

KANSAS JUDICIAL COUNCIL BULLETIN

OCTOBER, 1951

PART 3—TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT



HONORABLE C. A. SPENCER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	85
IMPROVEMENTS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.....	86
By Judge C. A. Spencer	
COMMENT ON STATISTICAL TABLES.....	91
SUPREME COURT—TWENTY-FOUR-YEAR SUMMARY	92
TABLE A-1, Roster of Judicial Officers as of July 1, 1951.....	94
TABLE A-2, Summary of District Courts, by Districts.....	96
TABLES A-3 and A-4 (combined), Disposition of Civil Cases, Including Divorce	99
TABLE A-5, District Courts, Types of Civil Cases.....	103
TABLE B-1 (condensed), Disposition of Criminal Cases.....	104
TABLE B-3, Nature of Crimes—State as a Whole.....	106
TABLE D-1 (combined with B-2), Disposition of Cases in County and City Courts	107
MEMBERS OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL.....	<i>(Inside back cover)</i>
FORMER MEMBERS OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL.....	<i>(Inside back cover)</i>

FOREWORD

In this issue our leading article is by Judge C. A. Spencer, who was a member of the Judicial Council from 1944 to 1951, and whose picture appears on the cover. Judge Spencer was born in Missouri in 1883 and came to Kansas in 1886, was educated at Kansas Wesleyan University and the University of Kansas, from which he was graduated in 1907 and admitted to the Bar in the same year. Judge Spencer commenced the practice of law at Oakley in 1907 and served two terms as county attorney at Logan county. He was appointed Judge of the Twenty-third Judicial District in 1937 and is still serving in that capacity.

In this issue we again print statistical tables showing the business transacted in various courts during the year ended June 30, 1951, with the exception of the probate courts. The great flood of last summer inundated the part of the courthouse at Manhattan which is occupied by the Probate Court of Riley county and severely damaged the records of that court. For this reason, it has been impossible, up to this time, for the probate judge to compile the report of the business in that court. Since the report from Riley county will have an important effect on the totals for the state, we have withheld the printing of the probate court statistics in this issue in the hope that the report from Riley county will be received in time to print the probate statistics in our next issue.

John W. Shuart, of Topeka, has been selected as executive secretary of The Bar Association of the State of Kansas. Mr. Shuart is a graduate of the Washburn University School of Law and was admitted to the Bar in 1948. For the last four and one-half years he has been personnel manager of the Hall Lithographing Company of Topeka.

There have been no meetings of the Judicial Council, or changes in its membership, since the publication of our July BULLETIN.

Improvement in the Administration of Justice

By JUDGE C. A. SPENCER

The title of this article covers a very broad field. The law, being a living and ever expanding subject hinged to our rapidly changing times and attitudes must, of necessity, remain flexible in its administration and no doubt there are many improvements which might be suggested in every branch of its administration. However, it is my purpose here to discuss briefly a suggested improvement in the administration of justice with respect to problems arising from matters over which the district court is expected to exercise continued control, specifically, paroles and the care, custody and control of minor children.

In perhaps a great majority of cases, the trial judge is faced with the problem relative to those convicted of a crime as to whether the culprit should be committed to jail or a penal institution, or whether the interests of society as a whole and of the individual would be best served by granting a parole.

The law prescribes a punishment for the crime committed, but in the ordinary case the court may, either before or after sentence, place the defendant upon parole under such conditions as may be prescribed by the trial judge. G. S. 1949, 62-2207 makes it the duty of the parolee to appear at each regular term of court and furnish, at his own expense, proof to the court that he has, since the parole, complied with all the terms and conditions thereof and conducted himself as a peaceable law abiding citizen. This is all well and good and compliance with the statute would seem to be all that is necessary to afford effectual supervision of the parolee. But all too often the practical effect of the parole is to bid farewell to the defendant with an admonition to stay out of trouble and with the hope that he will do so.

It has been my experience on the trial bench that when a parolee appears for his report, he is questioned by the court, or by the county attorney, or both, as to whether his conduct has been satisfactory since the parole was granted, whether he is employed and, if so, the nature of his employment, whether he has been providing for his family, if any, and such other questions as may occur to the court or county attorney which might throw some light as to whether he has been a law abiding citizen. Almost invariably the answers received to these generalities would indicate a reformed soul, but it must be borne in mind that the criminally disposed will not hesitate to "gild the lily" whenever it appears to be to his advantage. And the court, under our present system, has neither the means nor the time to check the truth and veracity in such cases and, unless some complaint has been made by some number of the general public, usually not too alert or concerned in these matters, the convicted and paroled is allowed to go his free way until the next regular term of court some months hence.

Invariably there are those on parole who do not appear before the court at the appointed time; perhaps because they have forgotten the date, or by reason of illness, road and weather conditions, being unable to leave their job, family conditions, no money to defray expense, or some other excuse that seems good to them. While such failure constitutes a violation of parole, the court is usually loath to order its revocation without some affirmative showing

that the parolee is not capable of being rehabilitated, particularly when the excuse for not reporting in person, flimsy though it may seem at the moment, may appear to be a major obstacle to the parolee. And then there are those who have left the jurisdiction of the court and who report by letter or not at all. Such reports have been accepted in my court for want of anything better, but again there is no satisfactory way for the court to check the matter. If the defendant has left the state and fails to report, the parole may be revoked, but seldom is he apprehended.

We also have a situation where two or more are involved in the commission of the same crime. Perhaps one of the parties is a local man and the other a nonresident of the state of Kansas, or perhaps has no fixed place of abode. The local man may safely be paroled on the theory that he will remain in the community and under such supervision as the court is able to give; but if the nonresident or the man without any fixed place of abode is paroled, this often is the last that is heard of him. In such cases, shall we parole one and commit the other, or shall we parole all, knowing that the nonresident may in all probability go to new pastures and to new scenes of crime? How can equal justice be administered in such cases? It may be answered that the law provides for a bond for their appearance in court on the first day of each regular term and during each and every day of such term of court, when required. The local man is able to give such bond, but not so the nonresident. He has no acceptable friends or acquaintances to sign as surety. If a parole is granted to the local offender and his nonresident partner committed for want only of friends to come to his relief, there is no equal justice under the law.

The moral effect of a parole must be considered. Some offenders seem to realize the gravity of their position and strive in every way to make amends to society, while others appear to carry away with them the opinion that the slap on the wrist was not too much to pay for the fruits of their criminal activities and that they may resume their past conduct with little fear of the consequences. Would it not be better that all offenders on parole be constantly reminded of the fact that they are not entirely free men, but that they are under supervision directed toward their rehabilitation without the expense to the county or state of their incarceration, while at the same time, giving them an opportunity to engage in industry and to support their families?

Other problems which so very frequently confront the trial court are those arising out of divorce cases where there is an award of alimony, or where the custody and support of minor children are involved.

There is the common situation of where the wife is given custody of the children and the husband ordered to pay a certain amount at specified times for their support, but he fails to do so. What is the wife to do? These cases very frequently, in my experience, involve people in very mediocre to poor financial circumstances, and very often it is because of failure to support in the first instance, that the domestic difficulties come about. The attorney who represented the wife in securing the decree of separation or divorce usually is of the opinion that the ordinarily nominal fee he may have been paid has been earned at the time the decree is entered, and he may be hesitant to extend further efforts in the matter for which he is not apt to be compensated; and likewise the mother may hesitate to seek the services of her attorney because of expense she believes might be involved. As a result, the wife and

mother often appeals to the judge who made the order who can only advise that she must initiate some kind of proceedings to bring the husband before the court in order that an inquiry may be made to ascertain why the orders have not been followed, which will ordinarily require the services of an attorney.

As a general rule, the lawyers who have practiced in my district have, at least willingly, accepted the burden of attempting to secure justice in such cases, and I believe more often than not, without pay; but I question the fairness of expecting this service of a profession the members of which have only their time and knowledge for sale, and upon whom so many unremunerative civic and social demands are made.

And then there is the case of the parent who has moved to another part of the state, or perhaps out of the state, and writes or otherwise notifies the judge of information that would indicate the children whose custody was granted to the other parent, are not being properly cared for. Certainly the judge should not ignore such information, and certainly some sort of investigation should be made; but how and by whom? Usually the complaining parent is without funds to pay for an investigation or to initiate proceedings for a change of custody.

Only a few of the problems arising in these situations have been mentioned here, but every attorney will readily recognize the very numerous difficulties that arise in attempting to exercise that continued supervision and control as is contemplated by our laws.

As a remedy to most of these problems, it is my opinion that there should be made available to each judge of a judicial district some person who is directly responsible to the court, who is made an officer of the court, and whose duty would be to investigate and report the circumstances surrounding all persons convicted of crime before sentence is imposed. Such investigation to pertain especially to personal and family background, prior criminal record, if any, financial circumstances which might have a bearing on the prisoner's behavior, whether addicted to the use of intoxicants or drugs, and such other information as may be required by the court and that might better inform the court of the situation; and, should there be an application for parole, which would better enable the court to determine the probability of rehabilitation without confinement. If such an investigation has not been made before sentence, it should by all means be made before a parole is granted. All reports should be in writing and should show the source of such information as is obtained. Special efforts should be made to learn whether there is evidence of excessive use of intoxicating liquor, or drugs, and to gambling, as these habits are too often found to be the basis of crime, and where they are found to exist, special supervision should be exercised in the event of parole.

All paroles should be made to this officer who should exercise such supervision of the parolee as the nature of the case demands. It should be this officer who would see that the parolee has employment, that he uses his earnings for the support of his family and towards making restitution or reparation to the aggrieved party or parties for actual damages or loss caused by the offense for which conviction was had, and that he pay the costs of the court and a reasonable sum for his supervision. If the defendant is a nonresident, it may be necessary to prescribe the territorial limits within which he may

live during the period of his parole. These conditions may seem harsh to some, but we must remember that they apply to one convicted of a crime and it is up to him to accept them or to suffer the penalty prescribed for the offense. Under our laws as they now stand, the court can prescribe all of the conditions mentioned, but there is no provision afforded to most of the courts for enforcing them.

The Kansas Judicial Council recognized the problem of lack of supervision of parolees some nineteen years ago, when it said in its December, 1932, issue,

"We understand the principal of the parole law is to enable the paroled person to establish himself in industry and good citizenship, and to assist him in doing so. These purposes are lost where there is no supervision, and are particularly lost when that is imperfectly done. In many counties and judicial districts the district judges give such supervision and assistance as fully and efficiently as they perform their other duties. In other judicial districts, including some of the larger centers of population we are told that cannot be done. The matter should receive legislative attention. We have not determined how it can best be handled. Perhaps a parole officer should be provided in some places."

Following this recommendation, laws have been enacted authorizing district judges in certain counties with a population of more than 45,000 and less than 75,000 and counties with a population of more than 115,000 to appoint a bailiff whose powers cover those of a parole officer and "such other duties as may be ordered and prescribed by the judge from time to time." See G. S. 1949, 20-314 to 20-317, inclusive, and 20-614 to 20-617, inclusive.

It is interesting to note the provisions of G. S. 1949, 62-2501 to 62-2503, inclusive, which authorize the state of Kansas to enter into compacts and agreements with other states for co-operative effort and mutual assistance in the prevention of crime and the enforcement of their respective criminal laws and policies, and to establish such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making such agreements and compacts. I direct attention to paragraph 111 of the compact entered into between the state of Kansas and the state of New Mexico and other states, G. S. 62-2503, particularly to subdivision (2) thereof. This provides,

"(2) That each compacting state assume the duties of visitation and of supervision over probationers or parolees or those under suspended sentence from any other compacting state, and in the exercise of those duties will be governed by the same standards that prevail for its own probationers and parolees and those under suspended sentence."

I am advised by the administrator of our department of parole that all forty-eight states are now signatory to these compacts and that a considerable number of the states do have centralized and co-ordinated parole and probation officers; that the compact implies that the various states shall handle probation cases out of the courts as well as parole cases out of the institutions, and that they do supervise probation cases from other states coming into Kansas; that technically and supposedly all probation cases out of the district courts in Kansas should be handled through that office; and they do handle all parole cases out of Kansas penal institutions, but have no provision under law for handling the probation cases out of the court and no central organization for doing so. She advises that they have eight parole officers, who are already overloaded with work and would be unable to handle the probation

work if given the parolees from the district courts. She further says, "With the progress that is being made in matters of parole and probation it will not be too long before Kansas is going to be compelled to revise and enlarge its parole department and to include in it probation cases or be hopelessly behind other states. It will require the interest and co-operation of all agencies concerned, as well as of our legislators, to accomplish that." It is obvious that under these interstate compacts there should be some tie-in between parole officers of the district courts and the state department of parole.

But I would not limit the duties of such officer, whether he be called bailiff, parole officer or friend of the court, to matters involving parole alone. There is a great need in Kansas for some authority to supervise children of divorced couples, and, in some instances, to see that alimony and support money are paid. Children of divorcees become wards of the court; but I am frank to say that in most instances the court is a very poor guardian. The court needs some one to investigate complaints and rumors concerning improper treatment of its wards, and if necessary, to cause proceedings to be instituted for their protection or their change of custody. The judge should not become a partisan and go looking for evidence in support of one side or the other, but must keep an open mind as to the parents until he has heard both sides of the controversy.

The entire subject of this article is covered by Mr. James E. Taylor in the December, 1949, issue of the JUDICIAL COUNCIL BULLETIN, under the title, "Probation and Probation Officers," and my purpose here is to emphasize the need of an aid to the court in matters of sentence, parole and the supervision of children who are wards of the court in the hope that the legal profession will carry the idea to the state legislators and aid in securing the necessary legislation to afford the necessary relief.

Appended to Mr. Taylor's article in the JUDICIAL COUNCIL BULLETIN is a suggested parole and probation act. This bill was introduced in the 1951 session of the legislature, but failed of passage.

The special acts hereinbefore mentioned which apply to only a few of our counties are perhaps broad enough to answer all of the purposes herein mentioned, but Mr. Taylor's bill is more specific and embodies all of the present law relating to paroles, G. S. 1949, 62-2201 to 62-2214, inclusive.

I know of no logical reason why there should be a need for a parole officer, or bailiff, if that is a better term, in some judicial districts and not in all. Judges in multiple county districts are faced with the same problems as those of a single county. Their territory greatly exceeds that of a single county, and in many instances, the population of the district exceeds that of any single judge in a multiple judge district. The cost per capita of a parole officer should not differ greatly in one class of districts than in another.

Comment on Statistical Tables

In compliance with G. S. 20-2203, the Judicial Council has collected statistics from the various courts of this state, showing the business transacted during the year ended June 30, 1951. Summaries of these statistics are printed in this issue, with the exception of the probate court statistics which are delayed on account of flood damage to the records in Riley county, as explained in the foreword. With this exception, the tables are generally in the same form as last year.

These statistics do not show any major changes in the volume or trends of litigation during the current year, as compared with 1950, but there are some increases and decreases in particular types of litigation, which are hereinafter mentioned.

SUPREME COURT

There has been an increase of about ten percent in the number of cases in the supreme court, which increased from 340 to 375. Most of this increase was in civil appeals, there being little change in original cases or criminal appeals. The number of cases submitted for decision was 266, compared with 237 the previous year. This is the largest number of cases decided in any year since 1940, except the year 1949, when the docket was overloaded with original habeas corpus cases.

DISTRICT COURTS

Divorces declined during the year. Although there was an increase in the number of divorce cases disposed of, this is more than offset by the greater number of dismissals, and only 4,697 divorces were granted, compared with 4,881 in the previous year and with 8,911 in 1946. In 23 cases divorces were denied, and in 354 an emergency was declared. There was a slight increase in other civil cases—from 7,879 in 1950 to 7,906 this year, and the number of civil jury trials increased from 250 to 270 in the district courts of the state.

There was a decline in the number of criminal cases in the district courts, particularly in the number of felony cases, which is an encouraging sign. The number of criminal trials also declined, from 231 in 1950 to 191 in 1951.

COUNTY COURTS

We have reports from two new county courts this year (in Franklin and Jackson counties), making a total of 59 in the state. However, the total number of cases in the county courts of the entire state showed a decline from 7,437 to 7,199. This resulted from a decrease in criminal cases from 5,943 to 5,551. Civil cases increased from 1,494 to 1,648 in the county courts.

CITY COURTS

There was an increase in both civil and criminal cases in the city courts from a total of 14,917 in 1950 to 17,134 in 1951. This increase was about equally divided between civil and criminal cases. It will be observed that the thirteen city courts transact over twice as much business, in the aggregate, as the fifty-nine county courts, and that only thirty-three counties are now without either a city or a county court.

Supreme Court—Twenty-four-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

SUPREME COURT SUMMARY—CONCLUDED

YEAR ENDED JUNE 30	Cases	Disposed of	Dismissed	Submitted
1940.....	Appealed, civil.....	426	117	309
	Appealed, criminal.....	31	10	21
	Original.....	39	20	19
	Totals.....	496	147	349
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.....	17	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
	Grand totals.....	10,778	3,391	7,387

TABLE A-1.—ROSTER OF JUDICIAL OFFICIALS AS OF JULY 1, 1951

COUNTY	Jud. dist.	District judge	Clerk of court	Probate judge
Allen.....	37	Spencer A. Gard.....	Ina F. West.....	A. M. Dunlap*
Anderson.....	4	Hugh Means.....	Nell Riley.....	Dean L. Smith
Atchison.....	2	Lawrence F. Day.....	Hal Waisner.....	Frank Hunn
Barber.....	24	Clark A. Wallace.....	Edith Myers.....	John C. Hilky
Barton.....	20	Roy J. McMullen.....	Geneva Steincamp.....	Leonard Birzer
Bourbon.....	6	Harry W. Fisher.....	Amy Armstrong.....	Frank Welch
Brown.....	22	John L. Gernon.....	Edna Boicourt.....	Richard W. Shaw
Butler..... Div. 1	13	Carl Ackarman.....	Harry R. Martin.....	Ralph B. Ralston*
..... Div. 2		W. N. Calkins		
Chase.....	5	Jay Sullivan.....	Mrs. Mildred Speer.....	C. A. Blackburn
Chautauqua Div. 1	13	Carl Ackarman.....	Edith K. Ross.....	Ima L. Raybourn
..... Div. 2		W. N. Calkins		
Cherokee.....	11	Jerome Harmon.....	Julia Wantiez.....	Millard Knock
Cheyenne.....	17	Robert W. Hemphill.....	Charles N. Roberts.....	A. A. Gillispie
Clark.....	31	Karl Miller.....	Hope Grimes.....	George M. Pike*
Clay.....	21	Lewis L. McLaughlin.....	Hazel K. Chestnut.....	Walter O. Curtis*
Cloud.....	12	W. D. Vance.....	Hazel Champlin.....	Harry C. Davis
Coffey.....	5	Jay Sullivan.....	Mrs. Ruth H. Johnson	Robert S. Luke, Sr.*
Comanche.....	31	Karl Miller.....	Mabel Chammess.....	Earl Martin
Cowley.....	19	Albert Faulconer.....	Sallie Smith.....	Sallie O. Athearn
Crawford.....	38	Perry Owsley.....	Grace Webb.....	Robert W. Colborn
Decatur.....	17	Robert W. Hemphill.....	Mrs. Alice J. Vernon.....	George Nellans*
Dickinson.....	8	James P. Coleman.....	Seth Barter, Jr.....	John P. Dieter*
Doniphan.....	22	John L. Gernon.....	Virgil Begesse.....	John R. Bell
Douglas.....	4	Hugh Means.....	Mrs. Mary E. Simmons	Frank R. Gray*
Edwards.....	33	Lorin T. Peters.....	John Stoner.....	L. L. Anderson*
Elk..... Div. 1*	13	Carl Ackarman.....	Frank A. Force.....	Mrs. Meriam O. Beaty
..... Div. 2		W. N. Calkins		
Ellis.....	23	C. A. Spencer.....	Julius T. Stroemel.....	Robert F. Glassman
Ellsworth.....	30	A. R. Buzick.....	James M. Wilson.....	Gerhard Haase*
Finney.....	32	Ray H. Calihan.....	G. Mae Purdy.....	Milward C. Schrader*
Ford.....	31	Karl Miller.....	Elta J. Riley.....	George F. Turner*
Franklin.....	4	Hugh Means.....	Christina Woke.....	Floyd H. Coffman
Geary.....	8	James P. Coleman.....	C. W. Marston.....	Jess W. Filby*
Gove.....	23	C. A. Spencer.....	Mrs. Louise Brown.....	V. J. Smith
Graham.....	34	W. K. Skinner.....	Cora A. Roberts.....	E. L. McClure
Grant.....	39	L. L. Morgan.....	Mrs. Juanita Barber.....	Veris J. Kinsman
Gray.....	31	Karl Miller.....	Mrs. Tressie Johnson.....	Grace H. Truax
Greeley.....	32	Ray H. Calihan.....	Laura M. Holmes.....	Hope Owen
Greenwood Div. 1	13	Carl Ackarman.....	Mrs. Alma Long.....	B. M. Beyer*
..... Div. 2		W. N. Calkins		
Hamilton.....	32	Ray H. Calihan.....	Amelia J. Minor.....	A. C. Bostwick
Harper.....	24	Clark A. Wallace.....	Helen Pearl.....	J. Howard Wilcox
Harvey.....	9	George L. Allison.....	Mrs. Mabel McMullen	Alfred G. Schroeder*
Haskell.....	39	L. L. Morgan.....	Mrs. Evelyn Yount.....	E. D. Bolinger
Hodgeman.....	33	Lorin T. Peters.....	F. S. Haun.....	Thomas Dunn*
Jackson.....	36	Robert H. Kaul.....	Chelcia Shelby.....	Lawrence E. Hay*
Jefferson.....	36	Robert H. Kaul.....	Mrs. Myrtle Kimmel.....	Walter E. Ferris
Jewell.....	15	Donald J. Magaw.....	Bernice Howard.....	James S. McCormick*
Johnson.....	10	John L. Kirkpatrick.....	Mrs. Gert. S. Hedberg	Harley V. Haskin
Kearny.....	32	Ray H. Calihan.....	Bertha Adams.....	Mrs. Della M. Barchet
Kingman.....	24	Clark A. Wallace.....	Mrs. Nell H. Walter.....	W. H. White
Kiowa.....	31	Karl Miller.....	James L. Estlack.....	Harry Paxton
Labette.....	16	Hal Hylar.....	Quincy B. Greer.....	John A. Henderson
Lane.....	32	Ray H. Calihan.....	Mrs. Eva Cramer.....	A. J. Myers
Leavenworth.....	1	Joseph J. Dawes.....	Miss Dorothy Harrison	William D. Reilly
Lincoln.....	30	A. R. Buzick.....	Willbur Powers.....	R. W. Greene
Linn.....	6	Harry W. Fisher.....	W. H. Bayless.....	George A. Kerr
Logan.....	23	C. A. Spencer.....	Mrs. Ada F. Rogge.....	Nell C. Potterf
Lyon.....	5	Jay Sullivan.....	Mrs. Roe G. Collins.....	W. W. Parker
Marion.....	8	James P. Coleman.....	Virgil M. Wiebe.....	Jay E. Hargett*
Marshall.....	21	Lewis L. McLaughlin.....	W. J. Koppes.....	Percy R. Pullaine*
McPherson.....	9	George L. Allison.....	Donald S. Clark.....	J. J. Heidebrecht
Meade.....	31	Karl Miller.....	Ethel R. Copenhaver.....	Florilla DeCov

TABLE A-1.—CONCLUDED. Roster of judicial officials as of July 1, 1951

COUNTY	Jud. dist.	District judge	Clerk of court	Probate judge
Miami	6	Harry W. Fisher	Ethel J. Hunt	A. H. Kraft
Mitchell	15	Donald J. Magaw	Ida B. Jamison	J. S. Waggoner*
Montgomery	14	Warren B. Grant	M. D. Smith	John Wright
Morris	8	James P. Coleman	Inez Featherston	A. R. Carpenter*
Morton	39	L. L. Morgan	Irene Kuder	Eula B. Sweem
Nemaha	22	John L. Gernon	Ruth Shaffer	Robert C. Randel
Neosho	7	B. M. Dunham	Merle Estes	J. L. Naff
Ness	33	Lorin T. Peters	Gladys K. Bondurant	Blair Eibert*
Norton	17	Robert W. Hemphill	Arthur V. Poage	Jean W. Kissel
Osage	35	A. K. Stavely	Edith Lindsay	T. L. Tiffany*
Osborne	15	Donald J. Magaw	Elma McColl	James W. Bell*
Ottawa	30	A. R. Buzick	A. H. Finley	Walter D. Lancaster
Pawnee	33	Lorin T. Peters	Rose Wood	Spencer C. Ackerman
Phillips	17	Robert W. Hemphill	Gene Britt	G. A. Radefeld*
Pottawatomie	36	Robert H. Kaul	Lloyd W. Hope	Henry H. Holuba
Pratt	24	Clark A. Wallace	Verna J. Barber	Edgar R. Barnes
Rawlins	17	Robert W. Hemphill	Mrs. Louise Portschy	Herbert Howland*
Reno	40	Franklin B. Hettinger	Glen R. Williams	James H. Rexroad
Republic	12	W. D. Vance	Warren A. Scott	Henry H. Van Natta*
Rice	20	Roy J. McMullen	Laura Saint	H. G. Doddridge*
Riley	21	Lewis L. McLaughlin	Joseph F. Musil	Scott Pfuetze
Rooks	34	W. K. Skinner	George F. Crane	G. M. James*
Rush	33	Lorin T. Peters	Esta Manahan	O. F. Showalter*
Russell	23	C. A. Spencer	George W. Brandt	J. D. Steinel*
Saline	30	A. R. Buzick	Robert H. Lively	Fred D. Joy
Scott	32	Ray H. Calihan	Nellie Scheurman	Frank Wilson*
Sedgwick	18	Ross McCormick	L. D. Leland	B. Mack Brown
		Howard C. Kline		
		Clair E. Robb		
		George Austin Brown		
Seward	39	L. L. Morgan	Mary Lindley	E. S. Irwin
Shawnee	7	Beryl Johnson	Lucille M. Carter	Glenn D. Cogswell
		Paul H. Heinz		
		Dean McElhenny		
Sheridan	34	W. K. Skinner	Marjorie M. Hilburn	Wallace W. Cooper
Sherman	34	W. K. Skinner	Sylvia Riley	Nora E. Beecham
Smith	15	Donald J. Magaw	Lucille Figg	Miles Elson
Stafford	20	Roy J. McMullen	Mrs. Wanda Tucker	L. L. Carleton*
Stanton	39	L. L. Morgan	Marjorie Harmon	Bessie Bradley
Stevens	39	L. L. Morgan	John F. Fulkerson	J. B. Porter*
Sumner	25	Wendell Ready	Laura McCormick	C. E. Russell
Thomas	34	W. K. Skinner	Winifred G. Van Horn	Henry H. Goetsch*
Trego	23	C. A. Spencer	Mrs. Albert H. Acre	Garland E. Wanker*
Wabaunsee	35	A. K. Stavely	Eva Dorman	Victor Hergenreter
Wallace	23	C. A. Spencer	Mrs. Ida Ward	Virgil W. Dobson*
Washington	12	W. D. Vance	Mrs. Alta Hennon	Bertha Pifer
Wichita	32	Ray H. Calihan	Daisy Dickey	Maggie Gilmore
Wilson	7	B. M. Dunham	A. G. Green	Bess Schmidt
Woodson	37	Spencer A. Gard	Mrs. Maudie Beckett	Miles C. Cook
Wyandotte	29	E. L. Fischer	George T. Groneman	O. Q. Clafin III
		Willard M. Benton		
		Harvey J. Emerson		
		William H. McHale		

* Also judge of county court.

TABLE A-2.—SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS, BY DISTRICTS—
YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1951

Judicial dist.	COUNTY	Civil cases, including divorce				Criminal cases			
		Pending July 1, 1950	Com-menced	Termi-nated	Pending July 1, 1951	Pending July 1, 1950	Com-menced	Termi-nated	Pending July 1, 1951
1	Leavenworth.....	445	368	421	392	16	34	33	17
2	Atchison.....	115	149	163	101	3	24	20	7
3	Shawnee.....	362	1,233	1,161	434	63	175	175	63
4	Anderson.....	16	57	44	29	4	6	9	1
	Douglas.....	86	180	180	86	21	58	56	23
	Franklin.....	50	168	159	59	7	36	33	10
	Totals.....	152	405	383	174	32	100	98	34
5	Chase.....	12	28	31	9	1	3	4	0
	Coffey.....	20	61	65	16	1	6	7	0
	Lyon.....	101	218	206	113	6	29	31	4
	Totals.....	133	307	302	138	8	38	42	4
6	Bourbon.....	50	158	149	59	10	25	27	8
	Linn.....	27	63	69	21	7	8	10	5
	Miami.....	45	167	161	51	4	26	26	4
	Totals.....	122	388	379	131	21	59	63	17
7	Neosho.....	50	100	109	41	1	17	18	0
	Wilson.....	28	124	107	45	2	18	18	2
	Totals.....	78	224	216	86	3	35	36	2
8	Dickinson.....	30	122	116	36	3	12	10	5
	Geary.....	105	229	238	96	5	59	49	15
	Marion.....	29	68	65	32	3	6	7	2
	Morris.....	19	59	56	22	1	4	3	2
	Totals.....	183	478	475	186	12	81	69	24
9	Harvey.....	46	147	132	61	6	49	40	15
	McPherson.....	58	149	147	60	2	21	17	6
	Totals.....	104	296	279	121	8	70	57	21
10	Johnson.....	270	500	459	311	25	50	37	38
11	Cherokee.....	174	241	233	182	2	25	12	15
12	Cloud.....	25	93	98	20	1	7	7	1
	Republic.....	18	58	55	21	0	2	1	1
	Washington.....	17	60	59	18	1	3	4	0
	Totals.....	60	211	212	59	2	12	12	2
13	Butler.....	159	223	268	114	29	73	72	30
	Chautauqua.....	31	37	46	22	0	7	6	1
	Elk.....	19	51	50	20	0	5	3	2
	Greenwood.....	34	149	122	61	1	16	12	5
	Totals.....	243	460	486	217	30	101	93	38
14	Montgomery.....	123	351	351	123	22	98	104	16
15	Jewell.....	24	41	43	22	0	10	9	1
	Mitchell.....	18	55	43	30	1	13	12	2
	Osborne.....	21	38	48	11	2	4	6	0
	Smith.....	22	44	53	13	1	9	7	3
	Totals.....	85	178	187	76	4	36	34	6
16	Labette.....	74	177	168	83	5	25	25	5

TABLE A-2.—CONTINUED. Summary of district courts, by districts—year ending June 30, 1951

Judicial dist.	COUNTY	Civil cases, including divorce				Criminal cases			
		Pending July 1, 1950	Com-menced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1951	Pending July 1, 1950	Com-menced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1951
17	Cheyenne.....	14	22	26	10	0	2	2	0
	Decatur.....	11	35	36	10	3	3	3	3
	Norton.....	18	44	48	14	4	5	6	3
	Phillips.....	16	45	42	19	0	1	1	0
	Rawlins.....	8	22	23	7	0	6	5	1
	Totals.....	67	168	175	60	7	17	17	7
18	Sedgwick.....	1,875	3,283	2,620	2,538	232	413	342	303
19	Cowley.....	112	272	270	114	6	48	42	12
20	Barton.....	110	280	274	116	7	54	47	14
	Rice.....	26	92	101	17	3	19	14	8
	Stafford.....	19	48	45	22	2	20	20	2
	Totals.....	155	420	420	155	12	93	81	24
21	Clay.....	24	59	56	27	9	26	19	16
	Marshall.....	19	82	75	26	1	8	7	2
	Riley.....	86	127	143	70	3	29	23	9
	Totals.....	129	268	274	123	13	63	49	27
22	Brown.....	22	73	62	33	3	9	10	2
	Doniphan.....	27	56	57	26	5	6	10	1
	Nemaha.....	17	60	55	22	2	8	10	0
	Totals.....	66	189	174	81	10	23	30	3
23	Ellis.....	57	82	81	58	2	11	10	3
	Gove.....	9	44	42	11	1	6	6	1
	Logan.....	10	35	34	11	1	6	7	0
	Russell.....	65	135	117	83	3	14	15	2
	Trego.....	4	26	26	4	0	9	8	1
	Wallace.....	3	22	15	10	0	9	8	1
	Totals.....	148	344	315	177	7	55	54	8
24	Barber.....	23	58	66	15	0	13	11	2
	Harper.....	23	60	68	15	2	26	25	3
	Kingman.....	19	55	61	13	3	10	12	1
	Pratt.....	35	105	108	32	0	22	20	2
	Totals.....	100	278	303	75	5	71	68	8
25	Sumner.....	91	187	191	87	5	10	14	1
29	Wyandotte.....	2,988	2,046	2,960	2,074	138	351	259	230
30	Ellsworth.....	25	48	61	12	0	6	6	0
	Lincoln.....	10	23	21	12	0	1	0	1
	Ottawa.....	25	28	31	22	0	2	2	0
	Saline.....	211	258	231	238	19	39	42	16
		Totals.....	271	357	344	284	19	48	50
31	Clark.....	8	28	24	12	1	2	1	2
	Comanche.....	12	11	17	6	0	4	4	0
	Ford.....	62	150	136	76	5	39	37	7
	Gray.....	19	49	57	11	2	7	6	3
	Kiowa.....	12	21	23	10	2	3	3	2
	Meade.....	16	33	35	14	0	2	2	0
	Totals.....	129	292	292	129	10	57	53	14

TABLE A-2.—CONCLUDED. Summary of district courts, by districts—year ending June 30, 1951

Judicial dist.	COUNTY	Civil cases, including divorce				Criminal cases			
		Pending July 1, 1950	Com-menced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1951	Pending July 1, 1950	Com-menced	Terminated	Pending July 1, 1951
32	Finney.....	122	132	151	103	15	56	51	20
	Greeley.....	10	29	22	17	0	4	4	0
	Hamilton.....	25	61	56	30	8	22	22	8
	Kearny.....	36	30	35	31	1	6	6	1
	Lane.....	20	28	34	14	7	7	9	5
	Scott.....	15	42	43	14	2	6	6	2
	Wichita.....	16	21	26	11	0	4	3	1
	Totals.....	244	343	367	220	33	105	101	37
33	Edwards.....	16	29	34	11	5	16	17	4
	Hodgeman.....	8	23	16	15	3	9	8	4
	Ness.....	12	30	27	15	2	9	10	1
	Pawnee.....	30	44	45	29	4	12	12	4
	Rush.....	14	42	40	16	0	6	5	1
Totals.....	80	168	162	86	14	52	52	14	
34	Graham.....	26	46	53	19	0	7	6	1
	Rooks.....	19	71	65	25	3	18	16	5
	Sheridan.....	16	39	44	11	1	7	3	5
	Sherman.....	27	74	66	35	2	7	5	4
	Thomas.....	9	50	48	11	0	1	1	0
Totals.....	97	280	276	101	6	40	31	15	
35	Osage.....	20	94	84	30	1	13	13	1
	Wabaunsee.....	6	47	39	14	0	2	2	0
Totals.....	26	141	123	44	1	15	15	1	
36	Jackson.....	42	75	81	36	1	5	4	2
	Jefferson.....	38	82	76	44	0	5	5	0
	Pottawatomie.....	16	49	49	16	1	10	10	1
Totals.....	96	206	206	96	2	20	19	3	
37	Allen.....	87	152	164	75	5	14	13	6
	Woodson.....	17	51	54	14	1	7	5	3
Totals.....	104	203	218	89	6	21	18	9	
38	Crawford.....	323	300	410	213	76	40	102	14
39	Grant.....	20	30	40	10	2	5	6	1
	Haskell.....	2	24	12	14	1	3	3	1
	Morton.....	10	27	30	7	1	7	7	1
	Seward.....	30	94	94	30	0	9	9	0
	Stanton.....	2	33	25	10	0	13	12	1
	Stevens.....	18	56	41	33	1	2	3	0
Totals.....	82	264	242	104	5	39	40	4	
40	Reno.....	459	566	573	452	39	144	125	58
	Grand totals...	10,365	16,541	16,790	10,116	902	2,688	2,472	1,118

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS—BY COUNTIES
TABLES A-3 AND A-4.—DISPOSITION OF CIVIL CASES, INCLUDING DIVORCE

COUNTIES	Total number of cases	Foreign transcripts	Divorce cases					Other civil cases				
			Number	Dismissed	Denied	Granted to wife	Granted to husband	Emergency declared	Number	Dismissed	Tried to court	Tried to jury
Allen*†	163	6	77	20	1	36	20	0	80	32	45	3
Anderson†	14	0	14	6	0	6	2	1	0	7	23	0
Anderson†	163	1	90	38	0	40	12	1	73	21	50	1
Barber	208	1	98	10	0	15	4	0	86	6	27	3
Barton*†	269	12	118	41	1	66	10	2	139	44	94	1
Bourbon	140	1	65	19	1	31	14	14	83	11	72	0
Brown	42	1	17	4	0	11	2	0	44	8	36	0
Butler	298	1	125	48	0	62	15	3	142	46	91	5
Chase	31	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	28	3	23	2
Chautauqua	40	0	12	3	0	7	2	0	34	4	30	0
Cherokee	233	7	110	35	0	55	20	4	116	40	75	1
Cheyenne	20	0	9	2	0	6	1	0	17	7	8	2
Clark	24	2	7	4	0	3	2	0	13	0	13	0
Cowley	56	0	27	7	1	16	3	0	29	5	22	2
Clay	98	4	45	15	0	24	6	1	49	12	35	2
Coffey	65	1	22	6	0	9	7	1	42	7	35	0
Comanche	17	0	10	2	0	6	2	0	7	1	5	1
Cowley	270	0	148	62	0	73	13	4	122	26	92	4
Crawford*	409	0	252	153	0	75	24	12	148	75	69	4
Decatur	36	1	14	1	0	10	3	0	21	4	17	0
Dickinson	116	0	53	10	0	33	10	0	63	5	58	0
Doniphan	37	2	13	4	0	7	2	0	42	16	24	2
Douglas*†	179	1	86	24	0	50	12	0	92	33	53	6
Edwards	54	2	10	2	0	9	5	0	16	3	12	1
Elk	50	3	11	4	0	3	4	0	36	4	32	0

* Additional cases which were removed to the Federal Court: Allen county, 1; Barton County, 5; Crawford County, 1; Douglas County, 1.
† Additional jury trials in cases which were later dismissed: Allen County, 2; Anderson County, 1.
‡ Additional jury trials resulting in mistrials in cases which are still pending and not terminated: Barton County, 1; Douglas County, 1.

TABLES A-3 AND A-4.—CONTINUED. Disposition of civil cases, including divorce—year ending June 30, 1951

COUNTRIES	Total number of cases	Foreign transcripts	Divorce cases					Other civil cases				
			Number	Dismissed	Denied	Granted to wife	Granted to husband	Emergency declared	Number	Dismissed	Tried to court	Tried to jury
Ellis*.....	78	8	11	5	0	4	2	0	59	20	38	1
Ellsworth†.....	61	3	15	6	0	6	3	0	43	19	24	0
Finney.....	151	8	64	21	0	33	10	2	83	22	57	4
Ford*.....	135	8	75	25	0	42	8	2	100	15	36	9
Franklin†.....	139	0	59	24	1	25	9	0	100	24	67	
Geary.....	238	5	116	37	1	43	35	13	117	47	67	3
Gove.....	42	0	10	3	0	5	2	0	32	10	22	0
Graham.....	55	1	10	0	0	6	4	0	42	6	34	2
Grant.....	40	1	11	2	0	7	2	1	28	8	16	4
Gray††.....	43	1	13	4	0	8	1	0	29	5	23	1
Greeley.....	92	1	10	4	0	1	5	0	11	0	11	0
Greenwood†.....	122	2	23	5	0	11	7	1	97	7	90	0
Hamilton.....	56	0	14	4	0	8	2	0	42	5	36	1
Harper*.....	67	0	26	8	0	13	5	1	41	7	34	0
Harvey.....	132	2	47	18	0	22	7	5	83	22	60	1
Haskell.....	12	5	3	1	0	1	1	0	4	2	2	0
Hodgeman†.....	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	3	10	2
Jackson*.....	76	9	13	3	0	6	4	0	54	10	42	2
Jefferson.....	76	2	15	6	0	6	3	1	39	9	49	1
Jewell.....	43	1	7	1	0	5	1	2	35	5	30	0
Johnson*.....	456	38	169	66	0	88	15	1	249	86	159	4
Kearny.....	35	0	16	5	0	6	2	0	19	6	11	2
Kingman.....	61	0	13	5	0	5	3	1	48	17	30	1
Kiowa.....	23	0	9	0	0	5	3	2	15	4	11	0
Labette.....	163	0	90	40	1	25	24	1	78	19	59	0
Lane.....	34	0	10	4	0	5	1	0	24	4	20	0
Leavenworth.....	421	3	220	126	0	56	38	14	195	42	150	1
Lincoln.....	21	3	5	1	0	2	2	0	13	3	10	5
Linn.....	69	0	16	5	0	7	6	3	50	10	35	5
Logan.....	34	0	12	4	0	7	1	0	22	2	20	0

* Additional cases which were removed to Federal Court: Ellis County, 3; Ford County, 1; Harper County, 1; Jackson County, 1; Johnson County, 3; man County, 1.
 † Additional jury trials resulting in mistrials in cases which are still pending and not terminated: Ellsworth County, 1; Greenwood County, 1; Hodgeman County, 1.
 ‡ Additional jury trials in cases which were later dismissed: Franklin County, 1.
 †† Fourteen additional cases filed separately but consolidated and tried by jury as one case.

TABLES A-3 AND A-4.—CONTINUED. Disposition of civil cases, including divorce—year ending June 30, 1951

COUNTRIES	Total number of cases	Foreign transcripts	Divorce cases					Other civil cases				
			Number	Dismissed	Denied	Granted to wife	Granted to husband	Emergency declared	Number	Dismissed	Tried to court	Tried to jury
Lyon.....	206	7	68	17	1	39	11	0	131	47	75	9
Marion.....	65	0	24	9	0	14	1	0	35	6	29	0
Marshall.....	75	6	37	12	0	15	10	1	38	7	26	5
McPherson*.....	146	4	52	9	0	38	5	4	90	24	67	2
Meade.....	35	0	8	2	0	5	1	0	27	0	27	0
Miami.....	161	13	53	15	0	27	11	2	95	24	69	2
Mitchell.....	43	3	15	4	0	10	1	0	25	1	21	3
Montgomery*.....	350	13	173	61	3	80	29	5	164	47	108	9
Morris.....	56	3	15	3	0	8	4	2	38	12	24	2
Morton.....	30	2	15	1	0	3	1	0	23	3	17	3
Nemaha*.....	52	0	16	5	0	7	4	0	36	11	24	1
Neosho.....	109	1	56	16	0	27	13	5	52	16	35	1
Ness.....	27	0	5	1	0	2	2	0	22	4	18	0
Norton†.....	48	1	16	1	0	8	5	0	31	12	15	4
Osage.....	84	4	19	8	0	9	2	1	61	7	53	1
Osborne.....	48	2	8	5	0	3	0	0	38	7	30	1
Ottawa.....	31	0	8	3	0	4	1	0	23	5	18	1
Pawnee.....	45	0	13	7	0	4	2	0	32	10	18	4
Phillips.....	42	0	12	1	0	6	4	0	20	9	20	1
Pottawatomie.....	49	0	10	3	0	3	4	0	39	6	33	0
Pratt.....	108	0	44	15	0	20	9	0	64	9	53	2
Rawlins.....	23	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	12	0	12	0
Reno*.....	572	36	312	107	0	161	44	30	224	92	117	15
Republic.....	55	0	14	5	0	8	1	0	41	13	24	4
Rice.....	101	2	46	11	0	27	7	4	53	4	46	3
Riley.....	143	4	81	25	0	38	18	1	58	17	38	3
Rooks.....	65	0	22	7	0	13	2	0	43	9	34	0
Rush.....	40	0	20	6	0	10	4	0	20	6	14	0
Russell*.....	116	0	29	10	0	14	5	1	31	8	56	0
Saline†.....	231	3	124	35	2	71	16	2	104	38	64	2

* Additional cases which were transferred to the Federal Court: McPherson County, 1; Montgomery County, 1; Nemaha County, 1; Reno County, 1; Russell County, 1.

† Additional jury trials resulting in mistrials in cases which are still pending and not terminated: Norton County, 1.

‡ One additional jury trial in a case in which a new trial was granted.

TABLES A-3 AND A-4.—CONCLUDED. Disposition of civil cases, including divorce—year ending June 30, 1951

COUNTIES	Total number of cases	Foreign transcripts	Divorce cases					Other civil cases				
			Number	Dismissed	Denied	Granted to wife	Granted to husband	Emergency declared	Number	Dismissed	Tried to court	Tried to jury
Scott.....	43	0	13	6	0	3	4	0	30	10	19	1
Sedgwick.....	2,620	220	1,418	474	0	754	190	94	982	473	469	40
Seward.....	94	0	53	25	1	20	7	0	41	10	29	2
Shawnee*.....	1,159	0	733	314	4	339	76	54	426	158	251	17
Sheridan†.....	44	3	6	4	0	2	0	0	35	5	30	0
Sherman.....	66	2	19	4	0	11	4	0	45	20	25	0
Smith.....	53	2	21	3	0	16	2	0	30	6	23	1
Stafford*.....	44	2	15	6	0	7	2	0	27	5	21	1
Stanton.....	25	0	8	3	0	3	2	1	17	2	15	0
Stevens*.....	40	0	22	7	0	13	2	0	18	1	17	0
Sumner.....	191	16	68	23	1	34	10	2	107	31	74	2
Thomas.....	48	3	22	3	0	17	2	0	23	4	19	0
Trego.....	26	0	9	2	0	6	1	0	17	3	12	2
Wabunsee.....	39	4	3	2	0	1	0	0	32	9	21	2
Wallace*.....	13	0	5	1	0	4	0	0	8	2	6	0
Washington†.....	59	1	14	3	0	7	4	0	44	6	37	1
Wichita.....	26	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	22	9	13	0
Wilson.....	107	3	52	16	0	23	13	4	52	24	28	0
Woodson.....	2	2	21	4	0	12	5	0	31	8	21	0
Wyandotte* ††.....	2,947	68	1,934	1,237	2	564	131	45	945	494	414	2
Totals.....	16,729	596	8,227	3,507	23	3,622	1,075	354	7,906	2,616	5,020	270

* Additional cases which were transferred to the Federal Court: Shawnee County, 2; Stafford County, 1; Stevens County, 1; Wallace County, 2; Wyandotte County, 13.

† Additional jury trials resulting in mistrials in cases which are still pending and not terminated: Sheridan County, 1; Washington County, 1.

†† Three additional jury trials in cases which are still pending and not terminated: 1 mistrial; 1 judgment vacated; 1 new trial granted.

TABLE A-5.—DISTRICT COURTS

TYPES OF CIVIL CASES COMMENCED—STATE AS A WHOLE—COMPARED WITH 1946-1947-1948-1949-1950 AND 1951

	Year ending June 30, 1946	Year ending June 30, 1947	Year ending June 30, 1948	Year ending June 30, 1949	Year ending June 30, 1950	Year ending June 30, 1951
Number of cases*	22,301	19,788	18,100	16,325	16,380	15,945
Recovery of money	966	1,230	1,559	1,709	1,861	1,971
Damages	806	1,013	998	1,018	1,192	1,000
Foreclosures	111	97	120	174	222	206
Quiet title	4,134	4,208	3,729	2,835	2,296	2,283
Divorce	13,476	10,247	8,716	7,809	8,092	7,722
Replevin	72	147	159	197	184	157
Ejectment	63	48	39	16	33	45
Injunction	274	248	264	213	262	230
Partition	496	454	404	362	324	314
Tax cases	97	110	73	65	60	37
Habeas corpus	55	73	95	78	94	79
Appeals—Probate	91	94	127	133	143	146
Other appeals	284	383	521	445	432	446
Miscellaneous	1,380	1,436	1,296	1,271	1,185	1,309

* Does not include 596 foreign transcripts included in total of 16,541 on Table A-2, June 30, 1951, or 579 foreign transcripts included in total of 16,959 on Table A-2, June 30, 1950, or 486 foreign transcripts included in total of 16,811 on Table A-2, June 30, 1949, or 359 foreign transcripts included in total of 18,459 on Table A-2, June 30, 1948.

NOTE.—Personal tax warrants are not included as cases in any of these tables.

SUMMARY OF DISTRICT COURTS BY COUNTIES

TABLE B-1 (CONDENSED).—DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1951

COUNTIES	Number of cases	Dis-missed	Plea of guilty as charged	Plea of guilty of lesser offense	Trials			
					Convicted of crime charged	Convicted of lesser offense	Ac-quitted	Mis-trials
Allen.....	13	2	8	2	1	0	0	0
Anderson.....	9	2	6	1	0	0	0	0
Atchison*.....	19	9	1	8	1	0	0	0
Barber.....	11	1	10	0	0	0	0	0
Barton*.....	46	8	33	4	0	0	1	0
Bourbon.....	27	12	13	1	1	0	0	0
Brown*.....	9	2	6	1	0	0	0	0
Butler*.....	69	22	29	1	16	0	1	3
Chase.....	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
Chautauqua.....	6	0	4	0	2	0	0	0
Cherokee.....	12	3	4	2	1	2	0	0
Cheyenne.....	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Clark.....	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Clay.....	19	13	3	3	0	0	0	0
Cloud.....	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0
Coffey.....	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
Comanche.....	4	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
Cowley.....	42	12	23	7	0	0	0	0
Crawford.....	102	69	11	17	1	2	2	0
Decatur.....	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Dickinson.....	10	4	6	0	0	0	0	0
Doniphan.....	10	4	2	2	1	0	1	0
Douglas.....	56	24	21	9	1	0	1	0
Edwards.....	17	2	10	4	0	0	1	0
Elk.....	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Ellis.....	10	5	5	0	0	0	0	0
Ellsworth.....	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
Finney*.....	50	19	30	0	1	0	0	0
Ford.....	37	5	30	0	2	0	0	1
Franklin.....	33	17	9	3	3	0	1	1
Geary.....	49	12	32	2	2	1	0	0
Gove.....	6	1	4	0	0	0	1	0
Graham.....	6	1	4	1	0	0	0	0
Grant.....	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
Gray.....	6	1	4	0	0	1	0	0
Greeley.....	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Greenwood**.....	11	6	2	0	2	0	1	0
Hamilton.....	22	13	6	0	3	0	0	0
Harper.....	25	13	6	5	0	0	1	0
Harvey.....	40	8	20	8	3	0	1	0
Haskell.....	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Hodgeman.....	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson.....	4	0	3	0	0	0	1	0
Jefferson.....	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Jewell.....	9	4	5	0	0	0	0	0
Johnson.....	37	16	5	7	6	1	2	0
Kearny.....	6	3	2	0	0	0	1	0
Kingman.....	12	5	3	1	0	1	2	0
Kiowa.....	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Labette* †.....	24	6	11	3	1	0	3	0

* Additional cases in which the defendants were adjudged insane before trial: Atchison County, 1; Barton County, 1; Brown County, 1; Butler County, 3; Finney County, 1; Labette County, 1.

** One additional case which was transferred to Neosho County.

† Two additional trials in three cases which were appealed to the Supreme Court and are still pending and not terminated.

TABLE B-1 (Condensed).—CONCLUDED. Disposition of criminal cases—year ending June 30, 1951

COUNTIES	Number of cases	Dis-missed	Plea of guilty as charged	Plea of guilty of lesser offense	Trials			
					Con- victed of crime charged	Con- victed of lesser offense	Ac- quitted	Mis- tri- als
Lane.....	9	3	2	1	1	0	2	0
Leavenworth.....	33	17	9	5	1	0	1	0
Lincoln.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Linn.....	10	3	4	0	2	0	1	0
Logan.....	7	4	3	0	0	0	0	0
Lyon.....	31	18	12	0	1	0	0	0
Marion.....	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0
Marshall ††.....	7	1	4	1	0	0	1	0
McPherson.....	17	4	13	0	0	0	0	0
Meade.....	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Miami.....	26	5	20	1	0	0	0	0
Mitchell.....	12	1	9	0	1	0	1	0
Montgomery.....	104	35	51	11	4	1	2	1
Morris.....	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Morton.....	7	2	3	0	1	0	1	0
Nemaha.....	10	3	3	2	2	0	0	0
Neosho.....	18	8	8	0	1	0	1	0
Ness.....	10	1	6	0	2	0	1	0
Norton.....	6	2	3	0	1	0	0	0
Osage.....	13	1	7	1	3	0	1	0
Osborne.....	6	1	4	1	0	0	0	0
Ottawa.....	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Pawnee.....	12	4	8	0	0	0	0	0
Phillips.....	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Pottawatomie.....	10	3	4	0	3	0	0	0
Pratt.....	20	4	16	0	0	0	0	0
Rawlins.....	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0
Reno.....	125	36	83	3	2	0	1	2
Republic.....	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Rice.....	14	3	10	0	0	1	0	0
Riley.....	23	3	15	3	0	0	2	0
Rooks.....	16	2	11	0	1	0	2	0
Rush.....	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
Russell.....	15	5	9	0	0	0	1	1
Saline.....	42	17	16	2	3	1	3	0
Scott.....	6	2	3	1	0	0	0	0
Sedgwick*.....	341	117	170	31	11	3	9	0
Seward.....	9	2	6	0	1	0	0	0
Shawnee*.....	174	65	93	14	1	0	1	0
Sheridan.....	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Sherman.....	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Smith.....	7	4	2	0	0	0	1	0
Stafford.....	20	0	18	2	0	0	0	1
Stanton.....	12	2	9	0	0	1	0	0
Stevens.....	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sumner.....	14	8	5	0	1	0	0	0
Thomas.....	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Trego.....	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wabaunsee.....	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Wallace.....	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Washington.....	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Wichita.....	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Wilson.....	18	5	12	1	0	0	0	1
Woodson.....	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Wyandotte*.....	258	186	25	31	2	7	7	0
Totals.....	2,460	933	1,139	208	95	23	62	11

†† One additional jury trial in a case in which a new trial was granted.

* Additional cases in which the defendants were adjudged insane before trial: Sedgwick County, 1; Shawnee County, 1; Wyandotte County, 1.

TABLE B-3.—NATURE OF CRIMES—STATE AS A WHOLE

(Criminal cases commenced in District Courts)

	1942	1943	1949	1950	1951
<i>Felonies:</i>					
Murder.....	29	35	39	37	29
Manslaughter.....	13	12	11	24	28
Rape.....	53	52	57	63	56
Robbery.....	65	21	50	78	78
Felonious assault.....	69	45	71	98	85
Other crimes against person.....	26	11	54	46	61
Arson.....	16	13	17	14	15
Forgery.....	153	133	210	241	191
Grand larceny.....	303	194	246	298	325
Auto larceny.....	48	41	51	70	51
Embezzlement.....	24	17	21	30	22
Burglary.....	177	133	284	346	337
Other crimes against property.....	37	24	81	71	84
Desertion (wife or child).....	103	71	184	209	176
Narcotics.....	8	2	13	3	2
Liquor—persistent.....	86	15	1	0	0
Bad checks.....	50	22	183	212	191
Other felonies.....	61	111	38	67	46
Total felonies.....	1,321	952	1,611	1,907	1,777
<i>Misdemeanors:</i>					
Assault.....	41	71	60	38	46
Petty larceny.....	39	36	44	38	44
Liquor.....	535	339	286	185	239
Disturbing peace.....	23	12	20	23	20
Traffic offenses.....	50	89	86	56	35
Bad checks.....	3	19	1	14	21
Other misdemeanors.....	93	121	262	55	66
Total misdemeanors.....	784	687	759	409	471
Total cases*.....	2,105	1,639	2,370	2,316	2,248

* Does not include 440 Police Court Appeals in the total of 2,248 cases June 30, 1951, or 461 Police Court Appeals in the total of 2,316 cases June 30, 1950.

TABLE D-1 (COMBINED WITH B-2)—COUNTY AND CITY COURTS—
DISPOSITION OF CASES—YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1951

COUNTY COURTS	Number of cases	Civil cases			Criminal cases			
		Number	Dis-missed	Trials	Number	Dis-missed	Pleas of guilty	Trials
Allen	210	58	37	21	152	31	111	10
Anderson	139	34	7	27	105	13	92	0
Barber	184	33	0	33	151	26	125	0
Barton	35	29	13	16	6	0	6	0
Brown	53	16	10	6	37	18	19	0
Butler	281	70	25	45	211	63	112	36
Clark	43	5	0	5	38	8	30	0
Clay	67	17	6	11	50	8	39	3
Cloud	128	36	12	24	92	4	87	1
Coffey	86	12	8	4	74	12	62	0
Comanche	51	12	11	1	39	13	25	1
Decatur	61	7	4	3	54	4	50	0
Dickinson	73	37	18	19	36	10	24	2
Doniphan	134	26	12	14	108	9	97	2
Douglas	579	108	43	65	471	63	405	3
Edwards	89	19	5	14	70	40	28	2
Ellsworth	258	37	6	31	221	24	197	0
Finney	402	112	20	92	290	85	198	7
Ford	201	96	34	62	105	40	63	2
Franklin	224	23	2	21	201	7	190	4
Geary	131	63	17	46	68	42	15	11
Gove	26	4	1	3	22	5	15	2
Graham	88	4	1	3	84	3	81	0
Greenwood	112	49	27	22	63	8	48	7
Harper	122	35	10	25	87	20	64	3
Harvey	141	44	21	23	97	26	56	15
Hodgeman	13	7	5	2	6	2	4	0
Jackson	19	6	3	3	13	4	9	0
Jewell	63	19	4	15	44	3	41	0
Kearny	168	28	10	18	140	33	103	4
Marion	117	42	16	26	75	12	62	1
Marshall	153	56	22	34	97	3	85	9
Mitchell	169	22	4	18	147	7	138	2
Morris	54	13	7	6	41	11	28	2
Ness	29	4	3	1	25	6	17	2
Norton	106	19	6	13	87	8	78	1
Osage	181	36	21	15	145	31	111	3
Osborne	94	4	0	4	90	4	83	3
Pawnee	123	37	15	22	86	9	74	3
Phillips	149	13	5	8	136	27	109	0
Pottawatomie	72	12	1	11	60	6	45	9
Rawlins	86	33	33	0	53	15	37	1
Republic	179	44	30	14	135	9	125	1
Rice	285	57	15	42	228	83	141	4
Rooks	79	24	10	14	55	19	32	4
Rush	145	21	12	9	124	99	25	0
Russell	36	14	11	3	22	1	21	0
Scott	40	8	0	8	32	0	30	2
Sheridan	47	5	1	4	42	1	37	4
Sherman	42	24	9	15	18	0	18	0
Smith	68	9	4	5	59	13	45	1
Stafford	122	16	9	7	106	30	76	0
Stevens	83	16	8	8	171	29	140	2
Thomas	53	19	7	12	34	6	28	0
Trego	98	7	2	5	91	48	43	0
Wabaunsee	80	13	5	8	67	23	43	1
Wallace	67	1	1	0	66	22	43	1
Washington	58	16	10	6	42	21	21	0
Woodson	99	17	3	14	82	12	67	3
Totals	7,199	1,648	642	1,006	5,551	1,179	4,198	174

TABLE D-1 (Combined with B-2)—CONCLUDED. Disposition of cases—year ending June 30, 1951

CITY COURTS	Number of cases	Civil cases			Criminal cases			
		Number	Dis-missed	Trials	Number	Dis-missed	Pleas of guilty	Trials
Arkansas City.....	440	191	3	188	249	29	217	3
Atchison.....	558	409	67	342	149	25	121	3
Chanute.....	84	51	24	27	33	13	20	0
Coffeyville.....	1,219	975	112	863	244	10	211	23
Hutchinson.....	967	336	93	243	631	152	451	28
Independence.....	412	138	29	109	274	68	191	15
Kansas City.....	2,519	2,289	288	2,001	230	132	78	20
Leavenworth.....	269	75	32	43	194	25	151	18
Olathe.....	2,034	272	77	195	1,762	149	1,545	68
Pittsburg.....	451	90	46	44	361	22	327	12
Salina.....	779	245	122	123	534	214	270	50
Topeka.....	2,261	1,499	772	727	762	147	511	104
Wichita.....	5,141	3,060	1,038	2,022	2,081	750	1,264	67
Totals.....	17,134	9,630	2,703	6,927	7,504	1,736	5,357	411

Please Help Us Keep Our Mailing List Up to Date

The JUDICIAL COUNCIL BULLETIN is published quarterly 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, STATE HOUSE, TOPEKA, KAN.



MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

WALTER G. THIELE, <i>Chairman</i> . (1941-)	Lawrence
Justice of the Supreme Court.	
RANDAL C. HARVEY, <i>Secretary</i> . (1941-)	Topeka
JAMES E. TAYLOR. (1941-)	Sharon Springs
JOHN A. ETILING. (1945-)	Kinsley
Chairman Senate Judiciary Committee.	
ROBERT H. COBEAN. (1947-)	Wellington
DALE M. BRYANT. (1947-1949, 1951-)	Wichita
Chairman House Judiciary Committee.	
A. K. STAVELY. (1951-)	Lyndon
Judge Thirty-fifth Judicial District.	
J. WILLARD HAYNES. (1951-)	Kansas City
W. D. VANCE. (1951-)	Belleville
Judge Twelfth Judicial District.	

FORMER MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

W. W. HARVEY. (<i>Chairman</i> , 1927-1941)	Ashland
J. C. RUPPENTHAL. (<i>Secretary</i> , 1927-1941)	Russell
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
EDGAR C. BENNETT. (1938-1951)	Marysville
GEORGE TEMPLAR. (1939-1941, 1943-1947)	Arkansas City
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

KANSAS JUDICIAL COUNCIL
STATE HOUSE
TOPEKA, KANSAS
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

Sec. 34.66, P. L. & R.
U. S. POSTAGE

PAID

Topeka, Kansas
Permit No. 421

PRINTED BY
FERD VOILAND, JR., STATE PRINTER
TOPEKA, KANSAS
1951

24-1057