

The image shows the exterior of the Rhode Island Judiciary building at dusk. The building features a prominent dark, gabled roof with a central peak. Below the roof, there are several windows, some of which are illuminated from within. The main entrance is a large, glass-enclosed area supported by four thick, dark brick columns. The interior of the entrance is brightly lit, showing a modern interior with glass walls and doors. In front of the entrance, there is a paved area with several concrete pillars and a black metal bench. The sky is a deep blue, indicating twilight.

*Rhode Island*  
JUDICIARY

2006

*Annual Report*



Letter of  
**T R A N S M I T T A L**

To the Honorable Members of the General Assembly:

It is with pride and satisfaction that I present to you the 2006 Annual Report of the Rhode Island Judiciary, pursuant to G.L. 1956 (1997 Reenactment) § 8-15-7. The year 2006 was both busy and exciting.

The Rhode Island Judiciary has built two new courthouses - the Kent County Courthouse and the Rhode Island Traffic Tribunal - and opened both of them within a five-and-one-half month time frame. These new court facilities are concrete examples of what can happen when our three branches of government work together for the benefit of all.

The year 2006 brought the final decommissioning of the Wang computer system with the conversion of the remaining three departments in the Judiciary. In its second full year of operation in 2006, our court interpreter program doubled its caseload, assisting 6,150 people in our courts. We have been able to expand this service beyond Providence by assigning a full-time interpreter to Kent County.

Without the dedication and diligence of our judicial workers, we could not achieve the level of excellence that is illustrated within the four corners of this Annual Report. We plan to continue an administration of accountability and service to the citizens of Rhode Island.



**J. JOSEPH BAXTER, JR.**  
STATE COURT  
ADMINISTRATOR

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "J. Joseph Baxter, Jr." in a cursive style.

J. Joseph Baxter, Jr.  
State Court Administrator

Letter to the  
**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

To the Honorable Members of the General Assembly:

It is with great pleasure that the State Court Administrator and I submit to you the 2006 Annual Report on the Rhode Island Judiciary. On these pages you will find the caseloads and the statistics that document our achievements. I think it is important to note that for each number, each statistic, there is usually at least one face attached to that figure. Our decisions have enormous impact on the lives of our citizens, and we in the Judiciary strive to do what is right to bring justice to those who come before us. We could not do this without your continued support and encouragement.



**THE HONORABLE  
FRANK J. WILLIAMS  
CHIEF JUSTICE**

In August, we opened our first new courthouse in almost 25 years. The new Kent County Courthouse will meet our needs for many years to come. Litigants have access to ample free parking in the garage adjacent to the courthouse. The building boasts the latest in court technology. Jurors, who are essential to our system of justice, have comfortable and secure quarters. It is a place where our judges and judicial staff are able to serve the public in a manner consistent with our mission.

In December, we finished our beautiful new Traffic Tribunal in Cranston, which you see on the cover and throughout this report. After decades in an inadequate facility, we now have six modern courtrooms for traffic cases, a multipurpose courtroom, and plenty of room for our judges, magistrates, and administrative staff. Because the Traffic Tribunal is the arm of the Judiciary that the majority of our citizens first encounter, this building, perhaps more than any other of our court facilities, is where we need to make a favorable first impression on the public.

Our courts performed admirably in 2006. Last year, our six state courts took in more than 233,000 new cases and disposed of more than 227,000. That is one case for almost every four Rhode Islanders. We did this within our budget that comprises only 1.4 percent of the entire state budget. For the fifth year running, we have not come back to you for a supplemental budget request.

I was pleased that many of you were able to attend our second biannual orientation for members of the General Assembly in 2007, so that you could witness our operation firsthand. We plan to do it again in 2009, after the next election.

In my six years as Chief Justice, there is no doubt that we have forged and maintained a positive working relationship with you that also recognizes our distinct and separate responsibilities. Let us continue this cooperation in these difficult times and work for continued success for the good of the citizens we serve.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frank J. Williams".

Frank J. Williams  
Chief Justice

Table of  
**C O N T E N T S**

Letter of Transmittal ..... i  
Letter to the General Assembly ..... ii  
Table of Contents ..... iii

*Judicial Performance*

Judicial Technology Center ..... 3  
Interpreters ..... 4  
State Law Library ..... 4  
John E. Fogarty Federal Building  
Dome Restoration Project ..... 5

*The Courts*

Supreme Court ..... 8  
Superior Court ..... 10  
Family Court ..... 12  
District Court ..... 14  
Workers' Compensation Court ..... 16  
Rhode Island Traffic Tribunal ..... 18

*Court Statistics*

At a Glance ..... 20  
Judiciary's Caseload Summary ..... 21  
Statistical Tables for all Courts ..... 22  
Court Structure ..... 39

**R H O D E I S L A N D J U D I C I A R Y**

250 Benefit Street  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903  
(401) 222-3266  
[www.courts.ri.gov](http://www.courts.ri.gov)

A photograph of a courtroom interior. The room features wood-paneled walls and a high ceiling with recessed lighting. In the foreground, there is a desk with a computer monitor, a printer, and various office supplies. A black leather chair is positioned in front of the desk. The background shows rows of wooden benches and a doorway. A large, white, oval-shaped graphic is superimposed over the upper portion of the image, containing the text "Judicial Performance" in a cursive font.

*Judicial Performance*

# JUDICIAL TECHNOLOGY CENTER

## **FINAL DECOMMISSIONING OF THE WANG SYSTEM TO THE ACS CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

Converted from the Wang system to the ACS case management system in 2006 were:

- ◆ Central Registry
- ◆ Attorney Registration
- ◆ MCLE

These conversions represent final conversions for our Judiciary. In addition to this work, the Judicial Technology Center (JTC) maintained the operation of the Wang system to assist the New Orleans Juvenile Division recover from the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. With all of the major components of the case management converted and our Katrina support efforts finished, the Wang was shut off in May and transferred to the Rhode Island Computer Museum.

## **UPGRADE OF THE LOCAL AREA NETWORK**

The JTC continued to roll out our dedicated fiber optic ring for all of the judicial facilities. The Kent County portion of the fiber ring went live in July of this year. The JTC will be installing the fiber ring to the new Rhode Island Traffic Tribunal in the first half of 2007.

## **KENT COUNTY COURTHOUSE COMPUTER ROOM**

In 2005, the JTC undertook the redesign of a server room into a fully redundant, state-of-the-art data center. This data center is now operational. The JTC personnel are now working on the next phase – The implementation of a fully redundant system to meet the Judiciary's data processing needs. Once we have accomplished this phase, the Kent County Courthouse will become a disaster recovery and business continuity site for the Judiciary. In case of a catastrophic failure of the current computer center, the new center will take over all processing requirements for the Judiciary within a short period of time (the switch time has not been finalized, but preliminarily it is expected that the courts will be only interrupted for about 30 to 45 minutes). This is a giant step forward for any organization. Disaster recovery has taken on a new importance for all organizations since the Katrina devastation. The Judiciary, with its two fully redundant data centers, will be a leader in this area.

*Judicial Performance*

## INTERPRETERS

The Office of Court Interpreters (OCI) had another successful and productive year. The OCI served 6,150 individuals, which represents a 100% increase compared to last year. The OCI provided interpreting and translation services in a wide variety of settings from interpreting defendants' rights to arraignments, pre-trial conferences, bail hearings, divorces, etc. We also provided tape transcription and translation when requested by the courts.

This year, the OCI gave two presentations: one at the Rhode Island Bar Association Annual Meeting and the second one for new lawyers. Both presentations dealt with diversity and interpreter use in the courts. The OCI continued contributing and participating in the Supreme Court Permanent Advisory Committee on Women and Minorities in the Courts as well as translating court forms as needed.

In the last quarter of 2006, a daily interpreter was assigned to the Kent County Courthouse to ensure that cases transferred from the Garrahy Judicial Complex would continue with the use of an interpreter. The OCI also used and distributed the interpreters' monthly schedule throughout the year as it proved to be an efficient and reliable method to call interpreters when needed.

Future OCI projects for this year include the following: organizing and/or attending professional development sessions, seminars, and conferences to enhance the knowledge and expertise of the OCI staff; provide support and guidance to individuals interested in the profession through collaborations with higher education institutions; and working closely with the Judiciary in expanding the availability of other language interpreters.

## STATE LAW LIBRARY

In 2006, the State Law Library focused on its continued commitment to providing superior legal research services and resources. This commitment was reemphasized through improvements to its technological infrastructure, wider accessibility to its wide range of legal materials, and community building through outreach to members of the judicial and legal profession as well as all Rhode Islanders.

Thanks to the generosity of the Champlin Foundations, a grant allowed the library to purchase 25 new computers. These new computers provide



integral support to the library's mission to enhance access to justice. Located in both staff and public areas, these computers support fast and dependable Internet access, allow for state of the art computer applications, and expand access to the library's vast and growing body of electronic data and subscription databases. The addition of new printers and the installation of wireless technology to overcome structural obstacles present in our older courthouses provide mobility and improve access.

In an effort to strengthen community connections, the library participated and initiated a number of innovative programs. Partnering with the Justice Rules program, the library hosted school age students of all ages from throughout the state.

In celebration of Law Week, the library hosted a two-day luncheon series entitled "Law and the Library." The first day of the series featured a workshop focusing on Westlaw enhancements and resources. The next day was highlighted by a CLE approved program on the S.S. Central America moderated by Professor Jane Rindsberg of Roger Williams University School of Law.

The first meeting of the Special Legislative Commission to Study the Current Strengths and Weaknesses of Library Service in Rhode Island was held in December. As a member of that commission, the State Law Library will be instrumental in creating a shared vision of library service that will have far reaching implications for the future.

JOHN E. FOGARTY  
FEDERAL BUILDING  
DOME RESTORATION PROJECT

The John E. Fogarty Federal Building, located at 24 Weybosset Street, Providence, is the oldest facility under the control of the Judiciary. When first erected in 1855 to 1857, the facility was originally known as the Federal Building and was the first one for Providence. The supervising architect, Ammi B. Young, was employed by the United States Treasury Department in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to design Custom Houses and governmental buildings. The Federal Building is three stories and constructed of granite in the Italian Renaissance style. A hemispherical dome and lantern, which is the centerpiece of this building, was added to the architectural design after construction had begun.

The Federal Building contained the Post Office, the Federal District Court, and the United States Customs. During this time period, the Custom House was previously located on South Main Street. While the Post Office had various locations over the years, when the Federal Building was built it was located in What Cheer Block. The court, Customs Department, and the Post Office operated out of the Federal Building until the present Federal Building was constructed at Kennedy Plaza in 1908. The Post Office moved to its present location in the Federal Building Annex in 1939. The Customs Department returned to the original Federal Building in 1922. The building became known as the Custom House.

On July 2, 1968 with the enactment of Public Law 90-372, the United States Custom House became known as the John E. Fogarty Federal Building. The Fogarty Building was listed in the National Register of Historic Places on April 13, 1972. In February 1988, the General Services Administration declared the Fogarty Building surplus property. The State of Rhode Island purchased the Fogarty Building in 1990 to expand the operations of the Superior Court.

The Fogarty Building has seen much wear and tear over the past 149 years. However, the crowning glory of the building is the hemispherical dome and lantern. Over a two-year period from 2003 to 2004, a total of \$90,000 had been invested in the Fogarty Building for capital improvements, including new internal roof drains, repairs and refurbishing of the walls and ceilings, and the painting of all windows. The improvement project also included the refurbishment of the dome on this historic structure. Unfortunately, the damage to the building was much more extensive than anticipated at the beginning of the project.

The Rhode Island Judiciary was awarded \$70,000 in 2006 from the Champlin Foundations to refurbish the dome. The project will be completed in 2007.

**Historical Reference Material**

John Hutchins Cady, F.A.I.A., *The Civic and Architectural Development of Providence 1636 – 1950*, 57, 129, 201 (The Book Shop, 1957).

Statewide Historical Preservation Commission, *Downtown Providence*, 18, 66 (May 1981).

McKenzie Woodward and Edward F. Sanderson, *Providence A Citywide Survey of Historic Resources*, 2 (Rhode Island Historical Preservation Commission 1986).



*The Courts*



Constance Brown

The Honorable Frank J. Williams, Chief Justice (Center)  
The Honorable Francis X. Flaherty (Far left)  
The Honorable Paul A. Suttell (2nd from left)  
The Honorable William P. Robinson III (2nd from right)  
The Honorable Maureen McKenna Goldberg (Far right)

## Supreme Court

### COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

The Supreme Court strengthened ties with the Rhode Island Bar Association to promote community outreach and partnered with the Rhode Island Department of Education's network of school-based coordinators to expand its court education programs in the schools. The court's "Justice Rules" program continued to put teams of lawyers, judges, and judicial staff into classrooms statewide to teach elementary and secondary students about the basic principles of the legal system, to cultivate positive attitudes about the third branch of government, and to promote interest about careers in the Judiciary. The program has also reached thousands of students through high school career fairs and the always popular courthouse tours, when students often view trials and appeals.

Now in its third year, the Chief Justice's "Citizens' Summit" television program on Rhode Island's Public Broadcasting Service channel educated viewers on the Workers' Compensation Court, the "Justice Rules" program, the Superior Court business calendar, and the new courthouse in Kent County.

The Supreme Court continued its twice yearly practice of "riding the circuit" to conduct oral arguments of actual cases in the outlying cities and towns. In 2006, the court sat in Warwick at City Hall and in East Providence at the Providence Country Day School.

The department also coordinated media coverage of dispositions in the high-profile Station nightclub fire case at courthouses in Providence and Kent County as well as providing guidelines to and accommodating requests from more than 30 news outlets.

## APPELLATE MEDIATION PROGRAM

The Appellate Mediation Program was proud to maintain its resolution rate of close to 60% as well as adding another mediator-justice to its roster. Based on the anonymous user surveys that are distributed to participants, the program continues to have a high satisfaction rate for both the program overall and the individual mediators. In 2007, we look forward to expanding the mediation program to Kent County Courthouse and the Traffic Tribunal in the Pastore Complex in Cranston.

## LAW CLERK DEPARTMENT

For 2006, the Law Clerk Department accomplished much and continued many of the initiatives of the previous year. The Department had a productive year, working on approximately 175 draft decision assignments.

The Law Clerk Department also continued its previous initiative to write, for those judges and magistrates consenting to same, annotative blurbs for the Superior Court decisions posted on the court website. Ideally, these annotations greatly assist the public, the Bar, and other law clerks with legal research.

An Open House held each October enables the judges and the law clerks to familiarize themselves with each other early in the year. Also, the practice of monthly department meetings for the purpose of discussing legal updates, administrative business, and legal research and writing issues continues to be held on a rotating basis at the different courthouses and has been helpful in promoting both communication and efficiency among the law clerks.



Row 1 (Bottom) - Left to right: Michael A. Silverstein, Francis J. Darigan, Jr., Mark A. Pfeiffer, Melanie Wilk Thunberg, Alice Bridget Gibney, Joseph F. Rodgers, Jr. (Presiding Justice), Robert D. Krause, Vincent A. Ragosta, Patricia A. Hurst, Judith C. Savage, and Stephen J. Fortunato, Jr. Row 2 - Left to right: Gordon M. Smith, Patricia L. Harwood, William J. McAtee, Jeffrey A. Lanphear, Susan E. McGuirl, Stephen P. Nugent, O. Rogerie Thompson, Netti C. Vogel, Edward C. Clifton, William A. Dimitri, Jr., Gilbert V. Indeglia, Edwin J. Gale, Daniel A. Procaccini, Allen P. Rubine, Joseph A. Keough, and Susan L. Revens.

## Superior Court

### MEDICAL MALPRACTICE MEDIATION

As part of a joint project with the Superior Court Bench/Bar Committee of the Rhode Island Bar Association, the Superior Court in October 2005 instituted a mandatory mediation program for all medical malpractice actions pending trial in Providence County Superior Court. Associate Justice (Retired) Richard J. Israel was recalled to active duty to mediate these cases. The cooperation of litigants and members of the bar representing both plaintiffs and defendants has been extraordinary. Mediation sessions have been held on Fridays of each week and justices presiding over the trials of medical malpractice actions in Providence County have excused counsel as required to attend mediation sessions.

Between October 14, 2005 and January 12, 2007, Associate Justice Israel mediated 65 pending cases. Of those cases, 29 were settled during mediation and 31 resulted in an impasse. The remaining five cases are currently pending further mediation on a later date. Of the 31 cases left in impasse, 16 have been reached for trial resulting in three plaintiffs' judgments, six defendants' judgments, five settlements, and two pending outcomes as of this report. Another 10 mediated cases remain pending trial. Associate Justice Israel has reported that he has scheduled 12 more mediation sessions, including the five cases continued from earlier sessions, between January 19 and March 23, 2007.

Members of the bar have reported that even in those cases where no settlement has resulted, the face-to-face conversations in the course of the mediation has been helpful in expediting the trial of unresolved claims and defenses.

## CIVIL CASELOAD REDUCED

The Superior Court has seen much progress in reducing the assigned civil case inventory. On January 1, 1991, there were 6,661 civil cases pending. By the end of calendar year 2006, that number had been cut by 70 percent to 1,975. The unified trial calendar, the continuing success of the annual "Settlement Week," and the efforts of the Superior Court judges and staff have contributed to the reduction of the backlog. During Settlement Week in December 2006, 228 cases were mediated, with 155 of those settling, or 68 percent. There will be further settlements posted toward the end of February 2007, with an estimated overall settlement rate of 73 percent. This progress reflects a steady trend over the past 15 years.

## CRIMINAL CASE INVENTORY REDUCED

At the end of calendar year 1991, the Superior Court's felony caseload totaled 2,720 statewide. Of those, 1,648 had been pending for over 180 days. By the end of 2006, that figure had not only been reduced to 2,312, but the number over 180 days old had been cut to 933, a reduction of 43 percent. In addition, the misdemeanor appeal case inventory numbered 114 by December 31, 2006, with 68 cases pending over 90 days, compared to 438 pending at the end of 1991 and 335 over 90 days old. These reductions of 74 percent for the overall misdemeanor appeal caseload and 80 percent of those cases pending over 90 days have greatly improved the disposition rate.



Constance Brown

Row 1 (Bottom) - Left to right: Howard I. Lipsey, Michael B. Forte, Pamela M. Macktaz, Jeremiah S. Jeremiah, Jr. (Chief Judge), Haiganush R. Bedrosian, Raymond E. Shawcross, and Kathleen A. Voccola. Row 2 - Left to right: Mary McCaffrey, Lauren D'Ambra, Francis J. Murray, Jr., John A. Mutter, Gilbert T. Rocha, Stephen J. Capineri, and Debra E. DiSegna. Row 3 - Left to right: Edward H. Newman, Jeanne L. Shepard, George N. DiMuro, John J. O'Brien, Jr., Angela M. Paulhus, Thomas Wright, and Patricia K. Asquith.

## Family Court

### DOMESTIC CASE FLOW SYSTEM

Chief Judge Jeremiah S. Jeremiah, Jr. has made certain modifications and adjustments for divorce filings on the domestic case flow system. First, the amount of time for the court to hear and decide a nominal divorce proceeding has been decreased to 70 days from 77 days. Secondly, the contested calendar case flow has been streamlined. The case management conference was removed from the flow and replaced with a pre-trial conference. Additionally, a settlement conference was added in an effort to facilitate agreements between parties. Also, the Chief Judge mandated a second trial week for contested matters. This extra trial week provides more continuity for judges and litigants, as well as providing an efficient manner to dispose of those cases awaiting trial.

### CHILD PROTECTION CALENDARS

The child protection calendars have also seen several changes. Chief Judge Jeremiah created a task force to review the efficiency of cases being heard by the child protection judges. As a result, the calendars were modified to provide for an a.m./p.m. calendar. This calendar is time specific for each respective court event thus reducing valuable resources for litigants and agency personnel awaiting a court hearing. Also, each judge on the calendar receives a designated trial week. Lastly, the arraignments on this calendar will be coordinated for time specific events to accommodate social workers and respondents who are being transported from the Adult Correctional Institutions.

### THE MENTAL HEALTH CLINIC

The Mental Health Clinic has afforded the Family Court the opportunity to appropriately address the complexity of issues that are presented. With this specialized program, the children and families that have been diagnosed with or believe to have mental health issues receive timely assessments that enable the Family Court to make a determination based

The Courts



on clinical information that was previously unavailable. Prior to the implementation of the Mental Health Clinic, young people with suspected mental health needs were referred to counseling service agencies in the community.

The Mental Health Clinic provides rapid assessments and evaluations with on-site capability for professional screening, referral, in-depth assessment in outpatient and residential settings, timely reporting of treatment recommendations to the court, and treatment and case management of both the child and family service needs. To date, the Mental Health Clinic has seen a total of 222 juveniles. In addition to our standard evaluations, two clinicians have performed 50 consultations (by telephone or in-person) with judges/magistrates. Evaluations have been conducted on juveniles from the ages of 11 to 17 years of age, with the average age being 15 years old (24 percent), with 68 percent of the juveniles residing in Providence County.

## THE FAMILY TREATMENT DRUG COURT

The Family Treatment Drug Court (FTDC) program has had over 250 participants and is looking forward to increasing this number as we enter our fifth year. The FTDC was expanded into Kent County in November 2005 and into Washington County in November 2006. Over 80 participants have graduated. We have celebrated the graduations of numerous fathers who successfully completed the program resulting in a reunification with their child(ren). Also, we have had four to five mothers in this specialized court give birth to drug-free babies, including one set of twins, and we have graduated a number of couples.

Our evaluator for this program, the National Perinatal Information Center, has found "the average time to first reunification for the FTDC participants was significantly less – 73 percent of infants of mothers participating in the FTDC were returned within the first three months, compared to 39 percent of infants with mothers served through the standard court calendar." The intensive court supervision, along with court ordered substance abuse treatment services and other ancillary services, allow participants to deal with their problems, keep their children (or work toward reunification), and learn the skills to move on to a healthy, drug-free future.

## THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COURT

The Domestic Violence Court has also been expanded into Kent County as a response to the growing need to have these services readily available to a population in dire need. The court continues to promote victim and family safety and stability by offering meaningful assistance to families along with holding perpetrators responsible for their behavior. During this past year, 446 restraining orders were granted.

A key advantage to this specialty court is that perpetrators are referred to interventions designed to minimize risks of further violence and monitor the perpetrator's compliance with court orders. The court holds perpetrators accountable.

This program is a model that effectively and efficiently processes domestic abuse cases. It provides victims the opportunity to obtain the necessary skills to become stronger, healthier, and productive members of society, provide a safe and stable home environment, and ultimately end the vicious cycle of domestic abuse with the generations to come.



Constance Brown

Row 1 (Bottom) - Left to right: John M. McLoughlin, Stephen P. Erickson, Michael A. Higgins, Albert E. DeRobbio (Chief Judge), Patricia D. Moore, Walter Gorman, and Frank J. Cenerini. Row 2 - Left to right: Christine S. Jabour, Raphael Ovalles, Jeanne E. LaFazia, Madeline Quirk, Elaine T. Bucci, Richard A. Gonnella, William Clifton, and Joseph P. Ippolito, Jr.

## District Court

Caseloads in the District Court continue to be handled expeditiously. The disposition rate of misdemeanors was 92 percent and the disposition rate for civil and small claims cases was well over 100 percent.

The District Court's Pretrial Services Unit (PTSU) had a 15 percent increase in referrals from 2005 to 2006. The PTSU has a satellite office in the new Kent County Courthouse that handled approximately 8 percent of the referrals. The PTSU continues to operate with six full-time staff members and three part-time staff members on weekends.

With the increase in referrals, there was a higher level of service needed for the defendants. Approximately 34 percent of defendants did not complete high school and 6 percent had less than an eighth-grade education. More than 50 percent were unemployed and 17 percent were engaged in mental health treatment at the time of arrest. Only 6 percent were involved in substance abuse treatment at the time of arrest, which may explain the significant number of referrals. Forty percent were charged with drug possession, drug trafficking, or drunk driving. Over half of the offenders referred to the PTSU had previous misdemeanor contact and approximately thirty percent had previous felony contacts.

Common terms of release for the offenders referred to the PTSU included some form of participation in substance abuse treatment, drug testing, and/or mental health treatment. Based on the level of the substance abuse problem or the mental health status of the offender at

the time of initial appearance, the defendant entered the appropriate level of care. The PTSU provided more than 335 referrals specifically to substance abuse agencies and/or private practitioners and more than 300 referrals to mental health providers, an indication of a strengthened network between the court system and the treatment providers.

The PTSU supervised slightly over 1,000 offenders during the calendar year. A supervised release has a positive impact on compliance and the failure to appear rate; only 4 percent did not appear at their next scheduled court appearance and only 5 percent were presented as bail violators.

The PTSU was involved in bail hearings for 172 defendants and in motions to reduce bail hearings for 107 defendants in 2006. Ninety-two percent were released after posting bail after the bail hearing. All of the released defendants were given supervision as part of their bail. Judges were willing to release the defendants as long as the PTSU was involved to supervise and monitor defendants for the remainder of the pretrial period. It is a cost effective measure for the taxpayer without jeopardizing public safety.

Specifically, the PTSU estimates the number of days that these defendants would have been incarcerated if the judge had not changed the bail decision from held without bail in the bail hearings. Without extensive research, the portion of those released defendants who would have remained incarcerated but for the PTSU cannot be certain. Therefore, the following table presents a range of cost savings estimates:

Upper-range estimate	8,952 days @ \$99.00/day	\$886,248.00
Mid-range estimate	4,476 days @ \$99.00/day	\$443,124.00
Low-range estimate	2,238 days @ \$99.00/day	\$221,562.00

The PTSU also estimates the number of days that defendants would have been incarcerated if the judge had not granted a motion to reduce bail. Similarly, the PTSU presents the same range of estimates for those hearings. The following table summarizes the estimated days saved and cost savings:

Upper-range estimate	3,301 days @ \$99.00/day	\$326,799.00
Mid-range estimate	1,650 days @ \$99.00/day	\$163,399.00
Low-range estimate	825 days @ \$99.00/day	\$81,675.00

The total estimated cost savings ranges from the PTSU for calendar year 2006 are:

Upper-range estimate	12,253 days @ \$99.00/day	\$1,213,047.00
Mid-range estimate	6,126 days @ \$99.00/day	\$606,474.00
Low-range estimate	3,063 days @ \$99.00/day	\$303,237.00



Constance Brown

Row 1 (Bottom) - Left to right: Bruce Q. Morin, John Rotondi, Jr., George E. Healy, Jr. (Chief Judge), Debra L. Olsson, and Janette A. Bertness. Row 2 - Left to right: Hugo L. Ricci, Jr., Dianne M. Connor, Edward P. Sowa, Jr., George T. Salem, Jr., and Robert Hardman.

## Workers' Compensation Court

In 2006, the court continued to pursue its dual commitments to efficiency and community outreach. For the first time in several years, the court was fully staffed with its complement of 10 judges, allowing it to more effectively address these goals. Despite an increase in the number of petitions filed with the court, dispositions exceeded filings. The court also addressed the time frames within which cases are disposed in order to provide more efficient services to court users.

The number of cases filed with the court climbed from 8,234 to 8,374. More significantly, the types of cases reflect the court's expanded jurisdiction and current trends in claims management. Of interest, petitions which typically address the employee's right to weekly compensation benefits, Employee's Original Petitions for Benefits and the Employee's Petitions to Review, fell to the lowest point in five years. In addition, Employer's Petitions to Review also declined. On the other side of this ledger, miscellaneous petitions increased by almost 62 percent. While the actual number of cases in this category seems relatively minor (287), the majority of these cases are complex and do not lend themselves to resolution in pretrial proceedings. In fact, one large class of these cases, Petition to Determine a Dispute Regarding Insurance Coverage, is not governed by the statute regarding pretrial conferences and must proceed to the litigation stage. Nevertheless, the court has been effective in bringing these cases to trial as soon as possible and providing guidance on difficult insurance coverage issues.

One other class of cases that experienced a dramatic increase was Petitions for Settlement. In 2006, these filings increased to their highest point

in three years. Since all lump-sum settlements involving workers' compensation benefits must be reviewed by the court to ensure that the proposed resolution is in the best interest of all parties, their precipitous decline in 2003 through 2005 was a source of confusion and concern. Analysis of this trend led to the conclusion that the decline was essentially due to the involvement of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) in certain types of settlements. The court collaborated with the other stakeholders in the system and crafted statutory and procedural provisions to protect CMS interests and allow the employer and employee to resolve their disputes without concern for future claims. The increase in filings in 2006 would seem to demonstrate that the procedural revisions have begun to address the issue.

The court has also carried on its initiatives to reduce the time frames required to conclude cases. In 2006, the court closed 51 percent of its cases within 31 days and 69 percent of the cases within 60 days. The improvement in these closing statistics is relatively minor. Nevertheless, these gains are remarkable in light of the fact that the prior time frames had exceeded expectations. This year's continued improvement is a graphic representation of the commitment the judges and staff of the court have to efficiently and equitably serve those who seek our support.

The court has continued its outreach efforts to educate those who rely upon it. The court spearheaded the Immigrant Workers Task Force in 2005. In the past year, judges and court personnel have appeared at community forums throughout the state to meet with non-English speaking workers and educate them about their right to a safe workplace as well as their rights in the event of an injury. These forums have been extremely well attended and serve as a palpable example of the Judiciary's dedication to the citizens of the state and the litigants who seek our assistance. Representatives of the court have also appeared on Hispanic radio as well as the Chief Justice's Citizens' Summit television program to discuss the court, its achievements, and its services.

Perhaps the most impressive outreach effort this past year was the success of the Young Employee Safety-Rhode Island (YES-RI) program. In October 2005, the YES-RI program was inaugurated as a joint effort of the bench, bar, and safety professionals to educate young workers about their right to a safe workplace and the right to benefits in the event of a work-related injury. In 2006, this program began to go out to schools throughout the state to meet with young workers. The YES-RI program was presented to hundreds of students from more than 10 cities and towns throughout the state. The students were not only instructed about their rights but also learned about the Judiciary's dedication to serve them. The commitment demonstrated by court personnel empowered these young people to exercise their rights to a safe work environment.



Constance Brown

Row 1 (Bottom) - Left to right: Joseph P. Ippolito, Jr., Albert E. DeRobbio (Chief Judge), and Lillian M. Almeida. Row 2 - Left to right: Albert R. Ciullo, Edward C. Parker, Domenic A. DiSandro III, and William T. Noonan.

## Rhode Island Traffic Tribunal

### E - CITATION

In partnership with the Judicial Technology Center, state and local police, the Rhode Island Traffic Tribunal (RITT) is developing a system where an officer will electronically generate a traffic summons in the patrol vehicle, automatically populating summons information for offender and vehicle. The summons is printed in the patrol vehicle and the summons data is electronically transmitted to the court computer system. The electronic citation process increases efficiency in the summoning process, reducing the overall time spent per summons.

The state police have successfully piloted the electronic ticketing process with several patrol vehicles issuing e-citations. Data from all state police traffic citations are being transmitted electronically to the Judiciary. Selected municipal courts are also transmitting summons data. Widespread deployment in all state police patrol vehicles is expected in 2007. Local departments have been selected to utilize e-citations in their agencies and should begin implementation sometime in 2007 as well.

### NEW RHODE ISLAND TRAFFIC TRIBUNAL

The new RITT is located at 670 New London Avenue in the John O. Pastore Government Center, Cranston, Rhode Island. The building has two floors above grade and contains approximately 86,000 square feet of floor space.

The new RITT houses seven courtrooms, administrative court support facilities, and records storage. The RITT also houses support facilities including the Law Library, Sheriff's Division, State Police, Security Officers, Facilities Management, and Central Holding for prisoners. The facility includes 450 parking spaces for judges, staff, and the public and 175 spaces for State employees at the Aimee Forand building located adjacent to the RITT.

The new RITT allows for the physical expansion of the building in 20 years to accommodate the growth of the court. The primary concerns in the building's construction and organization were to provide a user-friendly, secure, and technologically advanced courthouse. The RITT features functional space and floor areas for the building occupants, attorneys, and the public. The clarity of the architecture is enhanced by state of the art design and technology to streamline the judicial process for its users.



*Court Statistics*

# At a GLANCE

## 2006 CASELOAD

Filings/Hearings .....	233,315
Disposed .....	227,224

## FISCAL YEAR 2006 BUDGET - ENACTED

	ALL FUNDS	GENERAL REVENUE
Supreme Court .....	\$ 27,942,915	\$ 25,833,914
Defense of Indigent Persons .....	\$ 2,967,659	\$ 2,967,659
Superior Court .....	\$ 21,124,498	\$ 20,659,206
Family Court .....	\$ 18,879,704	\$ 17,271,175
District Court .....	\$ 9,923,880	\$ 9,923,880
Workers' Compensation Court .....	\$ 7,155,480 (restricted)	
Traffic Tribunal .....	\$ 7,318,155	\$ 7,318,155
<b>TOTAL .....</b>	<b>\$ 95,312,291</b>	<b>\$ 83,973,989</b>

**JUDGES**  
 66 Judges  
 4 Minorities  
 20 Female  
 18 Magistrates  
 8 Female

**EMPLOYEES**  
 FTE Count = 742

**FACILITIES**  
 6 Courthouses  
 81 Courtrooms  
 (including 4 Grand Jury rooms)

## FISCAL YEAR 2006 RECEIPTS – ALL FUNDS

	CIVIL	CRIMINAL/TRAFFIC/JUVENILE FINES/FEES/COSTS	GRANTS
Supreme Court .....	\$ 23,850	\$ N/A	\$ 763,478
Superior Court .....	\$ 1,305,834	\$ 1,795,593	\$ 234,628
Family Court .....	\$ 454,584	\$ 15,779	\$ 1,653,525
District Court .....	\$ 1,377,225	\$ 7,176,626	
Workers' Compensation Court .....	\$ 165,367	\$ N/A	
Traffic Tribunal .....	\$ N/A	\$13,863,911	
<b>TOTAL RECEIPTS GENERATED .....</b>	<b>\$ 3,326,860</b>	<b>\$22,851,909</b>	<b>\$ 2,651,631</b>

**TOTAL RECEIPTS FISCAL YEAR 2006 .....** **\$28,250,953**



# Judiciary's CASELOAD SUMMARY

COURT	CASE TYPE	FILINGS/HEARINGS	DISPOSITIONS
Supreme Court		341	270
	Appellate Mediation	86	50
Superior Court	Felonies	5,961	5,882
	Misdemeanors	272	238
	Civil	9,299	*6,368
Family Court	Juvenile	11,723	11,153
	Divorce	4,061	3,967
	Miscellaneous Petitions	718	
	Abuse	2,308	2,156
	Child Support	**5,307	
	Support Related Hearings	***21,116	
District Court	Misdemeanors	29,948	27,674
	Small Claims	18,510	20,375
	Civil	19,100	23,293
	Abuse	741	
	Mental Health/Other	586	
	Administrative Appeals	132	
Workers' Compensation Court		8,374	8,479
Traffic Tribunal		115,848	117,319
<b>Total Filings and Dispositions</b>		<b>233,315</b>	<b>227,224</b>
<i>Including Support Hearings</i>		254,431	

\* Please note, unlike 2003 and 2004, there was no mass dismissal of cases with no action in five years during 2005 and 2006.

\*\* Reciprocal filings stay open until age of majority of child unless otherwise ordered by court.

\*\*\* Support hearings represent the number of hearings held. Therefore, the same case may be counted more than once.

SUPREME COURT  
APPELLATE CASELOAD

CRIMINAL	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Docketed	81	64	80	70	64
Disposed	106	80	62	67	71
Pending	113	103	123	134	129
CIVIL	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Docketed	234	195	174	156	157
Disposed	266	207	194	148	155
Pending	250	249	231	236	237
CERTIORARI	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Docketed	130	75	87	87	83
Disposed	131	128	64	73	63
Pending	99	56	80	96	110
MISCELLANEOUS	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Docketed	309	339	53	32	37
Disposed	315	299	66	35	31
Pending	28	67	43	34	51
ALL CASES	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Docketed	754	673	394	345	341
Disposed	818	714	386	323	320
Pending	490	475	477	500	527

## SUPREME COURT MANNER OF DISPOSITION

BEFORE ARGUMENT	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Withdrawn	73	105	54	*	57
Dismissed	217	129	64	*	21
Petition Granted	146	129	7	*	4
Petition Denied	103	108	69	*	53
Other	29	32	12	*	17
Article 1, Rule 12A - Show Cause Orders	12	9	13	*	
<b>Total</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>151</b>
AFTER ARGUMENT/ MOTION CALENDAR	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Withdrawn	0	1	3	*	2
Affirmed	51	23	8	*	78
Modified	0	0	0	*	4
Reversed	2	0	0	*	8
Other	5	4	2	*	2
Total Orders	58	28	13	*	38
Per Curiam	105	110	87	*	56
<b>Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>94</b>
AFTER ARGUMENT/MERITS	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Withdrawn	0	0	1	*	6
Affirmed	47	31	43	*	48
Modified	11	12	6	*	1
Reversed	17	21	17	*	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Total Dispositions</b>	<b>818</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>320</b>
<b>% Disposed of Within 300 Days of Docketing</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>38%</b>

\* Due to the conversion of the Supreme Court case management system, the statistical reports were unavailable but will be reported next year.

## SUPERIOR COURT CIVIL CASELOAD

CIVIL ACTIONS					
PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	7,136	6,889	6,908	6,689	6,696
Cases Disposed	5,195	20,199	17,650	4,120	4,360
<b>Trial Calendar Summary</b>					
Cases Added	1,625	1,459	1,548	1,460	1,409
Cases Disposed	1,797	1,777	1,653	1,443	1,408
Pending at Year End	2,004	1,634	1,567	1,428	1,573
KENT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	1,182	1,150	1,099	1,168	1,208
Cases Disposed	836	2,462	2,520	920	911
<b>Trial Calendar Summary</b>					
Cases Added	347	299	337	312	309
Cases Disposed	299	299	387	426	433
Pending at Year End	381	388	337	150	132
WASHINGTON COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	682	743	796	772	765
Cases Disposed	547	1,758	1,551	604	614
<b>Trial Calendar Summary</b>					
Cases Added	174	184	182	214	181
Cases Disposed	192	190	205	265	257
Pending at Year End	268	285	248	177	147
NEWPORT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	670	686	614	586	630
Cases Disposed	443	1,116	1,425	581	483
<b>Trial Calendar Summary</b>					
Cases Added	175	198	126	158	152
Cases Disposed	172	149	158	252	160
Pending at Year End	157	232	206	107	123
STATEWIDE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	9,670	9,468	9,417	9,215	9,299
Cases Disposed	7,021	25,535	23,146	6,225	6,368
<b>Trial Calendar Summary</b>					
Cases Added	2,321	2,140	2,193	2,144	2,051
Cases Disposed	2,460	2,415	2,403	2,386	2,258
Pending at Year End	2,810	2,539	2,358	1,862	1,975

SUPERIOR COURT  
MANNER OF DISPOSITION  
CIVIL TRIAL CALENDAR

CIVIL ACTIONS					
PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Verdicts	81	86	69	25	23
Judicial Decisions	72	37	50	17	7
Total Trials	153	123	119	42	30
Dismissed/Settled/Other	1,310	1,250	1,066	1,240	944
Arbitration/Other Exceptions	334	404	468	161*	434*
Total Disposed	1,797	1,777	1,653	1,443	1,408
KENT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Verdicts	15	10	18	14	4
Judicial Decisions	32	20	20	15	5
Total Trials	47	30	38	29	9
Dismissed/Settled/Other	208	205	252	359	332
Arbitration/Other Exceptions	44	64	97	38*	92*
Total Disposed	299	299	387	426	433
WASHINGTON COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Verdicts	4	8	8	17	8
Judicial Decisions	15	6	3	6	4
Total Trials	19	14	11	23	12
Dismissed/Settled/Other	137	144	164	225	186
Arbitration/Other Exceptions	36	32	30	17*	59*
Total Disposed	192	190	205	265	257
NEWPORT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Verdicts	4	4	2	6	11
Judicial Decisions	17	7	6	10	7
Total Trials	21	11	8	16	18
Dismissed/Settled/Other	128	105	114	227	116
Arbitration/Other Exceptions	23	33	36	9*	26*
Total Disposed	172	149	158	252	160
STATEWIDE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Verdicts	104	108	97	62	46
Judicial Decisions	136	70	79	48	23
Total Trials	240	178	176	110	69
Dismissed/Settled/Other	1,783	1,704	1,596	2,051	1,578
Arbitration/Other Exceptions	437	533	631	225*	611*
Total Disposed	2,460	2,415	2,403	2,386	2,258

\* As a result of the civil conversion in June 2005, arbitration cases are being recorded differently in the new case management system. Although these cases are no longer included in this category, they are in the total for each county and statewide.

## SUPERIOR COURT FELONY CASELOAD

FELONIES					
PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	4,073	4,567	4,271	3,909	4,293
Cases Disposed	4,233	4,380	4,074	4,010	4,267
Total Pending Cases	1,535	1,683	1,838	1,791	1,843
% Over 180 Days Old	33%	36%	42%	50%	43%
KENT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	693	705	751	745	765
Cases Disposed	728	649	762	939	707
Total Pending Cases	141	192	193	199	254
% Over 180 Days Old	26%	13%	17%	22%	34%
WASHINGTON COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	489	447	413	434	571
Cases Disposed	482	415	359	413	557
Total Pending Cases	61	103	135	127	126
% Over 180 Days Old	23%	15%	13%	17%	27%
NEWPORT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	366	307	287	421	332
Cases Disposed	405	247	279	347	351
Total Pending Cases	96	72	64	99	89
% Over 180 Days Old	26%	35%	13%	9%	22%
STATEWIDE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	5,621	6,026	5,722	5,509	5,961
Cases Disposed	5,848	5,691	5,474	5,709	5,882
Total Pending Cases	1,803	2,050	2,230	2,216	2,312
% Over 180 Days Old	32%	33%	37%	44%	40%

SUPERIOR COURT  
MANNER OF DISPOSITION  
FELONIES

FELONIES					
<b>PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY</b>					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	3,827	3,970	3,689	3,624	3,936
Filed	3	3	3	8	1
Dismissed	352	359	331	338	264
Trial	50	48	51	40	66
Other	1	0	0	0	0
Total	4,233	4,380	4,074	4,010	4,267
% Disposed of Within 180 Days of Filing	67%	73%	69%	68%	70%
<b>KENT COUNTY</b>					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	612	537	700	679	650
Filed	24	24	21	18	17
Dismissed	73	77	35	237	33
Trial	18	11	6	5	7
Other	1	0	0	0	0
Total	728	649	762	939	707
% Disposed of Within 180 Days of Filing	71%	81%	85%	66%	83%
<b>WASHINGTON COUNTY</b>					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	457	347	290	354	490
Filed	4	5	14	11	7
Dismissed	16	22	47	36	42
Trial	4	10	7	10	14
Other	1	4	1	2	4
Total	482	415	359	413	557
% Disposed of Within 180 Days of Filing	85%	87%	84%	86%	82%
<b>NEWPORT COUNTY</b>					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	356	227	223	289	298
Filed	11	3	7	10	10
Dismissed	36	15	42	42	35
Trial	2	2	7	6	7
Other	0	0	0	0	1
Total	405	247	279	347	351
% Disposed of Within 180 Days of Filing	79%	86%	64%	80%	86%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	5,252	5,108	4,902	4,946	5,374
Filed	62	35	45	47	35
Dismissed	477	473	455	653	374
Trial	74	71	71	61	94
Other	3	4	1	2	5
Total	5,848	5,691	5,474	5,709	5,882
% Disposed of Within 180 Days of Filing	70%	75%	72%	70%	74%

## SUPERIOR COURT MISDEMEANOR CASELOAD

MISDEMEANORS					
PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	167	223	135	173	155
Cases Disposed	152	157	130	117	101
Total Pending Cases	74	90	69	59	91
% Over 90 Days Old	65%	70%	67%	83%	66%
KENT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	107	40	44	47	38
Cases Disposed	136	55	45	45	52
Total Pending Cases	18	13	8	23	9
% Over 90 Days Old	45%	15%	88%	52%	89%
WASHINGTON COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	57	57	49	41	47
Cases Disposed	55	90	68	53	60
Total Pending Cases	26	9	14	12	4
% Over 90 Days Old	23%	56%	43%	33%	0%
NEWPORT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	380	237	42	13	32
Cases Disposed	387	244	64	30	25
Total Pending Cases	38	26	6	2	10
% Over 90 Days Old	37%	73%	33%	0%	0%
STATEWIDE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	711	557	270	274	272
Cases Disposed	730	546	307	245	238
Total Pending Cases	156	138	97	96	114
% Over 90 Days Old	49%	65%	63%	68%	60%



SUPERIOR COURT  
MANNER OF DISPOSITION  
MISDEMEANORS

MISDEMEANORS					
PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	84	98	77	74	65
Filed	14	4	3	8	6
Dismissed	46	47	44	30	27
Trial	7	8	6	5	3
Other	1	0	0	0	0
Total	152	157	130	117	101
% Disposed of Within 90 Days of Filing	10%	56%	34%	28%	24%
KENT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	75	23	25	21	32
Filed	27	9	6	7	11
Dismissed	31	17	9	17	7
Trial	1	2	3	0	1
Other	2	4	2	0	1
Total	136	55	45	45	52
% Disposed of Within 90 Days of Filing	56%	65%	94%	47%	67%
WASHINGTON COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	36	54	39	37	33
Filed	8	13	10	3	9
Dismissed	8	18	17	10	16
Trial	3	2	1	2	0
Other	0	3	1	1	2
Total	55	90	68	53	60
% Disposed of Within 90 Days of Filing	59%	82%	82%	81%	81%
NEWPORT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	187	133	26	11	7
Filed	124	70	9	4	2
Dismissed	70	39	29	14	13
Trial	2	0	0	1	0
Other	4	2	0	0	3
Total	387	244	64	30	25
% Disposed of Within 90 Days of Filing	74%	81%	56%	33%	85%
STATEWIDE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	382	308	167	143	137
Filed	173	96	28	22	28
Dismissed	155	121	99	71	63
Trial	13	12	10	8	4
Other	7	9	3	1	6
Total	730	546	307	245	238
% Disposed of Within 90 Days of Filing	53%	70%	63%	41%	50%

## FAMILY COURT DOMESTIC RELATIONS

D O M E S T I C					
PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Filed	3,212	3,120	3,158	3,096	3,062
Filed-Divorce Only	2,788	2,711	2,694	2,630	2,558
Disposed	2,826	2,783	2,789	2,761	2,457
Cases Greater than 360 Days Old	17	11	4	3	19
KENT COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Filed	791	810	821	805	763
Filed-Divorce Only	717	731	727	714	678
Disposed	768	693	730	729	735
Cases Greater than 360 Days Old	5	12	10	7	10
WASHINGTON COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Filed	581	539	555	561	577
Filed-Divorce Only	514	473	488	483	509
Disposed	551	458	510	549	460
Cases Greater than 360 Days Old	2	20	2	0	0
NEWPORT COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Filed	407	380	381	329	377
Filed-Divorce Only	350	325	326	263	316
Disposed	394	307	317	292	315
Cases Greater than 360 Days Old	4	25	3	10	8
STATEWIDE					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Filed	4,991	4,849	4,915	4,791	4,779
Filed-Divorce Only	4,369	4,240	4,235	4,090	4,061
Disposed	4,539	4,241	4,346	4,331	3,967
Cases Greater than 360 Days Old	28	68	19	20	37
ABUSE COMPLAINT FILED					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Providence/Bristol County	2,126	1,849	1,933	1,736	1,806
Kent County	353	298	393	316	328
Washington County	145	134	120	112	88
Newport County	169	124	127	77	86
Statewide Total	2,793	2,405	2,573	2,241	2,308
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Support Petitions Filed	3,940	4,801	3,602	4,551	5,307

## FAMILY COURT JUVENILE CASELOAD

JUVENILE FILINGS BY CATEGORY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Wayward/Delinquent	7,069	7,415	7,331	7,018	7,125
Dependency/Neglect/Abuse	1,827	1,661	1,720	2,162	2,590
Termination of Parental Rights	350	365	393	424	348
Adoption/Guardianship	620	599	610	599	541
Violations	845	960	897	938	1,045
Other	80	50	80	68	74
Total Filings	10,791	11,050	11,031	11,209	11,723
<b>JUVENILE CALENDAR RESULTS FOR WAYWARD/DELINQUENT CASES</b>					
<b>PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Filed	5,305	5,852	5,717	5,537	5,706
Disposed	5,121	5,891	5,957	5,141	5,378
% Adjudicated Within 180 Days of Filing	57%	63%	74%	75%	75%
<b>KENT COUNTY</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Filed	1,264	1,312	1,449	1,289	1,241
Disposed	1,101	1,246	1,402	1,175	1,303
% Adjudicated Within 180 Days of Filing	48%	52%	56%	57%	57%
<b>WASHINGTON COUNTY</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Filed	753	698	632	728	708
Disposed	771	742	685	588	689
% Adjudicated Within 180 Days of Filing	67%	61%	63%	76%	76%
<b>NEWPORT COUNTY</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Filed	591	513	430	402	515
Disposed	578	543	464	407	443
% Adjudicated Within 180 Days of Filing	54%	56%	65%	61%	69%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Filed	7,914	8,375	8,228	7,956	8,170
Disposed	7,571	8,422	8,508	7,311	7,813
% Adjudicated Within 180 Days of Filing	56%	60%	70%	72%	72%

# FAMILY COURT CHILD PROTECTION

JUVENILE CALENDAR RESULTS FOR CHILD PROTECTION CASES					
PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Termination of Parental Rights</b>					
Filed	283	268	329	338	273
Disposed	282	308	300	269	296
<b>Dependency/Neglect/Abuse</b>					
Filed	1,386	1,310	1,305	1,626	1,915
Disposed	1,283	1,189	1,280	1,311	1,704
<b>Other</b>					
Filed	523	468	490	441	404
Disposed	478	460	422	373	431
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Termination of Parental Rights</b>					
Filed	37	36	29	48	39
Disposed	23	27	40	36	51
<b>Dependency/Neglect/Abuse</b>					
Filed	216	186	177	284	352
Disposed	203	218	236	254	337
<b>Other</b>					
Filed	90	84	112	108	105
Disposed	69	74	87	116	97
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Termination of Parental Rights</b>					
Filed	17	37	14	15	16
Disposed	25	20	21	25	14
<b>Dependency/Neglect/Abuse</b>					
Filed	108	100	106	115	193
Disposed	167	118	145	112	164
<b>Other</b>					
Filed	60	57	58	74	64
Disposed	52	47	57	67	68
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Termination of Parental Rights</b>					
Filed	13	24	21	23	20
Disposed	10	21	13	16	17
<b>Dependency/Neglect/Abuse</b>					
Filed	117	65	132	137	130
Disposed	103	77	96	108	115
<b>Other</b>					
Filed	27	40	30	44	42
Disposed	23	37	34	32	46
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
<b>Termination of Parental Rights</b>					
Filed	350	365	393	424	348
Disposed	340	376	374	346	378
<b>Dependency/Neglect/Abuse</b>					
Filed	1,827	1,661	1,720	2,162	2,590
Disposed	1,756	1,602	1,757	1,785	2,320
<b>Other</b>					
Filed	700	649	690	667	615
Disposed	622	618	600	588	642

## DISTRICT COURT SMALL CLAIMS

SECOND DIVISION - NEWPORT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	702	879	833	895	808
Cases Disposed	795	715	851	1,933	1,420
THIRD DIVISION - KENT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	2,256	1,990	2,107	2,459	3,133
Cases Disposed	3,457	2,889	3,154	2,532	4,686
FOURTH DIVISION - WASHINGTON COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	1,607	1,430	1,103	1,094	1,152
Cases Disposed	1,794	1,735	1,719	1,787	1,563
SIXTH DIVISION - PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	10,639	11,205	11,689	12,133	13,417
Cases Disposed	11,859	13,119	13,724	15,250	12,706
STATEWIDE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	15,204	15,504	15,732	16,581	18,510
Cases Disposed	17,905	18,458	19,448	21,502	20,375
MANNER OF DISPOSITION	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Defaults	8,846	9,382	10,306	11,008	10,275
Settlements	6,981	7,013	6,901	7,448	6,535
Judgments	2,078	2,063	2,241	3,046	3,565
Total	17,905	18,458	19,448	21,502	20,375
CASES FILED- OTHER CATEGORIES	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Domestic Abuse	926	926	765	734	741
Administrative Appeals	134	140	141	130	132
Mental Health Hearings	430	456	601	555	586

## DISTRICT COURT CIVIL CASELOAD

SECOND DIVISION - NEWPORT COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	1,196	1,173	1,193	1,367	1,150
Cases Disposed	1,247	1,535	1,516	1,632	1,427
THIRD DIVISION - KENT COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	2,523	2,595	2,454	2,343	3,018
Cases Disposed	3,723	3,456	4,287	4,226	4,539
FOURTH DIVISION - WASHINGTON COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	1,167	1,246	1,204	1,116	1,258
Cases Disposed	1,101	1,233	1,624	1,355	1,382
SIXTH DIVISION - PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	14,167	13,363	13,510	13,604	13,674
Cases Disposed	12,945	12,224	12,728	14,010	15,945
STATEWIDE					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	19,053	18,377	18,361	18,430	19,100
Cases Disposed	19,016	18,448	20,155	21,223	23,293
MANNER OF DISPOSITION					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Defaults	7,122	7,171	9,640	8,375	9,045
Settlements	6,272	6,264	5,394	7,076	8,454
Judgments	5,618	5,012	5,120	5,762	5,790
Other	4	1	1	10	4
Total	19,016	18,448	20,155	21,223	23,293

## DISTRICT COURT CRIMINAL CASELOAD

MISDEMEANORS					
SECOND DIVISION - NEWPORT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	2,454	2,276	2,518	2,515	2,470
Cases Disposed	2,578	2,229	2,359	2,311	2,401
Total Pending	153	152	339	510	216
% Over 60 Days Old	17%	41%	57%	69%	41%
THIRD DIVISION - KENT COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	4,879	4,893	4,911	5,369	5,600
Cases Disposed	4,984	4,708	4,633	4,986	4,970
Total Pending	197	351	513	725	1,188
% Over 60 Days Old	16%	32%	47%	53%	56%
FOURTH DIVISION - WASHINGTON COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	4,271	4,222	4,296	4,327	4,131
Cases Disposed	4,314	3,940	4,127	4,150	3,971
Total Pending	205	450	334	339	310
% Over 60 Days Old	6%	39%	19%	41%	21%
SIXTH DIVISION - PROVIDENCE/BRISTOL COUNTY	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	18,384	17,827	18,277	18,357	17,747
Cases Disposed	18,383	17,578	17,618	17,029	16,332
Total Pending	1,833	1,037	1,043	1,462	1,641
% Over 60 Days Old	*	28%	25%	39%	54%
STATEWIDE	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Cases Filed	29,988	29,218	30,002	30,568	29,948
Cases Disposed	30,259	28,455	28,737	28,476	27,674
Total Pending	2,388	1,990	2,229	3,036	3,355
% Over 60 Days Old	*	32%	34%	48%	51%
MANNER OF DISPOSITION	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pled	21,721	21,643	21,911	21,040	20,492
Filed	129	80	80	59	57
Dismissed	6,441	5,819	6,289	6,624	6,675
Trials	760	288	239	557	243
Other	1,208	625	218	196	207
Total	30,259	28,455	28,737	28,476	27,674
% Disposed of Within 60 Days of Filing	89%	88%	88%	88%	86%
STATEWIDE FELONIES	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Filed	7,242	7,428	7,170	7,403	8,037

\* Not available.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT  
MANNER/STAGE OF DISPOSITION

PRETRIAL	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Pretrial Order	3,160	3,129	3,214	3,147	3,264
Order	13	7	10	6	7
Decree	64	63	60	103	95
Consent Decree	85	84	69	69	132
Major Surgery	5	2	0	0	0
Withdrawn	2,773	2,716	2,720	2,644	2,555
Discontinued	40	11	7	18	3
Dismissed	27	38	18	74	68
Other	90	101	84	0	0
Total	6,257	6,151	6,182	6,061	6,124
TRIAL	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Decision	770	569	540	1,302	1,259
Consent Decree	211	189	203	173	199
Trial Claim Withdrawn	740	676	589	694	688
Petition Withdrawn	161	90	91	128	104
Order	58	34	18	30	13
Dismissed	16	11	18	25	17
Discontinued	11	5	4	2	2
Other	912	927	690	21	22
Total	2,879	2,501	2,153	2,375	2,304
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Appeals	122	123	94	56	51
Total Dispositions	9,258	8,775	8,429	8,492	8,479



## WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT CASELOAD SUMMARY

EMPLOYEE PETITIONS	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Original	3,076	3,027	2,899	2,783	2,654
To Review	2,178	2,171	2,165	1,951	1,857
Second Injury	0	0	0	1	1
To Enforce	929	873	983	799	976
Total	6,183	6,071	6,047	5,534	5,488
EMPLOYER PETITIONS	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
To Review	1,767	1,568	1,646	1,629	1,608
OTHER	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Lump Sum Settlement	856	780	669	763	827
Hospital/Physician Fees	70	161	66	131	164
Miscellaneous	106	104	136	177	287
Total	1,032	1,045	871	1,071	1,278
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Total Petitions	8,982	8,684	8,564	8,234	8,374
Total Dispositions	9,258	8,775	8,429	8,492	8,479
Total Pending Caseload	2,326	2,233	2,374	2,141	2,027
Total Cases Pending Trial	910	887	995	1030	926
% Pending Trial More Than 270 Days	29%	29%	32%	37%	36%

## RHODE ISLAND TRAFFIC TRIBUNAL (RITT) CASELOAD

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Total Summonses Issued*	163,390	187,429	203,207	220,338	232,176
RITT Summonses Issued	99,406	101,649	104,667	117,046	115,848
Total Violations	130,576	124,618	130,093	142,365	140,107
RITT Summonses Disposed	102,136	106,371	109,808	118,876	117,319
<b>BREAKDOWN OF DISPOSED SUMMONSES</b>					
Court Hearings	62,824	67,243	69,293	72,111	72,019
Pay by Mail	39,312	39,128	40,515	46,765	45,300
Total	102,136	106,371	109,808	118,876	117,319
% Disposed Within 60 Days	98%	98%	98%	98%	97%
<b>BREATHALYZER REFUSALS</b>					
Filed	1,655	1,587	1,870	1,844	1,670
Disposed	1,700	1,605	1,924	1,847	1,737
% Disposed Within 60 Days	93%	91%	91%	89%	88%
<b>DUI/.08</b>					
Filed	50	27	4	0	1
Disposed	50	33	4	0	1
% Disposed Within 60 Days	88%	79%	100%	**	100%
<b>INSURANCE</b>					
Filed	10,143	10,940	11,516	11,026	9,871
Disposed	10,625	11,572	12,384	11,446	10,294
% Disposed Within 60 Days	94%	94%	93%	95%	94%
<b>APPEALS</b>					
Filed	565	700	626	673	559
Disposed	426	507	433	458	385
Pending	**	59	67	50	54


\* Includes summonses issued to both the RITT and municipal courts.

\*\* Not available.

# Court STRUCTURE

## OFFICE OF STATE COURTS

State Court Administrator • Finance and Budget • Employee Relations • Law Library •  
 Judicial Technology Center • Facilities and Operations • Judicial Records Center • Domestic  
 Violence Training and Monitoring Unit • Mandatory Continuing Legal Education • Public  
 Relations and Community Outreach • Law Clerk Department • Judicial Planning Unit •  
 General Counsel • Disciplinary Counsel • Clerk's Office • Appellate Screening •  
 Administrative Assistant to Chief Justice • Office of Court Interpreters



\* Court of last resort

\*\* Court of general jurisdiction  
 All other courts have limited jurisdiction.



250 Benefit Street  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903  
(401) 222-3266  
[www.courts.ri.gov](http://www.courts.ri.gov)