


149510

# JUVENILE JUSTICE

## NON-DELINQUENTS PLACED IN FLORIDA'S SECURE JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITIES



149510

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Florida Dept. of Health  
and Rehabilitative Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Prepared by the staff of the Governor's Juvenile Justice  
and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Committee

Kathryn Rulon

Nathan Epps

Ted Tollett

Juvenile Justice Programs

Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services

October, 1993

Lawton Chiles  
Governor



H. James Towey  
Secretary

## INTRODUCTION

The information in this report reflects the placement of non-delinquent juveniles in secure detention facilities from January through June, 1993. Data concerning the placement of non-delinquents from July through December, 1992 has been included where indicated.


The data used to compile this report were obtained by the staff of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program (JJDP) in their monitoring of Florida's compliance with the mandates of the Federal JJDP Act.

## NON-DELINQUENT INCARCERATIONS IN SECURE DETENTION

During 1992 a total of 417 admissions of non-delinquent juveniles were reported by secure juvenile detention facilities. A total of 313 individual children accounted for these admissions. In July of that year, the Florida Supreme Court found that no juvenile may be held in secure detention for contempt of court (A.A. v. Rolle). While that finding was not final until October of 1992, the impact of the decision on the detention of non-delinquents in secure custody was seen through substantially lower admission figures by August of 1992.

During the first six months of 1993 a total of 90 juveniles were reported to have been held in secure facilities as non-delinquents. Admissions ranged from 11 to 21 per month, with an average admission rate of 15.


**NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE CUSTODY  
JANUARY 1992 - JUNE 1993  
BY MONTH**



<u>MONTH</u>	<u>ADMISSIONS</u>
JANUARY	37
FEBRUARY	41
MARCH	48
APRIL	46
MAY	53
JUNE	58
JULY	40
AUGUST	24
SEPTEMBER	17
OCTOBER	20
NOVEMBER	18
DECEMBER	15
JANUARY	14
FEBRUARY	17
MARCH	21
APRIL	13
MAY	11
JUNE	14

District 4 ranked highest in the holding of non-delinquents with an admission total of 30 for the six months. District 7 reported 28 admissions, followed by District 12 with 20. Districts 6, 2, and 3 reported admission rates of 9, 2, and 1 respectively. The remaining 9 districts reported 0 admissions of non-delinquent juveniles.

**NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
BY DISTRICT \***




\*THE REMAINING 9 DISTRICTS REPORTED 0 ADMISSIONS OF NON-DELINQUENTS

DISTRICT	JUVENILES
DISTRICT 4	30
DISTRICT 7	28
DISTRICT 12	20
DISTRICT 6	9
DISTRICT 2	2
<u>DISTRICT 3</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	90

For the first 6 months of 1993, 8 of the 20 juvenile detention centers in Florida reported admissions of non-delinquent juveniles to secure detention. Duval Regional Juvenile Detention Center ranked highest with 30 admissions, followed by Orlando with 24. Volusia reported 20 admissions, followed by Hillsborough with 9 and Seminole with 4. Bay, Leon, and Alachua each reported 1 admission of a non-delinquent to secure custody. The remaining 12 centers reported 0 admissions of non-delinquent juveniles.

**CONFINEMENT OF NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY - JUNE 1993  
BY CENTER\***




\*THE REMAINING 12 CENTERS REPORTED 0 ADMISSIONS OF NON-DELINQUENTS

CENTER	JUVENILES
DUVAL	30
ORLANDO	24
VOLUSIA	20
HILLSBOROUGH	9
SEMINOLE	4
BAY	1
LEON	1
<u>ALACHUA</u>	<u>1</u>
STATEWIDE	90



A comparison of the last 6 months of 1992 with the first six months of 1993 shows that while total admission rates have declined, Orlando, Volusia, and Hillsborough Regional Juvenile Detention Centers have reported higher admissions rates in 1993 than in 1992. Duval reflected the highest admission rate for both time periods. Six detention centers' admission rates dropped from 2 or more in 1992 to 0 in 1993. Five centers reported 0 admissions of non-delinquent juveniles for both time periods.

CONFINEMENT OF NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JULY-DECEMBER, 1992 COMPARED WITH JANUARY-JUNE, 1993  
BY CENTER



JULY-DEC 1992


ESCAMBIA	18
BAY	0
LEON	4
ALACHUA	2
MARION	7
DUVAL	33
VOLUSIA	18
PINELLAS	0
PASCO	3
HILLSBOROUGH	7
MANATEE	0
POLK	2
ORLANDO	18
SEMINOLE	8
BREVARD	0
PALM BEACH	0
ST LUCIE	0
S.W. FLORIDA	7
BROWARD	1
<u>DADE</u>	<u>5</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>133</b>

JAN-JUNE 1993

ESCAMBIA	0
BAY	1
LEON	1
ALACHUA	1
MARION	0
DUVAL	30
VOLUSIA	20
PINELLAS	0
PASCO	0
HILLSBOROUGH	9
MANATEE	0
POLK	0
ORLANDO	24
SEMINOLE	4
BREVARD	0
PALM BEACH	0
ST LUCIE	0
S.W. FLORIDA	0
BROWARD	0
<u>DADE</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>

During the first 6 months of 1993, non-delinquent juveniles in secure detention ranged in age from 12 to 17. Juveniles aged 15 made up the largest group with a statewide total of 26, followed by juveniles aged 14 who numbered 20.

CONFINEMENT OF NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY - JUNE 1993  
BY AGE




AGE	JUVENILES	PERCENT
ELEVEN	0	0%
TWELVE	2	2%
THIRTEEN	12	13%
FOURTEEN	20	22%
FIFTEEN	26	29%
SIXTEEN	17	19%
SEVENTEEN	13	15%
<u>EIGHTEEN</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total	90	100%

Seventy-nine percent (71) of all non-delinquent juveniles held between January and June, 1993 were female. Of that number, 77% (55) were white, 20% (14) were black, and 3% (2) were white Hispanic. No other racial categories were represented in the reported admissions.

Male juveniles made up 21% (19) of all non-delinquent admissions. Of that figure, 53% (10) were white, 32% (6) were black, and 16% (3) were white Hispanic. No other racial categories were represented in the reported admissions.


CONFINEMENT OF NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE CUSTODY  
JANUARY - JUNE 1993  
BY SEX



GENDER	JUVENILES	PERCENT
MALE	19	21%
<u>FEMALE</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>79%</u>
TOTAL	90	100%

White females made up 61% of all non-delinquents held in secure detention January - June, 1993 with a total of 55. Black females represented 16% with a total of 14, followed by white males at 11% with 10 admissions. Black males represented 7% with 6 admissions. White Hispanic males and white Hispanic females made up 3% (3 admissions) and 2% (2 admissions) respectively. No other racial categories were represented in the reported admissions.

NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
BY RACE AND SEX




RACE/GENDER	JUVENILE	PERCENT
WHITE FEMALE	55	61%
BLACK FEMALE	14	16%
WHITE HISPANIC FEMALE	2	2%
WHITE MALE	10	11%
BLACK MALE	6	7%
<u>WHITE HISPANIC MALE</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3%</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100%</b>



The most common reason cited for incarceration of non-delinquents was Contempt/Runaway with a total of 32 cases out of 90 (36%). The category of Pick-Up Orders was second highest with a total of 26 (29%). It is of note that 25 of the 32 Contempt/Runaway incarcerations occurred in District 4, and 18 of the 26 Pick-Up Order incarcerations occurred in District 7.

NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE CUSTODY  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
BY REASON FOR PLACEMENT



<u>REASON FOR DETENTION</u>	<u>JUVENILE</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
CONTEMPT/RUNAWAY	32	36%
PICK UP ORDER	26	29%
OTHER	24	27%
VIOLATING PROTECTIVE SERVICES ORDER	3	3%
FAILURE TO APPEAR	2	2%
CONTEMPT/ BEYOND CONTROL	2	2%
<u>CONTEMPT/TRUANCY</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>
TOTAL	90	100%

# REASON FOR PLACEMENT BY CENTER


<u>CENTER</u>	<u>FAILURE TO APPEAR</u>	<u>PICK-UP ORDER</u>	<u>TRUANCY/ CONTEMPT</u>	<u>BEYOND CONTROL/ CONTEMPT</u>	<u>RUNAWAY/ CONTEMPT</u>
DUVAL	0	0	0	0	25
ORLANDO	0	18	1	2	0
ESCAMBIA	0	0	0	0	0
VOLUSIA	1	6	0	0	6
SEMINOLE	0	0	0	0	1
PASCO	0	0	0	0	0
MARION	0	0	0	0	0
HILLSBOROUGH	1	1	0	0	0
ST. PETERSBURG	0	0	0	0	0
DADE	0	0	0	0	0
S.W. FLORIDA	0	0	0	0	0
BAY	0	1	0	0	0
LEON	0	0	0	0	0
BROWARD	0	0	0	0	0
ALACHUA	0	0	0	0	0
POLK	0	0	0	0	0
MANATEE	0	0	0	0	0
PINELLAS	0	0	0	0	0
PALM BEACH	0	0	0	0	0
ST. LUCIE	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2	26	1	2	32

# REASON FOR PLACEMENT BY CENTER

<u>CENTER</u>	<u>VIOULATE SHELTER ORDER</u>	<u>FAIL TO FOLLOW PROTECTIVE SERVICES</u>	<u>FAIL TO FOLLOW FOSTER CARE ORDER</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
DUVAL	0	0	0	5	30
ORLANDO	0	1	0	2	24
ESCAMBIA	0	0	0	0	0
VOLUSIA	0	2	0	5	20
SEMINOLE	0	0	0	3	4
PASCO	0	0	0	0	0
MARION	0	0	0	0	0
HILLSBOROUGH	0	0	0	7	9
ST. PETERSBURG	0	0	0	0	0
DADE	0	0	0	0	0
S.W. FLORIDA	0	0	0	0	0
BAY	0	0	0	0	1
LEON	0	0	0	1	1
BROWARD	0	0	0	0	0
ALACHUA	0	0	0	1	1
POLK	0	0	0	0	0
MANATEE	0	0	0	0	0
PINELLAS	0	0	0	0	0
PALM BEACH	0	0	0	0	0
ST. LUCIE	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	3	0	24	90

White females incarcerated in secure detention under the category of Contempt/Runaway made up the largest group of non-delinquents when comparing race, sex, and reason held.


**NON-DELINQUENTS INCARCERATED IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
BY RACE/SEX/REASON**



	WHITE HISPANIC FEMALE	WHITE HISPANIC MALE	BLACK MALE	WHITE MALE	BLACK FEMALE	WHITE FEMALE	TOTAL
CONTEMPT/RUNAWAY	2	0	2	1	3	24	32
PICK-UP ORDER	0	0	1	4	6	15	26
OTHER	0	3	3	2	4	12	24
FAILURE TO FOLLOW PROTECTIVE SERVICE	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
FAILURE TO APPEAR	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
CONTEMPT/BEYOND CONTROL	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
CONTEMPT/TRUANCY	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	2	3	6	10	14	55	90

During the first 6 months of 1993, non-delinquents spent a total of 1,351 days in secure detention. Duval Regional Juvenile Detention Center showed the highest number of non-delinquent detention resident days with a total of 580, followed by Orlando with a total of 402 days.

TOTAL DAYS SPENT IN SECURE DETENTION BY NON-DELINQUENTS  
JANUARY - JUNE 1993  
BY CENTER




<u>CENTER</u>	<u>STAY</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
DUVAL	580	43.00%
ORLANDO	402	30.00%
VOLUSIA	199	15.00%
HILLSBOROUGH	109	8.00%
SEMINOLE	46	3.00%
LEON	6	0.40%
ALACHUA	6	0.40%
BAY	3	0.20%
S.W. FLORIDA	0	0.00%
POLK	0	0.00%
PINELLAS	0	0.00%
PASCO	0	0.00%
PALM BEACH	0	0.00%
ST. LUCIE	0	0.00%
MARION	0	0.00%
MANATEE	0	0.00%
ESCAMBIA	0	0.00%
DADE	0	0.00%
BROWARD	0	0.00%
BREVARD	0	0.00%
TOTAL	1351	100.00%



For the first 6 months of 1993, the overall average incarceration of a non-delinquent juvenile held in secure custody was 15.0 days, with an overall average standard deviation of 18.2 days. The range of days incarcerated per juvenile was from one day to 138 days.


AVERAGE STAY OF NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE, 1993  
BY CENTER



<u>CENTER</u>	<u>AVERAGE STAY</u>	<u>STANDARD DEVIATION</u>
BAY	3	0
LEON	6	0
ALACHUA	6	0
DUVAL	19	27
VOLUSIA	10	7
HILLSBOROUGH	12	4
ORLANDO	17	14
<u>SEMINOLE</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>
ENTIRE POPULATION	15	18

Black females represented the longest average stay with 17 days and a standard deviation of 15 days, followed by white females with an average stay of 16 days and a standard deviation of 22 days.


AVERAGE STAY OF NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
BY RACE AND SEX



	<u>AVERAGE STAY</u>	<u>STANDARD DEVIATION</u>
BLACK FEMALES	17	15
WHITE FEMALES	16	22
WHITE HISPANIC MALES	12	4
WHITE MALES	12	7
BLACK MALES	10	9
WHITE HISPANIC FEMALES	5	6

Non-delinquent juveniles incarcerated for Contempt/Beyond Control were held an average of 31 days, with a standard deviation of 27, followed by Other Contempt with an average stay of 21 days and a standard deviation of 27 days.


AVERAGE STAY OF NON-DELINQUENTS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
BY REASON FOR CONFINEMENT



	<u>AVERAGE STAY</u>	<u>STANDARD DEVIATION</u>
CONTEMPT/BEYOND CONTROL	31	27
OTHER	21	27
CONTEMPT/TRUANCY	18	0
FAILURE TO FOLLOW PROTECTIVE SERVICE	17	6
PICK-UP ORDER	13	13
CONTEMPT/RUNAWAY	12	13
FAILURE TO APPEAR	8	8

The total estimated cost for the confinement of non-delinquents in secure detention for the first 6 months of 1993 was \$106,288. This figure was based upon the calculated cost per child per day in secure detention (fiscal year 91-92 figures) for each facility. These figures ranged from \$70.24 per day in Polk County to \$155.50 per day in Broward County.

ESTIMATED COST OF NON-DELINQUENT INCARCERATION  
JANUARY - JUNE 1993  
BY CENTER




<u>CENTER</u>	<u>DAILY COST PER CHILD</u>	<u>TOTAL DAYS PER CENTER</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>
DUVAL	\$76.73	580	\$44,503
ORLANDO	\$83.95	402	\$33,748
VOLUSIA	\$76.73	199	\$15,269
HILLSBOROUGH	\$70.24	109	\$7,656
SEMINOLE	\$76.73	46	\$3,530
LEON	\$119.19	6	\$715
ALACHUA	\$84.82	6	\$509
BAY	\$119.19	3	\$358
ESCAMBIA	\$80.24	0	\$0
BROWARD	\$155.50	0	\$0
MARION	\$84.82	0	\$0
PASCO	\$82.45	0	\$0
BREVARD	\$76.73	0	\$0
POLK	\$70.24	0	\$0
DADE	\$116.95	0	\$0
MANATEE	\$70.24	0	\$0
S.W. FLORIDA	\$73.32	0	\$0
PINELLAS	\$82.45	0	\$0
PALM BEACH	\$131.58	0	\$0
<u>ST. LUCIE</u>	<u>\$131.58</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
STATEWIDE		1351	\$106,288



During the first 6 months of 1993, there were 90 individual admissions of non-delinquents to secure custody. Of the 90 admissions, 23 admissions included youth who were detained two or more times in the 6 month period. The highest duplication rate was seen in Duval where 12 of 30 admissions were re-admissions.

NON-DELINQUENT INCARCERATIONS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
DUPLICATED AND UNDUPLICATED BY JUVENILES



ORIGINAL  
ADMISSIONS

ORLANDO	20
DUVAL	18
VOLUSIA	17
HILLSBOROUGH	6
SEMINOLE	3
BAY	1
LEON	1
<u>ALACHUA</u>	<u>1</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>67</b>

RE-ADMISSIONS


ORLANDO	4
DUVAL	12
VOLUSIA	3
HILLSBOROUGH	3
SEMINOLE	1
BAY	0
LEON	0
<u>ALACHUA</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>

TOTAL  
ADMISSIONS

ORLANDO	24
DUVAL	30
VOLUSIA	20
HILLSBOROUGH	9
SEMINOLE	4
BAY	1
LEON	1
<u>ALACHUA</u>	<u>1</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>

The most common reason for incarceration among re-admissions was Contempt/Runaway with 14 of 32 admissions having been previously placed in detention as non-delinquents between January and June, 1993. (The original reason for placement of the re-admitted juveniles was not necessarily Contempt/Runaway.)


NON-DELINQUENT INCARCERATIONS IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
DUPLICATED AND UN-DUPLICATED BY JUVENILES  
BY REASON FOR INCARCERATION



	ORIGINAL ADMISSIONS	RE-ADMISSIONS	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
CONTEMPT/RUNAWAY	18	14	32
PICK-UP ORDER	22	4	26
OTHER	20	4	24
FAILURE TO FOLLOW PROTECTIVE SERVICE	3	0	3
FAILURE TO APPEAR	2	0	2
CONTEMPT/BEYOND CONTROL	1	1	2
CONTEMPT/TRUANCY	1	0	1
TOTAL	67	22	89

White females ranked highest of those non-delinquent juveniles held in secure custody who were re-admitted, with a rate of 18 out of 55 being re-admissions.

NON-DELINQUENTS INCARCERATED IN SECURE DETENTION  
JANUARY-JUNE 1993  
BY DUPLICATED/UNDUPLICATED ADMISSIONS BY RACE & SEX



ORIGINAL  
ADMISSIONS

WHITE MALE	9
WHITE FEMALE	37
BLACK MALE	5
BLACK FEMALE	12
WHITE HISPANIC MALE	2
WHITE HISPANIC FEMALE	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>67</b>

RE-ADMISSIONS

WHITE MALE	1
WHITE FEMALE	18
BLACK MALE	1
BLACK FEMALE	2
WHITE HISPANIC MALE	1
WHITE HISPANIC FEMALE	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>

TOTAL  
ADMISSIONS

WHITE MALE	10
WHITE FEMALE	55
BLACK MALE	6
BLACK FEMALE	14
WHITE HISPANIC MALE	3
WHITE HISPANIC FEMALE	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>

There has been much concern about juvenile delinquents "running loose in the streets" despite the large amounts of money spent on programs and personnel in the juvenile justice system. Generally, most of the focus has been directed at the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, which is charged by statute with the care and treatment of children that have been found delinquent by the courts.

The attached charts are an effort to put the issue in perspective. While HRS personnel are indeed responsible for the handling of the majority of the sanctions ordered by the courts as regards juveniles, Department personnel are only partly responsible for the handling of the cases prior to the actual adjudication and disposition. Subsequent to the arrest of a juvenile, responsibility for the processing of the child's case through the justice system actually rests with three separate agencies; law enforcement, HRS, and the local state attorney. In the ordinary progression of events, subsequent to a child's arrest, law enforcement officials must refer the case to HRS staff, a process which can take from one to several days. After the case is referred to the department, it is assigned to a delinquency case manager, who investigates the circumstances of the offense, interviews the victims, the youth and his family, and then makes a recommendation to the state attorney about the best way to pursue the case (judicial or non-judicial handling, transfer to the adult court system, etc.). From the time of the case manager's recommendation until the case is disposed in court, the responsibility for getting the case processed and scheduled by the court generally lies with the state attorney. Once a recommendation has been made to the state's attorney about how to handle the case, the case manager has little power or opportunity to expedite the disposition of the case. Given the constitutional presumption of innocence, any treatment efforts must await disposition of the case.

The attached charts display the time periods of responsibility outlined above, using data from the HRS Client Information System for those cases disposed during the 1992/93 fiscal year. As is obvious from the first chart, which displays the information for all the cases referred to HRS for delinquency statewide, case progression through the justice system slows dramatically after the Department makes its recommendation to the state's attorney. The attached charts display the data by county, grouped in two sections; HRS service districts and by Judicial Circuit, with the following findings (specific county numbers are attached in appendices):

- The minimum average length of time for any state attorney to get cases disposed after receiving HRS' recommendation was 29 days in Okeechobee County, compared to the statewide average of 52 days and the maximum of 95 days in Gilchrist County.
- The statewide average of 7 days it takes for law enforcement to make a referral to the Department ranges from a minimum of same-day referral in Washington County to a maximum average of 18 days in Monroe County.
- The amount of time a case spends on average with an HRS case manager before a recommendation is made to the local state attorney is 9 days, ranging from an average of 1 day in Palm Beach County to a maximum average of 35 days in Glades County.

*Thought must be given by policy-makers about where the responsibility for delays in case processing lies; where HRS delinquency case managers are dragging their feet in the process of making their preferences about case handling known to state's attorneys, they should be hurried along. In those few areas where law enforcement officials make referrals to the Department too slowly, they can surely be encouraged. But where the cases of alleged juvenile delinquents are languishing in state attorney's offices or on court dockets, officials of those agencies and the citizens of their jurisdictions must be made aware, so that those authorities can take responsibility for correcting the problem.*


# HRS SERVICE DISTRICTS

CASES DISPOSED, FY 1992-93



# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## STATEWIDE




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 1




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 2




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 3




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 4




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 5




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 6



ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL


HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOM.

ATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 7



■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL


□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMM. DATE

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION



# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 8



■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL


] HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

■ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 9

PALM BEACH




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 10




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 11




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 12




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 13




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 14




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## DISTRICT 15



ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION




# JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

CASES DISPOSED, FY 1992-93

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## STATEWIDE




☒ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

☐ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

☐ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOS ON

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

■ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT



ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL


HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION



# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

■ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

■ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## TWELFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT



ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL


HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

HILLSBOROUGH




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT



■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION


■ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION



# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

PALM BEACH




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

■ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT




■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

■ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# AVERAGE TIME INTERVALS IN DELINQUENCY CASE PROCESSING

## TWENTIETH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT



■ ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL

□ HRS REF. TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION

□ STATE ATTY. RECOM. TO DISPOSITION

# APPENDIX 1: DAYS FROM ARREST TO DISPOSITION, HRS DISTRICTS

<u>HRS DISTRICTS</u>	<u>(COUNTY)</u>	<u>ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL</u>	<u>HRS REFERRAL TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION</u>	<u>STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION TO DISPOSITION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
DISTRICT 1	ESCAMBIA	2	11	59	72
	OKALOOSA	4	6	53	63
	SANTA ROSA	3	8	47	58
	WALTON	10	12	48	71
DISTRICT 2	BAY	0	13	41	54
	CALHOUN	2	18	40	60
	FRANKLIN	3	15	40	59
	GADSDEN	7	15	53	76
	GULF	0	13	34	47
	HOLMES	6	27	48	78
	JACKSON	0	15	45	61
	JEFFERSON	5	10	76	91
	LEON	1	17	88	106
	LIBERTY	1	14	62	77
	MADISON	7	13	83	104
	TAYLOR	16	11	48	73
	WAKULLA	5	10	44	58
	WASHINGTON	0	17	77	94
DISTRICT 3	ALACHUA	9	5	68	83
	BRADFORD	14	13	63	89
	COLUMBIA	13	5	46	64
	DIXIE	2	6	69	77
	GILCHRIST	3	8	95	106
	HAMILTON	13	9	68	90
	LAFAYETTE	4	3	82	88
	LEVY	4	7	69	80
	PUTNAM	8	4	48	60
	SUWANNEE	14	11	54	80
	UNION	6	9	32	48
DISTRICT 4	BAKER	8	8	65	82
	CLAY	5	10	36	51
	DUVAL	3	7	39	49
	NASSAU	5	7	53	65
	ST. JOHNS	8	5	55	68
DISTRICT 5	PASCO	15	12	43	70
	PINELLAS	8	12	46	67
DISTRICT 6	HILLSBOROUGH	6	9	61	77
	MANATEE	8	7	61	76
DISTRICT 7	BREVARD	12	10	67	89
	ORANGE	6	16	76	98
	OSCEOLA	6	14	69	89
	SEMINOLE	8	16	79	102
DISTRICT 8	CHARLOTTE	4	12	39	56
	COLLIER	7	5	33	45
	DESOTO	12	10	35	57
	GLADES	6	35	64	104
	HENDRY	7	9	86	102
	LEE	1	10	45	56
	SARASOTA	8	10	52	70
DISTRICT 9	PALM BEACH	11	1	45	57
DISTRICT 10	BROWARD	13	7	44	64
DISTRICT 11	DADE	10	7	47	64
	MONROE	18	9	48	75
DISTRICT 12	FLAGLER	2	8	48	59
	VOLUSIA	1	4	78	83
DISTRICT 13	CITRUS	4	10	45	59
	HERNANDO	9	6	44	59
	LAKE	4	9	50	63
	MARION	8	13	47	69
	SUMTER	5	13	69	87
DISTRICT 14	HARDEE	6	11	32	49
	HIGHLANDS	5	11	37	53
	POLK	4	13	45	61
DISTRICT 15	INDIAN RIVER	4	11	39	55
	MARTIN	9	9	31	49
	OKEECHOBEE	7	6	29	42
	ST. LUCIE	3	13	48	65
	UNKNOWN	2	3	6	11
	OUT OF STATE	4	9	46	59
STATEWIDE		7	9	52	69

# APPENDIX 2: DAYS FROM ARREST TO DISPOSITION, JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

<u>JUDICIAL CIRCUITS</u>	<u>(COUNTY)</u>	<u>ARREST TO HRS REFERRAL</u>	<u>HRS REFERRAL TO STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION</u>	<u>STATE ATTY. RECOMMENDATION TO DISPOSITION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
FIRST CIRCUIT	ESCAMBIA	2	11	59	72
	OKALOOSA	4	6	53	83
	SANTA ROSA	3	8	47	59
	WALTON	10	12	49	71
SECOND CIRCUIT	FRANKLIN	3	15	40	59
	GADSDEN	7	15	53	76
	JEFFERSON	5	10	76	91
	LEON	1	17	88	106
	WAKULLA	5	10	44	58
	LIBERTY	1	14	62	77
THIRD CIRCUIT	DIXIE	2	6	69	77
	COLUMBIA	13	5	46	84
	HAMILTON	13	9	68	90
	LAFAYETTE	4	3	62	69
	MADISON	7	13	83	104
	SUWANNEE	14	11	54	80
	TAYLOR	16	11	46	73
FOURTH CIRCUIT	CLAY	5	10	36	51
	DUVAL	3	7	39	49
	NASSAU	5	7	53	65
FIFTH CIRCUIT	CITRUS	4	10	45	59
	HERNANDO	9	6	44	59
	LAKE	4	9	50	63
	MARION	8	13	47	69
	SUMTER	5	13	69	87
SIXTH CIRCUIT	PASCO	15	12	43	70
	FINELLAS	8	12	46	67
SEVENTH CIRCUIT	FLAGLER	2	8	48	59
	PUTNAM	8	4	48	60
	ST. JOHNS	8	5	55	68
	VOLUSIA	1	4	78	83
EIGHTH CIRCUIT	ALACHUA	9	5	68	83
	BAKER	8	8	65	82
	BRADFORD	14	13	63	89
	GILCHRIST	3	8	95	106
	LEVY	4	7	69	80
	UNION	6	9	32	48
NINTH CIRCUIT	ORANGE	6	16	76	98
	OSCEOLA	6	14	69	89
TENTH CIRCUIT	HARDEE	6	11	32	49
	HIGHLANDS	5	11	37	53
	POLK	4	13	45	61
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	DADE	10	7	47	64
TWELFTH CIRCUIT	DESOTO	12	10	35	57
	MANATEE	8	7	81	76
	SARASOTA	8	10	52	70
THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT	HILLSBOROUGH	6	9	61	77
FOURTEENTH CIRCUIT	BAY	0	13	41	54
	CALHOUN	2	18	40	60
	GULF	0	13	34	47
	HOLMES	6	27	46	78
	JACKSON	0	15	45	61
	WASHINGTON	0	17	77	94
FIFTEENTH CIRCUIT	PALM BEACH	11	1	45	57
SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT	MONROE	18	9	48	75
SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT	BROWARD	13	7	44	64
EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT	BREVARD	12	10	67	89
	SEMINOLE	8	16	79	102
NINETEENTH CIRCUIT	INDIAN RIVER	4	11	39	55
	MARTIN	9	9	31	49
	OKEECHOBEE	7	6	29	42
	ST. LUCIE	4	6	53	63
TWENTIETH CIRCUIT	CHARLOTTE	4	12	39	56
	COLLIER	7	5	33	45
	GLADES	6	35	64	104
	HENDRY	7	9	86	102
	LEE	1	10	45	56
	UNKNOWN	2	3	6	11
	OUT OF STATE	4	9	46	59
STATEWIDE		7	9	52	69