

ITEM 21 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 19  
Budget line No. 7

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL**

*For Support of the Judicial Council From the General Fund*

Amount requested .....	\$87,605
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	85,030
<hr/>	
Increase (3.0 percent) .....	\$2,575

**Summary of Increase**

	Total increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Salaries and wages .....	\$32	\$32	---	19	50
Operating expense .....	1,502	1,502	---	19	65
Equipment .....	1,041	1,041	---	19	72
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
Total increase .....	\$2,575	\$2,575	---		

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$87,605
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	87,605
<hr/>	
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

The Judicial Council is composed of 11 members of various state courts appointed by the Chief Justice to serve a term of two years each. The principal function of the council is the study of court procedures and equalization of the work of judges by making assignments of judges to courts with heavy dockets. The Chief Justice is chairman of this council.

The amount requested is a slight increase over the current budget request and is due to normal salary and price increases.

Approval of the amount requested is recommended.

**Judicial Council**

**EXTRA COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES OF ASSIGNED JUDGES**

ITEM 22 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 20  
Budget line No. 13

*For Additional Support of the Judicial Council From the General Fund*

Amount requested .....	\$30,000
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	29,000
<hr/>	
Increase (3.4 percent) .....	\$1,000

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$30,000
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	30,000
<hr/>	
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

Salary increases for judges and justices passed by the 1951 Session of the Legislature affect the cost to the State for the assignment of judges to various courts. Salary increases were granted to superior court judges, and the State's share of such salary increased \$1,750 per judge per annum. Appellate court justices and Supreme Court justices received a

salary increase of \$3,000 per annum. The charges to this appropriation depend on the court from which the judge is assigned and the differential in salary.

There is considerable congestion in many of the courts and the assignment of judges to these courts with backlogs appears to be essential. However, it should be pointed out that 19 superior court judges were added in 1949 and four more in 1951. A total of 76 municipal court judges were added in 1951. It appears that with these additional judges the backlog and congestion should be of a temporary nature.

Approval of this amount is recommended.

**DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT**

ITEM 23 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 21  
Budget line No. 7

*For Support of the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District,  
From the General Fund*

Amount requested .....	\$205,562
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	198,908
	<hr/>
Increase (3.3 percent) .....	\$6,654

**Summary of Increase**

	Total increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Salaries and wages .....	\$5,959	\$5,959	---	21	36
Operating expense .....	350	350	---	21	49
Equipment .....	345	345	---	21	56
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>		
Total increase .....	\$6,654	\$6,654	---		

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$205,562
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	205,562
	<hr/>
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

This court has jurisdiction over appeals from superior courts in Los Angeles, Ventura, San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties. Salary increases were granted to the justices and one clerk by the 1951 Session of the Legislature and became effective on September 22, 1951. Also other salary increases were granted by the Legislature to other employees.

The amount of \$1,655 was allocated from the Emergency Fund for the current fiscal year. Of this amount \$1,140 was for the purpose of reclassifying a legal research aid to a legal research associate. The balance was to cover price increases.

We recommend approval of the amount requested.