

SECOND MIDYEAR REPORT
OF
THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER
TO
THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

March 16, 1970

This abbreviated report covers the period October 1969 to March 1970. The Annual Report of the Center circulated to Conference members before its Fall session reports on Center activities for the year preceding.

I. THE BUDGET

The Fiscal 1970 budget, as finally approved, is \$600,000, double the previous fiscal year. It is divided as follows: \$246,000 for personnel; \$18,000 for personnel benefits; \$126,000 for education and training; \$13,000 for communications and postage; \$9,000 for printing; \$179,000 for contractual research studies; \$8,000 for supplies and equipment, and a \$1,000 amount for any miscellaneous expenditures. The budget request for Fiscal 1971 is \$975,000, an increase of \$375,000 as follows: \$110,000, personnel compensation and benefits; \$50,000, education and training; and \$215,000, contractual research, systems development, innovation, etc.

II. DISTRICT COURTS ADOPTING INDIVIDUAL CALENDAR

(1) District of Columbia Individual Calendar Criminal Docket Project:

The entire criminal docket was divided between eight judges on October 1, 1969. With a total of 2,224 cases pending during the next three months period, the eight judges reduced the docket to 947 active cases by January 1, 1970, not including 320 fugitive and mentally committed defendants which were non-triable. This cut the criminal docket half in two. On this basis this docket will be current by July 1, 1970. The judges attribute this record to the use of the individual calendar, the permanent assignment of two assistant U. S. Attorneys to each judge, the cooperation

of counsel, omnibus pretrial hearing techniques, and hard work by both judges and counsel. The Center is now providing by contract with Computer Retrieval Systems, Inc. computerized reports to the judges and a permanent criminal calendar control for the District. The judges are considering the extension of the individual calendar to the civil docket.

(2) Eastern District of Pennsylvania Individual Calendar:

After conducting a Center project on individual calendaring in the last quarter of 1969 the District voted to change its entire docket to the individual system as of October 1st. Civil dispositions increased 65% in the next quarter over the comparable period of 1968. The 7,000 case backlog should be current by July 1, 1971. (By "current" is meant a backlog of about 250 cases per judge.) Criminal cases are reached in four to six weeks with an average of 32 criminal cases per judge pending--one-half of the national figure. (Criminal calendars are "current" when there are 30 to 35 cases pending before each judge.)

(3) Southern District of New York Individual Calendar Project:

By action of Chief Judge Sugarman pursuant to a vote of the judges, on October 1st four judges volunteered to test out the use of the individual calendar. Each judge was assigned his pro rata of the 13,000 civil and 2,500 criminal cases on the docket, which ran about 600 civil and slightly over 100 criminal cases. All four judges report that their criminal dockets are now current. Civil calendars have been reduced about 50% by total number of cases and each of the four judges should be current by July 1, 1970.

(4) Eastern District of New York Individual Calendar:

This district also changed to the individual calendar on October 1, 1969, and now shows civil dispositions running 25% higher than the comparable period of 1968. The criminal docket runs about ten less cases per judge than the national average. This should improve with the staffing of the U. S. Attorney's Office.

(5) Northern District of California Individual Calendar:

This district likewise changed to the individual calendar on October 1st. Criminal dispositions increased during the last three months of 1969 over the comparable period of 1968 by 25%, while the civil case closings were 52% higher. However, filings increased appreciably. The criminal docket is now well below the national average and the civil docket should be current in 18 months.

(6) District of Minnesota Individual Calendar:

This district has also switched to the individual calendar and reports that its dockets are current.

III. THE COURTS OF APPEALS PROGRAMS

(1) Meeting of the Chief Judges:

The fourth meeting of the Chief Judges of the Courts of Appeals will be held at the Federal Judicial Center on March 18, 1970. The Chief Judges have found these meetings (held in conjunction with the Judicial Conference dates) to be helpful in discussing mutual problems. In addition, they have furnished a forum for an exchange of techniques,

ideas and improved procedures. The subjects cover such matters as records on appeal, screening, motions, clerical functions, use of law clerks, summary dispositions, opinion writing, rules, circuit councils, etc.

(2) Screening in the Fifth Circuit:

This project has been so successful that the Circuit is having difficulty in finding sufficient cases for April. The latest statistic shows that 40.9% of the cases are disposed of without argument. Civil cases lead this list, habeas corpus and Sec. 2255's are next and criminal appeals are third. Prior to screening, 1,300 cases required 48 weekly sittings while presently 1,775 filings are disposed of in 40 weeks of argument. In short this means that two weeks of sittings have been cut off of each judge's load (about 25%) and the use of judges outside the Fifth Circuit entirely eliminated. The Supreme Court has denied certiorari in three cases in which the screening practice was attacked.

(3) Delay in the Filing of Transcripts:

The Circuits are especially interested in reducing the delay on transcripts. The Fourth Circuit has drawn some tentative rules requiring appeals to be perfected without full transcripts with the right to enlarge on motion of the parties or the court.

In addition, the Center has been developing the use of "readers" for stenotype reporters which will eliminate some of the delay. Finally, experiments in tape recording are being organized in some of the Districts.

(4) The Tape Recording of Courts of Appeals Argument Sessions:

The use of tape recorders in Courts of Appeals courtrooms is being explored in some of the Circuits. Through this device the necessity for the keeping of minutes of these sessions by the Clerk and the time of law clerks devoted to attending the sessions might be eliminated.

IV. RESEARCH PROJECTS

(1) Automobile Accident Study for Department of Transportation:

The Center has now completed its report, based on findings of the Mitre Corporation which contracted with the Center to conduct an empirical study of the problem. It will not be made public presently but when accepted by the Department of Transportation will be circulated to the Conference.

(2) Weighted Caseload Index:

The District Judges time study which began in October 1969, was concluded March 1st. The contractor for the Center, the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture, will computerize the judges' work sheets and, in conjunction with the Subcommittee on Statistics of the Judicial Conference, prepare an index for all categories of cases. This index will then be tested out for refinement purposes before its adoption. The extremely high percentage of participating District Judges is not only greatly appreciated but should make for an extremely accurate index, which in turn will not only be helpful to the judges but also in budgetary problems.

(3) Post Conviction Remedies Report:

The first tentative draft has been submitted by William and Mary Law School to the Center and circulated to the State-Federal Relations Advisory Committee. Comments have been received from the committee members and forwarded to the Law School. Work continues and the final draft will be released in late March of 1970.

This report will be the most thorough and comprehensive inquiry into the operation of post conviction review procedures in the state courts. It should be of great value as background for continuing discussions between state and federal courts. It is hoped that such discussions, aided by the work of this study, will cut down on the filings of state habeas corpus petitions in federal courts.

(4) Prison Legal Assistance Clinics at Law Schools:

The Center has expanded this project in federal prisons since the need for the service has been demonstrated and its operation shown to be of direct benefit to the courts. The wardens report that these activities are highly desirable, that inmate morale is improved, and administrative problems reduced. While the programs are just beginning we find that numerically the federal prisoner petitions are reduced, those that are filed are more substantial, and the moving papers are better prepared. The projects now include: Danbury Prison (Yale); Alderson Reformatory for Women (Washington & Lee); Terminal Island (UCLA); Lompoc (USC); McNeil Island (University of Washington); Leavenworth (University of Kansas); Atlanta Prison (Emory); and Springfield Medical

Center (University of Missouri). The Center staff have kept in touch and coordinated with the Bureau of Prisons and with law schools and bar associations in order to provide the necessary service without duplication or overlapping. Research connected with these services will be aimed at quantifying the impact on court work loads, attitudinal changes of prisoners, and impact on prison administration.

(5) Probation Case Aide Project:

The Center continues to support and work with this project being conducted by the University of Chicago and the Northern District of Illinois. The project is aimed at acquiring the necessary experience upon which to develop volunteer and non-professional caseworkers in the rehabilitation of criminal offenders. It offers great promise in the probation area.

(6) Probation Supervision; San Francisco Project:

Working with the Probation Division of the Administrative Office, the Center is collecting data in five districts on offenders subjected to degrees of supervision. The objective of the project is to enlarge our knowledge about the relationship between varying degrees of supervision and successful probation experience. This knowledge will permit the more efficient use of the limited resources presently available to the supervision of offenders.

(7) Presentence Investigation Procedures:

The first of several inquiries into presentence investigation and report practices is a Center report done by contract with the Georgetown Law Journal on investigations before conviction. The report deals with the manner in which such investigations are conducted, their utilization in the districts that follow the practice, and an analysis of the legal problems present. The report is in press at Georgetown. Additional distribution will be made when available by the Center to judges and probation officers.

(8) Judge's Bench Book:

The Judge's Bench Book has now been distributed to all federal judges. As new District Judges are appointed the Book is sent them. The Bench Book Committee made up of Judges Dooling, Maxwell, and Will, will meet again on March 14, 1970, at the Center, to discuss the method to be followed in keeping the Book current. The overwhelming response from the federal judges gives reason to believe that the Bench Book is of great service to them. There have been numerous requests for the Book, other than from the federal judges, but it has been the policy of the Center to restrict distribution to the federal judiciary.

(9) Complex and Multidistrict Litigation Manual:

Under the sponsorship of the Federal Judicial Center a Board of Editors appointed by the Director has prepared a manual to preserve the experience that has been gained in recent cases of multidistrict and complet litigation. The Board of Editors (Judges Clary, Boldt, Estes, Robson, Becker, Will, Zirpoli and Wyatt) has prepared a

manual designed to provide guideposts to judges handling such litigation for the first time. The manual has been published by Mathew Bender as a part of Moore's Federal Practice and by Clark Boardman Company as a separate loose-leaf publication. The Editors constantly review and update the materials. The first supplement is now in preparation and should be printed in mid-summer.

A study of the problem of class actions is now being conducted by Professor Charles Wright of the University of Texas and his staff.

(10) Research on the Manual for Magistrates:

The Institute of Criminal Law of Georgetown University is collaborating with the Center and the Administrative Office in the research necessary for the preparation of a manual for the new magistrates.

(11) Geographical Reorganization of the Circuits:

A survey covering the geographical reorganization of the circuits is being organized with the Trial Practice Committee of the Judicial Conference. It should be ready for distribution at the Fall meeting of the Conference.

V. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

(1) Magistrates:

The Center presented a program on the Magistrates Act at each of the 1969 circuit judicial conferences. In addition to the District Judges of those districts having pilot magistrate projects the panels at these meetings included the new magistrates themselves and the Directors of the Center, Administrative Office and of Education and Training.

(2) Seminar for Magistrates:

The first Seminar for Magistrates will be held at Dolley Madison House on May 7 - 9, inclusive. The program has been designed to cover subjects of concern to the Magistrates in the discharge of their day-to-day responsibilities, including such topics as Search Warrants, Preliminary Hearings, Bail, Omnibus Hearings, Pretrial Conferences, etc. All of the Magistrates presently in office and four Clerks will attend

(3) Seminar for Newly Appointed District Court Judges.

Thirty District Judges, recently appointed or who had not previously attended such a seminar, met at the Center on January 23 - 31, 1970 for the Ninth District Judges Seminar. A copy of the schedule showing subjects, hours, and the names of "faculty-judges" participating is attached. Chief Judge Alfred P. Murrah, who has always been our seminar Chairman, declared the seminar the best yet. Questionnaires to all of the student-judges have now been returned and all agree that the seminar was highly successful. The faculty-judges report that this is the most responsive and eager class in their experience. The Center is grateful to Chief Judge Murrah and the other faculty-judges who participated. All were District Judges, save two from the Court of Appeals.

(4) Circuit Judges' Seminars.

Two seminars for the Circuit Judges of two and one-half days each were held in February of 1970, with a total of 54 student-judges attending, most of whom were recently appointed. These were the

first Circuit Judge seminars ever held. The schedule, which was identical for each, is attached. The faculty were all recruited from the Courts of Appeals save for two Circuit Clerks and two prominent educators, Bernard Witkin and James C. Quarles. While the questionnaires, which were mailed to the student judges, have not yet been returned, the Center has received enthusiastic letters from practically all of them. Our appreciation goes out to all of the faculty judges for their dedicated service.

(5) State-Federal Relations Committee: [Chief Justices Taft, Knutson, Kenison and Ethridge; Pringle and Burke, Associate Justices.]

Following through with the suggestions of members of this committee, the Director contacted all the Chief Justices of the states to inquire whether they felt meetings jointly attended by federal and state judges would be mutually beneficial. Their replies indicate that such meetings would be helpful. The main problem areas to both state and federal courts are engaged counsel, release of prisoners for trial in the other jurisdiction, review by the federal courts of state convictions, procedures involving prisoners convicted on both state and federal offenses, joint use of computerized juror lists, and data banks on habeas corpus filings in state and federal courts [Title 28 U.S.C. Sec. 2254]. Plans are currently being made for several seminars, some state-wide and others on a regional basis. At the suggestion of the Executive Committee of the Appellate Judges Conference, the Director has also initiated plans for a State-Federal appellate judges' seminar, tentatively scheduled for November at the Center, which would be attended

by Supreme Court Justices of the States and Federal Courts of Appeals Judges.

(6) Implementation of Minimum Standards for Criminal Justice:

In 1970 the Center will conduct programs at four Circuit Conferences, i.e., Fifth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth, on the ABA Minimum Standards for Criminal Justice. In addition, copies of the Standards, when requested, are sent to each judge with a recommendation that the same be cited in appropriate opinions.

(7) Probation Officers' Training Program:

The Center in conjunction with the Administrative Office is studying the reorientation of probation officers' training programs. In conjunction with Ben Meeker, Chief Probation Officer of the Northern District of Illinois, a format is being designed that will be oriented to the needs of the probationers and the probation officers as well. It will be tested out at the next seminars of the Service.

(8) Sentencing Techniques:

Conferences have been held with Chairman Reed of the Parole Board and the Director of the Bureau of Prisons in an effort to devise a program that will keep the judges informed as to the action of these agencies with relation to prisoners sentenced by the judge. The Board is organizing a study to demonstrate new scientific dimensions in parole decision making. The cooperation of the Center and the Administrative Office has been requested and granted.

The object of the Center is not only to give sentencing techniques a higher priority but to review sentencing in the light of

prison activity and parole decision making with a view to trial correlation. In cooperation with Chief Judge Hoffman, Chairman of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Administration of the Probation System, the Center proposes to organize a combination study and training program in presentence reports, the use of various alternatives in sentencing and their relationship to the parole and probation of the prisoner. The cooperation of the Prison Bureau and the Parole Board in such programs will furnish new light and enable the judges to perform the sentencing function with greater certainty and understanding.

VI. INNOVATION AND SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

(1) North American Rockwell Report:

Since this report was circulated to the Chief Judges, the Center has received dozens of requests for copies of it. Since we did not have copies and a reprint job of the two volumes would have been very costly, a 50-page summary was prepared and has been mailed to every Circuit Court and District Court Judge. The major recommendation of the report was that a separate and distinct organizational structure be established for administration and management of all judicial support activities. This recommendation included establishing the position of a U. S. Courts Executive and the training and assignment of Court Executives to each Circuit and to each large District Court. The latter recommendation was very much in line with the Bill currently pending in Congress and the creation of the Institute for Court Management. The report emphasizes that an improved management system is necessary to achieve more uniformity and to enhance the performance of Clerks'

Offices throughout the federal system. Many other areas of court organization and administration were reviewed and recommendations for improvement were made for each of these areas. The survey team concluded that a better information system and improved statistical measures were required in almost every area of court administration. However, it was emphasized that only through the use of computers will it be possible to meet many of the identified needs. Mr. Joseph Ebersole, who was in charge of the North American Rockwell survey team which prepared the report, has now taken a position at the Center as its Director of Innovation and Systems Development. In this position he will be responsible for planning and guiding the implementation of many of the recommendations contained in the report.

(2) Work Measurement Study:

In November of 1969 the National Archives & Records Service (NARS) submitted to the Center its report on this project. The study was made to determine the feasibility of establishing a series of work standards for measuring and quantifying the clerical work performed by the Clerks of Court. The standards were proposed to be used as guides for staffing Clerks' Offices, and to be used as a basis for recommended improvements in current office methods and procedures. Sixteen District Courts were used as the basis for the study, jurisdictions felt to be representative of a cross section of the federal court system throughout the country. Composite flow charts of case-processing procedures in Clerks' Offices have been drafted and submitted with the report, which has now been distributed to the Chief Judges of all 16

districts. The major finding of the study was that "the essential similarity does not exist today among the U.S. Courts to the degree necessary for a workable work measurement system." However, it was stated that enough data was obtained to be able to clearly demonstrate that such a system is feasible and can be effectively applied in the management of the U.S. Courts. Since the basic steps in the processing of cases are essentially identical, the report recommended there be a centrally coordinated effort to develop and apply common court management practices and uniform clerical procedures. The first step in such an effort would be the development of a model Court Clerk's Office system which would be refined and proven by field operations in one court and would then be applied in other courts.

In pursuance of this objective, the Center is now funding the development of a model system in the District Court of the Northern District of California. On February 10, 1970, the Director, accompanied by the NARS team working on this project, at the invitation of Chief Judge Harris of the Northern District of California, met with all the District Judges in this jurisdiction to discuss implementing some of the recommendations contained in this report. The judges are enthusiastic and cooperative and work is moving along quickly to start a program which is expected to be completed by spring or early summer of 1970.

(3) Louisiana Eastern Pilot Computer Project:

A master computer file of information on all pending civil cases has now been completed. At the present time we are engaged in the preparation of computer programs which will produce

several experimental judicial management reports. These reports will be reviewed for management usability by the Judges and key members of the Clerk's Office. In addition, an analysis of civil system capabilities will be made to determine other specific applications in the civil case management area. The initial design of a master computer file for criminal case information was completed last month and a review of design applications is being made by Center personnel to determine the initial product which should be generated by this part of the total system. Mr. Geiger of the Center has spent considerable time in this court over the past nine months in developing the experimental approach to this project. He is leaving the Center this month to accept a position with private industry and we are now negotiating with a computer systems expert who will fill his slot and continue the development work on the Louisiana Eastern project.

(4) Southern District of New York Monitoring: The Center has started a project in this court for the purpose of monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the individual assignment pilot project. In addition to preparing an evaluation report, the project will involve working with the Clerk's Office in order to determine and recommend changes which could result in improved operations. As a key element in the project approach, coordination will be maintained with the NARS project in California Northern and the computer project in Louisiana Eastern in order to determine the applicability of developments of these projects to the New York Southern Court. Mr. Harvey Solomon, who

recently joined the Center, will be spearheading this project. Mr. Solomon was in practice for eight years before returning to Harvard for his Masters in Public Administration. After receiving this degree, he worked for a year and a half as a key member of the staff which performed the Management Study of the District of Columbia Courts.

(5) Survey of Juror Management Systems:

In mid-February the Center discussed with the Public Systems Management Services Division of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, the possibility of that company undertaking, at no cost to the Center, a preliminary study of juror management and utilization in selected District Courts. It is contemplated that the preliminary study will focus on four or five of the District Courts spending the most on juror services. The proposed survey will document the juror management techniques used in each court and as part of the analysis will develop detailed recommendations for a thorough study of the areas offering potential improvement and saving. A target date for completion of the survey is April 15, 1970.

(6) District of Columbia Criminal Docket Management:

The Center has contracted with Computer Retrieval Systems, Inc. for the development and operation of a series of computer programs which will produce judicial management reports for the criminal part of the court. Several months ago, Computer Retrieval Systems on a non-cost basis developed some initial reports as an experiment. The judges on the criminal individual assignment calendar found them to be

extremely useful. As a result of this successful experience some additional reports were requested which would provide increased assistance to the judges. The project will continue until at least June 30, 1970, at which time the computer programs developed as a part of the contract will be turned over to the court for operation. During the period of the contract, Computer Retrieval Systems, Inc. will prepare all the reports for the court. The judges are enthusiastic about the project and the Clerk's Office is designating personnel who will work full time with the contractor to gain experience that will enable them to continue the reporting system after the contract is completed.

VII. OFFICE OF THE PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANT

(1) Publications:

The Third Branch. This bulletin continues to be published bi-monthly and mailed to approximately 4,500 individuals including federal judges and their supporting personnel, law libraries, deans of law schools, the Chief Justices of the States, etc. The mounting requests for copies indicates that it is widely read in many areas of the law both at home and abroad.

The Federal Judicial Center Report is an official publication of the Center and will contain articles and reports related to the Center work which deserve permanent binding and preservation. It serves a different purpose than the bulletin, which is aimed more at keeping its readers abreast of current developments.

(2) This office is charged with the fiscal affairs of the Center, including the preparation of the budget figures, writing the

justifications for the budget, and making available to the Director monthly reports on expenditures.

(3) The personnel of the Center come under the supervision of the Professional Assistant, whose responsibility includes not only the handling of special legal matters and assistance to the Director, the compilation of the Center Report and the Third Branch, but covers budgetary and general management operations. The fiscal details are under the Administrative Office.

VIII. SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

(1) Customs Court Bill:

The Center, at the request of the Customs Court and the Treasury and Justice Departments, consulted and assisted in the drafting of the Act reorganizing the Customs Service and Court currently pending in Congress. S.2624 has now passed the Senate and is awaiting House action. The Director recently testified on this Bill, at the request of the House Judiciary Committee.

(2) National Court Assistance Act:

At the request of the Senate Judiciary Committee the Director testified on the merits of this Act on February 27, 1970.

(3) National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws:

The Director is acting as Chairman of the Advisory Committee to this Commission. A preliminary report of the Commission is expected in the next few weeks. The Center is cooperating with the Commission in the matter.

IX. CONCLUSION

This month will mark the second year of existence of the Center. Its activities, the cooperation of all of the judges and the fervor of all participants in its work expresses more clearly than any report the high esteem that the Center enjoys. It has made a lasting impact on the federal judiciary and is an exemplar in the field of judicial administration. With the continued support of the judges its place in the judicial firmament shall never be denied.

It has been a personal pleasure to serve as the Center's first Director. I give up the post with appreciation for having had the opportunity to serve in this important capacity and with grateful thanks to all who have so generously contributed to the Center's cause. There can be no higher calling. I wish for my successor all that I had hoped for myself.

Respectfully submitted,



TOM C. CLARK, Director

SEMINAR FOR NEWLY APPOINTED UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGES

WASHINGTON, D. C.

JANUARY 23 to 31, 1970

HOURS	FRIDAY JANUARY 23	SATURDAY JANUARY 24	SUNDAY JANUARY 25	MONDAY JANUARY 26	TUESDAY JANUARY 27	WEDNESDAY JANUARY 28	THURSDAY JANUARY 29	FRIDAY JANUARY 30	SATURDAY JANUARY 31
8:30 a.m.	INTRODUCTION: MURRAY, C.J.	TRIAL OF A LAW SUIT CIVIL & CRIMINAL --	FREE TIME	BAIL AND COMMITMENT HUNTER, J. GASCH, J.	POST CONVICTION HUNTER, J. HOPKINS, J.	ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ERNEST FRIESEN	FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER PROJECTS JOSEPH EBERSOLE - DR. JOHN HOLDER MR. RALPH STAUBER - MR. DALE STAUBER	COMMUNITY RELATIONS WRIGHT, J. DEVITT, C.J.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION CLOSING REMARKS: THE CHIEF JUSTICE
9:00 a.m.	WELCOME: THE CHIEF JUSTICE	JURY & NONJURY ARRAJ, C. J. MURRAY, J. REAL, J.							
9:30 a.m.	PROCEEDINGS BEFORE TRIAL								
10:00 a.m.	WILL, J. CHARY, J. RUBIN, J.								
10:30 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK		COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK
11:00 a.m.	PROCEEDINGS BEFORE TRIAL	TRIAL OF A LAW SUIT		SENTENCING HOFFMAN, C. J.	MAGISTRATES STANLEY, C.J.	FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER MR. JUSTICE CLARK Handling Three Judge Court-Will, J.	MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION BECKER, C.J.	CIRCUIT COURT- DISTRICT COURT RELATIONS FEINBERG, J. TYLER, J.	CLOSING AND ADJOURNMENT MR. JUSTICE CLARK
11:30 a.m.	WILL, J. CHARY, J. RUBIN, J.	" "							
12:00 Noon		" "							
12:30 p.m.		" "							
1:00 p.m. to 1:45 p.m.	LUNCH	FREE TIME		LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	ADJOURNMENT
2:00 p.m.	STUDY PERIOD			STUDY PERIOD OR ELECTIVE: PATENT-COPYRIGHT RICH, J. Lane, J.	STUDY PERIOD OR ELECTIVE: ANTITRUST 2-3:30 p.m. GESELL, J. 3:30-4:30 p.m. ESTES, C.J.	HANDLING DIFFICULT CASES: MACMADON, J. WILSON, G.J. ROBSON, J.	STUDY PERIOD OR ELECTIVE: ADMIRALTY COOLING, J.	STUDY PERIOD	
2:30 p.m.									
3:00 p.m.									
3:30 p.m.									
4:00 p.m.									
4:30 p.m.									
5:00 p.m.									
5:30 p.m.									
6:00 p.m.	GROUP DISCUSSION			GROUP DISCUSSION	GROUP DISCUSSION	GROUP DISCUSSION	GROUP DISCUSSION		
6:30 p.m.									
7:00 p.m.									
7:30 p.m.									
	RECEPTION FOR SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS AND WIVES - DOLLEY MADISON HOUSE INFORMAL		7:00-9:00 p.m. GROUP DISCUSSION	8:00 - 10:00 p.m. RECEPTION FOR SEM- INAR PARTICIPANTS AND WIVES STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMAL				BANQUET AT SUPREME COURT BLACK TIE PREFERRED	

SEMINAR FOR UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

WASHINGTON, D. C.

FEBRUARY 26-28, 1970

Feb. 19-21, 1970

HOURS	THURSDAY FEBRUARY 26	FRIDAY FEBRUARY 27	SATURDAY FEBRUARY 28
9:00 a.m.	INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS: MR. JUSTICE CLARK - CHIEF JUDGE MURRAH WELCOME: THE CHIEF JUSTICE	OPINION WRITING: CHIEF JUDGE BAILEY ALDRICH DEAN JAMES C. QUARLES BERNARD WITKIN, ESO.	THE FUNCTION OF THE CIRCUIT COUNCIL AND ITS POWERS: CHIEF JUDGE ALFRED P. MURRAH JUDGE GRIFFIN B. BELL
9:15 a.m.	ORGANIZING THE WORK OF THE COURT OF APPEALS; HANDLING THREE JUDGE CASES: JUDGE FREDERICK G. HAMLEY JUDGE ALBERT V. BRYAN		
9:30 a.m.			
10:00 a.m.			
10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK	11:00 - 11:15 : COFFEE BREAK
10:45 a.m.	ORGANIZING THE WORK OF THE COURT OF APPEALS HANDLING THREE JUDGE CASES	OPINION WRITING: CONTINUATION	DISCUSSION OF SPECIAL PROBLEMS CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL JUDGE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: THE CHIEF JUSTICE
11:00 a.m.			
11:30 a.m.			
12:00 Noon			
12:30 - 1:30 p.m.	LUNCH	LUNCH	ADJOURNMENT
1:30 p.m.	CONTROL OF THE DOCKETS: JUDGE GRIFFIN BELL CHIEF JUDGE HARRY PHILLIPS	ADMINISTRATION OF THE COURT: CHIEF JUDGE J. EDWARD LUMBARD DANIEL A. FUSARO, CLERK, CA-2 THOMAS F. QUINN, CLERK, CA-3	
2:00 p.m.			
2:30 p.m.			
3:00 p.m.			
3:30 - 3:45 p.m.	COFFEE BREAK	COFFEE BREAK	
3:45 p.m.	THE RECORD ON APPEAL: JUDGE ALBERT V. BRYAN JUDGE GRIFFIN B. BELL	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE COURT OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURT: CHIEF JUDGE LUMBARD JUDGE HAROLD R. TYLER, JR.	
4:00 p.m.			
4:30 p.m.			
5:00 p.m.			
5:30 p.m.			