GAO

United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

159970

General Government Division

B-278382

February 11, 1998

The Honorable Herbert Kohl
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition
Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate

Subject: Federal Judiciary: Information on the Population and Case Filings Per Judgeship for U.S. District Courts

Dear Senator Kohl:

This letter responds to your July 18, 1997, request that we provide information on the distribution of the number of federal district court judgeships throughout the United States and the population and case filings per district court judgeship in each district and each state. Specifically, you asked that we (1) determine the average population per authorized, active, and recommended federal district court judgeship by district and by state; (2) determine the average unweighted and weighted case filings–total, civil, and criminal–per authorized, active, and recommended federal district court judgeship by district and by state;[1] and (3) identify how district court workload is measured and used to assess judgeship needs. For the case filing measures in our second objective, you also asked that we calculate the national average and the national median per judgeship for authorized, active, and recommended judgeships.

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The average population, unweighted case filings, and weighted case filings per judgeship varied widely among districts and states for each type of judgeship–authorized, active, and recommended. For example, 1990 district population per authorized judgeship ranged from 40,460 in the District of Columbia to

[1]Unweighted case filings measure the number of filings per judgeship in a district or state without regard to the relative amount of judicial time the cases may require. Weighted case filings represent a measure of the average amount of judicial time that a district's case filings may require. Weighted case filings are discussed in more detail in enclosure VII.



159970

967,515 in the Western District of Wisconsin. Fiscal year 1996 total unweighted case filings per authorized judgeship in each district ranged from 166 in the District of Wyoming to 3,849 in the Middle District of Louisiana. By state, total weighted case filings per authorized judgeship ranged from 190 in Wyoming to 762 in Nevada. Nationally, the fiscal year 1996 average unweighted case filings per authorized judgeship was 474 and the average weighted case filings per authorized judgeship was also 474. Civil case filings accounted for 389 of the 474 average unweighted case filings per authorized judgeship and 340 of the 474 weighted case filings per authorized judgeship.

The data for each district and each state are contained in six enclosures to this letter. Each enclosure provides population or case filing data separately for each type of judgeship–authorized, active, and recommended. The district population data are for 1990 (the latest compiled by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AOUSC)).[2] The state population per judgeship is shown separately for 1990 and 1996. Data on population per judgeship by district are in enclosure I and by state are in enclosure II. All data on case filings are for fiscal year 1996. Data on unweighted case filings–total, civil, and criminal–are shown by district in enclosure III and by state in enclosure IV. Data on weighted case filings–total, civil, and criminal–per judgeship are shown by district in enclosure V and by state in enclosure VI.

The Judicial Conference of the United States (Judicial Conference)[3] is responsible for assessing the need for additional judgeships in each district court. The Judicial Conference has established written workload standards and policies for assessing judgeship needs that use weighted case filings as the principal measure of a district's judicial workload. The Judicial Conference's policies also include consideration of judgmental factors, such as the district's management practices, but do not specifically include consideration of a district's population. Enclosure VII includes a description of case weights and the Judicial Conference's policies for using weighted case filings in assessing judgeship needs.[4]

---

[2]AOUSC provides an array of support services to the federal courts and maintains the judiciary's national statistical databases.

[3]The Judicial Conference of the United States is the federal judiciary's principal policymaking body. Its membership includes 26 judges and the Chief Justice of the United States, who presides over the Judicial Conference.

[4]In 1993, we reported on the Judicial Conference's policies for assessing district judgeship needs and on how the Conference applied those policies in developing the judgeship request it sent to Congress in 1990. See Federal Judiciary: How the Judicial Conference Assesses the Need for More Judges (GAO/GGD-93-31, Jan. 29, 1993).

## BACKGROUND

District courts are the general jurisdiction trial courts in the federal judiciary, which hear a wide variety of both civil and criminal cases. There are 94 federal district courts in the 50 states; the District of Columbia; the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and the U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. As of August 1, 1997, there were a total of 647 authorized district court judgeships; the number of authorized judgeships in each district–permanent and temporary–ranged from 1 to 28.[5] Authorized judgeships are the total number of judgeships that Congress has authorized by statute for each district.

As of August 1, 1997, 576 of these 647 authorized judgeship positions were filled and 71 were vacant. The federal judiciary uses the term "active judges" to refer to the number of authorized judgeship positions filled in each district at any point in time. Thus, as of August 1, 1997, there were 576 active district court judges.

In March 1997, the Judicial Conference sent Congress a request for 24 additional permanent judgeships and 12 additional temporary judgeships to be distributed among 23 districts. If approved by Congress, these additions would raise the total number of authorized district judgeships to 683. Recommended judgeships, as used in this report, are the total number of judgeships, permanent and temporary, authorized by statute in each district as of August 1, 1997, plus the total number of permanent and temporary judgeships, if any, the Judicial Conference requested for each district in March 1997.

## CONSIDERATIONS IN INTERPRETING THE DATA IN THE ENCLOSURES

The information in this section is provided to help interpret the data contained in the enclosures to this letter.

---

[5]Permanent judgeships are authorized until Congress enacts legislation that rescinds the position. A temporary judgeship is a position that is generally created for a minimum of 5 or 10 years. It is the position, not the judge appointed to it, that is temporary. Persons appointed to both permanent and temporary judgeship positions are appointed for life. A temporary judgeship expires with the first judicial vacancy to occur in the district after the specified period of time for which the temporary judgeship was created. That vacancy cannot be filled, thus reducing the number of judges to the number of authorized permanent judgeships for the district.

All analyses of population and weighted and unweighted case filings by state include data from districts within each of the 50 states, plus the District of Columbia. Thus, our state analyses excluded data for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the three U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. To ensure comparability for all of the calculations shown in the enclosures, our calculation of national average and median unweighted and weighted case filings per judgeship included data only from those districts within the 50 states plus the District of Columbia.

Unweighted case filings do not reflect the judicial time that may be required to dispose of a case; weighted case filings do. The more judicial time a case is expected to require, the higher the weight assigned. Thus, two districts with equal numbers of unweighted case filings may have very different weighted case filings. For example, a district with a majority of case filings with a weight of less than 1.0–the average case weight–would have lower weighted case filings than a district with a majority of cases that were assigned a weight of more than 1.0. The case weights represent national averages. The actual amount of judicial time any specific case requires may vary.

The number of cases filed in a district or state can vary from year to year, depending upon a number of factors. These factors include the prosecutorial policies of the U.S. Attorney in the district, which affect both the number of defendants and types of offenses prosecuted; the number of companies or persons who choose to bring their disputes to federal court;[6] and unusual circumstances in a specific year that may affect filings. For example, in fiscal year 1996, the Middle District of Louisiana had, by a large margin, the highest average total unweighted and weighted case filings per judgeship of any district in the nation. Specifically, total unweighted case filings per authorized judgeship were 3,849 and weighted case filings per authorized judgeship were 3,208. According to AOUSC, this district's fiscal year 1996 case filings were affected by a very large number of filings resulting from an oil refinery explosion. In fiscal year 1995, the Middle District of Louisiana recorded 1,484 unweighted case filings and 1,233 weighted case filings per authorized judgeship–less than half the level of fiscal year 1996.

Comparing unweighted and weighted case filings per authorized and active judgeships provides a measure of the impact of judicial vacancies in a district or state on the workload of the active judges in that district or state. For example, the fiscal year

---

[6]In some instances, litigants may have a choice between federal court or state court. Federal district court jurisdiction is available, for example, in a civil action where the matter in controversy exceeds a minimum dollar threshold of $75,000 and the matter is between citizens of different states.

1996 average weighted case filings for each of the 12 authorized judgeships in the Northern District of Texas was 561. However, with two judgeship vacancies (as of Aug. 1, 1997), the average weighted workload for each of the 10 active judges increased to 673. The fewer the number of judgeships in a district the greater the impact of each individual vacancy on the workload of the remaining judges. The effect of judicial vacancies on the workload of active judges is diminished in those districts that have senior judges–those who have retired from active service but may, at their option, continue to take case assignments–who assist with the caseload.

Some states have authorized judgeships that may be assigned to more than one district within that state. For example, while the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky each have four authorized judgeships, there is one additional judgeship for "Eastern and Western." For convenience, we divided these types of additional judgeships among the relevant states' respective districts. For example, in enclosure I, we have listed the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky as each having 4.5 authorized judgeships.

## SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

We obtained population data by federal judicial district from AOUSC (1990) and by state from the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1996). We determined the 1990 population of each state by summing the AOUSC population data for all districts within a state. We checked the accuracy of the resulting 1990 state totals by comparing them to Census Bureau data for 1990. We found our 1990 state totals to be almost identical to the Census Bureau totals reported for April 1990. The AOUSC also provided us with data on fiscal year 1996 unweighted and weighted case filings. Using the U.S. Code and AOUSC data, we determined the number of authorized, active, and recommended judgeships in each district. We did not validate the Census Bureau population data or AOUSC case filing data used in our analyses. Enclosure VIII includes a more detailed description of our scope and methodology.

We did our work between August 1997 and January 1998 in Washington, D.C., in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

## AGENCY COMMENTS

On January 26, 1998, we provided a draft of this letter to AOUSC officials for comment. On February 2, 1998, we met with AOUSC's Program Assessment Officer who generally agreed with the draft and provided technical corrections, which we incorporated into the report as appropriate.

- - - - -

We plan no further distribution of this letter for 15 days, unless it contents are made public. At that time, we will send copies to the Chairman of your subcommittee; the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts; the Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary; the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, House Committee on the Judiciary; the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; and the Director of the Federal Judicial Center. We will make copies available to others upon request.

Major contributors to this letter include William Jenkins, Assistant Director, Donald Jack, Evaluator-in-Charge, and Michael Little, Communications Analyst, General Government Division; and Geoffrey Hamilton, Senior Attorney Advisor, Office of the General Counsel.

If you have any questions about this report, please call me on (202) 512-8777.

Sincerely yours,

Richard M. Stana

Richard M. Stana
Associate Director
Administration of Justice Issues

Enclosures - 8

CONTENTS

## 1990 POPULATION BY FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION PER JUDGESHIP TYPE

The tables in this enclosure show 1990 district population per authorized judgeship, active judge, and recommended judgeship. The data in each table show both the total population of each district and the population per judgeship and active judge. The data in each table are arrayed from lowest to highest population per judgeship and active judge for districts within the 50 states and the District of Columbia (90 districts). Population data for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are shown at the end of each table rather than being included in the rankings. Population data were not available for the district courts in the three U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

Some states have authorized judgeships that may be assigned to more than one district within that state. For example, while the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky each have four authorized judgeships, there is one additional judgeship for "Eastern and Western." We have divided these types of additional judgeships among the relevant states' respective districts in the tables in this enclosure.

Table I.1: 1990 Population Per Authorized Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 606,900 | 15 | 40,460 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 1,619,759 | 13 | 124,597 |
| WY | 10th | 453,588 | 3 | 151,196 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 4,551,993 | 28 | 162,571 |
| DE | 3rd | 666,168 | 4 | 166,542 |
| AK | 9th | 550,043 | 3 | 183,348 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 1,023,318 | 5 | 204,664 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 5,179,074 | 23 | 225,177 |
| SD | 8th | 696,004 | 3 | 232,001 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 840,805 | 3.5 | 240,230 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 723,454 | 3 | 241,151 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 770,159 | 3 | 256,720 |

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MT | 9th | 799,065 | 3 | 266,355 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 1,603,040 | 6 | 267,173 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 1,089,840 | 4 | 272,460 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 1,365,837 | 5 | 273,167 |
| HI | 9th | 1,108,229 | 4 | 277,057 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 1,665,665 | 6 | 277,611 |
| VT | 2nd | 562,758 | 2 | 281,379 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 1,976,361 | 7 | 282,337 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 1,436,935 | 5 | 287,387 |
| NV | 9th | 1,201,833 | 4 | 300,458 |
| NM | 10th | 1,515,069 | 5 | 303,014 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 913,790 | 3 | 304,597 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 1,241,908 | 4 | 310,477 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 5,607,929 | 18 | 311,552 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 623,853 | 2 | 311,927 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 949,497 | 3 | 316,499 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 2,222,348 | 7 | 317,478 |
| ND | 8th | 638,800 | 2 | 319,400 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 1,280,184 | 4 | 320,046 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 970,176 | 3 | 323,392 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 2,607,319 | 8 | 325,915 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 5,246,433 | 16 | 327,902 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 2,647,094 | 8 | 330,887 |
| RI | 1st | 1,003,464 | 3 | 334,488 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 3,708,451 | 11 | 337,132 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 2,367,636 | 7 | 338,234 |
| UT | 10th | 1,722,850 | 5 | 344,570 |

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| IL (N) | 7th | 8,028,703 | 22 | 364,941 |
| NH | 1st | 1,109,252 | 3 | 369,751 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 1,515,530 | 4 | 378,883 |
| SC | 4th | 3,486,703 | 9 | 387,411 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 1,163,430 | 3 | 387,810 |
| NE | 8th | 1,578,385 | 4 | 394,596 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 3,953,652 | 10 | 395,365 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 1,995,818 | 5 | 399,164 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 1,606,335 | 4 | 401,584 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 1,813,697 | 4.5 | 403,044 |
| ME | 1st | 1,227,928 | 3 | 409,309 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,287,116 | 8 | 410,890 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 2,469,979 | 6 | 411,663 |
| KS | 10th | 2,477,574 | 6 | 412,929 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 4,143,210 | 10 | 414,321 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 1,871,599 | 4.5 | 415,911 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 5,013,023 | 12 | 417,752 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 6,283,331 | 15 | 418,889 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 639,115 | 1.5 | 426,077 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 4,319,575 | 10 | 431,958 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,730,188 | 17 | 454,717 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 2,748,917 | 6 | 458,153 |
| AZ | 9th | 3,665,228 | 8 | 458,154 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 2,313,438 | 5 | 462,688 |
| MA | 1st | 6,016,425 | 13 | 462,802 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 1,867,783 | 4 | 466,946 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 6,578,801 | 14 | 469,914 |

ENCLOSURE I

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CO | 10th | 3,294,394 | 7 | 470,628 |
| OR | 9th | 2,842,321 | 6 | 473,720 |
| MD | 4th | 4,781,468 | 10 | 478,147 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 5,770,574 | 12 | 480,881 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 7,240,451 | 15 | 482,697 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 1,495,443 | 3 | 498,481 |
| ID | 9th | 1,006,749 | 2 | 503,375 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 2,049,556 | 4 | 512,389 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 3,776,852 | 7 | 539,550 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 2,159,991 | 4 | 539,998 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 15,118,299 | 27 | 559,937 |
| MN | 8th | 4,375,099 | 7 | 625,014 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 5,076,541 | 8 | 634,568 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 2,554,964 | 4 | 638,741 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 1,281,312 | 2 | 640,656 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 7,084,280 | 11 | 644,025 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 3,230,721 | 5 | 646,144 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 3,357,709 | 5 | 671,542 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 2,024,117 | 3 | 674,706 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 2,840,302 | 4 | 710,076 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 2,956,740 | 4 | 739,185 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 3,011,966 | 4 | 752,992 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5,455,602 | 7 | 779,372 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 1,935,029 | 2 | 967,515 |
| PR | 1st | 3,522,037 | 7 | 503,148 |

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 252,904,881 | 647 | - |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC data on judges, judgeships, and population.

Table I.2: 1990 Population Per Active Judge by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 606,900 | 15 | 40,460 |
| WY | 10th | 453,588 | 3 | 151,196 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 1,619,759 | 10 | 161,976 |
| AK | 9th | 550,043 | 3 | 183,348 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 4,551,993 | 24 | 189,666 |
| DE | 3rd | 666,168 | 3 | 222,056 |
| SD | 8th | 696,004 | 3 | 232,001 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 1,023,318 | 4 | 255,830 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 770,159 | 3 | 256,720 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 5,179,074 | 20 | 258,954 |
| MT | 9th | 799,065 | 3 | 266,355 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 1,603,040 | 6 | 267,173 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 1,365,837 | 5 | 273,167 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 1,665,665 | 6 | 277,611 |
| VT | 2nd | 562,758 | 2 | 281,379 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 1,436,935 | 5 | 287,387 |
| NV | 9th | 1,201,833 | 4 | 300,458 |
| NM | 10th | 1,515,069 | 5 | 303,014 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 623,853 | 2 | 311,927 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 949,497 | 3 | 316,499 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 2,222,348 | 7 | 317,478 |
| ND | 8th | 638,800 | 2 | 319,400 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 970,176 | 3 | 323,392 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 1,976,361 | 6 | 329,394 |

ENCLOSURE I

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RI | 1st | 1,003,464 | 3 | 334,488 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 840,805 | 2.5 | 336,322 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 5,246,433 | 15 | 349,762 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 5,607,929 | 16 | 350,496 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 723,454 | 2 | 361,727 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 1,089,840 | 3 | 363,280 |
| HI | 9th | 1,108,229 | 3 | 369,410 |
| NH | 1st | 1,109,252 | 3 | 369,751 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 3,708,451 | 10 | 370,845 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 2,607,319 | 7 | 372,474 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 1,515,530 | 4 | 378,883 |
| SC | 4th | 3,486,703 | 9 | 387,411 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 1,163,430 | 3 | 387,810 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 1,995,818 | 5 | 399,164 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 8,028,703 | 20 | 401,435 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 1,606,335 | 4 | 401,584 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 1,813,697 | 4.5 | 403,044 |
| ME | 1st | 1,227,928 | 3 | 409,309 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 2,469,979 | 6 | 411,663 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 4,143,210 | 10 | 414,321 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 1,871,599 | 4.5 | 415,911 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 639,115 | 1.5 | 426,077 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 1,280,184 | 3 | 426,728 |
| UT | 10th | 1,722,850 | 4 | 430,713 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 2,647,094 | 6 | 441,182 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 913,790 | 2 | 456,895 |
| AZ | 9th | 3,665,228 | 8 | 458,154 |

ENCLOSURE I

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| IN (N) | 7th | 2,313,438 | 5 | 462,688 |
| MA | 1st | 6,016,425 | 13 | 462,802 |
| CO | 10th | 3,294,394 | 7 | 470,628 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 2,367,636 | 5 | 473,527 |
| MD | 4th | 4,781,468 | 10 | 478,147 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 4,319,575 | 9 | 479,953 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 7,240,451 | 15 | 482,697 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,730,188 | 16 | 483,137 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 3,953,652 | 8 | 494,207 |
| KS | 10th | 2,477,574 | 5 | 495,515 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 1,495,443 | 3 | 498,481 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 5,013,023 | 10 | 501,302 |
| ID | 9th | 1,006,749 | 2 | 503,375 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 2,049,556 | 4 | 512,389 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 6,283,331 | 12 | 523,611 |
| NE | 8th | 1,578,385 | 3 | 526,128 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 3,776,852 | 7 | 539,550 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,287,116 | 6 | 547,853 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 5,770,574 | 10 | 577,057 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 6,578,801 | 11 | 598,073 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 1,241,908 | 2 | 620,954 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 1,867,783 | 3 | 622,594 |
| MN | 8th | 4,375,099 | 7 | 625,014 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 2,554,964 | 4 | 638,741 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 1,281,312 | 2 | 640,656 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 15,118,299 | 23 | 657,317 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 2,024,117 | 3 | 674,706 |

ENCLOSURE I

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FL (M) | 11th | 7,084,280 | 10 | 708,428 |
| OR | 9th | 2,842,321 | 4 | 710,580 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 2,159,991 | 3 | 719,997 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 5,076,541 | 7 | 725,220 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 3,011,966 | 4 | 752,992 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 3,230,721 | 4 | 807,680 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 3,357,709 | 4 | 839,427 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 2,748,917 | 3 | 916,306 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 2,840,302 | 3 | 946,767 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 1,935,029 | 2 | 967,515 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 2,956,740 | 3 | 985,580 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5,455,602 | 5 | 1,091,120 |
| PR | 1st | 3,522,037 | 6 | 587,006 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 252,904,881 | 576 | - |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC data on judges, judgeships, and population.

Table I.3: 1990 Population Per Recommended Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 606,900 | 15 | 40,460 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 1,619,759 | 13 | 124,597 |
| WY | 10th | 453,588 | 3 | 151,196 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 4,551,993 | 28 | 162,571 |
| DE | 3rd | 666,168 | 4 | 166,542 |
| AK | 9th | 550,043 | 3 | 183,348 |
| NV | 9th | 1,201,833 | 6 | 200,306 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 1,023,318 | 5 | 204,664 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 623,853 | 3 | 207,951 |
| NM | 10th | 1,515,069 | 7 | 216,438 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 1,089,840 | 5 | 217,968 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 5,179,074 | 23 | 225,177 |
| SD | 8th | 696,004 | 3 | 232,001 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 949,497 | 4 | 237,374 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 723,454 | 3 | 241,151 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 840,805 | 3.3 | 254,789 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 770,159 | 3 | 256,720 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 1,665,665 | 6.4 | 260,260 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 2,607,319 | 10 | 260,732 |
| MT | 9th | 799,065 | 3 | 266,355 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 1,603,040 | 6 | 267,173 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 1,365,837 | 5 | 273,167 |
| HI | 9th | 1,108,229 | 4 | 277,057 |

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| VT | 2nd | 562,758 | 2 | 281,379 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 1,976,361 | 7 | 282,337 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 1,436,935 | 5 | 287,387 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 5,246,433 | 18 | 291,469 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 5,607,929 | 19 | 295,154 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 913,790 | 3 | 304,597 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 1,241,908 | 4 | 310,477 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 2,222,348 | 7 | 317,478 |
| ND | 8th | 638,800 | 2 | 319,400 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 1,280,184 | 4 | 320,046 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 970,176 | 3 | 323,392 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 1,813,697 | 5.5 | 329,763 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 2,647,094 | 8 | 330,887 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 1,995,818 | 6 | 332,636 |
| RI | 1st | 1,003,464 | 3 | 334,488 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 3,708,451 | 11 | 337,132 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 2,367,636 | 7 | 338,234 |
| UT | 10th | 1,722,850 | 5 | 344,570 |
| SC | 4th | 3,486,703 | 10 | 348,670 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 8,028,703 | 22 | 364,941 |
| CO | 10th | 3,294,394 | 9 | 366,044 |
| AZ | 9th | 3,665,228 | 10 | 366,523 |
| NH | 1st | 1,109,252 | 3 | 369,751 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 1,515,530 | 4 | 378,883 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 5,013,023 | 13 | 385,617 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 1,163,430 | 3 | 387,810 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 4,319,575 | 11 | 392,689 |

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NE | 8th | 1,578,385 | 4 | 394,596 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 3,953,652 | 10 | 395,365 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 1,606,335 | 4 | 401,584 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 7,240,451 | 18 | 402,247 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 2,024,117 | 5 | 404,823 |
| OR | 9th | 2,842,321 | 7 | 406,046 |
| ME | 1st | 1,227,928 | 3 | 409,309 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,287,116 | 8 | 410,890 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 2,469,979 | 6 | 411,663 |
| KS | 10th | 2,477,574 | 6 | 412,929 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 4,143,210 | 10 | 414,321 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 1,871,599 | 4.5 | 415,911 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 6,283,331 | 15 | 418,889 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,730,188 | 17 | 454,717 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 2,748,917 | 6 | 458,153 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 2,313,438 | 5 | 462,688 |
| MA | 1st | 6,016,425 | 13 | 462,802 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 1,867,783 | 4 | 466,946 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 6,578,801 | 14 | 469,914 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 7,084,280 | 15 | 472,285 |
| MD | 4th | 4,781,468 | 10 | 478,147 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 5,770,574 | 12 | 480,881 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 639,115 | 1.3 | 491,627 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 1,495,443 | 3 | 498,481 |
| ID | 9th | 1,006,749 | 2 | 503,375 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 2,049,556 | 4 | 512,389 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 3,230,721 | 6 | 538,454 |

| District | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WA (W) | 9th | 3,776,852 | 7 | 539,550 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 2,159,991 | 4 | 539,998 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 3,357,709 | 6 | 559,618 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 15,118,299 | 27 | 559,937 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 2,840,302 | 5 | 568,060 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5,455,602 | 9 | 606,178 |
| MN | 8th | 4,375,099 | 7 | 625,014 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 5,076,541 | 8 | 634,568 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 2,554,964 | 4 | 638,741 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 1,281,312 | 2 | 640,656 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 2,956,740 | 4 | 739,185 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 3,011,966 | 4 | 752,992 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 1,935,029 | 2 | 967,515 |
| PR | 1st | 3,522,037 | 7 | 503,148 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 252,904,881 | 683 | - |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC data on judges, judgeships, and population.

## STATE POPULATION PER AUTHORIZED JUDGESHIP, ACTIVE JUDGE, AND RECOMMENDED JUDGESHIP, USING 1990 AND 1996 POPULATION DATA

The tables in this enclosure show 1990 and 1996 state population per authorized judgeship, active judge, and recommended judgeship. The data in each table show both the total population of each state and the population per judgeship and active judge. For each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, the population data are arrayed from the lowest to highest population per judgeship and active judge. For those states with more than one federal district court, 1990 state population data were derived by adding the populations for all districts within the state. State population data for 1996 are based on data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population data for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are shown at the end of each table rather than being included in the rankings. Population data were not available for the district courts in the three U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

Table II.1: 1990 Population Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 606,900 | 15 | 40,460 |
| WY | 10th | 453,588 | 3 | 151,196 |
| DE | 3rd | 666,168 | 4 | 166,542 |
| AK | 9th | 550,043 | 3 | 183,348 |
| LA | 5th | 4,219,973 | 22 | 191,817 |
| WV | 4th | 1,793,477 | 8 | 224,185 |
| SD | 8th | 696,004 | 3 | 232,001 |
| MT | 9th | 799,065 | 3 | 266,355 |
| HI | 9th | 1,108,229 | 4 | 277,057 |
| VT | 2nd | 562,758 | 2 | 281,379 |
| MS | 5th | 2,573,216 | 9 | 285,913 |
| OK | 10th | 3,145,585 | 11 | 285,962 |
| AR | 8th | 2,350,725 | 8 | 293,841 |
| NV | 9th | 1,201,833 | 4 | 300,458 |

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NM | 10th | 1,515,069 | 5 | 303,014 |
| PA | 3rd | 11,881,643 | 39 | 304,658 |
| AL | 11th | 4,040,587 | 13 | 310,814 |
| ND | 8th | 638,800 | 2 | 319,400 |
| RI | 1st | 1,003,464 | 3 | 334,488 |
| UT | 10th | 1,722,850 | 5 | 344,570 |
| NY | 2nd | 17,990,455 | 52 | 345,970 |
| TN | 6th | 4,877,185 | 14 | 348,370 |
| GA | 11th | 6,478,216 | 18 | 359,901 |
| TX | 5th | 16,986,510 | 47 | 361,415 |
| MO | 8th | 5,117,073 | 14 | 365,505 |
| NH | 1st | 1,109,252 | 3 | 369,751 |
| IL | 7th | 11,430,602 | 30 | 381,020 |
| SC | 4th | 3,486,703 | 9 | 387,411 |
| NE | 8th | 1,578,385 | 4 | 394,596 |
| ME | 1st | 1,227,928 | 3 | 409,309 |
| KY | 6th | 3,685,296 | 9 | 409,477 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,287,116 | 8 | 410,890 |
| KS | 10th | 2,477,574 | 6 | 412,929 |
| FL | 11th | 13,610,897 | 31 | 439,061 |
| VA | 4th | 6,187,358 | 14 | 441,954 |
| WA | 9th | 4,866,692 | 11 | 442,427 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,730,188 | 17 | 454,717 |
| AZ | 9th | 3,665,228 | 8 | 458,154 |
| MA | 1st | 6,016,425 | 13 | 462,802 |
| CO | 10th | 3,294,394 | 7 | 470,628 |
| OR | 9th | 2,842,321 | 6 | 473,720 |

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MD | 4th | 4,781,468 | 10 | 478,147 |
| MI | 6th | 9,295,297 | 19 | 489,226 |
| ID | 9th | 1,006,749 | 2 | 503,375 |
| CA | 9th | 29,760,021 | 56 | 531,429 |
| OH | 6th | 10,847,115 | 20 | 542,356 |
| IN | 7th | 5,544,159 | 10 | 554,416 |
| IA | 8th | 2,776,755 | 5 | 555,351 |
| NC | 4th | 6,628,637 | 11 | 602,603 |
| MN | 8th | 4,375,099 | 7 | 625,014 |
| WI | 7th | 4,891,769 | 6 | 815,295 |
| PR | 1st | 3,522,037 | 7 | 503,148 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 252,904,881 | 647 | - |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC judge, judgeship, and population data.

Table II.2: 1990 Population Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 606,900 | 15 | 40,460 |
| WY | 10th | 453,588 | 3 | 151,196 |
| AK | 9th | 550,043 | 3 | 183,348 |
| DE | 3rd | 666,168 | 3 | 222,056 |
| SD | 8th | 696,004 | 3 | 232,001 |
| LA | 5th | 4,219,973 | 18 | 234,443 |
| WV | 4th | 1,793,477 | 7 | 256,211 |
| MT | 9th | 799,065 | 3 | 266,355 |
| VT | 2nd | 562,758 | 2 | 281,379 |
| MS | 5th | 2,573,216 | 9 | 285,913 |
| NV | 9th | 1,201,833 | 4 | 300,458 |
| NM | 10th | 1,515,069 | 5 | 303,014 |
| OK | 10th | 3,145,585 | 10 | 314,559 |
| ND | 8th | 638,800 | 2 | 319,400 |
| RI | 1st | 1,003,464 | 3 | 334,488 |
| AR | 8th | 2,350,725 | 7 | 335,818 |
| TN | 6th | 4,877,185 | 14 | 348,370 |
| HI | 9th | 1,108,229 | 3 | 369,410 |
| NH | 1st | 1,109,252 | 3 | 369,751 |
| GA | 11th | 6,478,216 | 17 | 381,072 |
| PA | 3rd | 11,881,643 | 31 | 383,279 |
| SC | 4th | 3,486,703 | 9 | 387,411 |
| NY | 2nd | 17,990,455 | 46 | 391,097 |
| TX | 5th | 16,986,510 | 43 | 395,035 |

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 11th | 4,040,587 | 10 | 404,059 |
| ME | 1st | 1,227,928 | 3 | 409,309 |
| KY | 6th | 3,685,296 | 9 | 409,477 |
| MO | 8th | 5,117,073 | 12 | 426,423 |
| UT | 10th | 1,722,850 | 4 | 430,713 |
| IL | 7th | 11,430,602 | 25 | 457,224 |
| AZ | 9th | 3,665,228 | 8 | 458,154 |
| MA | 1st | 6,016,425 | 13 | 462,802 |
| CO | 10th | 3,294,394 | 7 | 470,628 |
| MD | 4th | 4,781,468 | 10 | 478,147 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,730,188 | 16 | 483,137 |
| FL | 11th | 13,610,897 | 28 | 486,103 |
| WA | 9th | 4,866,692 | 10 | 486,669 |
| KS | 10th | 2,477,574 | 5 | 495,515 |
| ID | 9th | 1,006,749 | 2 | 503,375 |
| VA | 4th | 6,187,358 | 12 | 515,613 |
| NE | 8th | 1,578,385 | 3 | 526,128 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,287,116 | 6 | 547,853 |
| IA | 8th | 2,776,755 | 5 | 555,351 |
| MI | 6th | 9,295,297 | 16 | 580,956 |
| NC | 4th | 6,628,637 | 11 | 602,603 |
| IN | 7th | 5,544,159 | 9 | 616,018 |
| MN | 8th | 4,375,099 | 7 | 625,014 |
| OH | 6th | 10,847,115 | 17 | 638,066 |
| CA | 9th | 29,760,021 | 46 | 646,957 |
| OR | 9th | 2,842,321 | 4 | 710,580 |
| WI | 7th | 4,891,769 | 5 | 978,354 |

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PR | 1st | 3,522,037 | 6 | 587,006 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 252,904,881 | 576 | - |

Legend

n/a - Not available.

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC judge, judgeship, and population data.

Table II.3: 1990 Population Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 606,900 | 15 | 40,460 |
| WY | 10th | 453,588 | 3 | 151,196 |
| DE | 3rd | 666,168 | 4 | 166,542 |
| AK | 9th | 550,043 | 3 | 183,348 |
| LA | 5th | 4,219,973 | 23 | 183,477 |
| NV | 9th | 1,201,833 | 6 | 200,306 |
| NM | 10th | 1,515,069 | 7 | 216,438 |
| WV | 4th | 1,793,477 | 8 | 224,185 |
| SD | 8th | 696,004 | 3 | 232,001 |
| MT | 9th | 799,065 | 3 | 266,355 |
| HI | 9th | 1,108,229 | 4 | 277,057 |
| VT | 2nd | 562,758 | 2 | 281,379 |
| MS | 5th | 2,573,216 | 9 | 285,913 |
| OK | 10th | 3,145,585 | 11 | 285,962 |
| AL | 11th | 4,040,587 | 14 | 288,613 |
| AR | 8th | 2,350,725 | 8 | 293,841 |
| PA | 3rd | 11,881,643 | 39 | 304,658 |
| NY | 2nd | 17,990,455 | 57 | 315,622 |
| ND | 8th | 638,800 | 2 | 319,400 |
| TN | 6th | 4,877,185 | 15 | 325,146 |
| RI | 1st | 1,003,464 | 3 | 334,488 |
| UT | 10th | 1,722,850 | 5 | 344,570 |
| TX | 5th | 16,986,510 | 49 | 346,663 |
| SC | 4th | 3,486,703 | 10 | 348,670 |

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| GA | 11th | 6,478,216 | 18 | 359,901 |
| MO | 8th | 5,117,073 | 14 | 365,505 |
| CO | 10th | 3,294,394 | 9 | 366,044 |
| AZ | 9th | 3,665,228 | 10 | 366,523 |
| FL | 11th | 13,610,897 | 37 | 367,862 |
| KY | 6th | 3,685,296 | 10 | 368,530 |
| NH | 1st | 1,109,252 | 3 | 369,751 |
| IL | 7th | 11,430,602 | 30 | 381,020 |
| NE | 8th | 1,578,385 | 4 | 394,596 |
| WA | 9th | 4,866,692 | 12 | 405,558 |
| OR | 9th | 2,842,321 | 7 | 406,046 |
| ME | 1st | 1,227,928 | 3 | 409,309 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,287,116 | 8 | 410,890 |
| VA | 4th | 6,187,358 | 15 | 412,491 |
| KS | 10th | 2,477,574 | 6 | 412,929 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,730,188 | 17 | 454,717 |
| MA | 1st | 6,016,425 | 13 | 462,802 |
| MD | 4th | 4,781,468 | 10 | 478,147 |
| MI | 6th | 9,295,297 | 19 | 489,226 |
| CA | 9th | 29,760,021 | 60 | 496,000 |
| ID | 9th | 1,006,749 | 2 | 503,375 |
| IN | 7th | 5,544,159 | 11 | 504,014 |
| NC | 4th | 6,628,637 | 13 | 509,895 |
| OH | 6th | 10,847,115 | 20 | 542,356 |
| IA | 8th | 2,776,755 | 5 | 555,351 |
| MN | 8th | 4,375,099 | 7 | 625,014 |
| WI | 7th | 4,891,769 | 6 | 815,295 |

| State | Circuit | 1990 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PR | 1st | 3,522,037 | 7 | 503,148 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 252,904,881 | 683 | - |

Legend

n/a - Not available.

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC judge, judgeship, and population data.

Table II.4: 1996 Population Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 543,213 | 15 | 36,214 |
| WY | 10th | 481,400 | 3 | 160,467 |
| DE | 3rd | 724,842 | 4 | 181,211 |
| LA | 5th | 4,350,579 | 22 | 197,754 |
| AK | 9th | 607,007 | 3 | 202,336 |
| WV | 4th | 1,825,754 | 8 | 228,219 |
| SD | 8th | 732,405 | 3 | 244,135 |
| MT | 9th | 879,372 | 3 | 293,124 |
| VT | 2nd | 588,654 | 2 | 294,327 |
| HI | 9th | 1,183,723 | 4 | 295,931 |
| OK | 10th | 3,300,902 | 11 | 300,082 |
| MS | 5th | 2,716,115 | 9 | 301,791 |
| PA | 3rd | 12,056,112 | 39 | 309,131 |
| AR | 8th | 2,509,793 | 8 | 313,724 |
| ND | 8th | 643,539 | 2 | 321,770 |
| AL | 11th | 4,273,084 | 13 | 328,699 |
| RI | 1st | 990,225 | 3 | 330,075 |
| NM | 10th | 1,713,407 | 5 | 342,681 |
| NY | 2nd | 18,184,774 | 52 | 349,707 |
| TN | 6th | 5,319,654 | 14 | 379,975 |
| MO | 8th | 5,358,692 | 14 | 382,764 |
| NH | 1st | 1,162,481 | 3 | 387,494 |
| IL | 7th | 11,846,544 | 30 | 394,885 |

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| UT | 10th | 2,000,494 | 5 | 400,099 |
| NV | 9th | 1,603,163 | 4 | 400,791 |
| TX | 5th | 19,128,261 | 47 | 406,984 |
| GA | 11th | 7,353,225 | 18 | 408,513 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,274,238 | 8 | 409,280 |
| SC | 4th | 3,698,746 | 9 | 410,972 |
| NE | 8th | 1,652,093 | 4 | 413,023 |
| ME | 1st | 1,243,316 | 3 | 414,439 |
| KS | 10th | 2,572,150 | 6 | 428,692 |
| KY | 6th | 3,883,723 | 9 | 431,525 |
| FL | 11th | 14,399,985 | 31 | 464,516 |
| MA | 1st | 6,092,352 | 13 | 468,642 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,987,933 | 17 | 469,878 |
| VA | 4th | 6,675,451 | 14 | 476,818 |
| WA | 9th | 5,532,939 | 11 | 502,994 |
| MI | 6th | 9,594,350 | 19 | 504,966 |
| MD | 4th | 5,071,604 | 10 | 507,160 |
| OR | 9th | 3,203,735 | 6 | 533,956 |
| CO | 10th | 3,822,676 | 7 | 546,097 |
| AZ | 9th | 4,428,068 | 8 | 553,509 |
| OH | 6th | 11,172,782 | 20 | 558,639 |
| CA | 9th | 31,878,234 | 56 | 569,254 |
| IA | 8th | 2,851,792 | 5 | 570,358 |
| IN | 7th | 5,840,528 | 10 | 584,053 |
| ID | 9th | 1,189,251 | 2 | 594,626 |
| MN | 8th | 4,657,758 | 7 | 665,394 |
| NC | 4th | 7,322,870 | 11 | 665,715 |

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of authorized judgeships | Population per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WI | 7th | 5,159,795 | 6 | 859,966 |
| PR | 1st | 3,782,862 | 7 | 540,409 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 269,066,645 | 647 | - |

Legend

n/a - Not available.

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC data on judges and judgeships and U.S. Bureau of the Census population data.

Table II.5: 1996 Population Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 543,213 | 15 | 36,214 |
| WY | 10th | 481,400 | 3 | 160,467 |
| AK | 9th | 607,007 | 3 | 202,336 |
| DE | 3rd | 724,842 | 3 | 241,614 |
| LA | 5th | 4,350,579 | 18 | 241,699 |
| SD | 8th | 732,405 | 3 | 244,135 |
| WV | 4th | 1,825,754 | 7 | 260,822 |
| MT | 9th | 879,372 | 3 | 293,124 |
| VT | 2nd | 588,654 | 2 | 294,327 |
| MS | 5th | 2,716,115 | 9 | 301,791 |
| ND | 8th | 643,539 | 2 | 321,770 |
| RI | 1st | 990,225 | 3 | 330,075 |
| OK | 10th | 3,300,902 | 10 | 330,090 |
| NM | 10th | 1,713,407 | 5 | 342,681 |
| AR | 8th | 2,509,793 | 7 | 358,542 |
| TN | 6th | 5,319,654 | 14 | 379,975 |
| NH | 1st | 1,162,481 | 3 | 387,494 |
| PA | 3rd | 12,056,112 | 31 | 388,907 |
| HI | 9th | 1,183,723 | 3 | 394,574 |
| NY | 2nd | 18,184,774 | 46 | 395,321 |
| NV | 9th | 1,603,163 | 4 | 400,791 |
| SC | 4th | 3,698,746 | 9 | 410,972 |
| ME | 1st | 1,243,316 | 3 | 414,439 |
| AL | 11th | 4,273,084 | 10 | 427,308 |

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| KY | 6th | 3,883,723 | 9 | 431,525 |
| GA | 11th | 7,353,225 | 17 | 432,543 |
| TX | 5th | 19,128,261 | 43 | 444,843 |
| MO | 8th | 5,358,692 | 12 | 446,558 |
| MA | 1st | 6,092,352 | 13 | 468,642 |
| IL | 7th | 11,846,544 | 25 | 473,862 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,987,933 | 16 | 499,246 |
| UT | 10th | 2,000,494 | 4 | 500,124 |
| MD | 4th | 5,071,604 | 10 | 507,160 |
| FL | 11th | 14,399,985 | 28 | 514,285 |
| KS | 10th | 2,572,150 | 5 | 514,430 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,274,238 | 6 | 545,706 |
| CO | 10th | 3,822,676 | 7 | 546,097 |
| NE | 8th | 1,652,093 | 3 | 550,698 |
| WA | 9th | 5,532,939 | 10 | 553,294 |
| AZ | 9th | 4,428,068 | 8 | 553,509 |
| VA | 4th | 6,675,451 | 12 | 556,288 |
| IA | 8th | 2,851,792 | 5 | 570,358 |
| ID | 9th | 1,189,251 | 2 | 594,626 |
| MI | 6th | 9,594,350 | 16 | 599,647 |
| IN | 7th | 5,840,528 | 9 | 648,948 |
| OH | 6th | 11,172,782 | 17 | 657,222 |
| MN | 8th | 4,657,758 | 7 | 665,394 |
| NC | 4th | 7,322,870 | 11 | 665,715 |
| CA | 9th | 31,878,234 | 46 | 693,005 |
| OR | 9th | 3,203,735 | 4 | 800,934 |
| WI | 7th | 5,159,795 | 5 | 1,031,959 |

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of active judges | Population per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PR | 1st | 3,782,862 | 6 | 630,477 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 269,066,645 | 576 | - |

Legend

n/a - Not available.

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC data on judges and judgeships, and U.S. Bureau of the Census population data.

Table II.6: 1996 Population Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DC | DC | 543,213 | 15 | 36,214 |
| WY | 10th | 481,400 | 3 | 160,467 |
| DE | 3rd | 724,842 | 4 | 181,211 |
| LA | 5th | 4,350,579 | 23 | 189,156 |
| AK | 9th | 607,007 | 3 | 202,336 |
| WV | 4th | 1,825,754 | 8 | 228,219 |
| SD | 8th | 732,405 | 3 | 244,135 |
| NM | 10th | 1,713,407 | 7 | 244,772 |
| NV | 9th | 1,603,163 | 6 | 267,194 |
| MT | 9th | 879,372 | 3 | 293,124 |
| VT | 2nd | 588,654 | 2 | 294,327 |
| HI | 9th | 1,183,723 | 4 | 295,931 |
| OK | 10th | 3,300,902 | 11 | 300,082 |
| MS | 5th | 2,716,115 | 9 | 301,791 |
| AL | 11th | 4,273,084 | 14 | 305,220 |
| PA | 3rd | 12,056,112 | 39 | 309,131 |
| AR | 8th | 2,509,793 | 8 | 313,724 |
| NY | 2nd | 18,184,774 | 57 | 319,031 |
| ND | 8th | 643,539 | 2 | 321,770 |
| RI | 1st | 990,225 | 3 | 330,075 |
| TN | 6th | 5,319,654 | 15 | 354,644 |
| SC | 4th | 3,698,746 | 10 | 369,875 |
| MO | 8th | 5,358,692 | 14 | 382,764 |
| NH | 1st | 1,162,481 | 3 | 387,494 |

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| KY | 6th | 3,883,723 | 10 | 388,372 |
| FL | 11th | 14,399,985 | 37 | 389,189 |
| TX | 5th | 19,128,261 | 49 | 390,373 |
| IL | 7th | 11,846,544 | 30 | 394,885 |
| UT | 10th | 2,000,494 | 5 | 400,099 |
| GA | 11th | 7,353,225 | 18 | 408,513 |
| CT | 2nd | 3,274,238 | 8 | 409,280 |
| NE | 8th | 1,652,093 | 4 | 413,023 |
| ME | 1st | 1,243,316 | 3 | 414,439 |
| CO | 10th | 3,822,676 | 9 | 424,742 |
| KS | 10th | 2,572,150 | 6 | 428,692 |
| AZ | 9th | 4,428,068 | 10 | 442,807 |
| VA | 4th | 6,675,451 | 15 | 445,030 |
| OR | 9th | 3,203,735 | 7 | 457,676 |
| WA | 9th | 5,532,939 | 12 | 461,078 |
| MA | 1st | 6,092,352 | 13 | 468,642 |
| NJ | 3rd | 7,987,933 | 17 | 469,878 |
| MI | 6th | 9,594,350 | 19 | 504,966 |
| MD | 4th | 5,071,604 | 10 | 507,160 |
| IN | 7th | 5,840,528 | 11 | 530,957 |
| CA | 9th | 31,878,234 | 60 | 531,304 |
| OH | 6th | 11,172,782 | 20 | 558,639 |
| NC | 4th | 7,322,870 | 13 | 563,298 |
| IA | 8th | 2,851,792 | 5 | 570,358 |
| ID | 9th | 1,189,251 | 2 | 594,626 |
| MN | 8th | 4,657,758 | 7 | 665,394 |
| WI | 7th | 5,159,795 | 6 | 859,966 |

| State | Circuit | 1996 population | Number of recommended judgeships | Population per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PR | 1st | 3,782,862 | 7 | 540,409 |
| VI | 3rd | n/a | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | n/a | 1 | n/a |
| Total | - | 269,066,645 | 683 | - |

Legend

n/a - Not available.

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC data on judges and judgeships and U.S. Bureau of the Census population data.

## UNWEIGHTED TOTAL, CIVIL, AND CRIMINAL CASE FILINGS BY DISTRICT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 PER AUTHORIZED JUDGESHIP, ACTIVE JUDGE, AND RECOMMENDED JUDGESHIP

The tables in this enclosure show, by district, unweighted total, civil, and criminal case filings per judgeship and active judge. For each of these three categories of filings, there are three separate tables–filings per authorized judgeship, active judge, and recommended judgeship. In each table, the filings per judgeship and active judge are arrayed from the lowest to highest for the 90 districts within the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Thus, the order in which these 90 districts appear in each table may vary.

Data for the remaining four districts are shown at the end of each table. These districts are the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. However, to ensure comparability in calculating unweighted and weighted national average and median case filings by district, we excluded from the calculations the data for these four courts.

Some states have authorized judgeships that may be assigned to more than one district within the state. For example, while Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky each have four authorized judgeships, there is one additional judgeship for "Eastern and Western." We have divided these types of additional judgeships among the relevant states' respective districts in the tables in this enclosure.

Table III.1: Unweighted Total Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 166 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 201 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 216 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 224 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 273 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 279 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 281 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 282 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| ND | 8th | 2 | 284 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 285 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 288 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 289 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 290 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 4 | 323 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 337 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 338 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 341 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 341 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 356 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 356 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 362 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 372 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 374 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 374 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 392 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 396 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 397 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 400 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.5 | 401 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 408 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 409 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 410 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 411 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 415 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 415 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 415 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 417 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 431 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 434 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 436 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 441 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 446 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 448 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 449 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 452 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 454 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 457 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 458 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 462 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 466 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 47 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 4 | 47 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 474 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 478 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 479 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 18 | 502 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 5 | 506 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 515 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 516 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 520 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 521 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 10 | 526 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 529 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 530 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 535 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 16 | 537 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 537 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 539 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 540 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 541 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 543 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 558 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 5 | 565 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 565 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 567 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 568 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 582 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 12 | 593 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 597 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 599 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 628 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 7 | 635 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 11 | 659 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 672 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 701 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 705 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 723 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 8 | 760 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 817 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,849 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 330 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 389 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 211 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 86 |
| National average | - | - | 474 |
| National median | - | - | 453 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.2: Unweighted Total Case Filings Per Active Judge by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 166 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 216 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 224 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 268 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 273 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 279 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 281 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 284 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 285 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 288 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 289 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 341 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 4 | 353 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 356 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 356 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 363 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 374 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 397 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 410 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 415 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 415 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 20 | 416 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 417 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| PA (W) | 3rd | 8 | 423 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 3 | 431 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 436 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 437 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 10 | 438 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 448 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 20 | 449 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 455 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 458 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 462 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 466 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 7 | 467 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 470 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 474 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 478 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 479 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 24 | 484 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 10 | 485 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 496 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 499 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 515 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 520 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 521 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 23 | 524 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 3 | 528 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 529 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 530 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| LA (W) | 5th | 6 | 533 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 535 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 537 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 539 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 540 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 541 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 543 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 558 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 2.5 | 561 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 16 | 565 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 565 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 12 | 565 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 567 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 15 | 573 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 6 | 575 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 9 | 584 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 597 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 3 | 599 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 11 | 599 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 2 | 600 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 628 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 3 | 628 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 4 | 633 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 672 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 701 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 705 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 4 | 706 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| TX (N) | 5th | 10 | 712 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 10 | 725 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 774 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 3 | 776 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 3 | 799 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 2 | 852 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 2 | 868 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 7 | 869 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5 | 889 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 3 | 908 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 10 | 980 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 5 | 1,012 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,849 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 385 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 389 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 211 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 86 |
| National average | - | - | 533 |
| National median | - | - | 521 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.3: Unweighted Total Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 166 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 201 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 216 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 224 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 5 | 258 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 273 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 279 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 281 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 282 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 284 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 285 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 288 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 289 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 290 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 5 | 321 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 337 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 338 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 341 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 341 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 356 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 356 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 362 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 372 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 374 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| NE | 8th | 4 | 374 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 5 | 377 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6.4 | 384 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 386 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 392 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 396 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 397 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 400 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 408 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 409 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 411 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 415 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 415 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 415 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 417 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 418 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 6 | 422 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.3 | 425 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 431 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 18 | 433 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 6 | 434 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 434 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 436 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 441 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 442 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 5.5 | 444 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 446 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| NV | 9th | 6 | 448 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 448 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 449 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 452 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 454 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 457 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 458 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 462 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 466 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 471 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 6 | 471 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 474 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 19 | 476 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 18 | 477 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 477 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 478 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 11 | 478 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 15 | 483 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 9 | 494 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 515 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 529 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 4 | 529 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 539 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 540 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 13 | 547 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.3 | 553 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 558 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 561 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 565 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 567 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 568 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 582 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 597 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 599 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 10 | 608 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 628 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 723 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 817 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 3 | 2,566 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 330 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 389 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 211 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 86 |
| National average | - | - | 449 |
| National median | - | - | 434 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.4: Unweighted Civil Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 119 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 158 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 173 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 184 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 188 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 211 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 212 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 217 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 217 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 223 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 4 | 230 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 232 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 233 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 237 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 240 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 261 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 271 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 285 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 297 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 298 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 307 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 321 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 325 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 329 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 330 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 332 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.5 | 333 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 334 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 339 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 340 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 341 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 349 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 350 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 356 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 357 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 357 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 360 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 360 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 365 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 365 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 18 | 367 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 4 | 372 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 372 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 374 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 16 | 374 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 376 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 376 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 381 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 387 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 389 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 390 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 390 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 394 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 395 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 401 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 405 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 406 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 410 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 5 | 410 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 414 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 8 | 414 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 416 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 10 | 418 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 419 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 420 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 425 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 426 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 437 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 441 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 443 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 446 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 450 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 467 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 479 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 486 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| TX (N) | 5th | 12 | 493 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 7 | 494 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 506 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 510 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 511 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 518 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 5 | 522 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 11 | 527 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 540 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 630 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 648 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 758 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,800 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 223 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 203 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 114 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 54 |
| National average | - | - | 389 |
| National median | - | - | 373 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.5: Unweighted Civil Case Filings Per Active Judge by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 119 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 158 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 184 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 188 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 211 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 212 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 217 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 223 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 231 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 232 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 237 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 240 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 261 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 271 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 285 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 4 | 291 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 3 | 307 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 330 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 332 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 339 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 340 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 341 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 360 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 361 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 365 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 20 | 369 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 376 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 379 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 8 | 384 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 10 | 387 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 389 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 390 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 390 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 394 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 395 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 396 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 15 | 399 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 7 | 400 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 10 | 402 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 405 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 20 | 409 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 410 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 16 | 413 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 416 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 24 | 417 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 419 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 420 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 425 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 426 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 3 | 433 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 437 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 441 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 23 | 441 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 443 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 445 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 446 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 450 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 9 | 464 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 2.5 | 466 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 467 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 7 | 473 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 6 | 474 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 12 | 476 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 479 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 3 | 480 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 3 | 496 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 6 | 499 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 506 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 11 | 510 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 511 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 4 | 513 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 518 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 2 | 524 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 540 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 10 | 580 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted civil case filings per.active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| TX (N) | 5th | 10 | 592 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 593 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 2 | 621 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 630 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 3 | 648 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 4 | 653 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 3 | 680 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5 | 692 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 2 | 712 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 3 | 774 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 5 | 907 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 10 | 910 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,800 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 260 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 203 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 114 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 54 |
| National average | - | - | 438 |
| National median | - | - | 414 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.6: Unweighted Civil Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 119 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 158 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 173 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 184 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 5 | 184 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 188 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 190 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 5 | 204 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 211 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 212 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 217 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 217 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 223 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 232 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 233 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 237 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 240 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 250 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 261 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 271 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 285 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 297 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 5 | 298 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 298 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 307 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 321 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 325 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 329 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 330 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 10 | 331 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 332 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 18 | 332 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 334 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 337 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 339 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 339 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 340 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 341 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6.4 | 342 |
| N[illegible] (N) | 2nd | 6 | 342 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 18 | 342 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 19 | 348 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 349 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 350 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.3 | 353 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 356 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 357 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 357 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 360 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 360 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 365 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 5.5 | 368 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 372 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 6 | 372 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 374 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 374 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 376 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 376 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 11 | 380 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 381 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 383 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 9 | 384 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 15 | 386 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 387 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 389 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 390 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 390 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 394 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 401 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 405 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 406 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 414 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 419 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 420 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 425 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 6 | 435 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 441 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 443 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 13 | 455 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 467 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 4 | 473 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 486 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.3 | 492 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 510 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 511 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 518 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 540 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 648 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 758 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 3 | 2,533 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 223 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 203 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 114 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 54 |
| National average | - | - | 369 |
| National median | - | - | 355 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.7: Unweighted Criminal Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted criminal filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 28 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 30 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 32 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 36 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 36 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 38 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 39 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 41 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 41 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 5 | 43 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 45 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 46 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 47 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 47 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 48 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 49 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 49 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 49 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 51 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 51 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 53 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 54 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 54 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted criminal filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| ME | 1st | 3 | 56 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 57 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 57 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 57 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 58 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 58 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 59 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 59 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 63 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 65 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 67 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 67 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.5 | 68 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 68 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 69 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 70 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 71 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 71 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 71 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 71 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 72 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 72 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 73 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 74 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 75 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 75 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 75 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted criminal filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 76 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 76 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 77 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 78 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 84 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 85 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 85 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 88 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 88 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 89 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 89 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 4 | 93 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 93 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 96 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 96 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 5 | 96 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 96 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 12 | 99 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 4 | 100 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 100 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 10 | 107 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 109 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 114 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 121 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 126 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 11 | 132 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 133 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted criminal filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| TX (S) | 5th | 18 | 136 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 137 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 139 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 7 | 141 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 151 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 154 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 16 | 164 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 166 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 191 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 195 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 223 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 227 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 8 | 346 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 107 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 187 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 97 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 32 |
| National average | - | - | 85 |
| National median | - | - | 73 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W.- Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.8: Unweighted Criminal Case Filings Per Active Judge by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted criminal case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AK | 9th | 3 | 32 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 36 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 37 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 8 | 38 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 20 | 40 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 41 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 45 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 46 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 47 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 47 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 20 | 47 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 48 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 49 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 49 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 51 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 10 | 51 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 53 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 4 | 54 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 54 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 56 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 57 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 57 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 57 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted criminal case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| MD | 4th | 10 | 58 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 6 | 60 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 4 | 61 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 65 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 67 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 7 | 67 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 24 | 68 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 68 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 10 | 71 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 71 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 71 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 73 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 74 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 75 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 75 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 76 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 6 | 76 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 76 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 2 | 77 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 23 | 82 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 10 | 84 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 84 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 85 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 85 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 88 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 12 | 89 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 89 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted criminal case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| UT | 10th | 4 | 90 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 11 | 90 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 92 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 93 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 2.5 | 95 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 96 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 96 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 3 | 96 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 100 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 103 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 5 | 105 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 109 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 114 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 3 | 117 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 3 | 119 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 10 | 119 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 9 | 119 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 4 | 120 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 3 | 124 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 126 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 3 | 128 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 133 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 3 | 133 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 3 | 134 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 137 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 139 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 10 | 145 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted criminal case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| SD | 8th | 3 | 151 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 16 | 153 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 2 | 156 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 166 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 15 | 175 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 182 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 191 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 195 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5 | 197 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 223 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 227 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 2 | 231 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 7 | 395 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 125 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 187 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 97 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 32 |
| National average | - | - | 95 |
| National median | - | - | 85 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table III.9: Unweighted Criminal Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 28 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 30 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 32 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 3 | 33 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 36 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 6 | 36 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 36 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 38 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 39 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 41 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 41 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6.4 | 42 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 46 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 47 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 47 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 48 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 49 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 49 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 51 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 51 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 54 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 54 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 4 | 56 |

ENCLOSURE III

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| ME | 1st | 3 | 56 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 57 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 57 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 57 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 58 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 58 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 59 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 59 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.3 | 61 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 63 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 6 | 63 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 65 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 67 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 67 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 68 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 69 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 70 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 71 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 71 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 71 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 71 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 72 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.3 | 72 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 72 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 73 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 74 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 5 | 74 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 75 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 76 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 76 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 5.5 | 76 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 77 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 78 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 78 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 5 | 80 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 6 | 80 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 84 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 85 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 85 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 88 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 88 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 89 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 89 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 18 | 91 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 13 | 91 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 96 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 96 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 96 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 15 | 97 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 11 | 97 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 103 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 104 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 9 | 110 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 111 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| NC (W) | 4th | 5 | 117 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 126 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 19 | 129 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 133 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 136 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 137 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 139 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 18 | 146 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 151 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 154 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 178 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 227 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 10 | 277 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 107 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 187 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 97 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 32 |
| National average | - | - | 80 |
| National median | - | - | 72 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

## UNWEIGHTED TOTAL, CIVIL, AND CRIMINAL CASE FILINGS BY STATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 PER AUTHORIZED JUDGESHIP, ACTIVE JUDGE, AND RECOMMENDED JUDGESHIP

The tables in this enclosure show, by state, average unweighted total, civil, and criminal case filings per judgeship and active judge. For each of these three categories of filings, there are three separate tables–unweighted case filings per authorized judgeship, active judge, and recommended judgeship. In each table, the average unweighted case filings per judgeship and active judge in each of the 50 states (and the District of Columbia) are arrayed from the lowest to highest. Thus, the order in which the states appear in each table may vary.

Data for the remaining four districts are shown at the end of each table. These districts are the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. However, to ensure comparability in calculating unweighted and weighted national average and median filings by district and by state, we excluded the data for these four courts from the calculations.

Table IV.1: Unweighted Total Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 166 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 201 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 216 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 224 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 273 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 279 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 282 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 284 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 285 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 288 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 289 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 290 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| SD | 8th | 3 | 341 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 341 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 356 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 370 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 372 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 374 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 374 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 392 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 410 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 411 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 417 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 417 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 438 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 445 |
| NY | 2nd | 52 | 458 |
| WA | 9th | 11 | 461 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 462 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 463 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 470 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 470 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 473 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 478 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 488 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 508 |
| IN | 7th | 10 | 516 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 516 |
| CA | 9th | 56 | 521 |

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AR | 8th | 8 | 523 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 530 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 537 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 541 |
| VA | 4th | 14 | 547 |
| TX | 5th | 47 | 558 |
| FL | 11th | 31 | 586 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 654 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 672 |
| AL | 11th | 13 | 683 |
| LA | 5th | 22 | 694 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 701 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 330 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 389 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 211 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 86 |
| National average | - | - | 474 |
| National median | - | - | 445 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.2: Unweighted Total Case Filings Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 166 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 216 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 224 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 268 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 273 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 279 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 284 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 285 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 288 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 289 |
| WV | 4th | 7 | 322 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 341 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 356 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 363 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 374 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 417 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 437 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 445 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 455 |
| OK | 10th | 10 | 458 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 462 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 463 |
| GA | 11th | 17 | 464 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| PA | 3rd | 31 | 465 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 470 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 470 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 478 |
| IL | 7th | 25 | 492 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 496 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 499 |
| WA | 9th | 10 | 507 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 508 |
| NY | 2nd | 46 | 518 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 530 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 537 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 541 |
| MO | 8th | 12 | 552 |
| MI | 6th | 16 | 559 |
| IN | 7th | 9 | 573 |
| WI | 7th | 5 | 585 |
| AR | 8th | 7 | 598 |
| TX | 5th | 43 | 610 |
| CA | 9th | 46 | 634 |
| VA | 4th | 12 | 638 |
| FL | 11th | 28 | 649 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 672 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 701 |
| OH | 6th | 17 | 769 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 774 |
| LA | 5th | 18 | 849 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 11th | 10 | 888 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 385 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 389 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 211 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 86 |
| National average | - | - | 533 |
| National median | - | - | 470 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.3: Unweighted Total Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 166 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 201 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 216 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 224 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 273 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 279 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 282 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 284 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 285 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 288 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 289 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 290 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 341 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 341 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 356 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 370 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 372 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 374 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 374 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 386 |
| NC | 4th | 13 | 391 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 392 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 410 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 411 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 417 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 417 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 418 |
| NY | 2nd | 57 | 418 |
| KY | 6th | 10 | 423 |
| WA | 9th | 12 | 423 |
| TN | 6th | 15 | 431 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 438 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 442 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 445 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 448 |
| IN | 7th | 11 | 469 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 470 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 473 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 477 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 478 |
| CA | 9th | 60 | 486 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 488 |
| FL | 11th | 37 | 491 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 508 |
| VA | 4th | 15 | 510 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 523 |
| TX | 5th | 49 | 535 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 561 |
| AL | 11th | 14 | 634 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 654 |

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| LA | 5th | 23 | 664 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 330 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 389 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 211 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 86 |
| National average | - | - | 449 |
| National median | - | - | 417 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.4: Unweighted Civil Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 119 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 158 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 173 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 184 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 188 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 211 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 217 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 217 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 223 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 225 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 232 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 237 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 240 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 271 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 285 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 297 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 324 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 328 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 329 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 334 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 357 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MN | 8th | 7 | 360 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 363 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 363 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 364 |
| NY | 2nd | 52 | 379 |
| WA | 9th | 11 | 381 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 390 |
| KY | 6th | 9.0 | 391 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 394 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 394 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 395 |
| CA | 9th | 56 | 402 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 403 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 404 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 413 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 416 |
| TX | 5th | 47 | 419 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 420 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 437 |
| FL | 11th | 31 | 443 |
| VA | 4th | 14 | 444 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 450 |
| IN | 7th | 10 | 471 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 479 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 506 |
| AL | 11th | 13 | 590 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 595 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| LA | 5th | 22 | 651 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 223 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 203 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 114 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 54 |
| National average | - | - | 389 |
| National median | - | - | 363 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.5: Unweighted Civil Case Filings Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 119 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 158 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 184 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 188 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 211 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 217 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 223 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 231 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 232 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 237 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 240 |
| WV | 4th | 7 | 257 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 271 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 285 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 324 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 360 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 361 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 379 |
| GA | 11th | 17 | 385 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 390 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 391 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| MS | 5th | 9 | 394 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 395 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 396 |
| OK | 10th | 10 | 399 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 404 |
| PA | 3rd | 31 | 412 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 416 |
| WA | 9th | 10 | 419 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 420 |
| NY | 2nd | 46 | 428 |
| IL | 7th | 25 | 436 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 437 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 445 |
| TX | 5th | 43 | 458 |
| MI | 6th | 16 | 468 |
| MO | 8th | 12 | 470 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 479 |
| FL | 11th | 28 | 490 |
| CA | 9th | 46 | 490 |
| WI | 7th | 5 | 495 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 506 |
| AR | 8th | 7 | 515 |
| VA | 4th | 12 | 518 |
| IN | 7th | 9 | 523 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 593 |
| OH | 6th | 17 | 700 |
| AL | 11th | 10 | 767 |

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| LA | 5th | 18 | 795 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 260 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 203 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 114 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 54 |
| National average | - | - | 438 |
| National median | - | - | 396 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.6: Unweighted Civil Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 119 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 158 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 173 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 184 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 188 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 211 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 217 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 217 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 223 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 225 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 232 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 237 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 240 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 250 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 271 |
| NC | 4th | 13 | 274 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 285 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 297 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 328 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 329 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 334 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 337 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| OR | 9th | 7 | 339 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 340 |
| NY | 2nd | 57 | 345 |
| WA | 9th | 12 | 349 |
| KY | 6th | 10 | 352 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 357 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 360 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 363 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 363 |
| TN | 6th | 15 | 364 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 364 |
| FL | 11th | 37 | 371 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 374 |
| CA | 9th | 60 | 376 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 383 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 394 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 394 |
| TX | 5th | 49 | 402 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 403 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 404 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 413 |
| VA | 4th | 15 | 415 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 420 |
| IN | 7th | 11 | 428 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 450 |
| AL | 11th | 14 | 548 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 595 |

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| LA | 5th | 23 | 622 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 223 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 203 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 114 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 54 |
| National average | - | - | 369 |
| National median | - | - | 345 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.7: Unweighted Criminal Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 28 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 32 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 36 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 38 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 41 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 42 |
| LA | 5th | 22 | 44 |
| IN | 7th | 10 | 45 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 46 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 47 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 49 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 50 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 53 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 54 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 56 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 56 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 57 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 58 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 59 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 63 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 69 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 71 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 71 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| ID | 9th | 2 | 71 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 72 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 72 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 73 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 74 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 75 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 75 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 76 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 77 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 79 |
| WA | 9th | 11 | 80 |
| NY | 2nd | 52 | 80 |
| AL | 11th | 13 | 93 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 100 |
| VA | 4th | 14 | 102 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 104 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 114 |
| CA | 9th | 56 | 119 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 121 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 126 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 137 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 139 |
| TX | 5th | 47 | 139 |
| FL | 11th | 31 | 144 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 151 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 166 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 191 |

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 223 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 107 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 187 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 97 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 32 |
| National average | - | - | 85 |
| National median | - | - | 72 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.8: Unweighted Criminal Case Filings Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted criminal case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AK | 9th | 3 | 32 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 36 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 37 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 41 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 47 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 49 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 50 |
| IN | 7th | 9 | 50 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 51 |
| LA | 5th | 18 | 53 |
| PA | 3rd | 31 | 53 |
| IL | 7th | 25 | 56 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 56 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 57 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 57 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 58 |
| OK | 10th | 10 | 59 |
| WV | 4th | 7 | 64 |
| OH | 6th | 17 | 69 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 71 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 71 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 73 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 74 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted criminal case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| KS | 10th | 5 | 76 |
| GA | 11th | 17 | 79 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 79 |
| MO | 8th | 12 | 83 |
| AR | 8th | 7 | 83 |
| WA | 9th | 10 | 88 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 90 |
| WI | 7th | 5 | 90 |
| NY | 2nd | 46 | 90 |
| MI | 6th | 16 | 91 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 92 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 100 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 103 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 104 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 114 |
| VA | 4th | 12 | 119 |
| AL | 11th | 10 | 121 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 126 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 137 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 139 |
| CA | 9th | 46 | 144 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 151 |
| TX | 5th | 43 | 152 |
| FL | 11th | 28 | 159 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 166 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 182 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 191 |

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Unweighted criminal case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 223 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 125 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 187 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 97 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 32 |
| National average | - | - | 95 |
| National median | - | - | 79 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table IV.9: Unweighted Criminal Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 28 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 32 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 36 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 38 |
| IN | 7th | 11 | 41 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 41 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 42 |
| LA | 5th | 23 | 42 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 46 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 47 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 49 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 50 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 53 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 54 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 56 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 56 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 57 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 58 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 59 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 63 |
| TN | 6th | 15 | 68 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 69 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 71 |

ENCLOSURE IV

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| ID | 9th | 2 | 71 |
| KY | 6th | 10 | 71 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 71 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 72 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 72 |
| NY | 2nd | 57 | 73 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 74 |
| WA | 9th | 12 | 74 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 75 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 75 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 76 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 77 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 78 |
| AL | 11th | 14 | 87 |
| VA | 4th | 15 | 95 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 103 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 104 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 104 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 111 |
| CA | 9th | 60 | 111 |
| NC | 4th | 13 | 117 |
| FL | 11th | 37 | 121 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 126 |
| TX | 5th | 49 | 133 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 136 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 137 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 151 |

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Unweighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 178 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 107 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | 187 |
| GU | 9th | 1 | 97 |
| MP | 9th | 1 | 32 |
| National average | - | - | 80 |
| National median | - | - | 71 |

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

## WEIGHTED TOTAL AND CIVIL CASE FILINGS AND CRIMINAL DEFENDANT FILINGS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 BY DISTRICT PER AUTHORIZED JUDGESHIP, ACTIVE JUDGE, AND RECOMMENDED JUDGESHIP

The tables in this enclosure show, by district, average weighted total case filings, civil case filings, and criminal defendant filings per judgeship and active judge. For each of these three categories of weighted filings, there are three separate tables–weighted filings per authorized judgeship, active judge, and recommended judgeship. In each table, the average weighted case filings or criminal defendant filings per judgeship in each district within the 50 states (and the District of Columbia) are arrayed from the lowest to highest. Thus, the order in which districts appear in each table may vary.

The average weighted case filings or criminal defendant filings per judgeship and active judge for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are shown at the end of the rankings. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts does not maintain data on weighted civil case filings or criminal defendant filings for the district courts in the three U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Thus, no weighted filings data are shown in the tables for these three district courts. To ensure comparability in calculating unweighted and weighted national average and median case filings by district and by state, we excluded the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands from these calculations.

As discussed in enclosure VII, case weights for criminal cases are assigned on a per defendant basis, rather than on a per case basis. Thus, the tables for weighted criminal filings actually reflect the average weights of the offenses for which defendants have been charged.

Some states have authorized judgeships that may be assigned to more than one district within the state. For example, while the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky each have four authorized judgeships, there is one additional judgeship for "Eastern and Western." We have divided these types of additional judgeships among the relevant states' respective districts in the tables in this enclosure.

Table V.1: Weighted Total Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 190 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 221 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 233 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 251 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 256 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 298 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 4 | 301 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 303 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 304 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 306 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 321 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 323 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 329 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 342 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 348 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 351 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 351 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 351 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 360 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 361 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 376 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.5 | 376 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 377 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 384 |

ENCLOSURE V

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 387 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 388 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 399 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 400 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 405 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 405 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 411 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 411 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 413 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 416 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 420 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 423 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 428 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 429 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 429 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 432 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 433 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 435 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 436 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 441 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 447 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 449 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 451 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 453 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 458 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 459 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 474 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 474 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 479 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 482 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 483 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 486 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 490 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 492 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 4 | 492 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 493 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 5 | 494 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 18 | 503 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 506 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 506 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 508 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 5 | 509 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 511 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 513 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 10 | 518 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 520 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 525 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 531 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 533 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 12 | 561 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 561 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 7 | 570 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 582 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 608 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 617 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 16 | 634 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 651 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 661 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 11 | 684 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 703 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 729 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 762 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 809 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 8 | 833 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,208 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 366 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 474 |
| National median | - | - | 444 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.2: Weighted Total Case Filings Per Active Judge by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 190 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 233 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 251 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 295 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 298 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 303 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 304 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 306 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 4 | 320 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 323 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 348 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 351 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 351 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 351 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 387 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 8 | 401 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 3 | 401 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 405 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 411 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 411 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 413 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 416 |

ENCLOSURE V

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 420 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 428 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 429 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 429 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 20 | 432 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 433 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 435 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 10 | 445 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 449 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 449 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 20 | 452 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 458 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 461 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 474 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 479 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 3 | 481 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 482 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 483 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 492 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 7 | 498 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 503 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 6 | 504 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 506 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 506 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 508 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 520 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 24 | 522 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 525 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 2.5 | 526 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 23 | 529 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 531 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 532 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 533 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 533 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 2 | 540 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 10 | 542 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 561 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 16 | 566 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 12 | 574 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 9 | 576 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 582 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 10 | 583 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 6 | 588 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 3 | 604 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 608 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 617 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 4 | 618 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 11 | 624 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 3 | 632 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 4 | 636 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 651 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 3 | 656 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 10 | 673 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 15 | 676 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| VA (W) | 4th | 3 | 681 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 703 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 729 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 10 | 752 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 762 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 770 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 2 | 776 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5 | 798 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 3 | 810 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 7 | 952 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 2 | 992 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 5 | 1,133 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,208 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 427 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 532 |
| National median | - | - | 505 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.3: Weighted Total Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 190 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 221 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 233 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 5 | 241 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 251 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 256 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 298 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 303 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 304 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 306 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 321 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 323 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 329 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 342 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 348 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 351 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 351 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 351 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 360 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 361 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 5 | 370 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 376 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| NE | 8th | 4 | 377 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 384 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6.4 | 387 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 387 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 388 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 5.5 | 392 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 5 | 394 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.3 | 399 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 399 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 400 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 405 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 411 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 411 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 6 | 412 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 416 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 420 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 6 | 423 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 423 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 6 | 424 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 428 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 429 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 429 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 432 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 433 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 435 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 436 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 440 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 441 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 9 | 443 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 447 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 449 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 451 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 453 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 453 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 458 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 459 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 465 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.3 | 467 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 18 | 468 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 468 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 11 | 471 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 474 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 474 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 19 | 477 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 482 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 483 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 486 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 490 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 492 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 493 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 15 | 502 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 506 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 506 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 508 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 511 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 13 | 518 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 525 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 531 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 533 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 4 | 547 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 562 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 18 | 564 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 608 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 661 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 10 | 666 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 809 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 3 | 2,139 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 366 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 448 |
| National median | - | - | 431 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.4: Weighted Civil Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 115 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 123 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 4 | 154 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 164 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 167 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 179 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 184 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 189 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 190 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 194 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 204 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 206 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 213 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 222 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 232 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 238 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 243 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 245 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 245 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 247 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 251 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 262 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.5 | 265 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 272 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 277 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 277 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 279 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 281 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 283 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 286 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 288 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 294 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 294 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 299 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 307 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 309 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 312 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 18 | 312 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 316 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 320 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 325 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 326 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 326 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 329 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 5 | 332 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 334 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 4 | 334 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 335 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 336 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 338 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 339 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 342 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 344 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 345 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 10 | 346 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 347 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 348 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 351 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 352 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 353 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 16 | 356 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 361 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 362 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 7 | 363 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 364 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 367 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 369 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 371 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 376 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 376 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 377 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 378 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 380 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 387 |

ENCLOSURE V

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MD | 4th | 10 | 391 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 391 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 406 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 12 | 408 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 8 | 411 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 411 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 415 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 5 | 442 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 11 | 466 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 496 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 600 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 687 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,138 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 178 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 340 |
| National median | - | - | 328 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.5: Weighted Civil Case Filings Per Active Judge by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 115 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 123 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 164 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 179 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 189 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 190 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 194 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 204 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 3 | 205 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 206 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 213 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 223 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 4 | 230 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 232 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 238 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 247 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 251 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 262 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 278 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 279 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 281 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 286 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 294 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 299 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 307 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 316 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 324 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 325 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 326 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 326 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 3 | 327 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 329 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 332 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 334 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 338 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 339 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 8 | 346 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 16 | 351 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 10 | 354 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 20 | 355 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 357 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 362 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 364 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 369 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 371 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 2.5 | 371 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 376 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 377 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 378 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 15 | 380 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 9 | 384 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 387 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 20 | 387 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 7 | 391 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 391 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 392 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 6 | 401 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 406 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 23 | 409 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 24 | 410 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 411 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 10 | 414 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 4 | 415 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 415 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 3 | 416 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 2 | 425 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 3 | 427 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 12 | 431 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 3 | 445 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 447 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 6 | 463 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 10 | 469 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 7 | 470 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 3 | 481 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| CA (N) | 9th | 11 | 484 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 10 | 490 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 2 | 490 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 496 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5 | 508 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 10 | 513 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 530 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 2 | 551 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 4 | 553 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 3 | 576 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 600 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 5 | 962 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 3,138 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 208 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 382 |
| National median | - | - | 363 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.6: Weighted Civil Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 115 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 5 | 123 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 123 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 164 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 167 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 5 | 179 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 179 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 184 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 189 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 190 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 194 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 204 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 206 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 213 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 222 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 232 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 238 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 243 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 245 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 245 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 247 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 250 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 251 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 262 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 5 | 267 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 5.5 | 269 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 272 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 6 | 277 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 277 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 277 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 279 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 281 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.3 | 281 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 9 | 282 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 283 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 286 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 288 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 293 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 294 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 294 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 295 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 19 | 296 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 303 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 307 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 309 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 312 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 6 | 313 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 18 | 314 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 11 | 315 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 316 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 18 | 316 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6.4 | 317 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 320 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 320 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 325 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 10 | 329 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 331 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 334 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 335 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 336 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 339 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 342 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 15 | 342 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 344 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 345 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 347 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 348 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 351 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 352 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 361 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 362 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 364 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 367 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 6 | 368 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 371 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 376 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.3 | 376 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 13 | 377 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 378 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 380 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 387 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 391 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 391 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 406 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 415 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 4 | 450 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 687 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 3 | 2,092 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 178 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 322 |
| National median | - | - | 308 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.7: Weighted Criminal Defendant Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 44 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 53 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 54 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 59 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 59 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 60 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 64 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 67 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 5 | 67 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 70 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 70 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 71 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 72 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 75 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 75 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 76 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 77 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 77 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 77 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 80 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 87 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 87 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 88 |

ENCLOSURE V

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 90 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 91 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 93 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 94 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 95 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 95 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 96 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 99 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 100 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 103 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 105 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 107 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 107 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 110 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 110 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.5 | 111 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 115 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 116 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 116 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 116 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 117 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 117 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 119 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 122 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 127 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 128 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 131 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 131 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 134 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 134 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 135 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 137 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 138 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 139 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 140 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 144 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 145 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 4 | 148 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 150 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 150 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 12 | 153 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 155 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 157 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 4 | 158 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 160 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 5 | 162 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 162 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 172 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 10 | 172 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 184 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 185 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 18 | 190 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 194 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 197 |

| District | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| CA (E) | 9th | 7 | 206 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 11 | 219 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 227 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 231 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 265 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 266 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 16 | 277 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 294 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 301 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 318 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 329 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 334 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 8 | 422 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 188 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 134 |
| National median | - | - | 118 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.8: Weighted Criminal Defendant Filings Per Active Judge by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted criminal defendant filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AK | 9th | 3 | 54 |
| PA (W) | 3rd | 8 | 55 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 59 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 60 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 20 | 65 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 2 | 70 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 71 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 71 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6 | 75 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 75 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 76 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 77 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 77 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 20 | 77 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.5 | 80 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 4 | 84 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 85 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 87 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 4 | 90 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 90 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 10 | 91 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 91 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 92 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted criminal defendant filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| MN | 8th | 7 | 94 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 99 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 100 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 6 | 103 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 7 | 109 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 110 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 24 | 112 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 10 | 114 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 2 | 116 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 116 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 117 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 119 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 23 | 121 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 6 | 124 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 127 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 3 | 128 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 128 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 10 | 129 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 131 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 5 | 131 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 134 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 135 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 137 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 138 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 139 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 140 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 11 | 140 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted criminal defendant filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| HI | 9th | 3 | 140 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 12 | 144 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 145 |
| KY (E) | 6th | 4.5 | 150 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 3 | 155 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 155 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 2.5 | 155 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 157 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 5 | 171 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 172 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 3 | 179 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 179 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 10 | 184 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 15 | 184 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 185 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 9 | 191 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 194 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 197 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 3 | 197 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 3 | 200 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 4 | 203 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 3 | 211 |
| TX (S) | 5th | 16 | 214 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 3 | 216 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 227 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 231 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 3 | 232 |

| District | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted criminal defendant filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| OR | 9th | 4 | 240 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 10 | 241 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 265 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 266 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 2 | 288 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 5 | 288 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 15 | 295 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 301 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 3 | 318 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 329 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 334 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 2 | 441 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 7 | 482 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 219 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 150 |
| National median | - | - | 136 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table V.9: Weighted Criminal Defendant Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by District (Lowest to Highest)

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| PA (W) | 3rd | 10 | 44 |
| LA (M) | 5th | 3 | 47 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 53 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 54 |
| IN (S) | 7th | 6 | 56 |
| IL (N) | 7th | 22 | 59 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 59 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 60 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 64 |
| PA (E) | 3rd | 23 | 67 |
| LA (E) | 5th | 13 | 70 |
| OK (W) | 10th | 6.4 | 70 |
| MS (S) | 5th | 6 | 71 |
| WV (S) | 4th | 5 | 72 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 75 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 76 |
| IN (N) | 7th | 5 | 77 |
| WI (W) | 7th | 2 | 77 |
| AR (W) | 8th | 3 | 77 |
| TN (M) | 6th | 4 | 87 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 87 |
| LA (W) | 5th | 7 | 88 |
| MS (N) | 5th | 3 | 90 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MD | 4th | 10 | 91 |
| OK (E) | 10th | 1.3 | 92 |
| MO (E) | 8th | 8 | 93 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 94 |
| OH (S) | 6th | 8 | 95 |
| OH (N) | 6th | 12 | 95 |
| AL (M) | 11th | 4 | 96 |
| NY (S) | 2nd | 28 | 96 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 99 |
| KY (W) | 6th | 4.5 | 100 |
| CA (C) | 9th | 27 | 103 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 105 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 107 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 107 |
| TN (E) | 6th | 6 | 109 |
| CA (N) | 9th | 14 | 110 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 110 |
| MI (E) | 6th | 15 | 115 |
| IL (C) | 7th | 4 | 116 |
| WA (W) | 9th | 7 | 116 |
| PA (M) | 3rd | 6 | 116 |
| WV (N) | 4th | 3 | 117 |
| GA (N) | 11th | 11 | 117 |
| WA (E) | 9th | 5 | 118 |
| OK (N) | 10th | 3.3 | 118 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 119 |
| AL (N) | 11th | 7 | 122 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| KY (E) | 6th | 5.5 | 123 |
| NY (W) | 2nd | 5 | 126 |
| GA (S) | 11th | 3 | 127 |
| IA (S) | 8th | 3 | 131 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 134 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 134 |
| WI (E) | 7th | 4 | 134 |
| TN (W) | 6th | 5 | 135 |
| NY (N) | 2nd | 6 | 135 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 137 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 137 |
| AR (E) | 8th | 5 | 138 |
| GA (M) | 11th | 4 | 139 |
| MI (W) | 6th | 4 | 140 |
| TX (N) | 5th | 13 | 141 |
| IL (S) | 7th | 4 | 144 |
| MO (W) | 8th | 6 | 145 |
| VA (W) | 4th | 4 | 150 |
| NY (E) | 2nd | 18 | 153 |
| TX (E) | 5th | 7 | 155 |
| VA (E) | 4th | 11 | 156 |
| NC (M) | 4th | 4 | 157 |
| CA (E) | 9th | 9 | 160 |
| FL (M) | 11th | 15 | 161 |
| FL (N) | 11th | 4 | 162 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 175 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 177 |

| District | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| TX (S) | 5th | 19 | 180 |
| IA (N) | 8th | 2 | 185 |
| NC (W) | 4th | 5 | 191 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 197 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 215 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 227 |
| NC (E) | 4th | 4 | 231 |
| FL (S) | 11th | 18 | 246 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 265 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 267 |
| AL (S) | 11th | 3 | 294 |
| TX (W) | 5th | 10 | 329 |
| CA (S) | 9th | 10 | 338 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 188 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 127 |
| National median | - | - | 117 |

Legend

C - Central District
E - Eastern District
M - Middle District
N - Northern District
n/a - Not available
S - Southern District
W - Western District

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

## WEIGHTED TOTAL AND CIVIL CASE FILINGS AND CRIMINAL DEFENDANT FILINGS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 BY STATE PER AUTHORIZED JUDGESHIP, ACTIVE JUDGE, AND RECOMMENDED JUDGESHIP

The tables in this enclosure show, by state, average weighted total case filings, civil case filings, and criminal defendant filings per judgeship and active judge. For each of these three categories of weighted filings, there are three separate tables–weighted filings per authorized judgeship, active judge, and recommended judgeship. In each table, the average weighted case filings or criminal defendant filings per judgeship and active judge in each state (and the District of Columbia) are arrayed from the lowest to highest. Thus, the order in which states appear in each table may vary.

The average weighted case filings or criminal defendant filings per judgeship and active judge for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are shown at the end of the rankings. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts does not maintain data on weighted civil case filings or criminal defendant filings for the district courts in the three U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Thus, no weighted filings data are shown in the tables for these three district courts. To ensure comparability in calculating unweighted and weighted national average and median filings by district and by state, we excluded the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands from these calculations.

As discussed in enclosure VII, case weights for criminal cases are assigned on a per defendant basis, rather than on a per case basis. Thus, the tables for weighted criminal filings actually reflect the average weights of the offenses for which defendants have been charged.

Table VI.1: Weighted Total Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 190 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 221 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 233 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 251 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 275 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 298 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 303 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 304 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 323 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 329 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 351 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 351 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 366 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 377 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 384 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 399 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 400 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 400 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 401 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 401 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 415 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 423 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 429 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 433 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WA | 9th | 11 | 447 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 452 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 452 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 458 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 462 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 463 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 463 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 466 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 467 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 469 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 474 |
| IN | 7th | 10 | 479 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 482 |
| NY | 2nd | 52 | 488 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 513 |
| VA | 4th | 14 | 516 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 520 |
| CA | 9th | 56 | 530 |
| TX | 5th | 47 | 545 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 582 |
| FL | 11th | 31 | 631 |
| LA | 5th | 22 | 631 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 651 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 703 |
| AL | 11th | 13 | 756 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 762 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 366 |

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted total case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 474 |
| National median | - | - | 447 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.2: Weighted Total Case Filings Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 190 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 233 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 251 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 295 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 298 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 303 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 304 |
| WV | 4th | 7 | 314 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 323 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 351 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 351 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 401 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 411 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 415 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 429 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 433 |
| OK | 10th | 10 | 440 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 449 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 452 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 452 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 458 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 461 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| PA | 3rd | 31 | 461 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 474 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 482 |
| IL | 7th | 25 | 482 |
| WA | 9th | 10 | 492 |
| GA | 11th | 17 | 495 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 503 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 520 |
| AR | 8th | 7 | 529 |
| IN | 7th | 9 | 532 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 532 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 533 |
| MO | 8th | 12 | 547 |
| OH | 6th | 17 | 548 |
| MI | 6th | 16 | 549 |
| NY | 2nd | 46 | 552 |
| WI | 7th | 5 | 556 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 582 |
| TX | 5th | 43 | 595 |
| VA | 4th | 12 | 602 |
| CA | 9th | 46 | 645 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 651 |
| FL | 11th | 28 | 699 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 703 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 762 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 770 |
| LA | 5th | 18 | 771 |

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted total case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 11th | 10 | 983 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 427 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 532 |
| National median | - | - | 482 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.3: Weighted Total Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 190 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 221 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 233 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 251 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 275 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 298 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 303 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 304 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 321 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 323 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 329 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 351 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 351 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 366 |
| KY | 6th | 10 | 374 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 377 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 384 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 399 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 400 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 400 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 401 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 401 |
| NC | 4th | 13 | 401 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WA | 9th | 12 | 410 |
| TN | 6th | 15 | 422 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 423 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 429 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 433 |
| IN | 7th | 11 | 435 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 440 |
| NY | 2nd | 57 | 445 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 452 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 453 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 458 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 462 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 463 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 463 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 465 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 466 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 467 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 468 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 469 |
| VA | 4th | 15 | 482 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 482 |
| CA | 9th | 60 | 495 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 508 |
| TX | 5th | 49 | 522 |
| FL | 11th | 37 | 529 |
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 562 |
| LA | 5th | 23 | 604 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted total case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 11th | 14 | 702 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 366 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 448 |
| National median | - | - | 423 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.4: Weighted Civil Case Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 115 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 123 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 164 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 167 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 179 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 186 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 194 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 204 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 206 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 213 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 222 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 232 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 238 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 243 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 246 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 247 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 277 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 290 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 294 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 298 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 300 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 313 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WA | 9th | 11 | 320 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 323 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 324 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 326 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 332 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 335 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 336 |
| TX | 5th | 47 | 339 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 343 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 343 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 348 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 349 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| VA | 4th | 14 | 350 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 353 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 353 |
| NY | 2nd | 52 | 355 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 364 |
| CA | 9th | 56 | 367 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 369 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 371 |
| FL | 11th | 31 | 389 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 391 |
| IN | 7th | 10 | 407 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 411 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 496 |
| LA | 5th | 22 | 555 |

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 11th | 13 | 593 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 178 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 340 |
| National median | - | - | 324 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.5: Weighted Civil Case Filings Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 115 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 123 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 164 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 179 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 194 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 204 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 206 |
| WV | 4th | 7 | 212 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 213 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 223 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 232 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 238 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 246 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 247 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 278 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 290 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 300 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 324 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 324 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 326 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 332 |
| KS | 10th | 5 | 332 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| OK | 10th | 10 | 344 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 350 |
| WA | 9th | 10 | 352 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 357 |
| GA | 11th | 17 | 364 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 364 |
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 369 |
| TX | 5th | 43 | 371 |
| PA | 3rd | 31 | 374 |
| IL | 7th | 25 | 388 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 391 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 392 |
| AR | 8th | 7 | 398 |
| NY | 2nd | 46 | 402 |
| MI | 6th | 16 | 407 |
| VA | 4th | 12 | 409 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 411 |
| MO | 8th | 12 | 412 |
| WI | 7th | 5 | 418 |
| FL | 11th | 28 | 431 |
| OH | 6th | 17 | 437 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 447 |
| CA | 9th | 46 | 447 |
| IN | 7th | 9 | 452 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 496 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 530 |
| LA | 5th | 18 | 679 |

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted civil case filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 11th | 10 | 771 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 208 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 382 |
| National median | - | - | 352 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.6: Weighted Civil Case Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| WY | 10th | 3 | 115 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 123 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 164 |
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 167 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 179 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 186 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 190 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 194 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 204 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 206 |
| NC | 4th | 13 | 208 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 213 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 222 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 232 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 238 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 243 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 247 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 250 |
| KY | 6th | 10 | 261 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 277 |
| WA | 9th | 12 | 293 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 293 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 294 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 295 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 298 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 300 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 303 |
| TN | 6th | 15 | 310 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 311 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 321 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 323 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 324 |
| NY | 2nd | 57 | 324 |
| TX | 5th | 49 | 325 |
| FL | 11th | 37 | 326 |
| VA | 4th | 15 | 327 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 331 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 335 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 336 |
| CA | 9th | 60 | 342 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 343 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 343 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 348 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 349 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 353 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 364 |
| IN | 7th | 11 | 370 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 371 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 391 |
| LA | 5th | 23 | 531 |

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted civil case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL | 11th | 14 | 551 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 178 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 322 |
| National median | - | - | 300 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.7: Weighted Criminal Defendant Filings Per Authorized Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 53 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 54 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 59 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 60 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 64 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 69 |
| IN | 7th | 10 | 72 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 75 |
| LA | 5th | 22 | 76 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 76 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 77 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 78 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 87 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 87 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 89 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 91 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 94 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 95 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 99 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 105 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 107 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 107 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 110 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| MO | 8th | 14 | 115 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 115 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 115 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 119 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 120 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 120 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 124 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 125 |
| WA | 9th | 11 | 128 |
| NY | 2nd | 52 | 133 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 134 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 137 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 153 |
| OR | 9th | 6 | 160 |
| AL | 11th | 13 | 163 |
| CA | 9th | 56 | 163 |
| VA | 4th | 14 | 166 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 172 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 194 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 197 |
| TX | 5th | 47 | 205 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 227 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 228 |
| FL | 11th | 31 | 242 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 265 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 266 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 301 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of authorized judgeships | Weighted criminal defendant filings per authorized judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 334 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 188 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 134 |
| National median | - | - | 115 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.8: Weighted Criminal Defendant Filings Per Active Judge by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted criminal defendant filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AK | 9th | 3 | 54 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 59 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 60 |
| DE | 3rd | 3 | 71 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 75 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 76 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 77 |
| IN | 7th | 9 | 80 |
| CT | 2nd | 6 | 85 |
| PA | 3rd | 31 | 86 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 91 |
| NJ | 3rd | 16 | 92 |
| LA | 5th | 18 | 93 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 94 |
| IL | 7th | 25 | 94 |
| OK | 10th | 10 | 96 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 99 |
| WV | 4th | 7 | 102 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 110 |
| OH | 6th | 17 | 112 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 119 |
| TN | 6th | 14 | 120 |
| KY | 6th | 9 | 125 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted criminal defendant filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| KS | 10th | 5 | 128 |
| GA | 11th | 17 | 131 |
| AR | 8th | 7 | 132 |
| UT | 10th | 4 | 134 |
| MO | 8th | 12 | 135 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 137 |
| WI | 7th | 5 | 138 |
| HI | 9th | 3 | 140 |
| WA | 9th | 10 | 140 |
| MI | 6th | 16 | 143 |
| NY | 2nd | 46 | 150 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 153 |
| CO | 10th | 7 | 172 |
| NE | 8th | 3 | 179 |
| VA | 4th | 12 | 193 |
| SC | 4th | 9 | 194 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 197 |
| CA | 9th | 46 | 199 |
| AL | 11th | 10 | 212 |
| TX | 5th | 43 | 224 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 227 |
| NC | 4th | 11 | 228 |
| OR | 9th | 4 | 240 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 265 |
| NV | 9th | 4 | 266 |
| FL | 11th | 28 | 267 |
| NM | 10th | 5 | 301 |

| State | Circuit | Number of active judges | Weighted criminal defendant filings per active judge |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 8 | 334 |
| PR | 1st | 6 | 219 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 150 |
| National median | - | - | 132 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district judge, judgeship, and workload data.

Table VI.9: Weighted Criminal Defendant Filings Per Recommended Judgeship by State (Lowest to Highest)

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| DE | 3rd | 4 | 53 |
| AK | 9th | 3 | 54 |
| RI | 1st | 3 | 59 |
| DC | DC | 15 | 60 |
| CT | 2nd | 8 | 64 |
| IN | 7th | 11 | 65 |
| PA | 3rd | 39 | 69 |
| LA | 5th | 23 | 72 |
| WY | 10th | 3 | 75 |
| MA | 1st | 13 | 76 |
| MS | 5th | 9 | 77 |
| IL | 7th | 30 | 78 |
| OK | 10th | 11 | 87 |
| NJ | 3rd | 17 | 87 |
| WV | 4th | 8 | 89 |
| MD | 4th | 10 | 91 |
| MN | 8th | 7 | 94 |
| OH | 6th | 20 | 95 |
| ME | 1st | 3 | 99 |
| HI | 9th | 4 | 105 |
| KS | 10th | 6 | 107 |
| UT | 10th | 5 | 107 |
| VT | 2nd | 2 | 110 |

ENCLOSURE VI

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| TN | 6th | 15 | 112 |
| KY | 6th | 10 | 113 |
| MO | 8th | 14 | 115 |
| AR | 8th | 8 | 115 |
| WI | 7th | 6 | 115 |
| WA | 9th | 12 | 117 |
| ID | 9th | 2 | 119 |
| MI | 6th | 19 | 120 |
| NY | 2nd | 57 | 121 |
| GA | 11th | 18 | 124 |
| CO | 10th | 9 | 134 |
| NE | 8th | 4 | 134 |
| NH | 1st | 3 | 137 |
| OR | 9th | 7 | 137 |
| AL | 11th | 14 | 151 |
| CA | 9th | 60 | 152 |
| IA | 8th | 5 | 153 |
| VA | 4th | 15 | 155 |
| SC | 4th | 10 | 175 |
| NV | 9th | 6 | 177 |
| NC | 4th | 13 | 193 |
| TX | 5th | 49 | 197 |
| ND | 8th | 2 | 197 |
| FL | 11th | 37 | 202 |
| NM | 10th | 7 | 215 |
| MT | 9th | 3 | 227 |
| SD | 8th | 3 | 265 |

| State | Circuit | Number of recommended judgeships | Weighted criminal case filings per recommended judgeship |
|---|---|---|---|
| AZ | 9th | 10 | 267 |
| PR | 1st | 7 | 188 |
| VI | 3rd | 2 | n/a |
| GU | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| MP | 9th | 1 | n/a |
| National average | - | - | 127 |
| National median | - | - | 115 |

Legend

n/a - Not available

Source: GAO analysis of AOUSC district, judgeship, and workload data.

## WEIGHTED CASE FILINGS AND THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE'S POLICY FOR USING THEM TO ASSESS FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGESHIP NEEDS

The Judicial Conference has established general workload standards and policies for use in assessing the need for additional judgeships in individual federal district courts. The Judicial Conference uses weighted case filings as its measure of judicial workload in district courts.

### WHAT ARE WEIGHTED CASE FILINGS?

AOUSC reports district court case filings in two basic ways–unweighted and weighted. Unweighted case filings are the actual number of cases filed during a specific period (fiscal year or calendar year). Weighted case filings reflect a mathematical adjustment of unweighted case filings that is based on the nature of the cases filed and the average expected amount of time judges would require to dispose of the cases. Thus, the weighted case filings used by the Judicial Conference are a measure of the average expected amount of judicial time an individual case, or any specific group of cases, may require for disposition.

Case weights are based on the results of a Federal Judicial Center time study in which district court judges recorded the time that they spent on a sample of about 5,000 criminal defendant cases and 9,000 civil cases filed in district courts between November 1987 and January 1991. Using the results of this study, each case filed is assigned to a specific case category, and each category has a case weight. The weights range from 0.031 (e.g., a student loan default case) to 5.99 (e.g., a death penalty habeas corpus case), with the average case (as determined in the study) assigned a weight of about 1.0. Cases more complex than the average would be assigned a higher weight (e.g., a marine personal injury case is counted as 1.48 weighted cases), and cases less complex than the average would be assigned a lower weight (e.g., each drug-related property forfeiture case is counted as 0.27 weighted cases).

Each case filed in a district court is assigned to a specific case category (e.g., marine personal injury), and each of these case categories has a specific case weight (e.g., 1.48 for marine personal injury).[1] However, weights for criminal filings are assigned per defendant, rather than per case. Therefore, a case with three defendants who are all charged with the same offense (e.g., cocaine distribution) would be weighted at 3

[1]Case weights are not assigned to cases filed in the three territorial courts–the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

times the weight associated with that offense (e.g., 3 times 2.27, or 6.81). Criminal cases are weighted per defendant because each defendant's case must be decided individually. For example, in a cocaine distribution case with three defendants, one defendant may plead guilty and testify against the other two defendants at their trials.

For each district, the average weighted filings per authorized judgeship is calculated by adding the case weights for all cases filed in the district each year and dividing the total by the number of authorized judgeships for the district. The case weights for each court are reported annually, along with a 95-percent confidence interval to indicate the statistical reliability of the estimates. For example, in fiscal year 1996, the average weighted case filings per authorized judgeship for the Western District of Wisconsin was 483, with a confidence interval of 441 to 526. In other words, on the basis of the case weight study's results, there was a 95-percent probability that this district's actual weighted case filings per authorized judgeship were between 441 and 526. It is important to remember that the case weights represent national averages. Specific cases within a case weight category may require more or less judicial time than the case weight average for that case category.

## HOW THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE USES CASE WEIGHTS TO ASSESS FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGESHIP NEEDS

The Judicial Conference, though its Committee on Judicial Resources, biennially conducts a survey of federal district court judgeship needs. In response to the survey, each court requesting one or more additional judgeships is to submit a detailed justification to the Committee on Judicial Resources' Subcommittee on Statistics. The Subcommittee is to review and evaluate the requests and prepare a preliminary recommendation, which is to be given to the courts and appropriate circuit judicial councils for their recommendation. The Subcommittee is to use the most recent caseload data to evaluate responses from either the circuit judicial council or the court and to prepare recommendations for the Committee on Judicial Resources. The Judicial Conference must review and approve the Committee's recommendations before the final recommendations are transmitted to Congress.

For each district requesting additional judgeships,[2] the Judicial Conference may recommend the following:

- adding one or more permanent judgeships,

[2]The Judicial Conference generally limits its review to districts that have requested one or more additional judgeships.

- adding a temporary judgeship,
- adding a combination of permanent and temporary judgeships,
- converting an existing temporary judgeship to a permanent judgeship,
- extending the term of an existing temporary judgeship, or
- adding no new judgeship positions.

The Judicial Conference's written workload standards and policies for evaluating each district's judgeship needs rely largely on an analysis of weighted filings per authorized judgeship. However, the Judicial Conference's written policies combine both a consideration of weighted case filings and judgmental considerations, such as the district's management practices and use of senior judges.[3]

Under the Judicial Conference's written policies, a general standard of 430 or more weighted case filings per authorized judgeship is considered an indication of the need for 1 or more additional judgeships. In assessing the need for additional district court judgeships, it is the Judicial Conference's policy to review trends in district workload to determine if a district has a sustained workload of 430 or more weighted case filings per judgeship.

If an additional judgeship would leave current weighted case filings above or near 430 per authorized judgeship, and there are no other factors suggesting that a temporary judgeship or no judgeship is the appropriate recommendation, the Judicial Conference may recommend an additional permanent judgeship. If the Judicial Conference determines that the district's current weighted case filings per judgeship is the result of unique or temporary factors, it may recommend a temporary judgeship or no additional judgeships.

If weighted case filings per authorized judgeship were to drop between 350 and 430 after adding the requested judgeship, the Judicial Conference may consider a temporary judgeship or determine that no additional judgeships–temporary or permanent–are needed. If a district meets the 430 standard, but adding a judgeship

---

[3]Senior judges are judges who have retired from active, full-time status and who may, at their option, continue to handle a reduced caseload. According to AOUSC, during fiscal years 1992-96, senior district court judges (1) closed 15 percent of the civil cases and criminal defendants terminated in district courts and (2) conducted between 16 and 19 percent of all trials.

would result in reducing the per judgeship weighted case filings to "well below"[4] 430, the Judicial Conference is to review factors such as the availability and use of senior judges in the district. Generally, in such districts, the Judicial Conference's policy is to recommend an additional position only if the district has no senior judges and has no short-term prospects for senior judges. If the district has active senior judges[5] or active judges who will soon be eligible for senior status, the Judicial Conference's policy is to recommend no additional judgeships.

According to the Judicial Conference's policy, a district may qualify for a temporary judgeship if the district's weighted case filings would be between 350 and 430 after the additional position was added to the district's current authorized total. In small courts (generally those with four or fewer judges), the addition of a judgeship has a greater effect on the district's per judgeship weighted case filings than in larger courts.[6] For small courts, the addition of a judgeship may drop the weighted case filings per judgeship to near or below 300. In such cases, the Judicial Conference's policy is to recommend an additional judgeship only if the current weighted case filings per judgeship are in excess of 500.

---

[4]The term "well below" is not defined in the Judicial Conference's written policies.

[5]"Active" senior judges are those who had at least a partial caseload. Senior judges are not required to take any case assignments.

[6]For example, a court with 3 judgeships may have weighted case filings of 1,440, or 480 per authorized judgeship. With the addition of 1 judgeship, the weighted case filings per judgeship would drop to 360. A district with 6 judgeships and weighted case filings of 2,880 would also have weighted filings of 480 per judgeship. However, adding a single judgeship in this district would drop the filings to 411 per judgeship.

## SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

To determine the number of authorized judgeships, active judges, and recommended judgeships, we used four sources of data. We used the U.S. Code and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Court's (AOUSC) 1996 report, entitled Judicial Business of the United States Court, to obtain the number of authorized judgeships as of September 30, 1996. AOUSC identified two temporary judgeships that had expired between January 1 and August 1, 1996. To determine the number of active judges, we obtained the number of vacant judgeships in each district court (as of Aug. 1, 1997) from the U.S. Federal Judiciary's Internet site, where AOUSC posts an official monthly list of judicial vacancies by district. For those districts with vacancies, we subtracted the number of vacant judgeships from the number of authorized judgeships to determine the number of active judges. To determine the number of district court judgeships that the Judicial Conference of the United States had requested in 1997, we used the Judicial Conference's March 21, 1997, transmittal to Congress, which identified the number of additional judgeships, if any, requested for each district. To determine the total number of recommended judgeships, we added the requested number of new judgeships (permanent and temporary), if any, in each district to the total number of district court judgeships (permanent and temporary) authorized as of September 30, 1997.

To determine the population per judgeship by district and state, we obtained population data by judicial district from AOUSC for 1990. AOUSC did not have district populations for 1996, and, as agreed with your office, we limited our district population analysis to 1990. To determine 1990 state populations, we used AOUSC 1990 district population for those states with only one district court. For those states with multiple districts, we determined the 1990 state population by summing the AOUSC district populations of all the districts within the state. We compared these state totals to the 1990 state populations reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census and found them to be almost identical. We obtained 1996 state population data from the Census Bureau.

We obtained data on the unweighted and weighted case filings–total, civil, and criminal–per authorized judgeship for each district in fiscal year 1996 from AOUSC's report entitled Judicial Business of the U.S. Courts. To determine total unweighted and weighted case filings in each district, we multiplied these filings per judgeship by the number of authorized judgeships in each district. Using these totals, we computed the unweighted and weighted case filings per active judge and recommended judgeship in each district by dividing total, civil, or criminal filings for each district by the number of active judges and recommended judgeships, respectively, for each district. Case filings per judgeship in each state were based on the total judgeships and case filings of all the districts in the state.

ENCLOSURE VIII

Because we were asked to analyze federal district judgeships in the United States, our calculation of national average and median unweighted and weighted district case filings per judgeship excluded the district courts in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the three U.S. territories of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Our analysis of state population per judgeship and unweighted and weighted case filings per judgeship included the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

We did not independently verify the accuracy of the data used in our analyses. We did note, that for some districts, the total case filings–unweighted and weighted–shown in the 1996 Judicial Business of the United States Courts did not equal the sum of the civil and criminal case filings shown for these districts. When asked about these discrepancies, AOUSC officials told us the discrepancies were due to rounding in their reported case filings per authorized judgeship.

(188631)

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are $2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:

U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 37050
Washington, DC 20013

or visit:

Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000
or by using fax number (202) 512-6061, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

info@www.gao.gov

or visit GAO's World Wide Web Home Page at:

http://www.gao.gov

United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

Address Correction Requested

Bulk Rate
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100