 37 of Civil Procedure.

At the pretrial, parties to this suit will be represented by the counsellor or one of the counsellors which will be present at the trial. Said counsellor shall be familiar with all aspects of the case and have the necessary authorization from his client to agree to all relevant stipulations. Should he lack this authorization, his client or the person authorized to accept stipulations or settlements shall accompany him.

Trial is scheduled for ________________ at ________________ in courtroom ________________.

In ________________, Puerto Rico, on ________________.

Superior Court Judge

Attorney Signature

Attorney Signature

Attorney Signature

Attorney Signature
Form 4

Report Date: 

Compiled By: 

CIVIL REPORT

AGE OF PENDING BY STATUS

Division: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days From Filing</th>
<th>0-90</th>
<th>91-180</th>
<th>181-270</th>
<th>271-360</th>
<th>361 Over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Status Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Pre-Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form 5

Report Date: 

Compiled By: 

CIVIL REPORT

ACTIVITIES REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF 

Division: 

Total Number of Trials 

| Trials within 180 days from filing | ( %) |
| Trials within 181-210 days from filing | ( %) |
| Trials within 271-360 days from filing | ( %) |
| Trials exceeding 360 days from filing | ( %) |

Total Number of Status Hearings Held 

Total Number of Pre-Trials 

DISPOSITION BY STAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Disp. Age</th>
<th>Trials Age</th>
<th>Settled Age</th>
<th>Dismissed Age</th>
<th>Other Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form 6

CIVIL REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT CONTINUED</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Scheduled          |       |
| Total Continued          |       |
| Reasons:                 |       |
| Plaintiff                |       |
| Defendant                |       |
| Both                     |       |
| Court                    |       |

REPORT ON CONTINUANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Requests</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Plaintiff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Defendant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuances Denied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuances Granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuances Granted Because Discovery Not Complete</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Form 7

**Criminal Case**

**Disposition Card**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division:</th>
<th>(Print Defendant's Last Name)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Filing Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant Issued</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Returned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Exam Ordered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Exam Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Diversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned from Diversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Div. 10</th>
<th>WL: Warrant Issued</th>
<th>VL: Warrant Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to Diversion</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversion Terminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage at Dismissal</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage at Plea</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Tried:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verdict:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date at Sentence:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Sentence:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Form 8

The People of Puerto Rico vs. Defendant

Criminal Number: ____________________________

MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE

Filed by:  [ ] District Attorney  [ ] Defense Counsel

Scheduled Event:  [ ] Preliminary Hearing  [ ] Arraignment  [ ] Trial  [ ] Other

Reason for Requested Delay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Attorney</th>
<th>Date Available/Ready</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Assigned prosecutor not ready</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assigned prosecutor not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Police witness not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other witness not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lab report not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Date Available/Ready</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Defense counsel not ready</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Defense counsel not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Witness not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Defendant not present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Date Available/Ready</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Judge not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prisoner not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Courtroom not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an officer of the Court, I represent that the reason checked or given is the
true reason.

_____________________________  ________________________________
District Attorney                   Defense Counsel

Granted  [ ]  Denied  [ ]

Continued to: ___________________________  Judge  __________________

New Trial Date (if necessary) ________________________
# Form 9

**Criminal Report**

**PENDING CASES REPORT FOR MONTH OF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Pending</th>
<th>Inactive Pending</th>
<th>Active Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All Divisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Active Pending (Days)</th>
<th>0-15</th>
<th>16-30</th>
<th>31-45</th>
<th>46-60</th>
<th>61-40</th>
<th>90+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Form 10

CRIMINAL REPORT

CONTINUANCE REPORT
ALL DIVISIONS

Month of ________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT CONTINUED</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons:
- Prosecutor
- Defendant
- Both
- Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT ON CONTINUANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Prosecutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuances Denied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuances Granted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Date: __________
Compiled By: __________
Form 11

CRIMINAL REPORT

DISPOSITION REPORT FOR (Trial Event)*

MONTH OF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Cases Set For (Event)</th>
<th>Total Plea Age</th>
<th>Guilty Plead Age</th>
<th>Dismissed Age</th>
<th>Jury Trial Age</th>
<th>Court Trial Age</th>
<th>Total Cases Continued</th>
<th>Cases Tried At</th>
<th>Total Trials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Divisions

*NOTE: Disposition reports for following events: Arraignment, Preliminary Hearing, Trial, etc.
Common Elements of Successful Programs
COMMON ELEMENTS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

1. LEADERSHIP
   • CHIEF JUDGE
   • TRIAL COURT ADMINISTRATOR/CLERK
   • BAR LEADERS
   • PROSECUTOR
   • OTHERS

2. GOALS
   • CASE PROCESSING TIME STANDARDS
   • SIZE AND AGE OF PENDING CASELOAD

3. INFORMATION
   • BASELINE DATA (PRE-PROGRAM)
   • MANAGEMENT INFORMATION TO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS, MONITOR PROGRESS
4. COMMUNICATIONS

- COORDINATING COMMITTEES/CONSULTATION
- FEEDBACK ON PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

5. COMMITMENT

- JUDICIAL RESPONSIBILITY
- LONG TERM EFFORT

6. CASE MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

- EARLY CONTROL - MONITOR FROM FILING
- EARLY INTERVENTION BY COURT
- RAPID DISCOVERY
- SANE SCHEDULING
- CAPACITY TO MEET EXPECTATIONS
  - BACKUP JUDGES
  - CONTACT WITH LAWYERS
7. MECHANISMS FOR ACCOUNTABILITY
   • ALLOCATION OF RESPONSIBILITY
   • EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

8. ATTENTION TO DETAIL
   • LINKAGE OF CONCEPTS AND BEHAVIOR
   • KEY ROLES OF NON-JUDICIAL STAFF

9. EDUCATION AND TRAINING
   • JUDGES
   • STAFF
   • BAR

10. BACKLOG REDUCTION
    • NEED MANAGEABLE CASELOADS
    • MAY REQUIRE TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL RESOURCES
REDUCING TRIAL COURT DELAY

LEADERSHIP

• IDENTIFY DELAY AS A PROBLEM
• INITIATE/ASSIST FACT-FINDING PROCESS
• PROVIDE INFORMATION
• CONVENE/ENDORSE GOALS AND PLANS
• LEAD IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS
  - ASSIGN RESPONSIBILITY TO SENIOR STAFF
  - MONITOR
  - PROVIDE FEEDBACK, GUIDANCE
  - RECOGNIZE/REWARD SUCCESS
REDUCING TRIAL COURT DELAY

GOALS

• CASE PROCESSING TIME STANDARDS

• FILING TO DISPOSITION – MAXIMUM TIMES
  – BY CASE TYPE

• MAJOR STAGES
  – ARREST TO INDICTMENT
  – INDICTMENT – ADJUDICATION
  – ADJUDICATION TO SENTENCE

• SIZE AND AGE OF PENDING CASELOADS

• CONTINUANCE ON TRIAL DATE
INFORMATION

1. CASE PROCESSING TIMES

- NUMBER AND AGE OF PENDING CASES, BY CATEGORY OF CASE

  - CRIMINAL

    0-14, 15-28, 29-42, 43-56, etc.

  - CIVIL

    0-60, 61-120, 121-180, 181-240, ETC.

- AGE OF CASES AT DISPOSITION, BY CATEGORY OF CASE AND TYPE OF DISPOSITION
2. TRIAL DATE CONTINUANCE DATA

- NUMBER REQUESTED/TIMING
  - BY LAWYER

- NUMBER GRANTED
  - BY JUDGE

- REASONS FOR CONTINUANCE
STANDARDS OF TIMELY DISPOSITION

Based Upon the
American Bar Association's
Court Delay Reduction Standards

The following time standards should be adopted and compliance monitored:

A. General Civil - 90% of all civil cases should be settled, tried or otherwise concluded within 12 months of the date of case filing; 98% within 18 months of such filing; and the remainder within 24 months of such filing except for individual cases in which the Court determines exceptional circumstances exist and for which a continuing review should occur.

B. Summary Civil - Proceedings using summary hearing procedures, as in small claims, landlord-tenant and replevin actions, should be concluded within 30 days from filing.

C. Domestic Relations - 90% of all domestic relations matters should be settled, tried or otherwise concluded within 3 months of the date of case filing; 98% within 6 months and 100% within 1 year.
D. Criminal -

**FELONY** - 90% of all felony cases should be adjudicated or otherwise concluded within 120 days from the date of arrest; 98% within 180 days and 100% within one year.

**MISDEMEANOR** - 90% of all misdemeanors, infractions and other nonfelony cases should be adjudicated or otherwise concluded within 30 days from the date of arrest or citation and 100% within 90 days.

**PERSONS IN PRETRIAL CUSTODY** - Persons detained should have a determination of custodial status or bail set within 24 hours of arrest. Persons incarcerated before trial should be afforded priority for trial.

**JUVENILE** - Juvenile cases should be heard within the following time limits:

1. Detention and shelter hearings - not more than twenty-four hours following admission to any detention or shelter facility;
2. Adjudicatory or transfer (waiver) hearings -

   a. Concerning a juvenile in a detention or shelter facility: not later than fifteen days following admission to such facility;

   b. Concerning a juvenile who is not in a detention or shelter facility: not later than thirty days following the filing of the petition;

3. Disposition hearings - Not later than fifteen days following the adjudicatory hearing. The court may grant additional time in exceptional cases that require more complex evaluation.

(ABA Standards Relating to Juvenile Justice: Court Org. and Adm. 3.3)
Individual/Master and Hybrid Calendar Systems
Forwarded by case management staff based on criteria established by the Civil Presiding Judge.
VII. CHARTS AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
PONCE JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
FILINGS - DISPOSITIONS - PENDING

LEGEND
- FILINGS
- DISPOSITIONS
- PENDING

TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COMBINED

01-03/86 04-06/86 07-09/86 10-12/86 01-03/87 04-06/87 07-09/87 QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

Preliminary hearings are not included in totals.
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
BAYAMON JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
FILINGS - DISPOSITIONS - PENDING

LEGEND
- FILINGS
- DISPOSITIONS
- PENDING

TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES
CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COMBINED

QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN TOTALS.
DECEMBER REDUCTION PROJECT
PONCE JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
FILINGS

TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES
CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COMBINED

QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

Preliminary hearings are not included in totals.
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
PONCE JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
DISPOSITIONS

QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

Preliminary hearings are not included in totals.
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
PONCE JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
PENDING CASES

TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES
CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COMBINED

0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800
01-03/86 04-06/86 07-09/86 10-12/86 01-03/87 04-06/87 07-09/87

QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN TOTALS.
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
BAYAMON JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
FILINGS

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN TOTALS.
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
BAYAMON JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
DISPOSITIONS

TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES
CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COMBINED

QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

Preliminary hearings are not included in totals.
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
BAYAMON JUDICIAL CENTER
PUERTO RICO
PENDING

TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES
CIVIL AND CRIMINAL COMBINED

QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

Preliminary hearings are not included in totals.
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
PENDING CASELOAD STUDY
PONCE AND BAYAMON
PUERTO RICO

LEGEND

\[\begin{align*}
\text{PONCE} & : \text{Hatched Bars} \\
\text{BAYAMON} & : \text{Solid Bars}
\end{align*}\]

Number of Cases Pending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J/M 86</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/J 86</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J/S 86</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/D 86</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J/M 87</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/J 87</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J/S 87</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1986 - 1987
DELAY REDUCTION PROJECT
BAYAMON JUDICIAL CENTER
COMPARATIVE REPORT/FICTITIONAL
PENDING

QUARTERS
JANUARY 1986 - SEPTEMBER 1987

Preliminary hearings are not included in totals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cases Plagued In Place and Moveon from January 1996 to September 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>190.16% 180.6% 170.16% 160.6% 150.16% 140.6% 130.16% 120.6% 110.16% 100.6% 90.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>