Kansas Judicial Council Bulletin

OCTOBER, 1974 PARTS 1, 2 AND 3—FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT

LEONARD O. THOMAS

President

Please Help Us Keep Our Mailing List Up to Date

The JUDICIAL COUNCIL BULLETIN is published at least twice annually and mailed without charge to lawyers, courts, public officials, newspapers and libraries, who are or may be interested in our work. We are glad to add to our mailing list the name of any person who is interested in receiving the BULLETIN regularly. We will also send current numbers to persons making requests for them, and will furnish back numbers so far as available.

In order to save unnecessary printing expenses, we are constantly revising our mailing list, and are attempting to eliminate the names of persons who have died or moved out of the state or who have changed their addresses and are receiving the BULLETIN at the new address.

Please advise promptly if you have changed your address, giving the old address as well as the new. If you do not receive any current BULLETIN and wish to remain on the mailing list, please notify us to that effect. If you are receiving a BULLETIN addressed to some person who has died or moved away, please let us know and we will remove the name from the list.

Address all inquiries to THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL, 1105 MERCHANTS BANK TOWER, TOPEKA, KAN. 66612.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	2
What Is The Proper Response Of The Bar, And Of The Courtesy To Mounting Criticism Of Lawyers, And The Judicial System? By Leonard O. Thomas, *President* of The Kansas Bar Association	3
Statistical Summary of Supreme Court—Year Ending June 30, 1974	13
Supreme Court—Fourty-seventh Year Summary	21
Table A-1—Roster of Judicial Officials as of July 1, 1974	25
Table A-2—Summary of District Courts, by Districts—Year Ending June 30, 1974	28
Table A-3—Summary of District Courts, by Counties—Disposition of Civil Cases, Inluding Domestic Relations—Year Ending June 30, 1974	34
Table A-4—Summary of District Courts, by Counties—Disposition of Domestic Relations Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974	38
Table A-5—Summary of District Courts, by Counties—Types of Civil Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974	42
Table A-6—Summary of District Courts, State as a Whole—Types of Civil Cases Commenced	46
Table B-1—Summary of District Courts, by Counties—Disposition of Criminal Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974	47
Table B-2—Summary of District Courts, by Counties—Types of Crimes—Year Ending June 30, 1974	51
Table C-1—Probate Courts, Summary of Business Handled—Year Ending June 30, 1974	55
Table C-2—Estates of Decedants—Year Ending June 30, 1974	59
Table C-3—Guardianship and Trusts—Year Ending June 30, 1974	63
Table D-1—Disposition of Civil Cases, County Courts—Year Ending June 30, 1974	67
Table D-2—Disposition of Criminal Cases, County Courts—Year Ending June 30, 1974	71
Table E-1—Disposition of Civil Cases, City Courts—Year Ending June 30, 1974	75
Table E-2—Disposition of Criminal Cases, City Courts—Year Ending June 30, 1974	76
Please Help Us Keep Our Mailing List Up To Date	*(Inside front cover)*
Members of Judicial Council	*(Inside back cover)*
Former Members of Judicial Council	*(Inside back cover)*

FOREWORD

The Honorable Leonard O. Thomas, President of the Kansas Bar Association, has been requested to prepare an article on the subject of his choosing for publication in this issue of the *Judicial Council Bulletin.* He has done so, and we believe that his article is timely and should command the attention of the attorneys throughout the state. It is entitled "What Is The Proper Response Of The Bar, And Of The Courtesy To Mounting Criticism Of Lawyers, And The Judicial System?"

Leonard O. Thomas was born in Eugene, Oregon on June 30, 1911. He graduated from the Kansas City Missouri Junior College in 1931, and from the Kansas University School of Law in 1934, with the degree of LL.B. He was admitted to the Bar of the state of Missouri and Kansas in 1934, and began practice in Kansas City, Kansas in 1934. He continued practice in that city as a sole practitioner until 1942, at which time he joined the firm of Stanley, Stanley, Schroeder, Weeks & Thomas. He has continued practice with that firm to this date, the firm name now being Weeks, Thomas, Lysaught, Bingham & Mustain, Chartered. He was elected a member of the Order of the Coif, the American College of Trial Lawyers, and is a member of the Phi Delta Phi Legal Fraternity and the American Federation of Insurance Counsel. He is co-author of Kansas Practice Methods and an advisor to the preparation of Vernon's Kansas Statutes Annotated (Code of Civil Procedure). He has contributed articles for publication in the University of Kansas Law Review, the Journal of the Kansas Bar Association, and the University of Kansas City Law Review. His office has been in Kansas City, Kansas from July of 1934 to the present time, where he has been engaged in the general trial practice with emphasis upon casualty related matters.

In 1965, he was elected to the Executive Council of the Kansas Bar Association as the representative of the First District. He was reelected to the Council for succeeding terms until elected an officer of the Kansas Bar Association.

This issue of the *Bulletin* also contains summarized tables showing the volume of work in the Supreme Court, the district courts, probate courts, county courts and city courts of the state for the year ending June 30, 1974.

WHAT IS THE PROPER RESPONSE OF THE BAR, AND THE COURTS, TO MOUNTING CRITICISM OF LAWYERS, AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM?

(1) The Nature of the Attack

On August 13, 1974, the second day of the American Bar Convention in Honolulu, the local paper, the Honolulu *Advertiser,* greeted the visiting lawyers and judges with an article by a columnist which included the following:

"Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? Indeed, who will guard the guardians? Who will watch over those who are the watchers?

* * *

"But who watches over the lawyers? Who judges their worth as lawyers, their competence?

"STRANGELY ENOUGH, only other lawyers. And yet experience should certainly have taught us that no one group of human beings has ever been able to police itself without external controls.

"This is especially true of professionals because they all are disposed to protecting themselves from those outside their particular professions.

* * *

"WE HAVE NOT as yet provided means to police the legal profession except by members of the legal profession itself. And that provides no police at all. No control whatever.

* * *

"This would not be particularly dangerous were lawyers restricted to participation in only the Judiciary. But this is not true. Lawyers today control the other two branches of government. They predominate in the Executive. They are the majority of the Legislative.

* * *

"And it is obvious that poor old Karl Marx was wholly mistaken when he prophesied the eventual dictatorship of the proletariat. What we have today is the dictatorship of the lawyers."

A reading of contemporary writing indicates that this is no isolated comment by a disappointed litigant, but only one of a rising crescendo of articles, some in depth, some out of depth, some cursory, as well as editorials, newscasts and television programs devoted to the unmet need for essential legal services, the lawyer's proper role, his failing, his greed, the violation of even criminal law by some. Indeed, it seems that reporters have arrogated to themselves the duty of not only watching the courts, and the Bar, but the duty of formulating public opinion as to how and when and under what conditions lawyers should advise and protect the public. Thus, William Safire, a widely syndicated columnist for the New York *Times,* has written:

"I often go around muttering to myself, 'No man should be above the law.' Doctors and lawyers, huddled in protective shells called professional associations, should not be above the law that protects that individual's right of entry into the marketplace.

"Canons of ethics can be measures of monopoly, and the Hippocratic Oath can conceal its share of hypocrisy; as investment bankers have shown, advertising can be restrained and informative, not strident or hucksterish.

"The professions will one day be considering the how, and not the if, of advertising. Never say never; such a flat 'Sherman statement' is out of place in the field of antitrust."

Sample headlines include "How Well Do Lawyers Serve the Cause of Justice" (Parade) "Physician" (Lawyer) "Hail Thyself," "Coming Soon: Law Madison Avenue Style," Newspaper Enterprise Assn. The list from prestigious as well as popular publications could be extended, as any lawyer would say, ad nauseum.

The question now confronting us as lawyers, as well as the courts, is what we will do about this flood of invective, inquiry, suggestion and demand. It may not have been noticed that the brunt of this criticism, presently, is directed to the methods of delivering of legal service, the cost of legal services, the availability of legal advice, and to the formulation and enforcement of ethical considerations which should govern the actions of judges and attorneys. The criticism does not, except that by recognized pressure groups, often go to the rules of law or basic courtroom procedure, or the basis of office practice. The criticism is, thus, basically in areas not thought of, by attorneys, as being the concern of those outside the profession who have no real expertise in answering problems concerning ethics of delivery of legal services or the cost of these services. Thus our response to these criticisms may take the traditional attitude, which is that these criticisms merely reflect the feelings and attitudes which necessarily result from a lawyer's work and are no different than they always have been. Thus all of us know that because of the nature of our profession, and the basic structure of an adversary proceeding, at least half, and once in my own experience all, of the participants in a legal proceeding lose, with resulting complaints (sometimes even by the lawyers), recriminations and bad feeling our system must generate. Because of this situation, the very nature of our system of justice, the profession, the law and, to a lesser extent, our courts, have always been criticized and attacked, and have for the most part withstood these assaults by the simple expedient of ignoring them. My experience as an officer of the Kansas Bar Association has led me to believe that most lawyers in Kansas presently take this attitude and sincerely believe that our present methods of delivering legal services, tested by time, are working well, that Kansas lawyers are ethical and trustworthy, and that changes, especially radical changes in these areas, should be violently opposed.

It is suggested here that this attitude will not suffice, that times have in fact changed in that lawyers and judges are not now, by and large, as they once were, the molders of public opinion, but that the media, that is television, newspapers and magazines, probably in that order, are. I think it has been demonstrated in the last twenty years that reporters and writers for the media have not only reported facts, but have molded opinion. I know of no reporters or writers who are at all reticent about shouting to the public their version of the facts concerning our failings, as they see them. The lawyer or judge who believes that the media as this group is collectively called, since the advent of television, cannot effectively force changes which the individual writers and newscasters collectively believe necessary, is standing, with his eyes closed, in the eye of the tornado.

Further, the Bar should not make the same mistake the reporters did when considering no fault, and which some have made when considering the Uniform Probate Code. This mistake was the refusal of reporters to look carefully at the logic and statistics given by lawyers, but instead to dismiss the

statements made and information given by lawyers as a statement by interested persons not worthy of careful consideration. Every lawyer who has dealt with reporters on these subjects has had this experience, an experience which has left some quite bitter. Lawyers who now summarily dismiss the suggestions being made by the media would be making the same mistake. Perhaps such a mistake might be excused in a reporter, but never in a judge or lawyer who is trained to examine all evidence, no matter who produces it.

The fact is that a number of the suggestions made have real substance, and that remedial action should be seriously undertaken by the bench and bar. The most serious charge is that legal services are not delivered efficiently, or at a reasonable cost, and that as a result, large segments of our society are partially or completely denied the benefit of counsel. The second charge, widely, repeatedly made, is that lawyers give only lip service to ethical considerations and have been widely and uniformly guilty of violating not only ethical standards but criminal law. These will be briefly discussed in order.

(2) The Delivering of Legal Services

To call what lawyers do the "delivery of legal service" seems to put a mercantile connotation on professional services, but it is the term now in general use by those who consider the availability of legal advice to those who knowingly, or unknowingly, need such advice. The whole area is presently the subject of inquiry by Senator Tunney's "Subcommittee on the Judiciary on Representation of Citizen Interest." To this date, 1,800 pages of statements and testimony have been taken.

The hearings began with a statement by Senator Tunney that "more than 30,000 legal questions each day affecting Americans personally are not resolved because people cannot afford legal counsel. While the basis for this statement is not given, if it is one-half or one-fourth or one-twenty-fifth true, every lawyer and judge must take notice. How long will citizens stand a system which does not furnish what all, even the media, concede to be essential service, to those who need it? How long should lawyers suffer it to exist? Senator Tunney made a further remark with which every lawyer can agree, "As bureaucracies become more complex and unresponsive, the citizen needs a lawyer more than ever." I know of my own knowledge that in the last 40 years the number, and the difficulty of answering, legal questions has increased every year that Congress or the legislature, and sometimes the appellate court, has met, that the cost of rendering service has steadily increased, and that large segments of our society do not consult lawyers on most legal problems. Since the lawyer population is expected to double by 1985 (Tunney hearing legal fees, page 4) and since it must be admitted that some legal practices are inefficient and therefore could be made more efficient, it would seem that it would be physically possible for the Bar, with the assistance of the courts, to see to it that those who needed legal services could both recognize the need and secure such services if desired. There have been many suggestions as to how this can be done. Some will be here discussed:

(*a*) Advertising

Not surprisingly, newspaper reporters have recently been featuring an article which appeared in the Yale Law Journal entitled "Advertising, Solicitation

and the Professional Duty to Make Legal Counsel Available," Robert E. Gipson, 81 Yale Law Journal 1181 (1972).

It is argued that the First Amendment to the Constitution prohibiting infringements on free speech and free press is in conflict with the Canon 2 prohibiting advertising and that advertising would not only reduce the cost of legal services, but would inform citizens as to where it could be obtained, and perhaps when it would be needed.

Most members of the Bar will be surprised to know that responsible lawyers at the 1974 A. B. A. convention in Honolulu seriously debated the question as to whether the following advertisement should (1) as a matter of public service be permitted, and (2) irrespective of the answer to question 1, whether the Canon prohibiting it is inconsistent with the due process clause and free speech amendment to the United State Constitution:

"Do you need
QUALITY LEGAL SERVICE
at a
MINIMUM PRICE?

Then you need
The Legal Clinic of
HOLMES, HARRIS & HONE
for
DOMESTIC RELATIONS
WILLS AND ESTATES
BANKRUPTCY
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION
REAL ESTATE CLOSINGS
CONSUMER COMPLAINTS
LANDLORD-TENANT
PLUS
COUNSELING FOR TRAFFIC
AND SMALL CLAIMS COURT"

It is disconcerning to find that a knowledgable layman's first reaction to the idea that a lawyer might advertise the amount of his fee for a given service was that a lawyer wouldn't dare, no one would employ him. Those of us in the practice know that this is not true, and that in fact people not used to employing attorneys are usually agreeably surprised to find the fee less than expected.

The reporters are now, thus, directly asking the question as to whether the Kansas Supreme Court's Canon 2 is justified.

In connection with the debate on the advertisement mentioned above, it was said on the one hand:

"The present disciplinary rules constitute a serious impediment to obtaining affordable counsel capable of meeting the legal needs of groups and individuals. If the potential client or subscriber to group legal services cannot be apprised of the fact that he can, financially speaking, obtain an attorney or firm capable of handling his legal problems or providing a package of legal protective insurance, he will have been denied the means to effective access

to the courts. Where the holders of a right are denied the information needed to exercise that right, so too, for all practical purposes, is that right denied.

* * *

"In considering what specific conduct should be prohibited the potential for resulting harm has been of primary importance. On this basis the Bar and states have traditionally regulated against the practices of barratry, maintenance and champerty. *E. g., McCloskey v. Tobin,* 252 U. S. 107, 108 (1920). They have also sought to guard against deceptive and fraudulent practices fomenting litigation motivated solely by an attorney's desire for personal gain, 'ambulance chasing' and abuse of legal process. *E. g., Vitaphone Corp. v. Hutchinson Amusement Co.,* 28 F. Supp. 526 (D. C. Mass. 1939); *In re Welch,* 156 App. Div. 470, 141 N. Y. S. 381 (1913); *Fordsom Coal Co. v. Gerrerd,* 277 Ky. 218, 125 S. W. 2d 777 (1939).

* * *

"The disciplinary rules at issue here operate to maintain the costs of legal services at an unnecessarily high level and to limit or entirely prevent the dissemination of information concerning the availability of affordable legal services. They do this primarily by fostering a non-competitive market-place for legal services. Restrictions on advertising and solicitation, for example, impede the free play of price and quality competition among those engaged in traditional legal practice."

On the other hand, it was there said:

"Advertising and solicitation have long been considered at odds with proper professional conduct. By commercializing it, such practices work to undermine the lawyer-client relationship.

"In the 1928 case *In matter of Cohn,* 261 Mass. 484 (1928) in disciplining an attorney for advertising 'quiet divorces' the Court stated:

'It is incompatible with the maintenance of correct professional standards to employ commercial methods of attracting patronage. Advertising such as that disclosed in the record is commonly designed to stimulate popular attention to the end that the business of the advertising may be increased. It has always been regarded as contrary to sound public policy for an attorney to foment litigation or to instigate law suits.' *Id.*

"In *People v. McCabe,* 32 Pac. 280 (Colo. 1893), the Court warned that 'the foundation on which the principles of conduct rests is that attorneys at bar pursue a profession, they do not conduct a trade.' *See, also, Sember v. Oregon State Board of Dental Examiners,* supra; *In re Schwarz,* 132 N. E. 921 (N. Y. 1921); *In re Newman,* supra; A. B. A. Committee on Professional Ethics, *Formal Opinions* 148 (1935), 133 (1935), 116 (1934), 107 (1934), 72 (1932), 59 (1931) and 43 (1931); Drinker, *supra* at 59."

It came as a distinct shock to learn that this issue is debatable, and to listen to Lewis Bernsteen, Chief of the Litigation Section, Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, tell the National Conference of Bar Presidents in 1973 that advertising, except that false, misleading or undignified, should (must?) be permitted. No answer to the debate is suggested here except to say that in some manner those who need legal services must be made aware of the need, and of how it can be met. The reporters are asking whether or not we are capable of looking at this question from the standpoint of the public interest, and whether, in the public interest, more information must be given.

(*b*) Legal Clinics

It has been suggested that in the interest of economy, lawyers should practice together as a well-organized legal clinic. It is said that the cost of rendering legal services could be drastically reduced.

In such a clinic, usually a ground floor, storefront room, a client would see first a layman who would take the facts, send the client then to a lawyer who had special competence in the legal area involved. Legal services would be confined to divorces, bankruptcy, landlord-tenant law, garnishment, etc. Laymen would draw pleadings, under supervision, and do a great many of the things lawyers now do. A special schedule of fees known to the client, much less than the Bar usually charges, would govern. A group practice, operated in this fashion, if kept busy by advertising, or closed panel legal service agreements could, it is said, render quality, if impersonal, legal services with a great saving in lawyer's time and therefore a greatly reduced fee, all to persons now largely without access to lawyers.

As a matter of fact, the idea is not as novel as it seems, for most of the large law offices are organized on a somewhat impersonal basis for the purpose of having specialists within the firm handle problems with which they are familiar, often without the initial knowledge of the client. It is well known that this promotes efficiency, reduces the fee, and results in better service. As a matter of fact, knowledgable clients purposely seek out such firms because these clients want the firm to select someone familiar with their particular problems. Such clients know they do not have the ability or the time to determine the expertise of individual attorneys, and rely on the firm to assign such to them.

The only real difference between the actual rendition of service by ordinary large firms and the legal clinic as described, is the legal clinic's greater use of paralegal personel. It has been argued, and it seems sound to me, that a great many of the things done every day by any lawyer could be done as well, often better, by a well-trained and supervised paralegal. The large law firms, because of increased client resistence to legal fees, will finally be forced to maximum use of paralegals. Why should there be any objection to the legal clinic? Why shouldn't organization of legal clinics in the public interest be encouraged as one way of providing service to the groups who cannot in fact, for economic reasons, pay fees now charged? If quality services can be rendered at less cost, do we not have a duty to see to it that such is encouraged?

So far as known, there is presently no legal clinic in Kansas with special low fees specializing in the kind of problems common to people with middle or lower income such as divorce, contracts of sale, garnishment, warranties, replevin, landlord and tenant law, etc. If there were one, it could not advertise either its existence or its expertise, and without advertising or a closed panel contract probably could not secure sufficient clientele to operate efficiently. Consideration must be given to such practice.

(*c*) Prepaid Legal Service

Any lawyer who reads any of the publications of the Kansas Bar Association knows that the Kansas Bar Association is in the forefront of those prepared to offer contracts for prepaid legal service. We have recognized the opportunity and have offered an attractive open panel plan.

It is a matter of regrettable history that the United States Supreme Court had to force the organized Bar to accept the possibility of so furnishing legal services, this having been accomplished by the combined effect of four cases decided between the years 1962 and 1970: *NAACP v. Button,* 371 U. S. 415

(1962); *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. Virginia Bar Association,* 377 U. S. 1 (1963); *United Mine Workers of America v. Illinois Bar Association,* 389 U. S. 217 (1967); *United Transportation Union v. State Bar of Michigan,* 401 U. S. 576 (1970).

The Kansas open panel program has had difficulty in the beginning, partly because it is new, partly because of difficulty caused by competition of closed panels espoused by some consumer groups, some unions and one of the deputy U. S. Attorney Generals. The exact manner and character in which this service will emerge is not yet known, but it either as open or closed panels, has the potential of supplying legal services at a cost the public can bear to large groups to whom it is not now available.

(*d*) Small Claims Court

All persons familiar with legal problems are aware of the legal problems concerning the $25.00 cost of a broken window, a $75.00 fender scratch, the toaster that won't work. Resolving liability in many of these situations involves as much research and lawyer time as is involved in solving similar problems involving thousands, maybe millions, of dollars. The economics of the situation are such that the overhead, without any fee whatever, incurred by a lawyer who seeks to legally answer these problems often far exceeds the amount involved, yet the $25.00 loss incurred by a person whose income is $100.00 per week is a serious loss to which any system of justice must give some attention.

One answer has often been a small claims court, sometimes a court from which lawyers are barred. Kansas is among the states providing such services, K. S. A. 1973 Supp. 61-2701 *et seq.* having been approved by the 1973 Legislature. This court has jurisdiction up to $300.00, no discovery, one pleading, a petition, a $5.00 cost deposit, and under amendments in 1974, freedom of appeal. Prior to judgment, no lawyer may appear for any litigant, a matter which should concern the public since all controversies should be decided in accordance with legal principles. To deny a litigant not only its privilege of suggesting applicable legal principles, but the equally valuable privilege of having a lawyer assemble the relevant evidence, because one or both of the parties is poor, would not seem to promote a just resolution of disputes. Further, if a corporation appears in one of these courts by, for instance, its manager, isn't he, under all classical definitions, practicing law?

Kansas certainly needs no Federal intervention, but it is interesting that Republican Senator Cook, as part of the Tunney proceedings, stated:

"Let me say one thing relative to the remarks that the chairman made. Where the chairman and I disagree is that I think there should be a Federal system of small claims courts. As a matter of fact, I think this is really the way to answer this situation and get to it.

* * *

"I just think if a man has one lousy television set, he ought to be able to go into a small claims court under Federal rules in his own jurisdiction and try that one television case that he has been knocked out of the box on rather than have to join 9,873 other people and have a case tried in Detroit or Cleveland or someplace else that he does not even know when it is being tried."

Most Kansas lawyers would doubt the wisdom of a Federal Small Claims Court, especially if it is one with no lawyer and with jurisdiction to $3,000.00.

(3) The Ethical Standards of Kansas Lawyers

On May 4, 1973, the Kansas Supreme Court entered an order requiring all members of the Bar of that Court to register annually and to pay an annual $20.00 fee to be deposited in a "Bar Disciplinary Fee Fund." This fund has been used to finance disciplinary proceedings with the result that the effectiveness of such proceedings has been tremendously improved, as the following statistics for the first full year will indicate.

During the year July 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974, 2 lawyers were disbarred, 26 were suspended, 7 suffered public censure, and 4 private censure. The lawyers are thus shown to be financing, as they should, investigation and processing of complaints, with the result that the profession is being cleansed of those who do not live up to the ethical standards expected. The Supreme Court is certainly to be commended for its role in enforcing ethical standards.

The court is further to be commended for its adoption on February 11, 1970 of the carefully prepared Code of Professional Responsibility. In commenting on this Code, the court, in *State v. Alvey,* 215 Kan. 460 (July, 1974), stated:

"Every lawyer in this state should be familiar with the Code of Professional Responsibility. He should continuously seek to understand the obligations and duties placed on him by its provisions. It should be assumed that he knows certain kinds of conduct, generally condemned by responsible persons, will be grounds for discipline. The disciplinary rules of the code, having been adopted pursuant to statutory power, have the force and effect of a statute; and conduct of any attorney licensed by this court to practice law in this state may be subject to discipline if his conduct falls below the standards contained in these rules." (l. c. 464.)

There exists, therefore, now both a modern code of conduct and an effective means of enforcement.

No code, and no enforcement, will be truly effective unless lawyers are in fact taught to practice by, as well as live by, the ethical code thus established. Therefore, inquiry was made as to the present practice with respect to the teaching of ethics in the law schools. Dean Martin B. Dickinson, Jr., Dean of the School of Law, University of Kansas, and Dean Raymond L. Spring, Dean of the School of Law, Washburn University of Topeka, both replied with letters which disclose the faculty's recognition of the necessity of careful and complete instruction on ethical matters and the methods being used to meet the need. Both letters are included in full in Notes 1 and 2.

Such instruction is particularly necessary for law students because all lawyers know that the lawyer's practice will peculiarly require him to be in the area where temptation exists. We know that Watergate has laid bare lack of instruction, lack of screening, or the human inability of some to resist, and that any failure in these respects affects the public welfare. We are proud that the members of our profession are the ones who have and are cleaning up the mess, and proud that, with the smallest of exceptions, Kansas lawyers are honest, ethical and trustworthy citizens.

We are obviously trying to improve the quality of our service to the public by promulgating basic ethical consideration, by teaching ethics and by punishing deviation from the standards. One suggestion is here made, however, and that is that laymen be involved in the disciplinary proceedings. It is my thought that they would bring understanding and knowledge of what ought to be expected of our profession which would prove very helpful.

Conclusion

The question of how legal services may be effectively made available to all segments of our society has not been solved. It is a problem for which many solutions have been offered, some having been here discussed. It is a problem which must be met and satisfactorily answered by both the organized Bar and the Judiciary. The best legal minds are groping for a proper answer.

The question of legal ethics, because of the innate frailties of human nature, has always been a problem. The Kansas Supreme Court has, effectively, moved toward as complete a solution of this problem as is possible in our society. The Bar salutes the Court for its progress and pledges its support.

NOTE 1—DEAN DICKINSON:

"You asked for a summary of our instruction in ethical responsibility of lawyers. As I told you, we require for graduation a one hour course titled Legal Profession. This course is primarily devoted to the ethical responsibilities of a member of the legal profession, although some attention is given to related topics, such as the economics of law practice. Perhaps one-half of the class sessions consist not of presentations by a faculty member, but appearances by outsiders whose views are important in this respect. For example, Earl Hatcher, Disciplinary Administrator, presents a lecture on his office and its view of enforcement of ethical responsibilities. Justice David Prager gives a lecture on ethics as it relates to judges and the courtroom. We have found that often a practicing lawyer or a judge will have somewhat greater credibility in these matters than a member of the law faculty.

"In addition, ethical matters are discussed with great frequency in other courses in the curriculum. As I told you, I find that such matters crop up on numerous occasions in my Estate Planning course. I discuss them in depth right along with the substantive issues involved.

"The Legal Profession course has been offered and required as a condition of graduation at the K. U. Law School since, 'the mind of man runneth not to the contrary.'"

NOTE 2—DEAN SPRING:

"1. All first year students spend one week in general orientation prior to the commencement of law school classes. My practice is to welcome them, on the first day, to the legal profession, stressing that as law students they will be seen by many as representatives of the profession, and thus have an obligation to be aware of, and responsive to, the standards of the profession. During this first week there is a two hour block every day entitled 'The Legal Profession' and a substantial segment is devoted to a general discussion of the Code of Professional Responsibility.

"2. During the first semester all students are required to take a course in Law & Legal Method. The objective of this course is to create an understanding of the interrelationship of the various 'parts' of the law in a single complex of facts; it is something of a counterbalance to the segregated approach we have in the other basic courses such as Torts, Contracts, Procedure, etc. Professional Responsibility problems are among those specifically receiving consideration as a part of any situation.

"3. In the second semester all students are required to take one hour of credit which deals specifically with the lawyer-client relationship. This consists of eight one hour lecture sessions team-taught by a lawyer and a psychiatrist which examine the interpersonal dynamics of this relationship. Each lecture is followed by another hour of small-group discussion of the materials raised in the lecture. The objective is to make the student more fully aware of the unique position the lawyer holds, both from professional position and in the eyes of the client.

"4. In the second year, those students who elect to do so take a three hour course which is preparatory to internship with the legal clinic in the third year. One third of this course is devoted to study of the code of professional responsibility as a whole. Those who actually do serve an internship in the third year are expected to (and do) consult with the instructors of the second year professional responsibility course on problems arising in the clinical practice.

"5. Those students who do not participate in the clinical courses (par. 4) are required in their third year to take a one hour course in Legal Ethics which is devoted to the study of the Code of Professional Responsibility.

"Our ultimate objective is to achieve a saturation of the student, so that the Code is thought of not as a list of 'no-no's', but rather as a description of a professional lifestyle."

Statistical Summary of Supreme Court
Year Ending June 30, 1974

Rule No. 14 (1)

Pursuant to Rule No. 14 (1), the following statistical report relating to appeals to the supreme court and to original cases filed in the supreme court for the year ending June 30, 1974, is submitted.

SUMMARY OF CASES APPEALED TO SUPREME COURT

	Appeals pending 7-1-73	Appeals commenced during FY	Appeals docketed during FY	Appeals terminated during FY	Appeals pending 7-1-74
District court	409	592	.....	259	429
Supreme court	243	.....	313	335	221
Totals	652	592	313	594	650

SUMMARY OF SUPREME COURT DOCKET

	Pending 7-1-73	Commenced	Terminated	Pending 7-1-74
Civil appeals	188	215	265	138
Criminal appeals	55	98	70	83
Original cases	7	29	29	7
Totals	250	342	364	228

The preceding summary does not include 31 criminal and civil appeals specially docketed under Rules 5, 6 (*j*) and 17 and in which disposition of a case was not made or in which the case was not regularly docketed by filing the record on appeal. (See pages 4 and 5, *infra.*)

YEARLY COMPARISONS OF SUPREME COURT ACTIVITY

	7-1-72	7-1-73	7-1-74
Civil appeals commenced	245	233	215
Criminal appeals commenced	84	63	98
Original cases commenced	39	45	29
Totals	368	341	342
Civil appeals terminated	236	289	265
Criminal appeals terminated	96	81	70
Original cases terminated	41	50	29
Totals	373	420	364
Civil appeals left pending	249	188	138
Criminal appeals left pending	60	55	83
Original cases left pending	12	7	7
Totals	321	250	228

The study indicates that the number of cases pending on the supreme court docket has been reduced from 321 in 1972 to 228 by the end of fiscal year 1974. This has been achieved largely by the use of summary docket procedures and the assistance of retired district judges assigned to the supreme court. While the supreme court docket has thus been reduced (228 cases), the total number of cases pending remains high (657 cases) when combined with the number of appeals still in the district courts being prepared for docketing in the supreme court (429 appeals).

SUMMARY OF DISPOSITIONS
Year ending June 30, 1974

Type of Termination	Civil and criminal appeals						
	Work. Comp.	60-1507	Other Civil	All Civil	Direct Crim.	Total	% of Total
Dismissed	2	3	25	30	4	34	10.1
Affirmed	13	15	114	142	52	194	57.9
Reversed	2	0	36	38	4	42	12.6
Affirmed in part							
Reversed in part	0	0	15	15	0	15	4.5
Reversed and remanded	1	1	31	33	10	43	12.8
Other	0	0	7	7	0	7	2.1
Totals	18	19	228	265	70	335	100%

Original cases terminated		29
Denied	13	
Granted	1	
Dismissed	9	
Suspensions	4	
Other	2	
Additional Rule No. 6 (*j*) applications		15
Applications granted	4	
Applications denied	11	
Rule No. 5. Applications (civil interlocutory)		6
Applications granted	2	
Applications denied	4	
Rule No. 17. Applications (criminal interlocutory)		2
Both applications denied		

APPEALS TERMINATED BY FORMAL OPINION

Following is a time study based on the 301 formal opinions disposing of criminal and civil appeals during fiscal year 1974. Comparison is made with statistics of three previous years, showing the average length of time in months required to dispose of cases in the various categories. The readiness date as used in the study is the date of filing of the appellee's brief. In a few cases in which the brief of the appellee was not filed, the readiness date is computed as of the date the brief was due. The time of docketing these appeals is computed as of the date the record on appeal was filed, which is the normal docketing date, notwithstanding the previous special docketing of some cases. The submission date is the date the case is argued before the supreme court.

TIME STUDY No. 1

ALL CIVIL AND CRIMINAL APPEALS TERMINATED BY FORMAL OPINION—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

	Workmen's Compensation	60-1507	Other Civil	All Civil	Direct Criminal
Average time elapsed from notice of appeal to docketing	4.7 mos. (4.2 '73) (2.9 '72) (4.9 '71)	6.8 mos. (6.7 '73) (8.0 '72) (5.8 '71)	5.7 mos. (5.4 '73) (5.1 '72) (5.4 '71)	5.7 mos. (5.5 '73) (5.3 '72) (5.5 '71)	9.7 mos. (8.0 '73) ....
Average time elapsed from docketing to readiness	4.7 mos. (4.4 '73) (4.1 '72) (2.8 '71)	4.3 mos. (4.5 '73) (3.6 '72) (4.9 '71)	4.2 mos. (4.4 '73) (4.4 '72) (3.8 '71)	4.4 mos. (4.4 '73) (4.3 '72) (3.9 '71)	5.3 mos. (5.4 '73) (12.3 '72) (11.4 '71)
Average time elapsed from readiness to decision	5.8 mos. (5.5 '73) (4.4 '72) (3.9 '71)	5.8 mos. (4.5 '73) (4.9 '72) (4.4 '71)	6.1 mos. (8.7 '73) (11.9 '72) (10.6 '71)	5.9 mos. (8.0 '73) (11.2 '72) (9.4 '71)	4.0 mos. (4.1 '73) (3.9 '72) (4.7 '71)
Average time elapsed from docketing to decision	10.5 mos. (9.9 '73) (8.6 '72) (6.7 '71)	10.1 mos. (9.0 '73) (8.5 '72) (9.4 '71)	10.2 mos. (13.1 '73) (16.3 '72) (14.4 '71)	10.3 mos. (12.4 '73) (15.5 '72) (13.3 '71)	9.2 mos. (9.5 '73) (16.2 '72) (16.1 '71)
Average time elapsed from notice of appeal to decision	15.2 mos. (14.1 '73) (11.4 '72) (11.7 '71)	17.0 mos. (15.6 '73) (16.6 '72) (15.2 '71)	16.1 mos. (18.5 '73) (21.4 '72) (19.8 '71)	15.9 mos. (17.9 '73) (20.8 '72) (18.8 '71)	19.0 mos. (17.5 '73) (19.8 '72) (17.5 '71)
Average time elapsed from docketing to submission	7.6 mos. (8.3 '73)	8.7 mos. (8.0 '73)	8.9 mos. (11.4 '73)	8.4 mos. (10.8 '73)	7.9 mos. (8.1 '73)

Based on: 16 Workmen's Compensation appeals, 16 60-1507 appeals, 203 other civil appeals, 66 criminal appeals

TIME STUDY No. 2
WHEN THE CASES WERE HEARD

Length of Time	Workmen's Compensation	60-1507	Other Civil	All Civil	Criminal	Total	% Total
Up to 6 months	6	6	24	36	24	60	19.9
6-8 months	1	2	53	56	20	76	25.2
8-10 months	2	5	53	60	10	70	23.3
10-12 months	4	2	57	63	7	70	23.3
12-14 months	2	0	12	14	2	16	5.3
14-16 months	1	0	3	4	0	4	1.3
16-18 months	0	0	1	1	1	2	0.7
18-20 months	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.3
Over 20 months	0	1	0	1	1	2	0.7
Totals	16	16	203	235	66	301	100%

The Summary Docket

During fiscal year 1974, 31 civil and four criminal appeals were heard through the summary docket procedure and were terminated by formal opinion. On the following page is a time study of the civil and criminal appeals that were *not* placed on the summary docket; that is, the study *excludes* all of the appeals heard through the summary docket procedure. Below each figure, in parentheses, is the average time taken from the time study on page 6, *supra,* which included all civil and criminal appeals.

Of the 16 Workmen's Compensation appeals terminated, two (12.5%) were terminated on the summary docket. Nine (56.3%) of the 16 K. S. A. 60-1507 appeals were terminated on the summary docket. Twenty of the 203 other civil appeals (9.9%) were terminated through the summary docket procedure; therefore, 13.2% of all civil cases terminated by formal opinion were heard through the summary docket procedure.

Of the 66 criminal appeals terminated by formal opinion, four (6.1%) were heard through the summary docket procedure.

Of the 301 total appeals terminated by formal opinion, 35 (11.6%) were heard through the summary docket procedure.

TIME STUDY No. 3

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL APPEALS TERMINATED BY FORMAL OPINION
(APPEALS HEARD UNDER SUMMARY DOCKET PROCEDURE *EXCLUDED*)*—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

	Workmen's Compensation	60-1507	Other Civil	All Civil	Direct Criminal
Average time elapsed from notice of appeal to docketing	5.0 mos. (4.7)	8.1 mos. (6.8)	6.0 mos. (5.7)	6.4 mos. (5.7)	9.9 mos. (9.7)
Average time elapsed from docketing to readiness	4.8 mos. (4.7)	5.5 mos. (4.3)	4.3 mos. (4.2)	4.9 mos. (4.4)	5.4 mos. (5.3)
Average time elapsed from readiness to decision	6.2 mos. (5.8)	5.3 mos. (5.8)	6.1 mos. (6.1)	5.8 mos. (5.9)	4.0 mos. (4.0)
Average time elapsed from docketing to decision	11.1 mos. (10.5)	10.9 mos. (10.1)	10.4 mos. (10.2)	10.7 mos. (10.3)	9.3 mos. (9.2)
Average time elapsed from notice of appeal to decision	16.0 mos. (15.2)	18.9 mos. (17.0)	16.5 mos. (16.1)	17.0 mos. (15.9)	19.3 mos. (19.0)
Average time elapsed from docketing to submission	9.4 mos. (7.6)	9.5 mos. (8.7)	9.0 mos. (8.9)	9.3 mos. (8.4)	7.9 mos. (7.9)

* Based on:
16 Workmen's Compensation appeals (2 summary docket)
16 60-1507 appeals (9 summary docket)
203 Other civil appeals (20 summary docket)
66 Criminal appeals (4 summary docket)

Summary of Civil Appeals Pending in Supreme Court

On June 30, 1974, there were 138 civil appeals pending on the Supreme Court docket. They are classified as follows:

Civil cases submitted in June	35
Civil cases set for October (as of July 1)	0
Cases not submitted or set	103
	138

The status of the pending civil cases not submitted or set for hearing is as follows:

Cases ready	34
Appellant ready only	35
No brief either side	34
	103

The average length of time that all civil cases were pending on the docket as of June 30, 1974, is as follows:

From notice of appeal	8.8 months
	(12.4 '73) months
	(12.3 '72) months
From date of docketing	3.3 months
	(5.67 '73) months
	(6.5 '72) months

The age of 103 civil appeals not submitted as of June 30, 1974, is as follows:

	From docketing	From notice of appeal
Number pending up to 6 months	94 (105 '73)	33 (58 '73)
Number pending 6 to 12 months	8 (45 '73)	49 (51 '73)
Number pending over 12 months	1 (2 '73)	21 (43 '73)
Total pending not submitted	103 (152 '73)	103 (152 '73)

Summary of Criminal Appeals Pending in Supreme Court

On June 30, 1974, there were 83 criminal appeals pending in the Supreme Court. They are classified as follows:

Criminal cases submitted in June	8
Criminal cases set for October (as of June 30)	0
Not submitted or set	75
	83

Of the 75 cases not submitted or set, 15 were ready, 25 had the appellant's brief filed, and in 35 cases only the record on appeal had been filed.

The age of the criminal appeals not submitted as of June 30, 1974, is as follows:

	From docketing	From notice of appeal
Number pending up to 6 months	65	15
Number pending 6 to 12 months	9	31
Number pending over 12 months	1	29
Total pending not submitted	75	75

The average length of time of the 75 criminal cases pending from notice of appeal is 11.8 months and from docketing is 3.5 months. In fiscal year 1973, the average length of time from docketing was 4.1 months.

Summary of Appeals Reported by District Courts

Appeals pending in district courts fiscal year 1973	409
Notices of appeal reported during fiscal year 1974	592
Appeals docketed in Supreme Court	313
Appeals dismissed/abandoned in district courts	259
Appeals pending in district courts fiscal year 1974	429

The four urban counties of the state reported the most appeals:

County	No. reported	Percentage of total reported
Sedgwick	124 (131 '73)	20.9%
Wyandotte	84 (40 '73)	14.2%
Shawnee	58 (62 '73)	9.8%
Johnson	43 (62 '73)	7.3%
	309 (295 '73)	52.2%

Of the 313 civil and criminal appeals docketed in the Supreme Court during fiscal year 1974, the four urban counties accounted for the following:

County	No. docketed	Percentage of total docketed
Sedgwick	69 (75 '73)	22.0%
Shawnee	31 (30 '73)	9.9%
Wyandotte	30 (29 '73)	9.6%
Johnson	24 (23 '73)	7.7%
	154 (157 '73)	49.2%

SUPREME COURT—FORTY-SEVENTH YEAR SUMMARY

Year ended June 30	Cases	Disposed of	Dismissed	Submitted
1928	Appealed, civil	529	143	386
	Appealed, criminal	101	44	57
	Original	46	13	33
	Totals	676	200	476
1929	Appealed, civil	475	128	347
	Appealed, criminal	72	29	43
	Original	36	18	18
	Totals	583	175	408
1930	Appealed, civil	504	143	351
	Appealed, criminal	77	37	40
	Original	52	16	36
	Totals	633	196	437
1931	Appealed, civil	490	131	359
	Appealed, criminal	63	29	34
	Original	38	13	25
	Totals	591	173	418
1932	Appealed, civil	522	159	363
	Appealed, criminal	74	45	29
	Original	32	6	26
	Totals	628	210	418
1933	Appealed, civil	459	135	324
	Appealed, criminal	66	35	31
	Original	23	5	18
	Totals	548	175	373
1934	Appealed, civil	427	149	278
	Appealed, criminal	52	30	22
	Original	42	11	31
	Totals	521	190	331
1935	Appealed, civil	506	167	339
	Appealed, criminal	58	26	32
	Original	25	11	14
	Totals	589	204	385
1936	Appealed, civil	475	156	319
	Appealed, criminal	66	31	35
	Original	39	19	20
	Totals	580	206	374
1937	Appealed, civil	397	103	294
	Appealed, criminal	56	27	29
	Original	33	9	24
	Totals	486	139	347
1938	Appealed, civil	388	131	257
	Appealed, criminal	41	25	16
	Original	32	6	26
	Totals	461	162	299
1939	Appealed, civil	397	114	283
	Appealed, criminal	32	17	15
	Original	15	4	11
	Totals	444	135	309
1940	Appealed, civil	426	117	309
	Appealed, criminal	31	10	21
	Original	39	20	19
	Totals	496	147	349

SUPREME COURT SUMMARY—CONTINUED

Year ended June 30	Cases	Disposed of	Dismissed	Submitted
1941	Appealed, civil	314	103	211
	Appealed, criminal	31	14	17
	Original	64	39	25
	Totals	409	156	253
1942	Appealed, civil	293	82	211
	Appealed, criminal	23	4	19
	Original	27	6	21
	Totals	343	92	251
1943	Appealed, civil	290	72	218
	Appealed, criminal	28	14	14
	Original	35	17	18
	Totals	353	103	250
1944	Appealed, civil	216	59	157
	Appealed, criminal	77	7	10
	Original	16	5	11
	Totals	249	71	178
1945	Appealed, civil	186	51	135
	Appealed, criminal	9	8	1
	Original	15	6	9
	Totals	210	65	145
1946	Appealed, civil	178	44	134
	Appealed, criminal	19	6	13
	Original	43	15	28
	Totals	240	65	175
1947	Appealed, civil	189	55	134
	Appealed, criminal	13	4	9
	Original	59	19	40
	Totals	261	78	183
1948	Appealed, civil	244	63	181
	Appealed, criminal	23	8	15
	Original	93	73	20
	Totals	360	144	216
1949	Appealed, civil	284	54	230
	Appealed, criminal	22	8	14
	Original	96	31	65
	Totals	402	93	309
1950	Appealed, civil	304	91	213
	Appealed, criminal	17	4	13
	Original	19	8	11
	Totals	340	103	237
1951	Appealed, civil	327	83	244
	Appealed, criminal	22	8	14
	Original	26	18	8
	Totals	375	109	266
1952	Appealed, civil	244	57	187
	Appealed, criminal	42	17	25
	Original	10	3	7
	Totals	296	77	219
1953	Appealed, civil	291	96	195
	Appealed, criminal	43	13	30
	Original	33	11	22
	Totals	367	120	247

SUPREME COURT SUMMARY—CONTINUED

Year ended June 30	Cases	Disposed of	Dismissed	Submitted
1954	Appealed, civil	280	91	189
	Appealed, criminal	48	26	22
	Original	32	12	20
	Totals	360	129	231
1955	Appealed, civil	306	114	192
	Appealed, criminal	19	6	13
	Original	20	5	15
	Totals	345	125	220
1956	Appealed, civil	318	120	198
	Appealed, criminal	31	8	23
	Original	29	8	21
	Totals	378	136	242
1957	Appealed, civil	295	112	183
	Appealed, criminal	24	7	17
	Original	27	7	20
	Totals	346	126	220
1958	Appealed, civil	388	172	216
	Appealed, criminal	23	9	14
	Original	17	4	13
	Totals	428	185	243
1959	Appealed, civil	320	138	182
	Appealed, criminal	24	7	17
	Original	41	10	31
	Totals	385	155	230
1960	Appealed, civil	371	142	229
	Appealed, criminal	43	28	15
	Original	39	8	31
	Totals	453	178	275
1961	Appealed, civil	366	171	195
	Appealed, criminal	57	31	26
	Original	37	9	28
	Totals	460	211	249
1962	Appealed, civil	418	216	202
	Appealed, criminal	42	24	18
	Original	53	15	38
	Totals	513	255	258
1963	Appealed, civil	391	196	195
	Appealed, criminal	82	41	41
	Original	33	11	22
	Totals	506	248	258
1964	Appealed, civil	338	150	188
	Appealed, criminal	47	20	27
	Original	28	13	15
	Totals	413	183	230
1965	Appealed, civil	227	40	187
	Appealed, criminal	65	20	45
	Original	36	5	31
	Totals	328	65	263
1966	Appealed, civil	224	29	195
	Appealed, criminal	60	26	34
	Original	44	6	38
	Totals	328	61	267

SUPREME COURT SUMMARY—CONCLUDED

Year ended June 30	Cases	Disposed of	Dismissed	Submitted
1967	Appealed, civil	198	25	173
	Appealed, criminal	86	27	59
	Original	52	6	46
	Totals	336	58	278
1968	Appealed, civil	201	15	186
	Appealed, criminal	77	20	57
	Original	41	12	29
	Totals	319	47	272
1969	Appealed, civil	181	14	167
	Appealed, criminal	79	16	63
	Original	38	7	31
	Totals	298	37	261
1970	Appealed, civil	214	30	184
	Appealed, criminal	80	18	62
	Original	51	20	31
	Totals	345	68	277
1971	Appealed, civil	192	22	170
	Appealed, criminal	85	16	69
	Original	44	8	36
	Totals	321	46	275
1972	Appealed, civil	236	34	202
	Appealed, criminal	96	24	72
	Original	41	17	24
	Totals	373	75	298
1973	Appealed, civil	289	34	255
	Appealed, criminal	81	4	77
	Original	50	7	43
	Totals	420	45	375
1974	Appealed, civil	265	30	235
	Appealed, criminal	70	4	66
	Original	29	9	20
	Totals	364	43	321
	Grand totals	19,450	6,064	13,396

TABLE A-1.—ROSTER OF JUDICIAL OFFICIALS AS OF JULY 1, 1974

County	Jud. Dist.	District Judge	Clerk of Court	Probate Judge
Allen.....Div. 1	4	Floyd H. Coffman.....	Jeanne Smith.....	Leslie L. Norton *
Div. 2		Robert F. Stadler		
Anderson...Div. 1	4	Floyd H. Coffman.....	Roberta Bowman.....	Lawrence Selanders *
Div. 2		Robert F. Stadler		
Atchison....Div. 1	1	Kenneth Harmon.....	Mary Lou Underwood	Dolan Mckelvy
Div. 2		J. W. Lowry		
Barber.....Div. 1	19	Doyle E. White.....	Donna Garten.....	H. Lynn Randels *
Div. 2		Chas. H. Stewart		
Div. 3		John A. Potucek		
Barton.....Div. 1	20	Frederick Woleslagel...	Irene Horner.....	William J. Laughlin *
Div. 2		Herb Rohleder		
Bourbon.....	6	Charles M. Warren....	Betty O'Dell.....	Samuel I. Mason *
Brown.....	22	Chester C. Ingels.....	Mildred Davis.....	Dee Henery *
Butler.....Div. 1	13	J. Patrick Brazil.....	Virginia Elmore.....	Gale Moss *
Div. 2		Page W. Benson		
Chase.....	5	R. E. Miller.....	Virgene Gaines.....	George L. Imthurn *
Chautauqua Div. 1	13	J. Patrick Brazil.....	Morine Stout.....	Carrol Burch *
Div. 2		Page W. Benson		
Cherokee...Div. 1	11	Don Musser.....	Nina Caldiron.....	Roger Neer *
Div. 2		William P. Meek		
Div. 3		Hal Hyler		
Div. 4		George W. Donaldson		
Cheyenne.....	17	Wm. B. Ryan.....	Ena Zimbelman.....	Arthur Lueschen *
Clark.....	16	Ernest M. Vieux.....	Betty Ann Wyatt.....	Glenn E. Redfield *
Clay.....Div. 1	21	Lewis L. McLaughlin..	Lucille Murrison.....	Chester W. Kent *
Div. 2		Ronald D. Innes		
Cloud.....	12	Marvin O. Brummett..	Marguerite Larson.....	Marvin L. Stortz *
Coffey.....Div. 1	4	Floyd H. Coffman.....	Mayree E. White.....	Orville E. Steele *
Div. 2		Robert F. Stadler		
Div. 3		.....		
Comanche.....	16	Ernest M. Vieux.....	Ellen Erwin.....	Ralph R. Klepinger *
Cowley.....Div. 1	19	Doyle E. White.....	Barbara Gilland.....	Richard E. Cook
Div. 2		Chas. H. Stewart		
Div. 3		John A. Potucek		
Crawford...Div. 1	11	Don Musser.....	Janice Caruthers.....	Richard D. Loffswold
Div. 2		William P. Meek		
Div. 3		Hal Hyler		
Div. 4		George W. Donaldson		
Decatur.....	17	Wm. B. Ryan.....	Alice J. Vernon.....	Elmer J. Tacha *
Dickinson...Div. 1	8	John M. Rugh.....	Roberta Sleichter.....	Tom Nold *
Div. 2		A. B. Fletcher, Jr.		
Doniphan.....	22	Chester C. Ingels.....	Alice F. Crane.....	Virgil W. Begesse *
Douglas....Div. 1	7	Frank R. Gray.....	Lucille E. Allison.....	Mike Elwell *
Div. 2		James W. Paddock		
Edwards.....	24	Maurice A. Wildgen...	Joan Parnell.....	Richard Miller *
Elk.....Div. 1	13	J. Patrick Brazil.....	Gertrude Loyd.....	Edith M. Barkley *
Div. 2		Page W. Benson		
Ellis.....	23	Ben P. Cruise.....	W. J. Billinger.....	Tom Scott *
Ellsworth...Div. 1	20	Frederick Woleslagel...	Helen Katzenmeier....	Clarence Kahler *
Div. 2		Herb Rohleder		
Finney.....	25	Bert J. Vance.....	Rose Murry.....	Donald E. Farr *
Ford.....	16	Ernest M. Vieux.....	Beatrice Slattery.....	Camilla K. Haviland *
Franklin....Div. 1	4	Floyd H. Coffman.....	Ruby Sanford.....	Donald L. White *
Div. 2		Robert F. Stadler		
Div. 3		.....		
Geary.....Div. 1	8	John M. Rugh.....	Lillian Newman.....	William C. O'Keefe *
Div. 2		A. B. Fletcher, Jr.		
Gove.....	23	Benedict P. Cruise.....	Mabel Fagan.....	Alfred Bill Packard *
Graham.....	15	C. E. Birney.....	Margaret A. Hildebrand	Henry C. Albertson *
Grant.....	26	Keaton G. Duckworth	Edna M. Walker.....	Bernard Dalton *
Gray.....	16	Ernest M. Vieux.....	Marie Babcock.....	Maurice L. Johnson *
Greeley.....	25	Bert J. Vance.....	Margaret L. Pile.....	Carol A. Graber *
Greenwood..Div. 1	13	J. Patrick Brazil.....	Eleanor L. Tucker.....	Harriet Shumard *
Div. 2		Page W. Benson		
Hamilton.....	25	Bert J. Vance.....	Ruth Noggle.....	J. Cecil Wood *
Harper.....Div. 1	19	Doyle E. White.....	Olive L. Ghormley.....	J. Howard Wilcox *
Div. 2		Chas. H. Stewart		
Div. 3		John A. Potucek		
Harvey.....	9	Sam H. Sturm.....	Joe Fox.....	Bernard Peterson *

TABLE A-1.—CONTINUED. Roster of Judicial Officials as of July 1, 1974.

County	Jud. Dist.	District Judge	Clerk of Court	Probate Judge
Haskell	26	Keaton G. Duckworth	Georgia McNabb	David Rinehart *
Hodgeman	24	Maurice A. Wildgen	Agnes C. Gleason	Francis Sinclair *
Jackson	2	John W. Brookens	George W. Dunlap	H. E. Crosswhite *
Jefferson	2	John W. Brookens	Mary Schiller	Dr. Jesse J. Wilson *
Jewell	12	Marvin O. Brummett	Eva Myers	Jack D. Bradrick *
Johnson Div. 1	10	Herbert W. Walton	Hazel J. Mueller	Benjamin F. Farney
Div. 2		Harold L. Hammond		
Div. 3		Buford L. Shankel		
Div. 4		Harold R. Riggs		
Div. 5		Phillip L. Woodworth		
Kearny	25	Bert J. Vance	Elizabeth Williams	Patricia L. Jones *
Kingman Div. 1	19	Doyle E. White	Janice McIlrath	Gene Shay *
Div. 2		Chas. H. Stewart		
Div. 3		John A. Potucek		
Kiowa	16	Ernest M. Vieux	Billie M. Huckriede	Frank Peters *
Labette Div. 1	11	Don Musser	Virginia Beaty	Charles J. Sell *
Div. 2		William P. Meek		
Div. 3		Hal Hyler		
Div. 4		George W. Donaldson		
Lane	24	Maurice A. Wildgen	Ella E. Lawrence	Dayton Schmalzried *
Leavenworth Div. 1	1	Kenneth Harmon	Mary Kate Gausz	Douglas G. Walters, Jr.
Div. 2		J. W. Lowry		
Lincoln	12	Marvin O. Brummett	Jennie Panzer	R. S. Fern *
Linn	6	Charles M. Warren	Ferne Bearly	Deward Austin *
Logan	23	Benedict P. Cruise	H. Belle Selley	Annabell M. Peck *
Lyon	5	R. E. Miller	Alice M. Long	Darrell Meyer *
Marion Div. 1	8	John M. Rugh	Geraldine Seibel	Henry F. Loveless *
Div. 2		A. B. Fletcher, Jr.		
Marshall Div. 1	21	Lewis L. McLaughlin	Wilma Jean Blaser	Wilma Kirkwood *
Div. 2		Ronald D. Innes		
McPherson	9	Sam H. Sturm	Alma M. Bretches	H. Dean Cotton *
Meade	16	Ernest M. Vieux	Edyth Cooper	Clara Shore *
Miami	6	Charles M. Warren	Vivian McCready	Brooks Hinkle *
Mitchell	12	Marvin O. Brummett	Neva Wagner	Geo. P. Balthazor *
Montgomery	14	.....	Bessie Scofield	Kenneth D. David
Independence Div.		David Scott		
Coffeyville Div.		.....		Clarence L. Sawyer *
Morris Div. 1	8	John M. Rugh	Marie Borkert	
Div. 2		A. B. Fletcher, Jr.		Dorothy L. Prather *
Morton	26	Keaton G. Duckworth	Verda Mae Allen	
Nemaha	22	Chester C. Ingles	Jane Heinen	Francis "Fritz" G. Holthaus *
Neosho Div. 1	11	Don Musser	Virginia Embry	Alberta Gough
Div. 2		William P. Meek		
Div. 3		Hal Hyler		
Div. 4		George W. Donaldson		
Ness	24	Maurice A. Wildgen	Opal Burdett	Valdah M. Bovard *
Norton	17	Wm. B. Ryan	Elsie Brault	Jean Kissell *
Osage Div. 1	4	Floyd H. Coffman	Margaret Knight	Larry L. Coursen *
Div. 2		Robert F. Stadler		
Div. 3		.....		
Osborne	17	Wm. B. Ryan	Irene Laffoon	Ethel McCammon *
Ottawa Div. 1	28	Morris V. Hoobler	Esther Plunkett	Aline Funk *
Div. 2		Raymond E. Haggart		
Pawnee	24	Maurice A. Wildgen	Lois Miller	Leona Niedens *
Phillips	17	Wm. B. Ryan	Evelyn M. Parker	Martha C. Kellogg *
Pottawatomie	2	John W. Brookens	Deane L. Arnold	Gordon Bradshaw *
Pratt Div. 1	19	Doyle E. White	Betty Onstott	Walter McClauskey *
Div. 3		Chas. H. Stewart		
Div. 3		John A. Potucek		
Rawlins	17	Wm. B. Ryan	Bessie B. Peterson	George W. Buk *
Reno Div. 1	27	W. A. Gossage	Genevieve Getter	E. Victor Wilson
Div. 2		James H. Rexroad		
Republic	12	Marvin O. Brummett	Earl J. Baldridge	Arthur O. Williams *
Rice Div. 1	20	Frederick Woleslagel	Laura Saint	Paul W. Cline *
Div. 2		Herb Rohleder		

TABLE A-1.—CONCLUDED. Roster of Judicial Officials as of July 1, 1974.

County	Jud. Dist.	District Judge	Clerk of Court	Probate Judge
Riley.....Div. 1	21	Lewis L. McLaughlin..	Ruth Houghton.....	Jerry L. Mershon *
Div. 2		Ronald P. Innes		
Rooks.....	15	C. E. Birney.....	Nadine Desbien.....	Gerald Johnston *
Rush.....	24	Maurice A. Wildgen...	Clara Humburg.....	Bennie A. Parker *
Russell.....Div. 1	20	Frederick Woleslagel...	Vivian Miller.....	Eric E. Smith *
Div. 2		Herb Rohleder		
Saline.....Div. 1	28	Morris V. Hoobler.....	Betty J. Just.....	John Weckel
Div. 2		Raymond E. Haggart		
Scott.....	25	Bert J. Vance.....	B. Arlesta Grube.....	Eythel Hollingsworth *
Sedgwick...Div. 1	18	Willis W. Wall.....	Dorothy I. Van Arsdale	Clark Owens
Div. 2		Howard C. Kline		
Div. 3		B. Mack Bryant		
Div. 4		James V. Riddel, Jr.		
Div. 5		James J. Noone		
Div. 6		Robert T. Stephan		
Div. 7		Tom Raum		
Div. 8		Nicholas W. Klein		
Div. 9		David Calvert		Leroy C. Rose *
Seward.....	26	Keaton G. Duckworth	Dessie Jenkins.....	
Shawnee....Div. 1	3	William Randolph Carpenter.....	Lorene Wells.....	Bill G. Honeyman
Div. 2		Michael Barbara		
Div. 3		E. Newton Vickers		
Div. 4		Adrian J. Allen		
Div. 5		Kay McFarland		Ward Gilliland *
Sheridan.....	15	C. E. Birney.....	Vergie Wente.....	
Sherman.....	15	C. E. Birney.....	Viva Peter.....	Virginia Coen *
Smith.....	17	Wm. B. Ryan.....	Florence E. Vincent....	Clayton J. Hooper *
Stafford....Div. 1	20	Frederick Woleslagel...	Arlene E. McCandless..	Pricilla Budge *
Div. 2		Herb Rohleder		Evelyn Scott *
Stanton.....	26	Keaton G. Duckworth	Bonnie Eckas.....	Bernard Brubaker *
Stevens.....	26	Keaton G. Duckworth	Shirley DeCamp.....	
Sumner.....Div. 1	19	Doyle E. White.....	Mary E. Carter.....	Lloyd K. McDaniel *
Div. 2		Chas. H. Stewart		
Div. 3		John A. Potucek		Kenneth Tidball *
Thomas.....	15	C. E. Birney.....	Thelma Livingston....	David L. Rhoades *
Trego.....	23	Benedict P. Cruise.....	Cora V. Hladek.....	Verle L. Swenson *
Wabaunsee.....	2	John W. Brookens.....	Mary E. Tolbert.....	Mary Hill *
Wallace.....	23	Benedict P. Cruise.....	Evelyn A. Warren.....	
Washington.....	12	Marvin O. Brummett..	Lois Acree.....	Wayne W. Healy *
Wichita.....	25	Bert J. Vance.....	Margie Ames.....	John E. Ley *
Wilson.....Div. 1	11	Don Musser.....	Leslie York.....	Dwaine Spoon *
Div. 2		William P. Meek		
Div. 3		Hal Hyler		
Div. 4		George W. Donaldson		Paul C. Laidlaw *
Woodson...Div. 1	4	Floyd H. Coffman.....	Doris M. Peterson.....	
Div. 2		Robert F. Stadler		
Div. 3		.....		Francis J. Donnelly
Wyandotte..Div. 1	29	O. Q. Claflin, III.....	Richard P. Shannon...	
Div. 2		William J. Burns		
Div. 3		Harry G. Miller		
Div. 4		Joe H. Swinehart		
Div. 5		Leo J. Moroney		
Div. 6		Cordell D. Meeks		

* Also judge of county court.

TABLE A-2.—SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS, BY DISTRICTS—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Judicial Dist.	County	Civil cases including domestic relations						Criminal cases					
		Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months	Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months
1	Atchison	206	306	327	185	137	31	8	40	43	5	5	0
	Leavenworth	437	658	676	419	322	47	22	88	92	18	17	0
	Totals	643	964	1,003	604	459	78	30	128	135	23	22	0
2	Jackson	52	114	106	60	50	5	4	28	30	2	1	1
	Jefferson	60	178	165	73	59	7	2	36	30	8	8	0
	Pottawatomie	42	112	111	43	40	2	4	29	28	5	5	0
	Wabaunsee	23	42	42	23	18	2	8	12	16	4	3	1
	Totals	177	446	424	199	167	16	18	105	104	19	17	2
3	Shawnee	1,413	3,005	3,086	1,332	1,108	170	158	475	463	170	156	13
4	Allen	109	262	277	94	86	8	5	19	23	1	1	0
	Anderson	35	93	97	31	25	4	1	6	5	2	2	0
	Coffey	33	71	85	19	19	0	3	17	16	4	4	0
	Franklin	100	270	255	115	104	9	8	46	45	9	9	0
	Osage	100	173	185	88	66	15	2	4	0	6	4	1
	Woodson	40	84	87	37	32	5	1	22	12	11	10	1
	Totals	417	953	986	384	332	41	20	114	101	33	30	2
5	Chase	24	50	36	38	25	6	0	2	2	0	0	0
	Lyon	199	387	380	206	152	39	29	87	86	30	26	4
	Totals	223	437	416	244	177	45	29	89	88	30	26	4

TABLE A-2.—CONTINUED. Summary of District Courts, by Districts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Judicial Dist.	County	Civil cases including domestic relations						Criminal cases					
		Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months	Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months
6	Bourbon	95	241	263	73	58	10	10	33	38	5	5	0
	Linn	66	105	104	67	49	7	7	11	15	3	3	0
	Miami	136	272	276	132	96	19	17	43	40	20	14	5
	Totals	231	513	539	205	203	36	27	76	78	25	22	5
7	Douglas	534	833	831	536	406	87	73	172	172	73	54	8
8	Dickinson	98	232	227	103	89	10	13	25	31	7	6	0
	Geary	268	655	630	293	257	27	36	193	180	49	49	0
	Marion	49	116	103	62	54	5	5	9	10	4	4	0
	Morris	49	73	78	44	22	11	2	11	5	8	8	0
	Totals	464	1,076	1,038	502	422	53	56	238	226	68	67	0
9	Harvey	218	298	328	188	131	32	27	90	69	48	40	1
	McPherson	191	215	237	169	94	38	16	77	73	20	18	1
	Totals	409	513	565	357	225	70	43	167	142	68	58	2
10	Johnson	1,759	3,053	2,890	1,922	1,478	338	149	509	486	172	164	7
11	Cherokee	194	339	331	202	159	34	7	42	33	16	12	3
	Crawford	170	469	452	187	173	13	28	114	126	16	14	2
	Labette	170	349	360	159	128	25	16	88	79	25	21	1
	Neosho	87	249	246	90	84	6	3	20	17	6	6	0
	Wilson	65	147	153	59	46	12	6	20	20	6	6	0
	Totals	686	1,553	1,542	697	590	90	60	284	275	69	59	6

TABLE A-2.—CONTINUED. Summary of District Courts, by Districts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Judicial Dist.	County	Civil cases including domestic relations						Criminal cases					
		Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months	Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months
12	Cloud	46	111	114	43	40	3	5	12	12	5	3	2
	Jewell	16	27	31	12	9	2	1	5	4	2	2	0
	Lincoln	13	38	37	14	13	1	4	12	14	2	1	0
	Mitchell	21	60	48	33	29	4	1	4	4	1	1	0
	Republic	31	63	53	41	29	8	5	2	5	2	2	0
	Washington	21	68	48	41	35	3	1	0	0	1	0	1
	Totals	148	367	331	184	155	21	17	35	39	13	9	3
13	Butler	387	474	530	331	227	56	46	113	98	61	36	10
	Chautauqua	38	52	62	28	19	6	7	13	16	4	4	0
	Elk	17	34	35	16	13	0	8	10	16	2	2	0
	Greenwood	80	151	172	59	45	8	5	27	23	9	6	2
	Totals	522	711	799	434	304	70	66	163	153	76	48	12
14	Montgomery	292	726	730	288	255	29	47	155	140	62	51	5
15	Graham	38	59	51	46	28	12	10	5	11	4	4	0
	Rooks	68	89	90	67	45	15	6	12	10	8	7	0
	Sheridan	14	23	20	17	11	3	1	8	9	0	0	0
	Sherman	49	114	115	48	42	5	19	6	20	5	3	2
	Thomas	38	84	76	46	40	5	1	5	3	3	3	0
	Totals	207	369	352	224	166	40	37	36	53	20	17	2
16	Clark	31	24	33	22	16	3	3	4	6	1	1	0
	Comanche	15	15	16	14	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ford	169	382	366	185	148	23	13	32	29	16	10	6
	Gray	38	50	60	28	24	2	3	9	9	3	0	0
	Kiowa	17	21	16	22	14	2	0	13	3	10	10	0
	Meade	49	47	29	67	37	15	7	4	8	3	3	0
	Totals	319	539	520	338	246	51	26	62	55	33	24	6

TABLE A-2.—CONTINUED. Summary of District Courts, by Districts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Judicial Dist.	County	Civil cases including domestic relations						Criminal cases					
		Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months	Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months
17	Cheyenne	21	22	23	20	12	6	3	0	2	1	0	0
	Decatur	14	51	30	35	24	3	0	6	2	4	4	0
	Norton	25	59	58	26	18	4	6	20	13	13	13	0
	Osborne	20	50	54	16	12	2	3	5	7	1	0	1
	Phillips	30	51	40	41	26	3	3	7	9	1	0	0
	Rawlins	20	29	32	17	13	2	0	2	1	1	1	0
	Smith	17	48	43	22	20	1	2	22	20	4	4	0
	Totals	147	310	280	177	125	21	17	62	54	25	22	1
18	Sedgwick	2,492	6,657	6,373	2,776	2,662	102	314	1,193	1,189	318	314	4
19	Barber	40	76	81	35	25	5	1	15	10	6	6	0
	Cowley	223	395	465	153	121	21	14	79	79	14	14	0
	Harper	36	64	65	35	23	8	1	3	2	2	2	0
	Kingman	55	82	87	50	31	16	12	12	20	4	1	1
	Pratt	51	95	80	66	56	6	10	34	37	7	4	1
	Sumner	104	244	194	154	133	11	14	16	23	7	6	1
	Totals	509	956	972	493	389	67	52	159	171	40	33	3
20	Barton	273	508	480	301	211	59	26	92	79	39	36	1
	Ellsworth	34	68	75	27	21	6	1	7	7	1	1	0
	Rice	38	94	94	38	30	5	7	28	24	11	10	1
	Russell	38	108	105	41	36	5	10	27	30	7	7	0
	Stafford	19	66	60	25	23	2	5	3	5	3	0	0
	Totals	402	844	814	432	321	77	49	157	145	61	54	2
21	Clay	42	84	75	51	31	10	4	20	22	2	2	0
	Marshall	41	84	81	44	39	5	3	4	6	1	1	0
	Riley	255	453	425	283	214	57	4	17	0	21	17	2
	Totals	338	621	581	378	284	72	11	41	28	24	20	2

TABLE A-2.—CONTINUED. Summary of District Courts, by Districts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Judicial Dist.	County	Civil cases including domestic relations						Criminal cases					
		Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months	Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months
22	Brown	68	109	93	84	54	19	7	10	14	3	2	1
	Doniphan	70	118	115	73	51	12	7	18	19	6	6	0
	Nemaha	32	40	39	33	18	8	0	4	3	1	1	0
	Totals	170	267	247	190	123	39	14	32	36	10	9	1
23	Ellis	113	179	199	93	75	14	2	38	38	2	2	0
	Gove	11	18	20	9	7	0	2	4	5	1	1	0
	Logan	17	32	34	15	14	1	1	5	6	0	0	0
	Trego	19	30	31	18	12	2	0	6	4	2	2	0
	Wallace	5	12	10	7	7	0	1	5	4	2	2	0
	Totals	165	271	294	142	115	17	6	58	57	7	7	0
24	Edwards	29	47	54	22	18	0	4	4	7	1	0	0
	Hodgeman	16	33	35	14	10	4	0	7	3	4	4	0
	Lane	20	35	33	22	20	2	2	4	2	4	2	2
	Ness	10	31	26	15	13	2	1	2	3	0	0	0
	Pawnee	33	100	74	59	50	4	2	12	10	4	4	0
	Rush	35	25	37	23	11	8	10	2	4	8	0	2
	Totals	143	271	259	155	122	20	19	31	29	21	10	4
25	Finney	83	360	337	106	95	10	8	61	62	7	7	0
	Greeley	13	16	21	8	7	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
	Hamilton	23	39	47	15	13	1	0	5	3	2	2	0
	Kearny	14	31	25	20	15	3	1	1	1	1	0	1
	Scott	36	60	81	15	13	2	3	21	19	5	5	0
	Wichita	19	49	53	15	11	1	0	7	7	0	0	0
	Totals	188	555	564	179	154	18	12	96	93	15	14	1

TABLE A-2.—CONCLUDED. Summary of District Courts, by Districts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Judicial Dist.	County	Civil cases including domestic relations						Criminal cases					
		Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months	Pending July 1, 1973	Commenced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1974	Number pending less than 12 months	Pending 12 to 24 months
26	Grant	43	81	78	46	37	8	3	18	16	5	4	1
	Haskell	34	48	48	34	27	5	2	8	10	0	0	0
	Morton	27	44	52	19	13	5	0	3	3	0	0	0
	Stanton	12	38	24	26	24	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
	Stevens	50	59	70	39	25	10	0	6	6	0	0	0
	Seward	153	310	300	163	140	17	24	58	66	16	16	0
	Totals	319	580	572	327	266	46	29	94	101	22	20	1
27	Reno	356	889	807	438	271	49	46	265	278	33	26	7
28	Ottawa	17	39	40	16	14	1	0	3	1	2	2	0
	Saline	183	207	195	195	113	53	15	126	118	23	18	4
	Totals	200	246	235	211	127	54	15	129	119	25	20	4
29	Wyandotte	2,945	4,429	3,912	3,462	2,324	784	315	800	892	223	206	9
	Grand Totals	16,818	32,954	31,962	17,810	14,076	2,601	1,755	5,925	5,902	1,778	1,579	116

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS, BY COUNTIES

TABLE A-3.—DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES, INCLUDING DOMESTIC RELATIONS—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Number dismissed	Number not contested	Contested trials					Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
				Number	To court	To jury	Time from petition to termination		
							Number less than 12 months	12 to 24 months	
Allen	277	92	128	57	55	2	261	16	1
Anderson	97	36	30	31	31	0	93	4	0
Atchison	327	134	85	108	98	10	254	73	3
Barber	81	33	41	7	4	3	71	10	2
Barton	480	154	159	167	162	5	422	58	5
Bourbon	263	87	135	41	38	3	235	28	3
Brown	93	39	36	18	18	0	51	12	1
Butler	530	217	204	109	105	4	372	158	4
Chase	36	8	9	19	18	1	33	3	0
Chautauqua	62	17	12	33	33	0	57	5	0
Cherokee	331	111	139	81	78	3	263	68	3
Cheyenne	23	13	10	0	0	0	15	5	1
Clark	33	7	25	1	0	1	21	12	1
Clay	75	19	36	20	20	0	70	5	0
Cloud	114	34	46	34	33	1	107	7	1
Coffey	85	26	34	25	20	5	78	7	0
Comanche	16	5	2	9	9	0	9	7	0
Cowley	465	143	175	147	145	2	396	69	4
Crawford	452	153	234	65	57	8	434	18	3
Decatur	30	17	13	0	0	0	28	2	0
Dickinson	227	87	88	52	52	0	203	24	1
Doniphan	115	42	27	46	46	0	95	20	1
Douglas	831	342	303	186	181	5	627	204	3
Edwards	54	17	26	11	10	1	42	12	0
Elk	35	3	12	20	20	0	31	4	0

TABLE A-3.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Civil Cases, Including Domestic Relations—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Number dismissed	Number not contested	Contested trials					Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
				Number	To court	To jury	Time from petition to termination		
							Number less than 12 months	12 to 24 months	
Ellis	199	76	53	70	62	8	170	29	4
Ellsworth	75	27	44	4	4	0	61	14	0
Finney	337	106	148	83	81	2	319	18	5
Ford	366	130	155	81	79	2	329	37	3
Franklin	255	76	59	120	115	5	238	17	1
Geary	630	213	303	114	114	0	560	70	1
Gove	20	6	3	11	11	0	18	2	0
Graham	51	23	15	13	13	0	42	9	0
Grant	78	32	30	16	16	0	64	14	1
Gray	60	23	16	21	21	0	50	10	2
Greeley	21	7	11	3	3	0	15	3	0
Greenwood	172	37	119	16	15	1	153	19	0
Hamilton	47	15	19	13	13	0	36	11	0
Harper	65	15	31	19	19	0	57	8	1
Harvey	328	108	120	100	99	1	246	82	1
Haskell	48	19	15	14	12	2	34	14	0
Hodgeman	35	13	18	4	4	0	30	5	0
Jackson	106	38	26	42	42	0	100	6	0
Jefferson	165	68	52	45	43	2	160	5	1
Jewell	31	11	18	2	2	0	28	3	0
Johnson	2,890	1,156	976	758	723	35	2,373	517	15
Kearny	25	11	8	6	6	0	23	2	0
Kingman	87	23	41	23	21	2	74	13	0
Kiowa	16	8	7	1	1	0	10	6	1
Labette	360	80	178	102	96	6	306	54	8

TABLE A-3.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Civil Cases, Including Domestic Relations—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Number dismissed	Number not contested	Contested trials					Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
				Number	To court	To jury	Time from petition to termination		
							Number less than 12 months	12 to 24 months	
Lane	33	13	17	3	3	0	25	8	1
Leavenworth	676	292	226	158	152	6	566	110	14
Lincoln	37	14	11	12	12	0	36	1	0
Linn	104	32	52	20	17	3	76	28	0
Logan	34	6	16	12	12	0	33	1	0
Lyon	380	97	150	133	128	5	336	44	1
Marion	103	44	31	28	28	0	83	20	0
Marshall	81	33	38	10	10	0	69	12	0
McPherson	237	78	86	73	69	4	171	66	3
Meade	29	9	8	12	12	0	24	5	1
Miami	276	82	148	46	40	6	234	42	1
Mitchell	48	16	20	12	11	1	43	5	1
Montgomery	730	222	308	200	193	7	653	77	4
Morris	78	15	30	33	31	2	59	19	0
Morton	52	21	25	6	2	4	47	5	0
Nemaha	39	19	9	11	10	1	28	11	0
Neosho	246	63	113	70	67	3	240	6	2
Ness	26	12	6	8	8	0	24	2	0
Norton	58	19	27	12	12	0	52	6	0
Osage	185	70	55	60	54	6	156	29	1
Osborne	54	10	15	29	29	0	47	7	0
Ottawa	40	12	18	10	10	0	39	1	0
Pawnee	74	28	37	9	9	0	66	8	0
Phillips	40	14	19	7	6	1	36	4	0
Pottawatomie	111	32	44	35	35	0	106	5	1
Pratt	80	26	24	30	27	3	69	11	1
Rawlins	32	7	22	3	1	2	27	5	1
Reno	807	366	258	183	173	10	725	82	2
Republic	53	23	16	14	13	1	48	5	0
Rice	94	30	32	32	29	3	84	10	0

TABLE A-3.—CONCLUDED. Disposition of Civil Cases, Including Domestic Relations—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Number dismissed	Number not contested	Contested trials					Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
				Number	To court	To jury	Time from petition to termination		
							Number less than 12 months	12 to 24 months	
Riley	425	134	216	75	71	4	346	79	2
Rooks	90	39	34	17	15	2	74	16	1
Rush	37	19	9	9	8	1	23	14	2
Russell	105	38	39	28	26	2	92	13	0
Saline	195	101	36	58	54	4	472	146	3
Scott	81	31	31	19	19	0	70	11	0
Sedgwick	6,373	2,190	2,631	1,552	1,469	83	6,115	258	42
Seward	300	100	165	35	33	2	266	34	3
Shawnee	3,086	1,336	1,107	643	614	29	2,769	317	18
Sheridan	20	6	10	4	3	1	17	3	0
Sherman	115	46	46	23	21	2	95	20	3
Smith	43	8	19	16	16	0	40	3	1
Stafford	60	22	14	24	24	0	53	7	0
Stanton	24	5	15	4	4	0	18	6	0
Stevens	70	22	44	4	3	1	56	14	1
Sumner	194	53	115	26	26	0	177	17	0
Thomas	76	28	29	19	19	0	64	12	0
Trego	31	11	11	9	9	0	30	1	2
Wabaunsee	42	8	20	14	10	4	35	7	1
Wallace	10	9	0	1	1	0	6	4	0
Washington	48	13	25	10	8	2	43	5	0
Wichita	53	19	30	4	4	0	46	7	0
Wilson	153	50	76	27	23	4	148	5	1
Woodson	87	19	65	3	2	1	83	4	0
Wyandotte	3,912	1,027	1,826	1,059	997	62	3,063	849	19
Grand Totals	32,066	11,196	12,948	7,922	7,530	392	28,203	4,286	214

SUMMARY OF DOMESTIC COURTS, BY COUNTIES

TABLE A-4.—DISPOSITION OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases terminated	Divorce						Annulment	Separate maintenance	Recip-in	Recip-out	Other
		Total	Dismissed	Not contested	Contested	Granted	Denied					
Allen	129	110	38	55	17	75	1	2	6	5	6	0
Anderson	40	38	19	14	5	19	0	0	0	0	1	1
Atchison	157	126	39	48	39	91	0	2	13	8	4	4
Barber	47	43	17	24	2	26	0	0	2	1	0	1
Barton	246	227	68	80	79	161	0	0	10	5	0	1
Bourbon	155	140	36	82	22	105	0	1	1	5	6	2
Brown	51	47	16	20	11	31	0	0	0	2	2	0
Butler	293	252	105	110	37	150	0	2	9	10	18	2
Chase	16	13	2	3	8	11	0	0	1	1	1	0
Chautauqua	36	30	4	9	17	26	0	0	1	4	1	0
Cherokee	191	175	65	98	12	109	0	5	1	6	4	0
Cheyenne	12	11	2	9	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	0
Clark	11	10	0	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	0
Clay	48	39	11	20	8	28	0	1	1	3	3	1
Cloud	62	55	18	26	11	37	0	0	0	4	3	0
Coffey	36	35	13	16	6	22	0	0	0	1	0	0
Comanche	7	7	2	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cowley	329	278	82	119	77	200	0	1	13	14	17	6
Crawford	251	229	69	142	18	163	0	0	9	11	1	1
Decatur	18	16	9	7	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	0
Dickinson	136	105	38	43	24	67	0	2	7	11	10	1
Doniphan	39	34	14	14	6	21	0	0	2	2	0	1
Douglas	473	403	131	184	88	273	0	5	8	23	16	18
Edwards	36	34	7	24	3	27	0	0	0	2	0	0
Elk	15	13	1	10	2	12	0	0	0	0	1	1

TABLE A-4.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Domestic Relations Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases terminated	Divorce						Annulment	Separate maintenance	Recip-in	Recip-out	Other
		Total	Dismissed	Not contested	Contested	Granted	Denied					
Ellis	99	80	30	22	28	48	3	0	7	4	8	0
Ellsworth	32	30	11	18	1	19	0	0	0	0	2	0
Finney	184	161	39	87	35	126	0	3	4	15	1	0
Ford	204	161	63	63	35	100	0	4	3	16	20	0
Franklin	143	132	35	31	66	97	0	0	0	10	1	0
Geary	463	328	80	188	60	250	0	36	7	60	29	3
Gove	7	7	3	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
Graham	24	21	7	7	7	13	0	0	2	1	0	0
Grant	46	41	14	19	8	27	0	0	0	5	0	0
Gray	24	16	5	7	4	11	0	0	2	5	1	0
Greeley	8	8	4	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
Greenwood	66	60	19	33	8	40	0	0	0	3	3	0
Hamilton	14	14	3	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harper	33	31	6	15	10	25	0	0	0	2	0	0
Harvey	212	168	65	68	35	106	0	8	14	4	18	0
Haskell	14	9	3	4	2	6	0	0	1	4	0	0
Hodgeman	7	6	2	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1
Jackson	52	50	15	21	14	34	0	1	0	1	0	0
Jefferson	82	64	24	24	16	41	0	1	10	5	1	1
Jewell	18	15	7	7	1	8	0	0	0	1	1	1
Johnson	1,780	1,450	373	622	455	1,115	1	69	92	67	96	6
Kearny	10	10	1	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kingman	53	48	11	26	11	38	0	0	2	2	1	0
Kiowa	10	8	3	5	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	1
Labette	196	168	37	91	40	132	0	1	5	10	11	1

TABLE A-4.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Domestic Relations Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases terminated	Divorce						Annulment	Separate maintenance	Recip-in	Recip-out	Other
		Total	Dismissed	Not contested	Contested	Granted	Denied					
Lane	6	5	2	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
Leavenworth	435	363	148	148	67	219	0	19	17	25	9	2
Lincoln	21	19	5	6	8	14	0	0	2	0	0	0
Linn	38	28	8	13	7	20	0	1	0	7	2	0
Logan	19	18	4	8	6	14	0	0	0	1	0	0
Lyon	221	199	39	90	70	163	0	1	4	9	7	1
Marion	40	34	9	15	10	25	0	2	0	3	1	0
Marshall	44	41	11	26	4	31	0	0	2	1	0	0
McPherson	131	109	26	52	31	86	0	1	5	8	8	0
Meade	13	9	1	4	4	9	0	0	2	2	0	0
Miami	160	143	43	81	19	106	0	4	1	6	5	1
Mitchell	26	26	8	12	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	387	313	95	160	58	229	1	4	19	23	28	0
Morris	23	22	3	13	6	19	0	0	0	1	0	0
Morton	13	11	2	9	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	0
Nemaha	12	12	4	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neosho	125	117	24	65	28	93	0	2	1	5	0	0
Ness	7	7	1	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norton	29	25	5	13	7	21	0	0	1	1	2	0
Osage	66	59	20	31	8	39	0	4	0	1	1	1
Osborne	24	23	8	11	9	20	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ottawa	25	20	5	11	4	16	0	0	1	2	1	1
Pawnee	51	45	12	27	6	33	0	1	0	2	2	1
Phillips	18	15	7	6	2	8	0	0	0	3	0	1
Pottawatomie	67	50	11	27	12	40	0	0	2	6	8	1
Pratt	48	43	16	16	11	28	0	0	3	0	2	0
Rawlins	17	16	2	14	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	0
Reno	511	448	138	221	89	309	5	3	12	28	20	0
Republic	28	24	9	13	2	16	0	0	1	3	0	0
Rice	56	52	15	24	13	36	1	0	2	1	1	0

TABLE A-4.—CONCLUDED. Disposition of Domestic Relations Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases terminated	Divorce						Annulment	Separate maintenance	Recip-in	Recip-out	Other
		Total	Dismissed	Not contested	Contested	Granted	Denied					
Riley	264	225	48	149	28	179	1	2	5	14	18	0
Rooks	47	42	16	22	4	25	0	0	0	3	2	0
Rush	16	15	6	6	3	9	0	0	0	1	0	0
Russell	57	49	14	23	12	35	0	0	2	3	2	1
Saline	0	0	86	164	105	276	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scott	31	30	9	18	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sedgwick	3,860	3,189	984	1,529	676	2,250	3	33	148	150	178	162
Seward	168	142	38	92	12	104	0	2	3	7	13	1
Shawnee	1,870	1,487	476	731	280	1,021	1	42	57	72	141	71
Sheridan	6	6	1	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sherman	59	52	14	28	10	41	0	0	4	3	0	0
Smith	25	24	3	13	8	21	0	0	0	1	0	0
Stafford	22	21	4	9	8	17	0	0	0	1	0	0
Stanton	12	12	2	9	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	1
Stevens	26	25	5	18	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sumner	130	119	27	80	12	96	0	0	6	4	0	1
Thomas	32	25	5	13	7	20	0	0	0	4	1	2
Trego	17	15	3	8	4	11	1	1	0	1	0	0
Wabaunsee	18	18	3	10	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wallace	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	15	15	1	11	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wichita	13	12	5	7	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wilson	78	73	24	34	15	50	0	1	0	4	0	0
Woodson	25	23	4	19	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	2
Wyandotte	2,417	1,913	584	1,005	324	1,355	1	134	97	104	149	20
Grand Totals	18,486	15,386	4,706	7,676	3,004	11,230	21	401	633	851	891	324

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS, BY COUNTIES

TABLE A-5.—TYPES OF CIVIL CASES COMMENCED—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Divorce	Other domestic relations	Auto negligence	Other tort	Actions under 60-1507	Foreclosures	Real property	Contractual	Injunctions, mandamus quo warranto	Other	*Total number cases
Allen	104	19	12	3	1	4	15	93	5	6	262
Anderson	27	2	3	0	0	3	18	0	2	38	93
Atchison	114	27	31	1	2	2	19	66	4	40	306
Barber	41	4	3	2	0	2	7	9	1	7	76
Barton	225	23	27	10	0	10	10	162	5	36	508
Bourbon	135	13	3	6	0	1	39	29	0	15	241
Brown	52	6	9	7	0	1	8	18	1	7	109
Butler	236	42	20	10	0	12	20	81	9	44	474
Chase	16	1	3	1	0	1	10	14	0	4	50
Chautauqua	29	2	0	3	0	0	12	4	0	2	52
Cherokee	184	15	13	4	0	3	52	37	2	29	339
Cheyenne	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	22
Clark	7	2	1	0	0	1	6	5	0	2	24
Clay	48	9	1	0	0	0	4	5	1	16	84
Cloud	51	7	7	1	0	2	16	19	0	8	111
Coffey	32	0	2	2	0	0	15	4	1	15	71
Comanche	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	15
Cowley	253	38	13	6	0	9	26	40	3	7	395
Crawford	237	13	48	1	1	7	28	103	4	27	469
Decatur	24	2	1	0	0	1	4	10	0	9	51
Dickinson	107	31	11	4	0	8	10	47	1	13	232
Doniphan	39	6	4	4	0	3	32	20	8	2	118
Douglas	410	62	46	21	4	11	30	159	7	83	833
Edwards	31	3	0	0	0	2	0	7	1	3	47
Elk	9	3	2	0	0	1	5	10	0	4	34

TABLE A-5.—CONTINUED. Types of Civil Cases Commenced—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Divorce	Other domestic relations	Auto negligence	Other tort	Actions under 60-1507	Foreclosures	Real property	Contractual	Injunctions, mandamus quo warranto	Other	*Total number cases
Ellis	80	22	13	0	1	6	8	33	1	15	179
Ellsworth	22	3	3	1	0	0	6	28	0	5	68
Finney	186	21	21	8	0	10	10	88	1	15	360
Ford	155	44	10	2	0	3	15	137	4	12	382
Franklin	139	13	13	3	1	11	11	52	6	21	270
Geary	339	150	45	6	2	3	15	63	6	26	655
Gove	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	0	1	18
Graham	22	3	1	0	0	0	8	14	3	8	59
Grant	44	8	2	2	0	1	4	13	0	7	81
Gray	14	6	0	2	0	1	5	13	1	8	50
Greeley	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	4	16
Greenwood	52	7	3	0	0	0	29	48	0	12	151
Hamilton	9	0	3	0	0	0	4	18	2	3	39
Harper	27	4	0	4	0	1	5	15	0	8	64
Harvey	169	35	10	8	0	2	16	38	2	18	298
Haskell	12	5	1	0	0	0	0	17	0	13	48
Hodgeman	1	3	2	3	1	2	6	13	0	2	33
Jackson	56	2	10	0	0	8	7	15	0	16	114
Jefferson	68	17	4	2	0	7	12	40	2	26	178
Jewell	14	2	2	0	0	0	4	1	0	4	27
Johnson	1,455	335	204	181	4	136	37	420	32	249	3,053
Kearny	8	0	5	0	2	0	6	8	1	1	31
Kingman	41	6	2	1	0	2	4	17	1	8	82
Kiowa	8	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	0	3	21
Labette	167	32	11	2	2	4	32	62	5	32	349

TABLE A-5.—CONTINUED. Types of Civil Cases Commenced—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Divorce	Other domestic relations	Auto negligence	Other tort	Actions under 60-1507	Foreclosures	Real property	Contractual	Injunctions, mandamus quo warranto	Other	*Total number cases
Lane	11	1	2	0	0	0	5	10	0	6	35
Leavenworth	345	66	37	10	4	15	38	98	4	41	658
Lincoln	12	3	5	1	0	1	2	12	0	2	38
Linn	40	12	0	1	0	3	24	22	3	0	105
Logan	11	1	1	0	0	6	5	6	0	2	32
Lyon	194	23	24	15	1	7	43	55	4	21	387
Marion	33	7	9	3	0	2	10	35	3	14	116
Marshall	46	2	4	2	0	2	4	14	0	10	84
McPherson	108	11	12	3	2	2	12	45	0	20	215
Meade	9	5	2	2	0	1	9	9	1	9	47
Miami	137	16	12	2	0	6	21	47	0	31	272
Mitchell	34	0	1	2	0	1	3	16	0	3	60
Montgomery	336	73	27	25	3	24	54	154	9	21	726
Morris	25	5	3	0	0	3	16	14	2	5	73
Morton	14	1	3	0	0	0	2	14	0	10	44
Nemaha	15	0	5	0	0	0	10	2	1	7	40
Neosho	120	8	6	9	0	16	20	61	5	4	249
Ness	10	0	1	0	0	1	6	3	0	10	31
Norton	29	5	3	2	0	1	4	12	0	3	59
Osage	68	10	9	1	0	4	25	42	0	14	173
Osborne	23	0	1	0	0	3	16	5	0	2	50
Ottawa	18	5	1	1	0	0	4	7	0	3	39
Pawnee	55	5	3	3	0	1	3	19	0	11	100
Phillips	21	5	3	1	0	0	12	6	0	3	51
Pottawatomie	52	18	7	0	0	0	19	12	0	4	112
Pratt	52	2	9	2	0	3	2	18	1	6	95
Rawlins	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	29
Reno	498	59	47	2	2	20	39	72	6	144	889
Republic	24	4	4	0	0	0	6	12	0	13	63
Rice	53	4	3	1	0	1	5	16	1	10	94

TABLE A-5.—CONCLUDED. Types of Civil Cases Commenced—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Divorce	Other domestic relations	Auto negligence	Other tort	Actions under 60-1507	Foreclosures	Real property	Contractual	Injunctions, mandamus quo warranto	Other	*Total number cases
Riley	252	45	19	9	0	4	9	99	4	12	453
Rooks	49	6	4	2	0	2	3	12	2	9	89
Rush	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	0	1	25
Russell	49	7	2	1	0	2	13	30	2	2	108
Saline	0	0	31	37	3	15	18	97	3	3	207
Scott	28	2	2	1	0	0	6	16	0	5	60
Sedgwick	3,375	653	72	568	14	231	72	1,303	58	311	6,657
Seward	145	30	18	6	2	8	7	64	1	29	310
Shawnee	1,432	376	141	60	5	86	75	337	57	436	3,005
Sheridan	8	1	2	0	0	0	4	5	0	3	23
Sherman	54	6	5	2	0	0	10	31	2	4	114
Smith	26	2	0	0	0	1	8	7	0	4	48
Stafford	26	1	1	2	0	4	10	17	2	3	66
Stanton	16	0	5	1	0	0	0	7	0	9	38
Stevens	23	1	0	1	0	0	4	21	1	8	59
Sumner	143	25	1	5	1	6	23	22	1	17	244
Thomas	33	5	6	0	0	6	2	19	0	13	84
Trego	14	2	4	1	0	1	1	2	0	5	30
Wabaunsee	14	4	2	1	0	2	4	9	2	4	42
Wallace	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	12
Washington	21	3	3	2	0	1	14	20	1	3	68
Wichita	11	2	1	0	0	0	3	18	0	14	49
Wilson	73	6	12	2	0	3	19	27	0	5	147
Woodson	22	4	6	7	0	3	11	26	0	5	84
Wyandotte	2,127	553	333	225	12	323	130	347	42	337	4,429
Grand Totals	15,900	3,139	1,543	1,332	70	1,105	1,504	5,511	340	2,615	33,059

* This does not include foreign transcripts.

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS—STATE AS A WHOLE

TABLE A-6.—TYPES OF CIVIL CASES COMMENCED COMPARED WITH 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974

	Year ending June 30, 1969	Year ending June 30, 1970	Year ending June 30, 1971	Year ending June 30, 1972	Year ending June 30, 1973	Year ending June 30, 1974
Number of cases *	25,995	28,737	29,826	31,649	31,488	33,059
Divorce	11,561	13,174	13,344	14,568	15,046	15,900
Other domestic relations	2,980	2,777	2,700	3,020	3,020	3,139
Automobile negligence	1,877	2,140	2,040	1,808	1,669	1,543
Other tort	890	1,006	1,052	1,138	1,200	1,332
Actions under K. S. A. 60-1507	127	124	113	115	96	70
Foreclosures	954	1,105	1,353	1,137	1,074	1,105
Real property	1,681	1,636	1,503	1,657	1,594	1,504
Contractual	4,180	4,580	5,068	5,432	5,155	5,511
Injunctions, mandamus Quo Warranto	235	317	366	411	382	340
Other	1,501	1,878	2,287	2,363	2,251	2,615

* Foreign transcript statistics were not collected for the fiscal years: 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, and 1974.

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS, BY COUNTIES

TABLE B-1.—DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Number of cases	Cases not tried		Trials				Time from filing to trial		Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
		Dismissed	Plea of guilty	Jury	Court	Convicted	Acquitted	Number less than 12 months	Number over 12 months	
Allen	23	8	13	2	0	0	2	21	1	1
Anderson	5	1	3	1	0	0	1	5	0	0
Atchison	43	8	31	4	0	3	1	43	0	1
Barber	10	4	5	0	1	1	0	10	0	0
Barton	79	24	47	2	6	7	1	75	4	1
Bourbon	38	4	28	4	2	4	2	37	1	0
Brown	14	8	6	0	0	0	0	11	3	0
Butler	98	22	68	6	2	5	3	94	4	1
Chase	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Chautauqua	16	10	4	0	2	1	1	12	4	0
Cherokee	33	5	28	0	0	0	0	33	0	0
Cheyenne	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Clark	6	3	1	2	0	0	2	3	3	0
Clay	22	5	15	2	0	2	0	22	0	0
Cloud	12	4	4	3	1	3	1	12	0	1
Coffey	16	7	1	3	5	6	2	15	1	0
Comanche	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cowley	79	14	60	5	0	4	1	75	1	0
Crawford	126	27	91	4	4	7	1	124	2	1
Decatur	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Dickinson	31	12	14	2	3	3	2	29	2	0
Doniphan	19	14	4	1	0	0	1	17	2	0
Douglas	172	46	102	11	13	16	8	150	22	1
Edwards	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
Elk	16	3	6	4	3	6	1	14	2	0

TABLE B-1.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Criminal Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Number of cases	Cases not tried		Trials				Time from filing to termination		Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
		Dismissed	Plea of guilty	Jury	Court	Convicted	Acquitted	Number less than 12 months	Number over 12 months	
Ellis	38	6	28	4	0	3	1	38	0	1
Ellsworth	7	4	2	1	0	1	0	7	0	0
Finney	62	13	37	3	9	11	1	62	0	4
Ford	29	9	14	1	5	5	1	29	0	0
Franklin	45	9	31	4	1	5	0	45	0	0
Geary	180	98	64	13	5	11	7	176	4	3
Gove	5	1	3	1	0	0	1	5	0	0
Graham	11	2	6	2	1	2	1	4	7	0
Grant	16	3	11	0	2	2	0	16	0	0
Gray	9	5	2	2	0	2	0	9	0	0
Greeley	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Greenwood	23	2	19	0	2	2	0	22	1	0
Hamilton	3	1	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	0
Harper	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Harvey	69	21	42	4	2	6	0	64	5	0
Haskell	10	7	1	0	2	1	1	9	1	0
Hodgeman	3	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0
Jackson	30	10	17	1	2	2	1	30	0	0
Jefferson	30	9	19	2	0	0	2	30	0	0
Jewell	4	0	3	0	1	0	1	4	0	0
Johnson	486	179	228	54	25	58	21	471	15	7
Kearny	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Kingman	20	9	8	1	2	1	2	19	1	0
Kiowa	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Labette	79	27	48	4	0	1	3	75	4	1

TABLE B-1.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Criminal Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Number of cases	Cases not tried		Trials				Time from filing to termination		Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
		Dismissed	Plea of guilty	Jury	Court	Convicted	Acquitted	Number less than 12 months	Number over 12 months	
Lane	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Leavenworth	92	24	48	11	9	16	4	88	4	5
Lincoln	14	2	10	1	1	2	0	14	0	0
Linn	15	11	2	1	1	2	0	13	2	0
Logan	6	1	4	0	1	1	0	6	0	0
Lyon	86	30	34	21	1	13	9	84	2	0
Marion	10	6	3	0	1	1	0	10	0	0
Marshall	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	6	0	0
McPherson	73	17	27	5	24	23	6	70	3	0
Meade	8	5	2	1	0	0	1	8	0	0
Miami	40	18	22	0	0	0	0	35	5	0
Mitchell	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
Montgomery	140	49	85	6	0	6	0	132	8	1
Morris	5	3	1	0	1	1	0	5	0	0
Morton	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Nemaha	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Neosho	17	11	6	0	0	0	0	17	0	1
Ness	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Norton	13	1	9	0	3	2	1	13	0	0
Osage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Osborne	7	5	0	2	0	2	0	6	1	0
Ottawa	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Pawnee	10	4	6	0	0	0	0	9	1	0
Phillips	9	2	5	1	1	1	1	9	0	0
Pottawatomie	28	11	12	4	1	4	1	28	0	0
Pratt	37	8	27	0	2	0	2	37	0	0
Rawlins	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Reno	278	91	165	20	2	13	9	274	4	5
Republic	5	1	0	0	4	2	2	3	2	1
Rice	24	10	12	2	0	1	1	24	0	0

TABLE B-1.—CONCLUDED. Disposition of Criminal Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Number of cases	Cases not tried		Trials				Time from filing to termination		Appeals docketed (Supreme Court)
		Dismissed	Plea of guilty	Jury	Court	Convicted	Acquitted	Number less than 12 months	Number over 12 months	
Riley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rooks	10	3	4	3	0	2	1	7	3	0
Rush	4	1	2	1	0	0	1	4	0	0
Russell	30	9	20	1	0	1	0	28	2	2
Saline	118	16	85	16	1	10	7	118	0	2
Scott	19	6	3	2	8	8	2	19	0	1
Sedgwick	1,189	164	745	171	109	217	63	1,173	16	26
Seward	66	21	37	3	5	7	1	64	2	0
Shawnee	463	121	178	73	91	129	35	455	8	19
Sheridan	9	3	3	3	0	3	0	9	0	0
Sherman	20	19	1	0	0	0	0	11	9	0
Smith	20	5	9	6	0	5	1	20	0	0
Stafford	5	2	2	0	1	1	0	5	0	0
Stanton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stevens	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0
Sumner	23	6	15	0	2	2	0	20	3	0
Thomas	3	1	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	0
Trego	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	0
Wabaunsee	16	5	7	0	4	4	0	6	2	0
Wallace	4	1	1	0	2	0	2	4	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wichita	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
Wilson	20	8	9	2	1	0	3	20	0	0
Woodson	12	3	8	1	0	1	0	12	0	0
Wyandotte	892	413	150	61	268	266	63	875	17	11
Grand Totals	5,917	1,792	2,902	574	649	933	290	5,720	188	98

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS, BY COUNTIES

TABLE B-2.—Types of Crimes—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Felonies				Misdemeanors				Appeals from lower courts				Total criminal cases commenced
	Against person	Against property	Other	Total felonies	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total misdemeanors	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total appeals	
Allen	3	11	2	16	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	19
Anderson	5	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Atchison	20	14	4	38	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	40
Barber	1	13	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	15
Barton	17	42	1	60	4	3	4	11	2	16	3	21	92
Bourbon	7	12	5	24	0	0	1	1	5	2	1	8	33
Brown	3	2	1	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3	10
Butler	40	48	4	92	0	1	2	3	3	5	10	18	113
Chase	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Chautauqua	2	6	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	13
Cherokee	4	17	11	32	1	5	4	10	0	0	0	0	42
Cheyenne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clark	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	4
Clay	3	12	3	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	20
Cloud	4	2	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	12
Coffey	1	2	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	4	8	12	17
Comanche	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cowley	11	64	3	78	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	79
Crawford	51	21	2	74	6	6	0	12	12	11	5	28	114
Decatur	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	6
Dickinson	3	8	7	18	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	6	25
Doniphan	2	2	0	4	0	3	0	3	1	2	8	11	18
Douglas	28	62	62	152	1	1	8	10	1	7	2	10	172
Edwards	3	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Elk	3	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

TABLE B-2.—CONTINUED. Types of Crimes—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Felonies				Misdemeanors				Appeals from lower courts				Total criminal cases commenced
	Against person	Against property	Other	Total felonies	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total misdemeanors	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total appeals	
Ellis	23	8	4	35	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	38
Ellsworth	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	7
Finney	7	26	11	44	1	1	0	2	1	4	10	15	61
Ford	8	16	2	26	1	1	1	3	2	1	0	3	32
Franklin	10	15	4	29	1	0	0	1	6	0	10	16	46
Geary	47	30	62	139	0	1	8	9	12	5	28	45	193
Gove	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4
Graham	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	9
Grant	6	8	3	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	18
Gray	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	9
Greeley	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Greenwood	8	15	2	25	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	27
Hamilton	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	5
Harper	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Harvey	5	37	20	62	0	0	0	0	12	8	8	28	90
Haskell	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	8
Hodgeman	1	4	0	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	7
Jackson	0	13	7	20	0	0	7	7	0	1	0	1	28
Jefferson	8	12	10	30	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	36
Jewell	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Johnson	43	124	115	282	1	5	5	11	28	112	76	216	509
Kearny	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kingman	0	7	1	8	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	12
Kiowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	13	13
Labette	27	19	4	50	2	1	3	6	11	7	14	32	88

TABLE B-2.—CONTINUED. Types of Crimes—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Felonies				Misdemeanors				Appeals from lower courts				Total criminal cases commenced
	Against person	Against property	Other	Total felonies	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total misdemeanors	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total appeals	
Lane	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Leavenworth	23	26	6	55	0	0	0	0	4	13	16	33	88
Lincoln	0	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	12
Linn	4	1	1	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4	11
Logan	1	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Lyon	15	29	23	67	5	5	2	12	3	3	2	8	87
Marion	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	9
Marshall	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
McPherson	3	15	15	33	1	5	3	9	2	21	12	35	77
Meade	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Miami	9	7	9	25	0	0	2	2	3	11	2	16	43
Mitchell	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4
Montgomery	25	81	27	133	3	0	2	5	4	3	10	17	155
Morris	1	2	1	4	0	1	2	3	3	0	1	4	11
Morton	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Nemaha	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4
Neosho	6	8	4	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	20
Ness	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Norton	4	6	1	11	1	1	3	5	0	0	4	4	20
Osage	0	2	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	4
Osborne	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	5
Ottawa	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Pawnee	3	1	5	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	12
Phillips	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	7
Pottawatomie	7	11	5	23	2	1	1	4	1	1	0	2	29
Pratt	3	24	3	30	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3	34
Rawlins	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Reno	26	119	54	199	0	2	4	6	18	22	20	60	265
Republic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
Rice	2	19	2	23	0	0	3	3	1	0	1	2	28

TABLE B-2.—CONCLUDED. Types of Crimes—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Felonies				Misdemeanors				Appeals from lower courts				Total criminal cases commenced
	Against person	Against property	Other	Total felonies	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total misdemeanors	DWI	Other traffic	Other	Total appeals	
Riley	4	6	4	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	17
Rooks	5	1	1	7	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	12
Rush	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Russell	6	14	6	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	27
Saline	47	68	2	117	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	8	126
Scott	2	3	2	7	0	1	1	2	2	3	7	12	21
Sedgwick	225	592	249	1,066	13	27	18	58	9	31	29	69	1,193
Seward	7	33	9	49	1	1	0	2	1	2	4	7	58
Shawnee	74	163	129	366	3	3	5	11	49	33	16	98	475
Sheridan	2	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	8
Sherman	3	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	6
Smith	0	13	5	18	1	0	2	3	0	1	0	1	22
Stafford	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	5
Stanton	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Stevens	5	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Sumner	2	3	3	8	1	1	3	5	2	0	1	3	16
Thomas	1	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Trego	3	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Wabaunsee	3	3	2	8	2	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	12
Wallace	1	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wichita	5	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Wilson	8	6	0	14	0	0	2	2	0	4	0	4	20
Woodson	5	3	14	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Wyandotte	114	177	1	292	1	1	28	30	161	104	213	478	800
Grand Totals	1,086	2,173	954	4,213	58	90	139	287	377	488	576	1,441	5,941

PROBATE COURTS

TABLE C-1.—SUMMARY OF BUSINESS HANDLED—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Estates of decedents		Guardianships and conservatorships		Trusts under supervision	Juvenile cases	Habeas corpus hearings	Orders in absence of district judge	Adoption Proceedings	Care and treatment proceedings	Determination of descent	Miscellaneous	Foreign transcripts
	Opened during year	Closed during year	Opened during year	Closed during year									
Allen	54	47	27	13	16	68	0	0	10	8	29	8	5
Anderson	46	46	8	5	2	10	0	0	9	0	18	5	3
Atchison	52	49	15	14	9	53	0	0	19	14	29	7	10
Barber	44	51	12	7	29	16	0	18	10	1	7	7	27
Barton	119	93	25	15	41	287	0	23	30	74	30	9	42
Bourbon	40	56	18	15	10	178	2	1	12	12	30	9	7
Brown	66	34	14	13	11	41	0	0	10	23	31	9	9
Butler	104	87	20	17	11	125	0	0	41	20	47	0	40
Chase	13	7	8	2	4	2	0	0	4	5	13	0	6
Chautauqua	15	20	1	1	3	27	0	1	4	0	13	9	10
Cherokee	43	44	13	1	0	77	0	0	18	18	89	0	5
Cheyenne	24	22	1	0	2	4	0	0	5	0	9	0	0
Clark	16	16	1	0	1	9	0	0	1	4	14	1	15
Clay	72	67	6	5	23	0	0	4	9	1	20	3	7
Cloud	35	49	6	8	26	21	0	17	8	8	27	10	21
Coffey	36	41	9	9	4	17	0	0	5	4	21	2	10
Comanche	20	17	9	0	1	8	10	4	2	2	6	0	5
Cowley	98	127	22	20	17	226	0	0	21	20	51	9	22
Crawford	62	69	25	13	40	392	0	0	28	46	77	0	14
Decatur	22	22	1	2	4	6	0	5	2	0	11	1	15
Dickinson	100	98	21	10	35	201	0	12	17	32	29	7	10
Doniphan	24	26	9	11	11	38	0	14	6	7	12	7	6
Douglas	95	94	25	12	40	732	1	0	58	51	69	21	12
Edwards	30	23	12	2	5	22	0	6	6	9	13	48	18
Elk	22	23	2	2	2	17	0	3	1	5	21	2	6

TABLE C-1.—CONTINUED. Summary of Business Handled—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Estates of decedents		Guardianships and conservatorships		Trusts under supervision	Juvenile cases	Habeas corpus hearings	Orders in absence of district judge	Adoption proceedings	Care and treatment proceedings	Determination of descent	Miscellaneous	Foreign transcripts
	Opened during year	Closed during year	Opened during year	Closed during year									
Ellis	71	59	22	6	22	77	0	10	16	43	18	44	40
Ellsworth	55	57	7	9	5	50	0	17	5	14	16	0	19
Finney	55	36	17	7	1	203	0	28	36	34	24	26	55
Ford	61	71	21	12	39	180	0	115	35	31	42	10	27
Franklin	60	44	11	6	9	68	0	0	20	13	26	6	36
Geary	44	67	14	21	8	150	1	5	70	26	16	2	6
Gove	6	15	2	1	6	2	0	4	2	1	5	5	15
Graham	29	28	2	1	3	0	0	0	5	7	7	0	21
Grant	14	14	3	0	7	123	0	0	8	1	6	0	17
Gray	13	17	8	8	11	20	0	8	6	6	14	4	18
Greeley	7	5	4	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	9
Greenwood	49	61	12	8	6	61	0	0	9	9	17	0	20
Hamilton	6	10	1	3	4	19	0	1	1	11	10	0	19
Harper	47	35	5	1	14	21	0	16	7	2	22	2	15
Harvey	110	106	30	12	26	139	0	2	28	45	27	12	23
Haskell	15	10	2	1	0	10	0	0	4	1	2	0	19
Hodgeman	14	15	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	11
Jackson	33	1	0	0	2	56	0	7	13	4	17	4	9
Jefferson	34	31	13	6	6	67	0	0	21	7	21	12	12
Jewell	17	19	6	0	4	10	0	0	1	2	23	0	15
Johnson	214	225	103	71	107	1,522	0	4	278	81	69	140	4
Kearny	9	14	0	2	6	30	0	1	6	5	10	0	26
Kingman	58	50	9	10	16	96	0	0	5	15	15	0	31
Kiowa	16	31	4	4	9	12	0	0	1	5	3	1	15
Labette	56	50	21	8	14	103	0	0	18	37	76	14	22

TABLE C-1.—CONTINUED. Summary of Business Handled—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Estates of decedents		Guardianships and conservatorships		Trusts under supervision	Juvenile cases	Habeas corpus hearings	Orders in absence of district judge	Adoption proceedings	Care and treatment proceedings	Determination of descent	Miscellaneous	Foreign transcripts
	Opened during year	Closed during year	Opened during year	Closed during year									
Lane	8	10	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	2
Leavenworth	70	82	30	29	12	275	2	0	79	45	60	21	4
Lincoln	24	25	7	4	4	25	0	5	4	3	10	44	17
Linn	25	34	9	4	7	27	0	0	6	14	21	2	6
Logan	24	34	10	0	1	28	0	0	2	1	6	4	21
Lyon	88	73	31	15	4	129	0	0	28	26	44	1	32
Marion	68	67	20	6	18	52	0	18	11	7	19	0	15
Marshall	54	60	17	13	15	26	0	3	8	4	48	20	14
McPherson	93	89	7	4	19	175	0	15	22	17	35	34	33
Meade	26	28	5	1	13	39	0	4	1	5	20	4	20
Miami	33	52	17	21	6	129	0	50	23	115	29	1	13
Mitchell	44	48	10	5	6	30	0	16	2	5	25	0	29
Montgomery	101	83	36	21	32	216	0	0	40	67	66	19	38
Morris	16	17	9	6	3	39	0	9	2	3	16	0	9
Morton	21	9	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	18
Nemaha	33	39	7	7	14	1	0	0	5	0	28	0	7
Neosho	68	53	20	15	10	72	0	0	16	30	38	12	4
Ness	21	29	3	1	4	29	0	0	6	2	19	4	24
Norton	28	28	7	9	8	26	0	0	6	7	18	21	15
Osage	28	28	15	11	11	45	0	11	13	11	19	0	12
Osborne	45	51	3	3	14	7	0	14	4	2	10	1	13
Ottawa	34	33	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	23	0	17
Pawnee	71	69	18	26	31	29	0	22	5	391	10	2	25
Phillips	36	53	10	5	11	22	0	0	6	9	28	3	9
Pottawatomie	39	38	8	10	7	0	0	0	10	9	18	0	23
Pratt	61	75	12	8	30	69	0	18	12	10	23	19	36
Rawlins	15	30	2	4	4	12	0	0	5	3	5	1	10
Reno	149	152	53	36	86	502	0	0	61	61	94	31	39
Republic	78	50	13	5	4	0	0	0	2	8	16	8	7
Rice	51	63	13	8	21	78	0	10	11	8	16	5	33

TABLE C-1.—CONCLUDED. Summary of Business Handled—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Estates of decedents		Guardianships and conservatorships		Trusts under supervision	Juvenile cases	Habeas corpus hearings	Orders in absence of district judge	Adoption proceedings	Care and treatment proceedings	Determination of descent	Miscellaneous	Foreign transcripts
	Opened during year	Closed during year	Opened during year	Closed during year									
Riley	57	63	45	14	36	276	0	10	43	21	28	16	12
Rooks	43	34	8	1	4	35	0	2	4	22	19	0	19
Rush	30	27	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	0	21
Russell	45	47	7	3	7	21	0	29	11	5	18	16	9
Saline	95	101	33	10	69	697	0	0	67	73	63	3	23
Scott	13	15	4	0	2	58	0	0	7	5	3	0	3
Sedgwick	592	470	315	132	340		0	0	400	1,697	160	176	57
Sedgwick (Juvenile)						2,420							
Seward	17	11	15	14	17	167	1	0	21	148	50	0	62
Shawnee	324	276	154	87	181	1,008	1	0	187	846	184	66	34
Sheridan	19	19	2	1	5	1	0	0	5	3	4	0	32
Sherman	22	29	6	4	15	59	0	0	13	12	11	0	16
Smith	37	30	6	2	2	7	0	11	5	0	22	0	14
Stafford	40	54	9	5	8	10	1	14	4	6	20	3	24
Stanton	11	12	1	0	0	9	0	0	2	1	4	2	20
Stevens	21	13	6	2	3	6	0	0	7	0	7	0	31
Sumner	91	97	11	21	31	109	0	0	21	15	48	9	64
Thomas	36	32	5	8	10	105	0	0	9	7	8	2	10
Trego	21	29	3	4	2	36	0	1	3	4	10	12	13
Wabaunsee	21	36	8	11	3	14	0	0	6	3	17	2	14
Wallace	10	9	3	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	1
Washington	29	31	5	4	1	2	0	0	8	2	25	0	16
Wichita	7	7	0	1	0	3	0	1	4	0	2	1	10
Wilson	64	56	21	16	8	49	1	16	11	15	31	10	11
Woodson	16	0	7	1	0	26	0	0	2	9	15	0	18
Wyandotte	254	267	100	65	21	4,251	0	0	168	374	139	195	25
Totals	5,712	5,566	1,808	1,091	1,849	17,047	10	605	2,334	4,902	2,905	1,231	1,933

PROBATE COURTS

TABLE C-2.—ESTATES OF DECEDENTS—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Total number	Wills		Bonds			Estates closed			Estates pending July 1, 1974		
				With	Without	Personal	Surety	None	Total number closed	Closed within 15 months		Total number pending	Pending less than 1 year	
										Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Allen	64	54	118	71	47	40	25	53	47	33	70	71	54	76
Anderson	59	46	105	72	33	35	14	56	46	29	63	59	46	77
Atchison	77	52	129	89	40	5	53	71	49	33	67	80	52	65
Barber	65	44	109	81	28	35	12	62	51	33	65	58	44	76
Barton	149	119	268	185	83	66	38	164	93	61	65	175	119	68
Bourbon	67	40	107	62	45	30	18	59	56	35	62	51	40	78
Brown	95	66	161	104	57	32	28	101	34	17	50	127	66	51
Butler	139	104	243	164	79	44	51	148	87	58	66	156	104	66
Chase	10	13	23	13	10	2	11	10	7	5	71	16	13	81
Chautauqua	25	15	40	24	16	4	17	19	20	12	60	20	15	75
Cherokee	1	43	44	27	17	2	11	31	44	4	9	0	43	0
Cheyenne	31	24	55	39	16	12	13	30	22	13	59	33	24	72
Clark	23	16	39	23	16	10	13	16	16	4	25	23	16	69
Clay	91	72	163	120	43	51	5	107	67	48	71	96	72	75
Cloud	69	35	104	71	33	24	21	59	49	30	61	55	35	63
Coffey	34	36	70	40	30	2	35	33	41	37	90	29	36	80
Comanche	39	20	59	41	18	16	3	40	17	8	47	42	20	47
Cowley	143	98	241	179	62	69	44	128	127	96	75	114	98	85
Crawford	116	62	178	116	62	15	61	102	69	35	50	109	62	56
Decatur	22	22	44	32	12	1	20	23	22	18	82	22	22	100
Dickinson	95	100	195	143	52	44	27	124	98	83	84	97	100	97
Doniphan	39	24	63	39	24	19	10	34	26	20	76	37	24	64
Douglas	126	95	221	168	53	6	70	145	94	48	51	127	95	74
Edwards	28	30	58	41	17	7	15	36	23	13	56	35	30	85
Elk	31	22	53	34	19	16	4	33	23	13	56	30	22	73

TABLE C-2.—CONTINUED. Estates of Decedents—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Total number	Wills		Bonds			Estates closed			Estates pending July 1, 1974		
				With	Without	Personal	Surety	None	Total number closed	Closed within 15 months		Total number pending	Pending less than 1 year	
										Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Ellis	96	71	167	119	48	45	9	113	59	44	74	108	71	65
Ellsworth	52	55	107	66	41	37	6	64	57	49	85	50	55	90
Finney	77	55	132	92	40	17	22	93	36	18	50	96	55	57
Ford	120	61	181	141	40	1	55	125	71	32	45	110	61	55
Franklin	79	60	139	93	46	23	17	99	44	37	84	95	60	63
Geary	90	44	134	88	46	19	49	66	67	29	43	67	44	65
Gove	27	6	33	24	9	7	5	21	15	11	73	18	6	33
Graham	45	29	74	48	26	22	0	52	28	23	82	46	29	63
Grant	18	14	32	24	8	5	6	21	14	10	71	18	14	77
Gray	33	13	46	29	17	9	15	22	17	15	88	29	13	44
Greeley	14	7	21	13	8	9	1	11	5	3	60	16	7	43
Greenwood	72	49	121	86	35	37	17	67	61	42	68	60	49	81
Hamilton	30	6	36	28	8	6	3	27	10	3	30	26	6	23
Harper	51	47	98	77	21	16	7	75	35	25	71	63	47	74
Harvey	140	110	250	208	42	38	27	185	106	75	70	144	110	76
Haskell	11	15	26	19	7	2	3	21	10	5	50	16	15	93
Hodgeman	24	14	38	27	11	2	15	21	15	7	46	23	14	60
Jackson	0	33	33	21	12	7	8	18	1	1	100	32	33	96
Jefferson	56	34	90	54	36	24	19	47	31	20	64	59	34	57
Jewell	33	17	50	29	21	21	7	22	19	11	57	31	17	54
Johnson	335	214	549	412	137	55	136	358	225	129	57	324	214	66
Kearny	18	9	27	13	14	0	12	15	14	9	64	13	9	69
Kingman	82	58	140	109	31	35	8	97	50	26	52	90	58	64
Kiowa	49	16	65	48	17	18	1	46	31	13	41	34	16	47
Labette	75	56	131	85	46	16	26	89	50	35	70	81	56	62

TABLE C-2.—CONTINUED. Estates of Decedents—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Total number	Wills		Bonds			Estates closed			Estates pending July 1, 1974		
				With	Without	Personal	Surety	None	Total number closed	Closed within 15 months		Total number pending	Pending less than 1 year	
										Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Lane	19	8	27	20	7	6	6	15	10	8	80	17	8	47
Leavenworth	146	70	216	130	86	11	71	134	82	42	51	134	70	52
Lincoln	31	24	55	31	24	17	11	27	25	21	84	30	24	80
Linn	41	25	66	37	29	33	6	27	34	23	67	32	25	78
Logan	43	24	67	41	26	22	5	40	34	16	47	33	24	72
Lyon	135	88	223	150	73	34	83	106	73	44	60	150	88	58
Marion	72	68	140	101	39	38	16	86	67	57	85	73	68	93
Marshall	99	54	153	107	46	15	39	99	60	44	73	93	54	58
McPherson	109	93	202	145	57	56	6	140	89	66	74	113	93	82
Meade	40	26	66	40	26	12	19	35	28	16	57	38	26	68
Miami	68	33	101	66	35	0	42	59	52	37	71	49	33	67
Mitchell	73	44	117	82	35	15	23	79	48	34	70	69	44	63
Montgomery	136	101	237	156	81	2	98	137	83	50	60	154	101	65
Morris	37	16	53	34	19	9	14	30	17	9	52	36	16	44
Morton	3	21	24	15	9	0	8	16	9	6	66	15	21	71
Nemaha	48	33	81	62	19	6	18	57	39	26	66	42	33	78
Neosho	67	68	135	97	38	12	27	96	53	46	86	82	68	98
Ness	42	21	63	41	22	17	10	36	29	17	58	34	21	61
Norton	62	28	90	57	33	16	36	38	28	7	25	62	28	45
Osage	54	28	82	49	33	24	16	42	28	21	75	54	28	51
Osborne	68	45	113	69	44	31	23	59	51	37	72	62	45	72
Ottawa	43	34	77	52	25	23	9	45	33	23	69	44	34	77
Pawnee	95	71	166	109	57	26	20	120	69	48	69	97	71	73
Phillips	62	36	98	71	27	35	9	54	53	29	54	45	36	80
Pottawatomie	56	39	95	53	42	43	11	41	38	25	65	57	39	68
Pratt	95	61	156	124	32	31	19	106	75	52	70	81	61	75
Rawlins	44	15	59	32	27	30	7	22	30	21	70	29	15	51
Reno	212	149	361	253	108	64	61	236	152	83	54	209	149	71
Republic	91	78	169	99	70	72	45	52	50	38	76	119	78	65
Rice	117	51	168	123	45	10	22	136	63	37	58	105	51	48

TABLE C-2.—CONCLUDED. Estates of Decedents—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Total number	Wills		Bonds			Estates closed			Estates pending July 1, 1974		
				With	Without	Personal	Surety	None	Total number closed	Closed within 15 months		Total number pending	Pending less than 1 year	
										Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Riley	98	57	155	111	44	36	47	72	63	37	58	92	57	61
Rooks	55	43	98	76	22	84	13	1	34	25	73	64	43	67
Rush	30	30	60	45	15	10	10	40	27	11	40	33	30	90
Russell	70	45	115	78	37	35	5	75	47	29	61	68	45	66
Saline	172	95	267	197	70	21	42	204	101	66	65	166	95	57
Scott	26	13	39	22	17	9	4	26	15	7	46	24	13	54
Sedgwick	956	592	1,548	1,072	476	137	522	889	470	256	54	1,078	592	54
Seward	72	17	89	52	37	10	20	59	11	2	18	75	17	21
Shawnee	565	324	889	601	288	160	240	489	276	169	61	613	324	52
Sheridan	20	19	39	32	7	5	15	19	19	10	52	20	19	95
Sherman	38	22	60	34	26	8	16	36	29	17	58	31	22	70
Smith	44	37	81	48	33	45	0	36	30	17	56	51	37	72
Stafford	103	40	143	97	46	32	19	92	54	32	59	89	40	44
Stanton	18	11	29	9	20	0	0	29	12	0	0	17	11	64
Stevens	17	21	38	25	13	8	7	23	13	8	61	25	21	84
Sumner	134	91	225	156	69	23	66	136	97	64	65	128	91	71
Thomas	52	36	88	65	23	14	5	69	32	11	34	56	36	64
Trego	40	21	61	35	26	24	11	26	29	25	86	32	21	65
Wabaunsee	43	21	64	42	22	17	14	33	36	25	69	28	21	75
Wallace	20	10	30	18	12	6	6	18	9	4	44	21	10	48
Washington	76	29	105	67	38	28	29	48	31	19	61	74	29	39
Wichita	21	7	28	17	11	20	1	7	7	4	57	21	7	33
Wilson	70	64	134	86	48	41	16	77	56	49	87	78	64	82
Woodson	17	16	33	19	14	10	9	14	0	0	0	33	16	48
Wyandotte	501	254	755	409	346	95	303	357	267	163	61	488	254	52
Totals	8,731	5,712	14,443	9,790	4,653	2,646	3,293	8,504	5,566	3,491	62%	8,877	5,712	64%

PROBATE COURTS

TABLE C-3.—GUARDIANSHIPS, CONSERVATORSHIPS AND TRUSTS—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Guardianships and conservatorships														Trusts	
	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Number closed during the year	Number pending June 30, 1974	Guardianship	Conservatorship	Both	Voluntary	Involuntary	Bonds			Inventory of account filed during the year		Number under supervision	Number of accounts during year
										Personal	Surety	None	Number	Percent of total		
Allen	136	27	13	150	2	73	88	68	95	117	35	11	39	23	16	13
Anderson	42	8	5	45	12	18	20	19	31	38	12	0	27	54	2	2
Atchison	128	15	14	129	41	31	71	10	133	26	100	17	12	8	9	0
Barber	42	12	7	47	1	17	36	14	40	42	11	1	26	48	29	10
Barton	128	25	15	138	0	54	99	49	104	53	84	16	32	20	41	23
Bourbon	63	18	15	66	4	27	50	20	61	47	19	15	44	54	10	8
Brown	54	14	13	55	18	26	24	25	43	35	17	16	11	16	11	3
Butler	139	20	17	142	8	17	134	118	41	64	54	41	39	24	11	4
Chase	25	8	2	31	5	10	18	7	26	24	7	2	14	42	4	4
Chautauqua	18	1	1	18	12	0	7	6	13	3	16	0	13	68	3	3
Cherokee	0	13	1	12	0	3	10	2	11	2	6	5	3	23	0	0
Cheyenne	5	1	0	6	0	0	6	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	0
Clark	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	50	1	1
Clay	61	6	5	62	40	22	5	22	45	47	14	6	35	52	23	15
Cloud	63	6	8	61	5	18	46	8	61	34	23	12	17	24	26	14
Coffey	39	9	9	39	20	10	18	9	39	9	33	6	16	33	4	3
Comanche	9	9	0	18	0	8	10	6	12	15	0	3	1	5	1	0
Cowley	134	22	20	136	7	80	69	34	122	80	47	29	58	37	17	9
Crawford	192	25	13	204	45	21	151	6	211	35	167	15	45	20	40	23
Decatur	20	1	2	19	2	8	11	16	5	15	4	2	8	38	4	4
Dickinson	87	21	10	98	45	24	39	35	73	59	41	8	95	87	35	33
Doniphan	60	9	11	58	0	10	59	6	63	54	10	5	19	27	11	9
Douglas	56	25	12	69	8	53	20	80	1	7	59	15	13	16	40	24
Edwards	38	12	2	48	0	14	36	14	36	18	24	8	12	24	5	3
Elk	25	2	2	25	0	7	20	6	21	17	10	0	23	85	2	2

TABLE C-3.—CONTINUED. Guardianships, Conservatorships and Trusts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Guardianships and conservatorships														Trusts	
	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Number closed during the year	Number pending June 30, 1974	Guardianship	Conservatorship	Both	Voluntary	Involuntary	Bonds			Inventory of account filed during the year		Number under supervision	Number of accounts during year
										Personal	Surety	None	Number	Percent of total		
Ellis	139	22	6	155	38	43	80	20	141	125	13	23	48	29	22	11
Ellsworth	45	7	9	43	6	25	21	8	44	39	10	3	32	61	5	0
Finney	68	17	7	78	23	33	29	36	49	21	45	19	9	10	1	1
Ford	88	21	12	97	6	71	32	34	75	12	82	15	42	38	39	28
Franklin	99	11	6	104	13	49	48	70	40	61	23	26	32	29	9	3
Geary	76	14	21	69	50	18	22	10	80	32	42	16	62	68	8	8
Gove	13	2	1	14	6	2	7	2	13	7	6	2	3	20	6	2
Graham	27	2	1	28	16	3	10	29	0	27	1	1	6	20	3	3
Grant	7	3	0	10	2	4	4	0	10	2	7	1	1	10	7	6
Gray	33	8	8	33	1	24	16	25	16	21	14	6	22	53	11	6
Greeley	3	4	1	6	0	5	2	7	0	4	2	1	0	0	2	0
Greenwood	33	12	8	37	6	22	17	23	22	23	17	5	18	40	6	4
Hamilton	11	1	3	9	0	6	6	7	5	11	0	1	3	25	4	3
Harper	18	5	1	22	5	7	11	10	13	11	5	7	3	13	14	10
Harvey	125	30	12	143	42	43	70	28	127	77	61	17	18	11	26	16
Haskell	1	2	1	2	1	0	2	3	0	1	0	2	1	33	0	0
Hodgeman	14	3	2	15	0	8	9	6	11	9	7	1	6	35	0	0
Jackson	19	0	0	19	0	7	12	8	11	9	8	2	3	15	2	1
Jefferson	80	13	6	87	25	38	30	34	59	46	34	13	33	35	6	5
Jewell	20	6	0	26	3	3	20	2	24	12	13	1	14	53	4	4
Johnson	502	103	71	534	161	268	176	4	601	152	258	195	180	29	107	39
Kearny	13	0	2	11	7	6	0	8	5	5	8	0	1	7	6	3
Kingman	58	9	10	57	13	29	25	23	44	47	20	0	25	37	16	4
Kiowa	19	4	4	19	7	11	5	4	19	13	9	1	8	34	9	4
Labette	88	21	8	101	4	26	79	5	104	44	51	14	46	42	14	8

TABLE C-3.—CONTINUED. Guardianships, Conservatorships and Trusts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Guardianships and conservatorships														Trusts	
	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Number closed during the year	Number pending June 30, 1974	Guardianship	Conservatorship	Both	Voluntary	Involuntary	Bonds			Inventory of account filed during the year		Number under supervision	Number of accounts during year
										Personal	Surety	None	Number	Percent of total		
Lane	2	2	0	4	0	2	2	4	0	2	1	1	0	0	3	1
Leavenworth	140	30	29	141	26	19	125	18	152	59	77	34	92	34	12	11
Lincoln	24	7	4	27	7	9	15	5	26	19	10	2	14	45	4	2
Linn	55	9	4	60	20	9	35	8	56	52	8	4	35	54	7	2
Logan	10	10	0	20	2	12	6	20	0	4	1	15	2	10	1	1
Lyon	143	31	15	159	21	55	98	39	135	49	102	23	51	29	4	3
Marion	96	20	6	110	51	32	33	28	88	84	25	7	33	28	18	10
Marshall	109	17	13	113	12	54	60	63	63	53	59	14	50	39	15	10
McPherson	97	7	4	100	24	35	45	46	58	85	15	4	52	50	19	19
Meade	26	5	1	30	3	13	15	4	27	16	12	3	4	12	13	9
Miami	92	17	21	88	26	49	34	12	97	18	75	16	43	39	6	2
Mitchell	48	10	5	53	12	12	34	41	17	38	14	6	4	6	6	3
Montgomery	181	36	21	196	67	49	101	66	151	19	105	93	89	41	32	23
Morris	53	9	6	56	19	17	26	8	54	28	14	20	30	48	3	1
Morton	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Nemaha	41	7	7	41	0	11	37	23	25	18	22	8	18	37	14	11
Neosho	97	20	15	102	11	55	51	38	79	58	42	17	34	29	10	5
Ness	30	3	1	32	4	7	22	2	31	24	7	2	7	21	4	4
Norton	53	7	9	51	0	17	43	9	51	35	23	2	25	41	8	6
Osage	57	15	11	61	2	15	55	15	57	33	35	4	45	62	11	8
Osborne	39	3	3	39	0	8	34	15	27	23	17	2	30	75	14	8
Ottawa	38	5	7	36	12	13	18	20	23	19	14	10	21	48	8	6
Pawnee	48	18	26	40	9	29	28	25	41	27	21	18	3	4	31	21
Phillips	48	10	5	53	9	34	15	22	36	38	20	0	28	48	11	10
Pottawatomie	69	8	10	67	22	38	17	48	29	54	14	9	16	20	7	4
Pratt	47	12	8	51	6	18	35	27	32	29	22	8	23	38	30	24
Rawlins	28	2	4	26	0	18	12	9	21	23	6	1	8	26	4	4
Reno	261	53	36	278	94	89	131	27	287	53	208	53	111	35	86	49
Republic	55	13	5	63	22	40	6	43	25	28	40	0	21	30	4	4
Rice	78	13	8	83	41	41	9	36	55	15	26	50	9	20	21	10

TABLE C-3.—CONCLUDED. Guardianships, Conservatorships and Trusts—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Guardianships and conservatorships														Trusts	
	Number pending July 1, 1973	Number filed since July 1, 1973	Number closed during the year	Number pending June 30, 1974	Guardianship	Conservatorship	Both	Voluntary	Involuntary	Bonds			Inventory of account filed during the year		Number under supervision	Number of accounts during year
										Personal	Surety	None	Number	Percent of total		
Riley	95	45	14	126	60	33	47	47	93	61	57	22	46	32	36	27
Rooks	55	8	1	62	11	36	16	49	14	51	12	0	12	19	4	1
Rush	2	3	1	4	1	3	1	5	0	2	1	2	1	20	1	1
Russell	39	7	3	43	18	16	12	9	37	27	9	10	18	39	7	5
Saline	178	33	10	201	47	65	99	104	107	94	93	24	54	25	69	35
Scott	4	4	0	8	0	6	2	8	0	5	2	1	1	12	2	2
Sedgwick	1,364	315	132	1,547	292	448	939	430	1,249	602	819	258	692	41	340	161
Seward	82	15	14	83	27	31	39	7	90	10	55	32	60	61	17	16
Shawnee	815	154	87	882	36	190	743	150	819	415	433	121	197	20	181	117
Sheridan	21	2	1	22	5	3	15	4	19	11	6	6	11	47	5	5
Sherman	28	6	4	30	7	20	7	5	29	10	15	9	11	32	15	11
Smith	23	6	2	27	2	20	7	11	18	25	4	0	5	17	2	0
Stafford	36	9	5	40	15	13	17	22	23	17	21	7	24	53	8	7
Stanton	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Stevens	14	6	2	18	3	9	8	10	10	9	8	3	5	25	3	3
Sumner	128	11	21	118	2	40	97	21	118	35	91	13	86	61	31	26
Thomas	18	5	8	15	6	11	6	2	21	15	4	4	7	30	10	5
Trego	26	3	4	25	0	21	8	7	22	25	4	0	14	45	2	2
Wabaunsee	32	8	11	29	6	13	21	10	30	20	18	2	26	65	3	1
Wallace	7	3	1	9	1	4	5	8	2	5	4	1	2	20	3	2
Washington	17	5	4	18	1	4	17	5	17	17	5	0	12	54	1	1
Wichita	9	0	1	8	1	7	1	8	1	8	1	0	2	22	0	0
Wilson	39	21	16	44	10	18	32	21	39	32	17	11	25	41	8	7
Woodson	4	7	1	10	0	3	8	9	2	4	3	4	5	45	0	0
Wyandotte	611	100	65	646	111	146	459	188	523	150	354	207	154	21	21	7
Totals	8,876	1,808	1,091	9,593	1,894	3,265	5,525	2,858	7,826	4,312	4,603	1,769	3,587	33%	1,849	1,092

COUNTY COURTS

TABLE D-1.—DISPOSTION OF CIVIL CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases dismissed	Cases not contested	Trials			Number pending	Appeal to district court	Garnishments	Attachments	Replevins	Forcible detainer
				Total number	By court	By jury						
Allen	160	36	38	40	40	0	46	0	3	4	0	0
Anderson	45	0	21	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0
Barber	25	6	11	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	1	0
Barton	336	88	114	93	93	0	41	4	44	0	0	0
Bourbon	117	15	85	14	14	0	3	1	13	4	0	0
Brown	35	9	10	4	4	0	12	0	0	1	0	1
Butler	304	48	105	69	69	0	82	3	5	0	0	0
Chase	35	9	21	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0
Chautauqua	63	18	34	4	4	0	7	0	4	5	0	0
Cherokee	250	51	153	2	2	0	44	1	22	11	0	0
Cheyenne	21	0	11	0	0	0	10	0	4	0	0	0
Clark	12	0	6	4	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Clay	16	3	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cloud	55	8	29	9	9	0	9	1	2	0	0	0
Coffey	36	5	15	2	2	0	14	1	1	2	0	0
Comanche	14	3	7	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Decatur	7	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson	140	49	85	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0
Doniphan	34	5	10	5	5	0	14	0	4	0	0	0
Douglas	557	155	55	55	55	0	292	7	57	42	3	25
Edwards	22	8	4	0	0	0	10	0	2	1	0	0
Elk	11	2	0	8	8	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Ellis	321	73	64	121	121	0	63	0	47	0	0	0
Ellsworth	38	6	28	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0
Finney	221	54	82	6	6	0	79	2	5	0	0	0

TABLE D-1.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Civil Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases dismissed	Cases not contested	Trials			Number pending	Appeal to district court	Garnishments	Attachments	Replevins	Forcible detainer
				Total number	By court	By jury						
Ford	403	124	0	162	162	0	117	0	19	1	0	0
Franklin	149	39	99	11	11	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
Geary	208	66	79	49	49	0	14	4	5	0	3	0
Gove	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graham	17	1	12	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Grant	86	17	6	0	0	0	63	0	23	0	0	1
Gray	67	30	19	2	2	0	16	0	3	0	2	1
Greeley	10	1	6	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0
Greenwood	10	2	3	0	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	0
Hamilton	6	1	2	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Harper	71	27	9	0	0	0	35	0	3	1	0	0
Harvey	114	23	56	1	1	0	34	0	10	0	0	0
Haskell	39	1	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Hodgeman	6	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Jackson	22	5	4	1	1	0	12	0	2	3	0	0
Jefferson	67	13	52	2	2	0	0	0	5	1	0	0
Jewell	61	1	25	2	2	0	33	1	1	0	0	0
Kearny	26	11	9	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Kingman	29	3	22	4	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
Kiowa	6	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0
Labette	151	15	0	54	54	0	82	0	6	0	0	0
Lane	27	4	11	1	1	0	11	0	4	0	0	0
Lincoln	70	7	36	4	4	0	23	0	4	1	0	0
Linn	77	8	53	4	4	0	12	2	0	0	0	0
Logan	11	3	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0

TABLE D-1.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Civil Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases dismissed	Cases not contested	Trials			Number pending	Appeal to district court	Garnishments	Attachments	Replevins	Forcible detainer
				Total number	By court	By jury						
Lyon	334	97	125	11	11	0	101	2	31	5	0	0
Marion	62	34	17	1	1	0	10	0	2	0	0	0
Marshall	42	12	20	9	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
McPherson	69	12	13	9	9	0	35	1	2	0	2	0
Meade	67	5	41	4	4	0	17	0	6	0	0	0
Miami	106	9	84	13	13	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Mitchell	55	4	38	1	1	0	12	0	2	0	0	0
Morris	72	21	46	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0
Morton	12	0	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	0
Nemaha	11	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Ness	27	13	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
Norton	17	3	7	4	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Osage	65	17	26	4	4	0	18	0	2	5	0	0
Osborne	37	9	25	3	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Ottawa	57	7	38	3	3	0	9	0	2	0	0	0
Pawnee	54	7	43	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	0	0
Phillips	48	12	36	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
Pottawatomie	20	6	8	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	1	0
Pratt	83	47	29	1	1	0	6	2	11	0	0	0
Rawlins	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Republic	41	22	14	5	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Rice	150	119	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Riley	276	150	18	67	67	0	41	1	11	2	0	0
Rooks	127	36	40	4	4	0	47	0	1	18	0	0
Rush	15	5	5	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	0	0

TABLE D-1.—CONCLUDED. Disposition of Civil Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases dismissed	Cases not contested	Trials			Number pending	Appeal to district court	Garnishments	Attachments	Replevins	Forcible detainer
				Total number	By court	By jury						
Russell	58	19	34	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	0	0
Scott	16	9	2	0	0	0	5	0	1	1	0	0
Seward	165	33	68	8	8	0	56	0	11	10	0	0
Sheridan	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Sherman	102	38	47	6	6	0	11	0	8	0	0	1
Smith	8	1	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Stafford	16	3	1	5	5	0	7	0	1	0	0	0
Stanton	34	7	2	0	0	0	25	0	2	0	0	0
Stevens	41	13	12	2	2	0	14	0	12	0	0	0
Sumner	82	23	58	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Thomas	31	6	8	9	9	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Trego	35	10	12	7	7	0	6	1	3	3	0	0
Wabaunsee	31	10	16	5	5	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
Wallace	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	11	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wichita	12	1	6	1	1	0	4	0	2	1	0	0
Wilson	119	41	40	32	32	0	6	0	12	0	0	0
Woodson	12	7	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	7,246	1,939	2,621	958	957	1	1,728	39	494	132	14	29

COUNTY COURTS

TABLE D-2.—DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases not tried		Bound over to district court	Trials			Pending	Paroles granted	Paroles revoked
		Number dismissed	Plea of guilty		Total number	Acquitted	Convicted			
Allen	1,167	214	942	11	0	0	0	0	21	0
Anderson	1,369	22	1,306	2	1	0	1	38	0	0
Barber	600	18	555	16	11	6	5	0	9	0
Barton	2,549	219	2,144	28	119	12	107	39	34	1
Bourbon	1,500	114	1,286	25	27	1	26	48	10	2
Brown	1,134	30	1,087	10	2	2	0	5	15	0
Butler	4,978	111	4,750	83	34	10	24	0	143	1
Chase	1,039	59	966	3	11	5	6	0	6	0
Chautauqua	284	11	257	9	5	0	5	2	10	0
Cherokee	253	60	156	11	5	1	4	21	1	1
Cheyenne	215	1	199	0	0	0	0	15	0	0
Clark	353	17	310	2	14	5	9	10	21	1
Clay	462	13	407	25	7	1	6	10	0	0
Cloud	1,292	54	1,218	9	8	1	7	3	10	2
Coffey	2,225	100	2,111	1	13	0	13	0	4	0
Comanche	71	13	51	1	0	0	0	6	0	0
Decatur	420	4	416	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Dickinson	1,437	214	1,199	13	3	2	1	8	6	0
Doniphan	936	69	776	2	20	3	17	69	22	0
Douglas	3,465	479	2,463	118	85	19	66	320	95	0
Edwards	646	54	531	4	13	0	13	44	0	0
Elk	183	17	148	13	5	1	4	0	3	0
Ellis	297	7	290	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ellsworth	3,488	105	3,161	5	20	0	20	197	9	0
Finney	2,225	194	1,814	45	25	6	19	147	70	5

TABLE D-2.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Criminal Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases not tried		Bound over to district court	Trials			Pending	Paroles granted	Paroles revoked
		Number dismissed	guilty Plea of		Total number	Acquitted	Convicted			
Ford	2,400	219	1,765	28	40	9	31	348	27	0
Franklin	2,189	188	1,930	34	35	8	27	2	14	0
Geary	2,710	300	2,104	106	51	2	49	149	49	0
Gove	886	37	795	3	6	2	4	45	3	0
Graham	342	25	310	2	1	0	1	4	7	0
Grant	626	47	546	18	12	2	10	3	1	0
Gray	964	54	899	6	5	2	3	0	1	0
Greeley	104	10	89	1	0	0	0	4	5	0
Greenwood	1,179	36	1,015	23	1	0	1	104	23	0
Hamilton	361	26	327	3	5	4	1	0	2	1
Harper	616	33	574	2	5	4	1	2	6	0
Harvey	3,112	196	2,474	57	64	13	51	321	2	0
Haskell	390	41	340	6	2	0	2	1	5	0
Hodgeman	165	9	144	7	5	1	4	0	0	0
Jackson	1,626	84	1,259	23	0	0	0	260	108	0
Jefferson	1,310	172	1,115	15	8	6	2	0	0	0
Jewell	409	26	326	6	2	1	1	49	18	0
Kearny	388	43	298	0	13	2	11	34	13	0
Kingman	2,311	131	2,095	9	16	3	13	60	5	0
Kiowa	506	68	436	2	0	0	0	0	22	2
Labette	1,722	172	1,425	60	21	3	18	44	15	1
Lane	248	26	208	2	8	6	2	4	3	2
Lincoln	647	176	409	12	7	0	7	43	26	0
Linn	713	56	640	5	12	5	7	0	5	0
Logan	431	18	381	6	1	0	1	25	0	0

TABLE D-2.—CONTINUED. Disposition of Criminal Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases not tried		Bound over to district court	Trials			Pending	Paroles granted	Paroles revoked
		Number dismissed	Plea of guilty		Total number	Acquitted	Convicted			
Lyon	4,956	342	4,498	52	64	24	40	0	70	0
Marion	1,775	75	1,680	6	3	0	3	11	10	0
Marshall	1,536	51	1,472	3	9	3	6	1	0	0
McPherson	2,869	78	2,450	23	76	9	67	242	98	8
Meade	620	124	480	0	11	1	10	5	29	0
Miami	2,350	168	2,105	23	54	10	44	0	12	0
Mitchell	597	23	572	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morris	366	37	274	4	0	0	0	51	1	0
Morton	212	24	169	8	0	0	0	11	0	0
Nemaha	569	17	530	0	1	0	1	21	0	0
Ness	276	5	268	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
Norton	640	39	545	17	5	3	2	34	14	4
Osage	3,873	737	3,101	12	23	4	19	0	0	0
Osborne	365	9	351	1	4	0	4	0	0	0
Ottawa	1,358	46	1,293	1	18	4	14	0	19	0
Pawnee	395	25	327	0	2	0	2	41	0	0
Phillips	446	26	391	0	0	0	0	29	2	0
Pottawatomie	1,958	98	1,403	18	0	0	0	349	0	0
Pratt	1,180	91	1,043	33	3	1	2	10	51	1
Rawlins	461	18	441	2	0	0	0	0	7	0
Republic	655	37	605	1	6	1	5	6	0	0
Rice	1,028	59	860	12	7	2	5	90	2	0
Riley	3,249	447	2,587	131	56	11	45	28	194	1
Rooks	478	23	410	8	4	4	0	33	15	3
Rush	705	38	531	0	0	0	0	136	1	0

TABLE D-2.—CONCLUDED. Disposition of Criminal Cases—Year Ending June 30, 1974

Counties	Total number cases	Cases not tried		Bound over to district court	Trials			Pending	Paroles granted	Paroles revoked
		Number dismissed	Plea of guilty		Total number	Acquitted	Convicted			
Russell	644	206	422	0	16	16	0	0	1	0
Scott	557	28	506	7	12	0	12	4	4	0
Seward	223	12	172	0	1	0	1	38	0	0
Sheridan	174	16	152	5	1	0	1	0	2	3
Sherman	1,174	140	943	4	10	5	5	77	0	0
Smith	329	20	266	9	2	0	2	32	5	0
Stafford	513	36	465	2	9	0	9	1	7	0
Stanton	315	15	291	1	7	5	2	1	36	0
Stevens	267	24	235	6	2	0	2	0	19	0
Sumner	2,943	90	2,573	11	1	0	1	268	29	0
Thomas	1,200	56	963	5	7	1	6	169	0	0
Trego	1,139	86	969	5	8	2	6	71	11	0
Wabaunsee	4,134	100	3,773	8	17	0	17	236	2	0
Wallace	111	7	92	3	2	0	2	7	0	0
Washington	529	16	475	0	36	0	36	2	0	0
Wichita	160	6	146	2	6	1	5	0	0	0
Wilson	930	64	800	15	16	3	13	35	37	0
Woodson	434	85	326	20	1	1	0	2	0	0
Totals	107,636	8,036	92,492	1,332	1,251	262	989	4,525	1,530	38

CITY COURTS

TABLE E-1.—DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Cities	Total number cases	Cases number dismissed	Cases not contested	Trials			Pending	Appeals	Garnishments	Attachments	Replevins	Forcible detainer
				Total number	To court	To jury						
Arkansas City	245	44	130	15	15	0	56	0	12	0	1	0
Atchison	346	77	179	9	9	0	81	1	68	0	1	3
Chanute	143	15	79	42	41	1	7	4	19	0	0	0
Court of Coffeyville	489	133	311	20	20	0	25	1	0	0	0	0
Hutchinson (Magistrate Court)	1,424	290	676	119	119	0	339	14	227	0	45	1
Independence	177	25	140	10	10	0	2	0	20	11	0	0
Kansas City (Magistrate Court of Wyandotte Co.)	8,191	2,557	4,040	396	396	0	1,198	51	819	20	305	288
Leavenworth	385	75	170	46	46	0	94	0	3	0	0	0
Olathe (Magistrate Court of Johnson Co.)	3,221	633	1,062	494	491	3	1,032	49	249	164	7	68
Pittsburg	266	60	45	86	86	0	75	0	20	0	0	0
Salina (Magistrate Court of Saline Co.)	548	100	244	98	97	1	106	8	62	0	0	0
Topeka (Magistrate Court of Shawnee Co.)	3,429	1,121	1,751	97	97	0	460	11	0	0	9	0
Wichita (Court of Common Pleas of Sedgwick Co.)	10,383	3,601	4,182	900	899	1	1,700	87	2,644	5	702	616
Winfield	172	53	88	10	10	0	21	0	1	0	0	0
Totals	29,419	8,784	13,097	2,342	2,336	6	5,196	226	4,144	200	1,070	976

CITY COURTS

TABLE E-2.—DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1974

Cities	Total number cases	Cases not tried		Bound over to district court	Trials			Pending	Paroles granted	Paroles revoked
		Number dismissed	Plea of guilty		Total number	Acquitted	Convicted			
Arkansas City	685	188	384	44	46	10	36	23	69	1
Atchison	582	147	382	39	14	2	12	0	35	0
Chanute	1,394	156	1,170	14	45	12	33	9	16	1
Court of Coffeyville	1,009	73	848	57	9	0	9	22	79	3
Hutchison (Magistrate Court)	5,969	303	5,346	144	21	9	12	155	223	0
Independence	1,184	84	964	73	53	10	43	10	95	6
Kansas City (Magistrate Court of Wyandotte Co.)	7,458	1,030	5,642	179	173	165	8	434	89	0
Leavenworth	2,853	382	2,173	60	84	0	84	154	95	14
Olathe (Magistrate Court of Johnson Co.)	9,269	974	6,724	260	143	20	123	1,168	51	1
Pittsburg	1,813	52	1,441	54	236	10	226	30	10	0
Salina (Magistrate Court of Saline Co.)	4,636	792	3,230	96	129	9	120	389	125	3
Topeka (Magistrate Court of Shawnee Co.)	10,248	2,402	6,405	281	276	33	243	884	158	0
Wichita (Court of Common Pleas of Sedgwick Co.)	13,564	1,196	10,283	769	1,023	110	913	293	773	4
Winfield	1,029	163	743	28	9	3	6	86	63	0
Totals	61,693	7,942	45,735	2,098	2,261	393	1,868	3,657	1,881	33

MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

ALFRED G. SCHROEDER, *Chairman.* (1963-) ..... Newton
Justice of the Supreme Court.
JAMES D. WAUGH, *Secretary.* (1963-) ..... Topeka
ROBERT H. COBEAN. (1947-) ..... Wellington
DOYLE E. WHITE. (1961-) ..... Arkansas City
Judge, Nineteenth Judicial District.
ALBERT B. FLETCHER, JR. (1973-) ..... Junction City
Judge, Eighth Judicial District
J. C. TILLOTSON. (1973-) ..... Norton
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee.
JOHN F. HAYES. (1973-) ..... Hutchinson
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee.
JACK E. DALTON. (1969-) ..... Dodge City
MARVIN E. THOMPSON. (1969-) ..... Russell

FORMER MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

W. W. HARVEY, *Chairman.* (1927-1941) ..... Ashland
Justice of the Supreme Court.
WALTER G. THIELE, *Chairman.* (1941-1954) ..... Lawrence
Justice of the Supreme Court.
ROBERT T. PRICE, *Chairman.* (1954-1963) ..... Topeka
Justice of the Supreme Court.
J. C. RUPPENTHAL, *Secretary.* (1927-1941) ..... Russell
RANDAL C. HARVEY, *Secretary.* (1941-1953) ..... Topeka
WILLIAM M. MILLS, JR., *Secretary.* (1953-1957) ..... Topeka
WALTER G. THIELE, *Secretary.* (1957-1963) ..... Topeka
EDWARD L. FISCHER. (1927-1943) ..... Kansas City
ROBERT C. FOULSTON. (1927-1943) ..... Wichita
CHARLES L. HUNT. (1927-1941) ..... Concordia
CHESTER STEVENS. (1927-1941) ..... Independence
JOHN W. DAVIS. (1927-1933) ..... Greensburg
C. W. BURCH. (1927-1931) ..... Salina
ARTHUR C. SCATES. (1927-1929) ..... Dodge City
WALTER PLEASANT. (1929-1931) ..... Ottawa
ROSCOE H. WILSON. (1931-1933) ..... Jetmore
GEORGE AUSTIN BROWN. (1931-1933) ..... Wichita
RAY H. BEALS. (1933-1938) ..... St. John
HAL E. HARLAN. (1933-1935) ..... Manhattan
SCHUYLER C. BLOSS. (1933-1935) ..... Winfield
E. H. REES. (1935-1937) ..... Emporia
O. P. MAY. (1935-1937) ..... Atchison
KIRKE W. DALE. (1937-1941) ..... Arkansas City
HARRY W. FISHER. (1937-1939) ..... Fort Scott
GEORGE TEMPLAR. (1939-1941, 1943-1947, 1953) ..... Arkansas City
EDGAR C. BENNETT. (1938-1951) ..... Marysville
SAMUEL E. BARTLETT. (1941-1951) ..... Wichita
PAUL R. WUNSCH. (1941-1943) ..... Kingman
WALTER F. JONES. (1941-1945) ..... Hutchinson
GROVER PIERPONT. (1943-1944) ..... Wichita
I. M. PLATT. (1943-1945) ..... Junction City
C. A. SPENCER. (1944-1951) ..... Oakley
CHARLES VANCE. (1945-1947) ..... Liberal
RICHARD L. BECKER. (1949-1951) ..... Coffeyville
W. D. VANCE. (1951-1952) ..... Belleville
JOHN A. ETLING. (1945-1953) ..... Kinsley
DALE M. BRYANT. (1947-1949, 1951-1953) ..... Wichita
FRANKLIN B. HETTINGER. (1952-1953) ..... Hutchinson
JOHN H. MURRAY. (1953-1957) ..... Leavenworth
A. K. STAVELY. (1951-1959) ..... Lyndon
MAX L. DICE. (1957-1959) ..... Johnson
WILLIAM L. MITCHELL. (1959-1961) ..... Hutchinson
JOSEPH J. DAWES. (1953-1960, 1961) ..... Leavenworth
WILFORD RIEGLE. (1953-1960, 1961) ..... Emporia
GLEE S. SMITH. (1961-1963) ..... Larned
SPENCER A. GARD. (1959-1964) ..... Iola
CLYDE HILL. (1961-1965) ..... Yates Center
JAMES E. TAYLOR. (1941-1969) ..... Sharon Springs
J. WILLARD HAYNES. (1951-1969) ..... Kansas City
ALEX HOTCHKISS. (1964-1973) ..... Lyndon
STEADMAN BALL. (1963-1973) ..... Atchison
JACK R. EULER. (1965-1973) ..... Wathena

KANSAS JUDICIAL COUNCIL
1105 MERCHANTS BANK TOWER
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED
ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Topeka, Kansas
Permit No. 421

PRINTED BY
ROBERT R. (BOB) SANDERS, STATE PRINTER
TOPEKA, KANSAS
1974

35-5881