

Vermont Judiciary – Office of the Court Administrator **Report on Judiciary Collection of Penalties, Fines and Fees**

Summary:

This report responds to the legislative mandate under Section E.204.7 of Act 58 of 2015 (FY 2016 Appropriations Act) regarding the Judiciary's collection of revenues.

Within the various constraints listed below, the Judiciary utilizes the tools at its disposal to effectively collect civil and criminal fees, penalties, and other revenue. Nonetheless, changes in the external environment have resulted – and may continue to result – in declining collection rates, particularly in the area of collections for criminal violations.

This report proposes several recommendations to improve the collection process. Some of these recommendations may generate some modest incremental increases in collection revenues. In other cases, the net effect of these recommendations will be to improve customer service and financial reporting; they will have little or no impact in terms of additional revenue.

This report was prepared by a team within the Court Administrator's Office, including Matt Riven, Chief of Finance and Administration; Jeff Loewer, Chief Information Officer; Tari Scott, Chief of Trial Court Operations; Kelly Carbo, Finance Manager; Sean Thomson, Manager of Applications; and Gabrielle Lapointe, Statewide Court Clerk, including the Judicial Bureau. The team's work was overseen by – and reflects input from – the Budget Subcommittee of the Judiciary Advisory Council, including, Hon. Thomas Zonay, Superior Judge; Hon. Robert Mello, Superior Judge; Hon. Karen Bradley, Assistant Judge for Lamoille County; and Gaye Paquette, Superior Court Clerk for Franklin and Grand Isle Counties.

Report Language:

FY 2016 Appropriations Act (H.490: "Big Bill" or Operating Budget)

Sec. E.204.7 REPORT ON PENALTIES, FINES, AND FEES

(a) On or before December 15, 2015, the Court Administrator shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Judiciary with recommendations for:

- (1) increasing efficiency in collection of court-ordered monetary penalties, fines, and fees and encourage compliance with court-ordered payments, including strategies for and impediments to maximizing collections; and*
- (2) how to account for court-ordered monetary penalties, fines, and fees that are determined to be uncollectible.*

(b) To encourage timely payment of court-ordered penalties, fines, and fees, the Judiciary shall ensure that a person who is ordered to pay may satisfy the judgment by cash, check, debit card, or credit card, or may establish a payment schedule to discharge the judgment at the time and place the penalty, fine, or fee is ordered.

Context:

Court ordered monetary penalties, fines, and fees are imposed in both civil and criminal matters. The civil proceedings fall within the jurisdiction of the Judicial Bureau and primarily arise out of a motor vehicle complaint being issued under the authority of Title 23 of the Vermont Statutes Annotated. The criminal proceedings fall within the jurisdiction of the Vermont Superior Court, Criminal Division and primarily arise out of a criminal violation being filed under the authority of Title 13 of the Vermont Statutes Annotated.

The monetary penalties imposed in a civil complaint are largely established by a schedule of waiver penalties. The vast majority of complaints issued are resolved by the individual paying the waiver fine amount by mail and no hearing being held.

In contrast, the monetary penalties imposed in a criminal matter are set forth by statute as a maximum penalty, with some offenses having a mandatory minimum fine. Criminal defendants are subject to a number of court-imposed financial obligations such as fines, fees, and surcharges. These charges are often in addition to any court-ordered restitution to the victim, as well as costs associated with other obligations which may be imposed upon a defendant as part of a sentence (i.e. substance abuse/mental health treatment).

In many cases, these court-imposed financial obligations, when considered in light of a defendant's individual situation, can be quite significant. Indeed, defendants upon whom these obligations are imposed can be unemployed and receive support through public assistance and/or disability benefits. In addition to the direct obligations imposed as part of a criminal conviction, and the necessary expenditures for food, clothing, and housing, it is not uncommon for a number of these individuals to also have child support obligations which they are ordered to pay.

Findings:

- 1. Collections summary:** The Judiciary collects over \$20M annually in revenue. (See Table 1.) The majority of this revenue is collected from civil violations by the Judicial Bureau. The vast majority of this revenue is collected directly by the Judiciary via payments in person, mailed to the bureau or courts, or paid on the Judicial Bureau's website. The Judiciary also utilizes a collection agency for both civil and criminal violations, as well as state tax refund offsets via the Tax Department for civil violations, and some specific amounts due for criminal violations. The amounts collected via these two channels are relatively small as compared to direct collections. As illustrated in Table 2, the collection agency collects more than half the civil violations referred to it; collections for criminal violations are more challenging.
- 2. Collections rate – Civil;** The Judiciary collects over 90% of the amount due for civil violations within five years of the violation obligation. (See Table 3.) (This result based on FY 2015 data is consistent with the October 2013 study that was previously reported, although the methodology applied is slightly different.)

3. **Collections Rate – Criminal:** The FY 2015 data suggest that there is some decline in the rate of criminal collections. The October 2013 report showed collections of 75% of the amount due within a five-year timespan. The most recent data indicate collections of 50% of the amount due between 2011 and 2015, the most recent five-year span. (See Table 4.) While it is possible that collections in the out-years could bring the net collection rate up to 75%, in practice collections get more difficult in the out-years. It is expected that the criminal offenses would have a lower collection rate than civil violations, given that cohort faces larger payment amounts and more challenges around payment. In addition, policy changes have made enforcement of criminal collections more difficult (see discussion below).
4. **Other states:** The National Center for State Courts advises that it does not collect state-by-state information regarding collection rates. It is well-known that debt collection is a challenge for court systems across the nation. Some court systems take more aggressive measures regarding non-payment, often with negative policy implications. Anecdotally, we are advised by court consultants that our collection rates are consistent with, or better than, other states.
5. **Accumulated receivables:** Despite the best efforts of the Judiciary with the tools at its disposal, on average \$2M-\$3M of new receivables are accumulated each year, and though some of those debts will be collected over time (see finding #2 above), some portion will not be collected. As a result, the portion of those receivables that is estimated to be uncollectible grows by \$1M-\$2M per year on average. Because these estimated uncollectible receivables never go away, they have accumulated to \$25.9M by the end of FY 2015. (See Table 5.)
6. **“Writing off” bad debt:** Subsection (a)(2) of the legislative language tasks the branch with reviewing options for the estimated \$26M of likely uncollectible receivables. Conferring with State financial operations staff confirmed the Judiciary’s understanding that under general accounting principles, “writing off” bad debt involves relinquishing the claims that underlie that debt. In the case of these receivables, the Judiciary cannot take any financial steps without addressing the underlying violations. Further, it would require a prosecutor to take proactive action to reduce the amount owed to zero. We recommend such steps be taken, but it is not an action that can be taken from an accounting standpoint alone.

Challenges, Constraints, and Obstacles of Existing Collection Process:

Various challenges, constraints, and obstacles limit the Judiciary’s ability to collect 100% of revenues associated with fines, penalties, surcharges, etc. (Filing fees are required as a condition of filing the applicable documents, and hence are essentially fully collected.)

- A. **VTADS limitations:** VTADS is our obsolete legacy case management system. The decentralized configuration of VTADS, with multiple instances of data and, in the case of the Judicial Bureau, separate systems, makes it difficult to view statewide data, and provide court statistics and management reports that would support

collection efforts. The systems in place also are cumbersome in processing payments, especially the processing of partial payments and single payments against multiple violations.

- B. Less than state of the art payment processing:** The Branch's credit card payment processor, VIC, appears to be using outdated technology that does not include active processing technology (resulting in e.g., 3 business day wait). The Judiciary does not utilize modern alternative payment options, such as PayPal, Bill Me Later, etc. It is unclear whether our current credit card payment processor is able to offer those features.
- C. License suspension, and associated policy issues:** License suspension creates a "double-edged sword." On the one hand, the threat of license suspension encourages payment of violations and thereby helps collection efforts. On the other hand, for violators with multiple violations (including multiple license suspension violations), there can arise a cycle of successive non-payments, with impact on collections. The latter policy issues have created momentum for the Court Diversion program and Drivers' Restoration Day, as well as proposed legislation around license suspension. It should be noted, however, that the absence of license suspension would remove one of the few remaining incentives to encourage payment of violations, and hence changes in this policy could result in lower collection rates.
- D. Installment payments (e.g., "30/30" program):** Installment payments are one method of encouraging payments that might not otherwise be collected. The Judicial Bureau's "30/30" program has been more effective and efficient than other payment-plan programs, but still requires significant administrative work.
- E. Loss of criminal contempt threat:** Use of criminal contempt, to include incarceration for failure to pay a fine, was extremely expensive for the Judiciary and other justice partners, but had both an individual and general deterrent effect. The Judiciary, however, does not recommend reinstatement of criminal contempt, because the cost and effort – for staff, judges, Sheriffs, State's Attorneys, Corrections etc. – was significant and disproportionate to the amount collected in individual cases. Moreover, there are public policy considerations involved in the use of criminal contempt as a collection tool, as has been seen in other states where incarceration has been used to attempt to collect fines and other amounts due. Nonetheless, there does appear to be a correlation, between the removal of the potential of criminal contempt and the increase in receivables, particularly in regard to criminal offenses. (See Table 5.)
- F. Daily deposits:** Under statewide accounting procedures, use of credit cards requires daily deposits by court staff, even when there are only a few transactions. So convenience for customers results in significant additional staff burden.
- G. Surcharges:** In addition to the underlying penalty, the various surcharges added to the penalty make it extremely difficult for some violators to pay. The Judiciary

therefore notes that any proposals to increase surcharges would likely increase the non-payment rate, and as a result, may not generate the intended additional revenues.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

Within the various constraints listed above, the Judiciary utilizes the tools at its disposal to effectively collect civil and criminal fees, penalties, and other revenue. Nonetheless, changes in the external environment have resulted – and may continue to result – in declining collection rates, particularly in the area of collections for criminal violations.

This report proposes several recommendations to improve the collection process. Some of these recommendations may generate some modest incremental increases in collection revenues. In other cases, the net effect of these recommendations will be to improve customer service and financial reporting; they will have little or no impact in terms of additional revenue.

- 1. Collection Agency Practices:** The Judiciary effectively utilizes its current relationship with Alliance One collection agency. Currently, receivables are generally referred to Alliance One, with collections shown in Table 2. However, the Judiciary will review: (1) to ensure that all applicable debts are referred to Alliance One; and (2) compare Alliance One's collection rate and commission to contractual goals and national standards.

Impact: It is unclear that any additional significant revenues can be collected but is certainly worth exploring.

- 2. Payment Plans for Criminal Offenses:** The Judiciary will explore opportunities to develop payment plan opportunities for criminal offenses, similar to the “30/30” plan currently available for civil violations. There may be statutory restrictions that impede such plans, as well as limitations to their effectiveness. It may also require additional staff work.

Impact: It is unclear that any additional significant revenues can be collected but is certainly worth exploring.

- 3. Expansion of Tax Offset Program for Criminal Violations:** Currently, all civil violations meeting specified criteria are sent to the Tax Department for offset against tax refunds. For criminal violations, currently only a limited universe of debts – e.g., reimbursement of public defender fees – is sent for offset. The Judiciary will work with the Tax Department to see if there are opportunities to expand the use of tax offsets for other receivables associated with criminal violations.

Impact: If more criminal violations are referred there could be some indeterminate increase in collections. However, the offset program requires the use of social security numbers, which may not be available for all criminal violations. In addition, the Judiciary would need to work with the Tax Department to determine whether funds collected are returned to the Judiciary for processing, and/or how the receivables associated with the offset program are treated for state reporting purposes.

4. **Credit Cards in All Divisions:** Per Subsection (b) of the language, no later than the end of Calendar 2016, the Judiciary will add credit and debit card payment capability, in addition to cash and check, in all divisions of each unit, including Family, Civil and Probate divisions where they are not currently universally offered. In addition, the Judiciary will examine the feasibility of providing online credit card payments for criminal court-ordered obligations, similar to the system currently available to pay civil obligations in the Judicial Bureau. (The current 3% service charge would apply.) The timing of this recommendation reflects the current industry transition to chip readers versus “swipe” readers, and associated cost of the new machines. There will continue to be some limited circumstances where technical and/or procedural constraints limit the use of remote payment systems.

Impact: This expansion will provide an increase in customer service and convenience, and responds to growing public expectation to pay with a card. It will, however, provide little or no increase in revenues because current collection rate for these divisions is essentially 100%. Expansion of acceptance of credit cards will increase court staff administrative effort and resources due to processing daily VISION transactions. This additional staff work is somewhat offset by reduced handling of checks and cash, and associated risk.

5. **“Real-time” Payments of Civil Violations:** The Judiciary will explore the technical and administrative challenges of accepting civil violation payments – via all forms of payment, including credit cards – at Judicial Bureau hearings held “on the road” (i.e., away from White River Junction).

Impact: As noted above, 90% of civil violations are currently collected already, so the additional incremental revenue is likely to be small. However, it would allow revenues to get booked more quickly and would enhance customer service. However, it is unclear without further exploration as to what is involved in overcoming the technical hurdles.

6. **Identification of Dormant Receivables, and Reduction of Underlying Debt:** A significant number of receivables are associated with fines, penalties, and other debts that are unlikely to be collected for a variety of reasons. The debtor may be dead or a defunct business. Or the debt owed may be *de minimus* (e.g., one dollar). These receivables are carried on the Judiciary’s – and hence, the State’s – financial books, creating the false expectation of potential collection. Under this proposal, the Finance and RIS units would develop periodic lists of debts that, based on agreed-upon criteria, are likely dormant. In the case of civil violations, the violations would be presented to a Hearing Officer for review, and if appropriate, reduction in the amount due. For example, in March 2015 a civil “Driver Restoration Day” was held in Chittenden County. This allowed a large number of persons with outstanding debts for civil violations to settle them for a fraction of the actual debt. This was able to be accomplished by application of 23 V.S.A. § 2307, *Remedies for failure to pay traffic violations*, which allows, in part, a Judicial Bureau hearing officer to reduce an amount due based upon a number of factors including ability to pay, the collateral consequences, or in the interests of justice. This procedure served to

generate income from a number of fines which may not have been paid absent the ability of the debtors to pay a reduced amount.

In criminal cases the situation is somewhat different given that fines and surcharges are imposed as part of a sentence and there are time limitations which impact the ability of a court to alter or amend a sentence. See 13 V.S.A. § 7042, Sentence review (allowing 90 days from sentencing date to reduce sentence). There is, however, a statute found at 13 V.S.A. § 7180, *Remedies for failure to pay fines, costs, surcharges and penalties*. This statute does not, however, have a provision similar to the civil statute to allow reduction of amounts due. Rather, it specifically sets forth that surcharges cannot be waived and that a court may “suspend all or any part of the amount due in the interest of justice” if following a contempt hearing the court concludes the defendant is not in contempt because he does not have the ability to pay. 13 V.S.A. § 7180(c)(4)(C). Thus, the difference between the civil and criminal statutes is such that, absent some type of statutory modification, there is no ability to reduce a fine/surcharges imposed as part of a criminal sentence after the Sentence Review period has elapsed.

Impact: A process to eliminate dormant debts would not increase revenues. It would, however, bring the Judiciary’s – and hence the State’s – receivables more closely in line with collectible debts. In addition, the underlying violations, which may currently be open in the case management system solely as a result of the unpaid debt, could be closed.

Longer-term approach:

It has come to our attention that there has been discussion about transferring the Judiciary’s collections process – as well as those of other State units with revenue collections – to a future state entity responsible for State-wide revenue collection. As noted, the Judiciary effectively collects debts within the constraints discussed in this report. To the extent that a state-wide “revenue collection unit” could employ additional tools and resources toward revenue collection, it is possible that could result in a marginal increase in State revenues.

To that end, the Judiciary would not categorically object to transfer of collections to such an entity. However, any such transfer would need to ensure that the data associated with collections and payments received by this new entity are communicated effectively with the Judiciary, to ensure that the transactions in our case management system reflect as accurately and timely as possible the debts owed – or paid – by the individuals.

TABLE 1 - FY15 Judiciary Gross Revenue Collections	
By Division/Unit	Total
Judicial Bureau - Current Traffic Fine Structure	12,687,174.73
Judicial Bureau - All other JB	229,992.51
Criminal Division	2,936,162.82
Civil Division	2,472,205.68
Family Division	2,447,483.47
Grants	932,839.34
Probate Division	858,014.61
Attorney Licensing Fund	730,437.00
Research & Information Services	265,262.50
Environmental Division	56,163.74
Supreme Court	48,172.50
	23,663,908.90
By Source of Recipient Fund	Total
General Fund	6,245,096.51
Transportation Fund	4,522,152.55
JUD Pass Thru External Fund	2,708,647.27
Inter-Unit Transfers Fund	2,284,948.99
Victims Compensation Fund	2,076,677.89
Court Technology Fund	1,916,730.88
Crime Victims Restitution Fund	1,276,395.19
Attorney, Admission, Licensing	730,337.00
Domestic & Sexual Violence	683,398.62
Federal Revenue Fund	484,842.35
DUI Enforcement Special Fund	218,415.25
Public Defender Special Fund	190,853.18
Youth Substance Abuse Safety	82,532.75
Drug Task Force	76,460.25
Blood & Breath Alcohol Testing	72,728.79
Miscellaneous Grants Fund	60,000.00
Snowmobile Trails	13,634.15
All-Terrain Vehicles	12,205.52
Fish & Wildlife Fund	4,099.50
Motorboat Registration Fund	3,752.26
	23,663,908.90

TABLE 2 – ALLIANCEONE INFORMATION

**AllianceOne from FY09 to FY15
Judicial Bureau Only**

FY	Transfer to <u>Alliance 1</u>	Amount Received from <u>Alliance 1</u>
FY09	1,178,944	476,695
FY10	791,715	387,952
FY11	496,851	402,742
FY12	687,610	370,496
FY13	840,821	382,442
FY14	570,921	394,055
FY15	654,708	406,548
	5,221,570	2,820,930

**AllianceOne from FY09 to FY15
All Other Courts**

FY	Transfer to <u>Alliance 1</u>	Amount Received from <u>Alliance 1</u>
FY09	-	-
FY10	-	-
FY11	49,321	-
FY12	3,714,921	76,065
FY13	3,339,192	142,314
FY14	2,620,914	189,046
FY15	2,252,689	259,505
	11,977,036	666,930

OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT – ACT 58 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

TABLE 3 – JUDICIAL BUREAU COLLECTION HISTORY

VTADS Reports
Judicial Bureau

Generated on:

8/21/2015

Fiscal Year	Amount of Fines Ordered per Year-End (data as of FY2014)	Amount of Fines Ordered as of: 6/30/2015	Fine Amts Amended in FY2015	Amount of Fines Paid as of : 6/30/2015	Fines Receivable	% Not Paid
2015		\$ 12,999,293.20		\$ 9,771,274.80	\$ 3,228,018.40	24.83%
2014	\$13,483,599.10	\$13,345,096.30	(\$138,502.80)	\$11,331,058.43	\$ 2,014,037.87	15.09%
2013	\$13,701,913.90	\$13,478,354.42	(\$223,559.48)	\$11,800,572.98	\$ 1,677,781.44	12.45%
2012	\$13,591,078.32	\$13,441,058.72	(\$150,019.60)	\$12,039,801.67	\$ 1,401,257.05	10.43%
2011	\$14,602,163.91	\$14,468,750.27	(\$133,413.64)	\$13,027,138.32	\$ 1,441,611.95	9.96%
2010	\$16,444,837.46	\$16,314,364.36	(\$130,473.10)	\$14,932,139.35	\$ 1,382,225.01	8.47%
2009	\$16,353,389.34	\$16,244,651.62	(\$108,737.72)	\$14,952,919.37	\$ 1,291,732.25	7.95%
2008	\$15,840,203.46	\$15,745,257.61	(\$94,945.85)	\$14,627,279.86	\$ 1,117,977.75	7.10%
2007	\$17,819,233.36	\$17,743,319.66	(\$75,913.70)	\$16,618,172.60	\$ 1,125,147.06	6.34%
2006	\$18,158,437.86	\$18,066,435.81	(\$92,002.05)	\$16,888,601.06	\$ 1,177,834.75	6.52%
2005	\$17,745,635.88	\$17,659,709.45	(\$85,926.43)	\$16,546,333.02	\$ 1,113,376.43	6.30%
2004	\$17,285,351.20	\$17,226,454.77	(\$58,896.43)	\$16,313,402.98	\$ 913,051.79	5.30%
2003	\$14,525,358.93	\$14,509,814.39	(\$15,544.54)	\$13,965,144.44	\$ 544,669.95	3.75%
2002	\$13,994,048.42	\$13,982,411.79	(\$11,636.63)	\$13,423,903.28	\$ 558,508.51	3.99%
2001	\$11,229,418.39	\$11,221,033.89	(\$8,384.50)	\$10,811,376.57	\$ 409,657.32	3.65%
2000	\$10,345,798.64	\$10,334,832.64	(\$10,966.00)	\$9,991,846.59	\$ 342,986.05	3.32%
1999	\$9,767,936.05	\$9,761,712.55	(\$6,223.50)	\$9,408,014.93	\$ 353,697.62	3.62%
1998	\$9,061,330.01	\$9,054,127.55	(\$7,202.46)	\$8,758,912.16	\$ 295,215.39	3.26%
1997	\$8,429,101.71	\$8,425,461.58	(\$3,640.13)	\$8,114,650.39	\$ 310,811.19	3.69%
1996	\$6,003,864.36	\$6,000,930.73	(\$2,933.63)	\$5,757,307.36	\$ 243,623.37	4.06%
1995	\$6,015,920.22	\$6,014,791.72	(\$1,128.50)	\$5,786,891.36	\$ 227,900.36	3.79%
1994	\$5,741,679.44	\$5,740,562.44	(\$1,117.00)	\$5,515,955.17	\$ 224,607.27	3.91%
1993	\$5,626,301.63	\$5,624,879.63	(\$1,422.00)	\$5,402,643.20	\$ 222,236.43	3.95%
	\$275,766,601.59	\$ 287,403,305.10	\$ (1,362,589.69)	\$265,785,339.89	\$ 21,617,965.21	88.99%

Over 90%
collected
after 5 yrs

TABLE 4 – ASSESSMENTS AND COLLECTIONS IN CRIMINAL CASES

ASSESSMENTS AND COLLECTIONS IN CRIMINAL CASES

FISCAL YEAR 2009 - FISCAL YEAR 2015

FY	Assessed			Collected							Tax Referral		Uncollected			
	Total	Amended	Net	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
2009	\$4,121,151	-\$384,741	\$3,736,410	\$2,209,551	\$517,440	\$46,348	\$16,596	\$5,356	\$1,969	\$2,653	\$2,799,913	75%	\$666,364	18%	\$270,133	7%
2010	\$5,017,092	-\$286,326	\$4,730,766		\$2,675,149	\$560,408	\$36,304	\$13,095	\$8,555	\$4,634	\$3,298,145	70%	\$669,761	14%	\$762,860	16%
2011	\$5,143,626	-\$233,213	\$4,910,413			\$2,047,749	\$312,621	\$45,355	\$32,197	\$22,314	\$2,460,236	50%	\$690,045	14%	\$1,760,132	36%
2012	\$5,160,694	-\$241,037	\$4,919,657				\$1,750,414	\$310,787	\$45,063	\$27,243	\$2,133,507	43%	\$563,311	11%	\$2,222,839	45%
2013	\$6,007,121	-\$473,819	\$5,533,302					\$1,689,495	\$313,980	\$61,738	\$2,065,213	37%	\$943,837	17%	\$2,524,252	46%
2014	\$5,647,667	-\$336,414	\$5,311,253						\$1,500,339	\$295,276	\$1,795,615	34%	\$960,340	18%	\$2,555,298	48%
2015	\$5,295,863	-\$393,306	\$4,902,557							\$1,459,136	\$1,459,186	30%	\$254,059	5%	\$3,189,312	65%

TABLE 5 – JUDICIARY ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE AND ESTIMATED UNCOLLECTIBLE – FY09 to FY15

Judiciary - Accounts Receivable and Estimated Uncollectible - FY09 to FY15

Total Receivables	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
Courts(Criminal)	3,817,204	4,613,668	6,439,550	9,075,358	12,487,000	15,311,107	17,898,625
Judicial Bureau (Civil)	19,393,893	20,651,378	21,393,058	22,007,102	22,731,234	23,427,478	22,438,338
Total Receivables	23,211,097	25,265,046	27,832,608	31,082,460	35,218,234	38,738,585	40,336,963
of which:							
Estimated Uncollectible							
Courts(Criminal)	1,902,472	2,397,875	3,547,711	4,087,810	7,516,628	9,575,278	11,401,273
Judicial Bureau (Civil)	9,987,981	10,923,652	11,877,120	10,008,085	13,959,451	14,362,918	14,510,711
Total Estimated Uncollectible	11,890,453	13,321,527	15,424,831	14,095,895	21,476,079	23,938,196	25,911,984
Est uncollectible %	0.517	0.5326	0.55	0.4535	0.6098	0.6317	0.6573
Estimated collectible							
Courts(Criminal)	1,914,732	2,215,793	2,891,839	4,987,548	4,970,372	5,735,829	6,497,352
Judicial Bureau (Civil)	9,405,912	9,727,726	9,515,938	11,999,017	8,771,783	9,064,560	7,927,627
Estimated collectible	11,320,644	11,943,519	12,407,777	16,986,565	13,742,155	14,800,389	14,424,979