The mission of the Utah State Courts is to provide an open, fair, efficient, and independent system for the advancement of justice under the law.
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Our courts are owned by the people and are tasked with resolving disputes brought by people. Whether an individual, a business, or an official representing state or local government, ensuring that the public has access to their courts is a responsibility we take very seriously.

Such access can be hindered by cost, distance, and inconvenience. We recognize the implications of such barriers and are working to make them as minimal as possible, if not remove them altogether. This report highlights a number of these efforts, including new programs, such as Licensed Paralegal Practitioners and Online Dispute Resolution, existing services, such as the Self-Help Center and Alternative Dispute Resolution, and technological improvements, which can bring the courthouse to the individual.

The Licensed Paralegal Practitioner is a new market-based solution aimed at providing legal assistance in domestic, landlord/tenant, and debt collection cases where the full services of a lawyer are not necessary. A committee of the Utah Supreme Court is presently preparing the rules, course work, and licensing requirements that will allow this new type of legal assistance to be available. It is anticipated that in early 2018 Utah will become only the second state to offer such assistance.
Online Dispute Resolution is another innovation presently being developed by the Utah courts. Think of the many functions that are possible from a hand-held device and add the ability to resolve a small claims case to that list. A committee of the Utah Judicial Council is presently working on providing court patrons the ability to have a case evaluated, mediated, or, if necessary, resolved by a judge without a trip to a courthouse. This is a technology and service application that Utah is out front in making available in order to improve convenience and reduce cost.

The Self-Help Center, a remote service that provides assistance to self-represented patrons, is on track to assist over 20,000 people this year, while the Alternative Dispute Resolution Program has been providing mediation in a variety of case types for over 20 years. These court programs and others, along with programs provided through the Utah State Bar, are all aimed at lowering barriers and providing the public better access to their courts.

We would like to express appreciation to Governor Gary Herbert and members of the Utah Legislature for their continued support of Utah’s courts.

Honorable Matthew B. Durrant
Chief Justice, Utah Supreme Court

Daniel J. Becker
Utah State Court Administrator
Licensed Paralegal Practitioners: A New Profession Takes Shape

In May 2015, the Utah Supreme Court appointed a task force to study whether qualified non-lawyers should be permitted to provide legal advice and assistance to clients in certain areas of law without the supervision of a lawyer. Despite the tremendous service that lawyers provide to their clients, and efforts of the Utah State Bar to provide legal services to under-served clients, the Utah Supreme Court was concerned that there were still a large number of people who needed legal assistance, yet do not have a lawyer to help them.

The Limited Legal Licensing Task Force quickly took up its work, and in November 2015, it issued a forward-thinking report, recommending that the Utah Supreme Court create a new legal professional who could practice law on a limited basis. This new Licensed Paralegal Practitioner (LPP) would have more training and responsibilities than a normal paralegal, but would not be a lawyer.

In his 2016 State of the Judiciary address, Utah Supreme Court Chief Justice Matthew Durrant described the new LPP program as putting Utah, “on the cutting edge of innovation and public service when it comes to access to justice.” He also lauded the program’s great potential to the people of Utah:

“We believe this new client and market-driven approach holds great promise – not as a substitute for attorneys – but as a complementary legal resource for providing meaningful assistance in specific areas where existing legal resources are inadequate and the need is great.”
LPPs will be able to help clients in three areas: debt collection, eviction, and family law cases. These are areas where Utah residents generally do not hire lawyers. The task force found an LPP can be a cheaper alternative for people who can't afford a lawyer, or who don’t want to spend their money on one. An LPP would be able to assist clients by doing such things as filling out court-approved forms, filing and serving the forms, advising clients how a court order affects their rights and obligations, representing a client in settlement negotiations, and helping clients prepare a written settlement agreement. An LPP, however, cannot represent a client in the courtroom.

The Utah Supreme Court appointed a steering committee to implement the task force’s recommendations. The steering committee coordinates the work of four subcommittees — executive, education, admissions and administration, ethics and discipline — that are working hard to develop the basic infrastructure for the program, which will include defining minimum educational requirements, learning objectives and required curricula, licensing, mentoring, continuing education, service to the community, and rules of professional responsibility and discipline. The subcommittees have made remarkable progress, and are finalizing their proposals to be transmitted to the steering committee for its consideration. The steering committee is expected to complete its work in early 2017, making it possible for Utah to see its first paralegal practitioners sometime in 2018.
Online Dispute Resolution: Handling Small Claims Cases Online Can Save People Time and Money

In a world of changing technologies and even greater access to the internet, the opportunity to improve the court system in the State of Utah and to make it more accessible to everyday citizens through technology gave rise to a proposal to develop an online court in which many individuals would no longer need to enter a courthouse to resolve certain disputes. In September of 2015, the Judicial Council approved the development of a pilot project that would allow small claim civil disputes to be heard in a virtual environment where the dispute can be resolved online.

In July of 2016 the Utah Judicial Council formed a steering committee to begin development of the project. Under the leadership of Utah Supreme Court Justice Deno Himonas, the group has been working to move the traditional court process of pursuing money claims under $10,000 to an online environment. The main goals of the pilot project include developing an online system that will feature alternative dispute resolution, improve access to justice in small claims cases, simplify court processes, and reduce costs for all involved.

To accomplish these goals the steering committee is building a program that assists parties in resolving their case by facilitating communication between parties as well as providing individualized assistance to develop and present their claims to an adjudicator. The program will be easy to understand and use, accessible to unrepresented individuals involved in a small claims case, and robust enough to assist parties in finding a resolution to their disputes without the need to ever step into a courthouse or take the time to be at a trial. The pilot project will not replace the current small claims system but will provide an alternative to the traditional court process for those who prefer to resolve their case on their own time and through a fair and efficient online process.

The pilot project is set to be completed in June of 2017. If successful, the project may act as a framework for moving other court processes online in an effort to improve the overall efficiency and effectiveness of Utah's judicial system.
A Closer Look: Innovations in Process

eFiling Expands in Utah Juvenile Court

The Juvenile Court began eFiling on existing cases in September 2015. This process became mandatory on Dec. 1, 2015. In 2016, eFiling was expanded to include functions to enable prosecutors, attorneys general, private attorneys and probation officers to file new cases at any time of the day or night. On Aug. 1, 2016, case initiation through eFiling became mandatory.

Unlike District Court eFiling, which utilizes private service providers, Juvenile Court eFiling is integrated into the Juvenile Courts’ case management system C.A.R.E. (Court Agency Record Exchange).

This year, Juvenile Court eFiling expanded access for attorneys or parties to eFile and view documents in C.A.R.E. 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The major benefit of eFiling for the Juvenile Court is efficiency and reduction in error due to misfiling. As an example, some routine documents are “auto filed” into the court record. This means that a document is not processed or filed by judicial assistants, and is handled only as necessary, such as at the time of the court hearing. Between 50-60% of the documents eFiled with the Juvenile Court are auto filed. Other benefits to attorneys, judges, and judicial assistants include:

- Proposed orders are created in C.A.R.E. and automatically transferred to the judge’s queue for approval and signature so a judge may digitally sign or edit the proposed order as needed, instantly.

- Linking documents that are related to one other, such as a motion and order, for ease of review or access.

Additional functionality is being developed to make the eFiling process better for attorneys, judges, and judicial assistants. The next phase of Juvenile Court eFiling will include functionality for self-represented litigants.
eFiling Arrives in Utah Justice Court

Following the advent of eFiling in the District and Juvenile Courts, the Judicial Council adopted a rule in 2016 that brought eFiling to Utah’s Justice Courts as well. Once necessary changes were made to the District Courts’ eFiling programs, the Administrative Office of the Courts began to pilot eFiling by working with the Justice Courts, prosecutors and defense counsel in West Valley City and West Jordan to monitor the filings submitted electronically and make any additional programming changes. As the pilot progressed, additional courts were added.

On Nov. 14, 2016, eFiling was made available in every Justice Court. On Dec. 31, 2016, the electronic filing of pleadings and other papers by attorneys relating to criminal cases in Justice Court became mandatory. eFiling is also available in small claims cases, though it is not mandatory.
Improvements to the Domestic Case Process

The Domestic Case Process Improvement Subcommittee is authorized by the Judicial Council to review current practices in domestic cases, examine data about domestic case filings, examine other jurisdictions’ programs that are intended to simplify processes, and identify best practices.

The subcommittee conducted a survey of judges, commissioners, attorneys, and self-represented parties to identify issues that needed to be examined and areas for improvement.

Subcommittee members include judges, commissioners, family law attorneys, the courts’ Self-Help Center, mediators, and others with an interest in domestic law.

Recommendations will be reviewed by the Standing Committee on Children and Families and are due to the Judicial Council in July of 2017.

Juvenile Indigent Representation Study Committee

In June 2016, the Judicial Council created the Juvenile Indigent Representation Study Committee to conduct a thorough assessment of the provision of indigent representation services for juveniles in delinquency cases and adults in child welfare cases before Utah’s Juvenile Courts. Guided by the results of the recent study completed by the Indigent Criminal Defense Task Force, the committee was directed to expand on that inquiry to identify those problems and issues unique to juvenile representation.

In November 2016, the committee made an initial report to the Judicial Council. The committee’s report included recommendations regarding best practices, model contracts, data collection and the newly formed Indigent Defense Commission. The committee is expected to make its final report to the Judicial Council in early 2017.
In 1994, the Utah State Legislature enacted the Utah Alternative Dispute Resolution Act (ADR Act) (Utah Code §78B-6-201 et seq.) which required the Judicial Council to implement a program utilizing alternative dispute resolution in the state courts. The program was implemented by the Judicial Council and Utah Supreme Court rules on Jan. 1, 1995. The program encourages the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) if it serves the interests of the involved parties. It is not intended to supplant traditional litigation, only to supplement it, and to provide more flexibility and choice of methods used to resolve disputes.

Since that time, several more ADR Programs have been established by the Utah Legislature: Child Welfare Mediation, Parent-Time (Co-Parenting) Mediation, and Mandatory Divorce Mediation; all which reference the ADR Act and court rules for program development and procedure. Each year, more than 3,000 mediation sessions are conducted through the Utah State Courts’ ADR programs. In addition to mediations conducted through court programs, many mediations are also arranged privately.

Utah State Courts ADR programs are structured in various ways. Generally speaking, if the program is mandatory, the court requires more training, oversight and evaluation. For general civil cases, the court administers a roster of private mediators and arbitrators who have met specific education, experience, and ethical requirements.

For Child Welfare Mediation cases which are individually court-ordered and subject to very tight statutory timelines, the court provides staff mediators who are hired and trained specifically for these cases. Child Welfare mediators assist parents, attorneys, and caseworkers in working together to resolve issues and negotiate agreements that will meet the needs of the family and best interests of the children. Participants in child welfare mediation report greater satisfaction with their agreements, more clarity on their roles and responsibilities, and service
plans which are implemented sooner and with better follow through. Since 1998, the Child Welfare Mediation Program has conducted over 14,000 mediations for the Utah’s juvenile courts, with 85% reaching full resolution.

The courts’ Restorative Justice Mediation Programs use specially trained volunteers to mediate cases involving juvenile offenders and crime victims, as well as students who are experiencing problems with school attendance. Other mediation programs, including Small Claims, Law and Motion, and Landlord-Tenant utilize trained volunteer mediators and are administered through collaborations with schools, universities, and other nonprofit organizations. Over 1,000 pro bono mediations were provided through ADR Program collaborations with nonprofit community organizations and educational institutions.

All of these programs are overseen by the ADR Committee, which advises the Judicial Council on policies, plans, and priorities relating to Alternative Dispute Resolution. The committee is made up of judges, commissioners, attorneys, mediators, and mediation educators. Recently the committee completed the Utah Mediation Best Practice Guide. The Best Practice Guide provides a summary of Utah statutes and court rules governing mediation, as well as national standards of best practice for mediators. The guide is a concise, user-friendly reference for Utah mediators, lawyers, parties, and administrators. A copy of the Guide and additional information about the courts’ ADR Program can be found at www.utcourts.gov/mediation.
Similar to other American institutions, the Utah State Courts’ workforce, is experiencing a well-documented aging demographic. Baby Boomers are retiring at an accelerated speed. As a result, the generational composition of the courts’ overall workforce is changing rapidly.

The below chart illustrates that, until recently, Baby Boomers comprised the courts’ largest age group. However, as of 2015, Boomers gave way to the Millennials to assert themselves as the dominant court workforce age group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proactively anticipating the courts’ aging demographic bubble, the Judicial Council in 2014 empowered the Administrative Office of the Courts’ Human Resources and Education departments to collaboratively create a succession planning strategy. Getting ahead of the courts’ aging demographic trend was important, in part, because the courts were potentially threatened with losing invaluable institutional memory, internal talent, and long-held unique institutional values.

Human Resource and Education department representatives began succession planning efforts by meeting with court employees and leaders across the state. Those meetings yielded rich ideas to address the retirement bubble dilemma.

Those statewide conversations led to the creation of two separate academies, both designed to prepare our non-supervisory and middle-management employees for future higher level management and leadership opportunities. Even in their infancy, these academies have measurably enhanced the management and leadership skills of graduates.
In a parallel succession planning effort, the AOC has collaborated with Michigan State University’s Judicial Administration Program to offer a university-recognized certificate in Judicial Administration. The first round of MSU judicial administration students graduated in August 2016. That class was comprised of Utah’s Trial Court Executives, Clerks of Court and Chief Probation Officers. The second round of MSU judicial administration students, comprised mainly of AOC managers, is scheduled to graduate in 2017.

The MSU curriculum is designed around 10 core court competencies as developed by the National Association of Court Management (NACM). To graduate, the students must culminate their coursework by successfully completing a “capstone project,” which improves their court’s administration of justice.

The Utah State Courts’ succession planning strategy emphasizing weeklong academies and a multi-year judicial administration curriculum is the only one of its kind in the country. This unique innovation once again demonstrates our courts are learning organizations committed to ensuring the future excellence of Utah’s court system.

For example, overall, 26% of academy graduates were promoted to a higher position within a year and a half after graduating. The first 2014 Court Skills Academy saw a 42% promotion rate among its graduates.

Prior to attending the academies, every student was asked to self-assess their skills and abilities in three dozen court skill categories. After attending the academies, they were again asked to self-assess their skills and abilities along those same categories.

One hundred percent of academy graduates indicated their proficiencies along every single learning objective, skill, and ability had improved. In fact, the majority of skills and abilities showed very significant improvement according to post-academy evaluation measurements.

Immediate supervisors were also surveyed as to their academy students’ pre- and post-academy skills improvement. The supervisor survey results uniformly reflected that academy graduates’ court skill levels improved across the board.
# Navigating the Court System

## Utah Supreme Court
*Five Justices: 10-year terms*

The Supreme Court is the “court of last resort” in Utah. It hears appeals from capital and first-degree felony cases and all District Court civil cases other than domestic relations cases. The Supreme Court also has jurisdiction over judgments of the Court of Appeals, proceedings of the Judicial Conduct Commission, lawyer discipline and constitutional and election questions.

## Court of Appeals
*Seven Judges: 6-year terms*

The Court of Appeals hears all appeals from the juvenile courts and those from the district courts involving domestic relations and criminal matters of less than a first-degree felony. It also may hear any cases transferred to it by the Supreme Court.

## Juvenile Court
*Thirty-one Judges: 6-year terms. 1.5 Court Commissioners*

Juvenile Court is the state court with jurisdiction over youth under 18 years of age who violate a state or municipal law. The Juvenile Court also has jurisdiction in all cases involving a child who is abused, neglected or dependent.

## District Court
*Seventy-two Judges: 6-year terms. 10.5 Court Commissioners*

District Court is the state trial court of general jurisdiction. Among the cases it hears are: civil cases, domestic relations cases, probate cases, criminal cases, small claims cases and appeals from justice courts.

## Justice Court
*Ninety-eight Judges: 6-year terms*

Located throughout Utah, justice courts are locally-funded and operated courts. Justice Court cases include misdemeanor criminal cases, traffic and parking infractions and small claims cases.
The Utah Judicial Council is established in the Utah Constitution and directs the activities of all Utah courts. The Judicial Council is responsible for adopting uniform rules for the administration of all courts in the state, setting standards for judicial performance, and overseeing court facilities, support services, and judicial and nonjudicial personnel. The Judicial Council holds monthly meetings, typically at the Scott M. Matheson Courthouse in Salt Lake City. These meetings are open to the public. Dates and locations of Judicial Council meetings are available at www.utcourts.gov/admin/judcncl/sched.htm.
Utah State Courts Boards of Judges

The Utah State Courts has four boards of judges representing each court level that meet monthly. The boards propose court rules, serve as liaison between local courts and the Judicial Council, and plan budget and legislative priorities.

**Board of Appellate Court Judges**
Chief Justice Matthew B. Durrant, chair, Utah Supreme Court
Judge Michele M. Christiansen, Utah Court of Appeals
Justice Christine M. Durham, Utah Supreme Court
Justice Deno Himonas, Utah Supreme Court
Associate Chief Justice Thomas R. Lee, Utah Supreme Court
Judge David M. Mortensen, Utah Court of Appeals
Associate Presiding Judge Gregory K. Orme, Utah Court of Appeals
Justice John A. Pearce, Utah Supreme Court
Judge Jill M. Pohlman, Utah Court of Appeals
Judge Stephen L. Roth, Utah Court of Appeals
Judge Kate Toomey, Utah Court of Appeals
Presiding Judge J. Frederic Voros, Jr., Utah Court of Appeals
James Ishida, board staff, Appellate Court Administrator

**Board of District Court Judges**
Judge Mark S. Kouris, chair, Third District Court
Judge Kevin K. Allen, First District Court
Judge Lyle R. Anderson, Seventh District Court
Judge Robert J. Dale, Second District Court
Judge Noel S. Hyde, Second District Court
Judge Christine Johnson, Fourth District Court
Judge Bruce C. Lubeck, Third District Court
Judge Eric Ludlow, Fifth District Court
Judge Andrew H. Stone, Third District Court
Judge James R. Taylor, Fourth District Court
Commissioner Kim Luhn, Third District Court
Debra Moore, board staff, District Court Administrator

**Board of Juvenile Court Judges**
Judge Michelle E. Heward, chair, Second District Juvenile Court
Judge Mary Manley, vice chair, Seventh District Juvenile Court
Judge Ryan Evershed, Eighth District Juvenile Court
Judge Elizabeth A. Lindsley, Third District Juvenile Court
Judge Jim Michie, Third District Juvenile Court
Judge Sharon S. Sipes, Second District Juvenile Court
Judge Rick Smith, Fourth District Juvenile Court
Dawn Marie Rubio, board staff, Juvenile Court Administrator

**Board of Justice Court Judges**
Judge Reuben J. Renstrom, chair, Harrisville City, Riverdale City, South Ogden City, South Weber City, and Woods Cross City Justice Courts
Judge Brent Bullock, Lindon and Pleasant Grove Justice Courts
Judge Augustus Chin, Holladay Justice Court
Judge Brent Dunlap, Parowan City, and Iron County Justice Courts
Judge Paul Farr, Herriman, Lehi, and Sandy City Justice Courts
Judge David Marx, Logan and Hyde Park Justice Courts
Judge Reed Parkin, Orem City Justice Court
Judge Catherine E. Roberts, Salt Lake City Justice Court
Judge Vernon F. Romney, Provo Justice Court
Judge Brook Sessions, Wasatch County Justice Court
James Peters, board staff, Justice Court Administrator
Presiding Judges

The presiding judge is elected by a majority vote of judges from the district and is responsible for effective court operation. The presiding judge implements and enforces rules, policies, and directives of the Judicial Council and often schedules calendars and case assignments. The presiding judge works as part of a management team in the district, which includes the trial court executive and clerk of court.

Utah Supreme Court-Chief Justice
Matthew B. Durrant

Fifth District Court-Judge
John Walton

Court of Appeals-Judge J. Frederic Voros, Jr.
First District Court-Judge Thomas L. Willmore
First District Juvenile Court-Angela F. Fonnesbeck
Second District Court-Judge W. Brent West
Second District Juvenile Court-Judge
Sherene Dillon
Third District Court-Judge Randall Skanchy
Third District Juvenile Court-Judge Mark May
Fourth District Court-Judge Darold J. McDade
Fourth District Juvenile Court-Judge
Suchada P. Bazzelle

Fifth District Juvenile Court-Judge
Thomas M. Higbee
Sixth District Court-Judge
Wallace A. Lee
Sixth District Juvenile Court-Judge
Paul D. Lyman
Seventh District Court-Judge
George Harmond
Seventh District Juvenile Court-Judge
Mary L. Manley
Eighth District Court-Judge
Edwin T. Peterson
Eighth District Juvenile Court-Judge
Ryan Evershed

Court Executives

The Utah State Court’s trial court executives are responsible for day-to-day supervision of non-judicial administration of the courts. Duties include hiring and supervising staff, developing and managing a budget, managing facilities, managing court calendars, and developing and managing court security plans.

Appellate Courts-James Ishida
First District and Juvenile Courts-Brett Folkman
Second District Court-Larry Webster
Second District Juvenile Court-Travis Erickson
Third District Court-Peyton Smith
Third District Juvenile Court-Neira Siaperas

Fourth District Court-Shane Bahr
Fourth District Juvenile Court-James Bauer
Fifth District and Juvenile Courts-Rick Davis
Sixth District and Juvenile Courts-Wendell Roberts
Seventh District and Juvenile Courts-Terri Yelonek
Eighth District and Juvenile Courts-Russell Pearson

Administrative Office of the Courts

The Administrative Office of the Courts is responsible for organizing and administering all of the non-judicial offices of the Utah State Courts. Activities include implementing the standards, policies and rules established by the Utah Judicial Council. The Court Administrator Act provides for the appointment of a State Court Administrator with duties and responsibilities outlined in the Utah Code. Appellate, district, juvenile, and justice court administrators and local court executives assist State Court Administrator Daniel J. Becker in performing these duties and responsibilities. Also assisting the state court administrator are personnel in finance, human resources, internal audit, judicial education, law, planning, public information, rules, and technology. The office also includes mediators, Office of Guardian ad Litem, a District Court capital case staff attorney, and two Juvenile Court law clerks.

For more information on Utah’s State Court System, go to www.utcourts.gov.
## Awards and Honors

Cheryl Aiono, Judicial Assistant, Probate/Appeals, Records Quality Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable Lyle Anderson,** Seventh District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

**Evangelina Burrows,** Court Interpreter Coordinator, Third District Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

Debbie Carlson, Domestic Case Manager, Second District Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable Augustus Chin,** Salt Lake County Justice Court, Service Award, Justice Court Board

**Honorable Glen R. Dawson,** Second District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

**Honorable Royal I. Hansen,** Third District Court, 2016 Peacekeeper Award, Utah Council on Conflict Resolution

**Honorable Ryan Harris,** Third District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

Dawn Hautamaki, Clerk of Court, Eighth District, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

Dawn Hautamaki (Clerk of Court), Brigette Townsend (Case Manager), Eighth District Court, Records Quality Award, Utah Judicial Council

James R. Holbrook, Clinical Professor, University of Utah S.J Quinney College of Law, Amicus Curiae Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Emily Iwasaki,** Law Clerk, Third District Juvenile Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable Jerald Jensen (retired),** Sunset City and Davis County Justice Courts, Lifetime Achievement Award, Justice Court Board

**Peggy Johnson,** Field Services Specialist, Administrative Office of the Courts, Records Quality Award, Utah Judicial Council

Kathi Johnston, Judicial Assistant III, First District Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable Thomas L. Kay,** Second District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

**Honorable Eric A. Ludlow,** Fifth District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

Rhonda Meeks, Judicial Assistant, Third District Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable David Miller,** Centerville and North Salt Lake Justice Courts, Justice Court Judge of the Year Award, Justice Court Board

**R. John Moody,** Guardian ad Litem Attorney, Fourth District Juvenile Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable David N. Mortensen,** Utah Court of Appeals, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

Nancy Nelson, Conference Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable C. Dane Nolan,** Third District Juvenile Court, 2016 Judge of the Year, Utah State Bar

Heather Olsen, Probation Officer, Third District Juvenile Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

Kimbal Parker, Chief Probation Officer, Fourth District Juvenile Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**James M. Peters,** Trial Court Executive, Fourth District Juvenile Court, Judicial Administration Award, Utah Judicial Council

Kristine Price, Judicial Educator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

**Honorable Derek P. Pullan,** Fourth District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

**Honorable Jeanne M. Robison,** Salt Lake City Justice Court, Quality of Justice Award, Utah Judicial Council
Alice Ronan, Team Manager, Third District Juvenile Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

Joanne Sayre, Probate Case Manager, Third District Court, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

Honorable Todd M. Shaughnessy, Third District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah Judicial Council

Honorable William A. Thorne Jr. (ret.), Utah Court of Appeals, 2016 Distinguished Service Award, National Center for State Courts

Honorable Vernice S. Trease, Third District Court, Mentoring Award, Women Lawyers of Utah

Honorable Jeffrey C. Wilcox, Fifth District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

Honorable Thomas Willmore, First District Court, Judicial Excellence Award, Utah State Bar

Jennifer L. Wood, Legal Secretary, Administrative Office of the Courts, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

Carolyn Wooten, Truancy Specialist, Jordan School District, Service to the Courts Award, Utah Judicial Council

Terri Yelonek, Trial Court Executive, Seventh District Court, Judicial Administration Award, Utah Judicial Council

Seventh District Court Clerical Team, District and Juvenile Courts, Records Quality Award, Utah Judicial Council

Members of the Probation Officer Trainers and Committee, Statewide, Meritorious Service Award, Utah Judicial Council

Salt Lake City Justice Court, Justice Court of the Year Award, Justice Court Board

Third District Court Employees, Records Quality Award, Utah Judicial Council

Salt Lake City Justice Court, Justice Court of the Year Award, Justice Court Board

In Memoriam

Honorable James Z. Davis, retired, Utah Court of Appeals

Honorable Don Tibbs, retired, Sixth District Court

Honorable Stephen Henroid, retired, Third District Court

Judges Who Retired From the Bench in 2016

Honorable J. Mark Andrus, Second District Juvenile Court

Honorable Charlene Barlow, Third District Court

Honorable Fred Howard, Fourth District Court

Honorable Scott Johansen, Seventh District Juvenile Court

Honorable Claudia Laycock, Fourth District Court

Honorable Paul Maughan, Third District Court

Honorable Russell B. Bulkley, Garfield County Justice Court

Honorable Lee Bunnell, Washington City Justice Court

Honorable Tony Hassell, Morgan County Justice Court

Honorable F. Kirk Heaton, Kane County Justice Court

Honorable Jerald L. Jensen, Davis County and Sunset Justice Courts

Honorable Catherine M. Johnson, South Salt Lake Justice Court

Honorable Ross McKinnon, Rich County Justice Court

Honorable Linda Murdock, East Carbon and Helper Justice Courts

Honorable Les Scott, Salina and Aurora Justice Courts

Honorable Anne B. Steen, Daggett County Justice Court - Dutch John Precinct

Honorable R. Scott Waterfall, Roy City Justice Court

Honorable Ronald Wolthuis, Midvale Justice Court
Utah operates 41 courthouses throughout the state from Logan to Monticello. Ensuring that these facilities meet the needs of an ever-changing population is important to providing Utah citizens access to justice.

We are currently building new courthouses in Provo (4th District, Utah County) and Price (7th District, Carbon County). These facilities will replace and consolidate three facilities in Utah County and one in Carbon County that are outdated and no longer provide adequate courtroom and related space, facility security, and do not comply with ADA guidelines.

The new Provo Courthouse will be 230,000 square feet. It will have 18 courtrooms, secure prisoner holding and transport areas, Guardian Ad Litem offices, Juvenile Probation offices, secure employee and judicial work areas, mediation conference rooms, and secure public entrance and waiting areas. This facility will consolidate the Orem Juvenile, Provo Juvenile, and Provo District courthouses.

The new Price Courthouse will be 32,000 square feet. It will have three courtrooms, secure prisoner holding and transport areas, Juvenile Probation offices, secure employee and judicial work areas, mediation conference rooms, and secure public entrance and waiting areas.

Both facilities are scheduled to open in 2018. Patrons to the new courthouses will benefit from the improvements to safety and security.

During the 2017 Legislative Session the courts will be requesting funding to design and construct a new facility in Sanpete County, Manti, in the 6th District.
FY 2016 Supreme Court Filings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Filings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Appeals</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Appeals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutory Appeals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writ of Certiorari</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Filings</strong></td>
<td><strong>585</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transferred to Court of Appeals: 423
Transferred from Court of Appeals: 23
Retained for decision: 185

**Total FY 16 Dispositions:** 220

FY 2016 Court of Appeals Filings

(Including Transfers from Supreme Court)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Filings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Agency</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Appeals</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Appeals</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Civil Appeals</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutory Appeals</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Appeals</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Filings</strong></td>
<td><strong>946</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total FY 16 Dispositions:** 846

FY 2016 District Court Filings and Dispositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Filings</th>
<th>Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td>40,082</td>
<td>44,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>21,144</td>
<td>20,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Civil</td>
<td>72,355</td>
<td>72,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate</td>
<td>9,160</td>
<td>8,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Rights</td>
<td>8,260</td>
<td>7,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>2,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>18,528</td>
<td>18,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Filings</strong></td>
<td><strong>171,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,874</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Court Caseload
FY 2016 Juvenile Court Referrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felonies</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanors</td>
<td>12,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt</td>
<td>5,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infractions</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Status</td>
<td>3,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Offenses</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency-Neglect-Abuse</td>
<td>3,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination of Parental Rights</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic/Probate</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,434</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2016 Justice Court Filings and Dispositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Filings</th>
<th>Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanors</td>
<td>68,612</td>
<td>70,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Claims</td>
<td>26,678</td>
<td>27,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>333,519</td>
<td>342,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>428,809</strong></td>
<td><strong>440,429</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2017 Annual Judicial Budget as Part of State of Utah Budget

- All Funds Including General Funds & Federal Funds
  - Judicial Budget ................................................. $157,140,000
    - appropriated FY 2017 budget
  - State Budget .................................................. $17,112,189,000
    - appropriated FY 2017 budget
  - **Total State Budget** ........................................ $17,269,329,000

- General Funds Only
  - Judicial Budget ................................................. $129,198,000
    - appropriated FY 2017 budget
  - State Budget .................................................. $2,250,783,000
    - appropriated FY 2017 budget
  - **Total State General Funds** ................................ $2,379,981,000

Source: Budget of the State of Utah, FY 2016-2017; Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Court Assistance is a Call, Email or Text Away

The Self-Help Center is a free service of the Utah State Courts that helps people understand their legal rights and responsibilities and helps them resolve legal problems on their own if they cannot afford a lawyer or choose not to hire one.

The Self-Help Center is a virtual center that provides services through a toll-free telephone helpline, email, text and the court’s website. The center’s staff speaks English and Spanish and is able to access court interpreters if someone speaks another language. The center helps people with cases at all court levels—justice, juvenile, district and appellate—and responds to questions about all legal issues. In FY2016, the center responded to more than 21,000 inquiries.

Self-Help Center staff provide the following services:

- Information about the law and court process
- Court forms and instructions and assistance completing forms
- Information about an individual court case
- Information about mediation services, legal advice and representation through pro bono and low cost legal services, legal aid programs and lawyer referral services
- Information about resources provided by law libraries and government agencies
- Presentations to the public and court staff on court self-help resources and how to navigate the justice system

For more information, go to www.utcourts.gov and click the link for Self-Help Center.