DepartmentofPlanningandBudget 2002FiscalImpactStatement

1.	BillNumber HouseofOrigin SecondHouse	in [924 Introduce InCom 1	_	Substitute Substitute		Engrossed Enrolled	
2.	Patron	Joann	ıou					
3.Committee SCourtsofJustice								
4.	Title	Exclusiveoriginaljurisdictionalofgeneraldistrictcourts.						
5. Summary/Purpose: Raisestheori ginaljurisdictionalamountofcasesinthegeneraldistrictcourtfrom\$3,000to \$4,500.Additionally,thebillallowsforacourttofindanappellantindigentandtherefore waivethebondonappealtothecircuitcourt.								
6. FiscalImpactEstimatesare :Tentative,seeItem8below.								
7. Budgetamendmentnecessary:No								
8. Fiscalimplications:Inraisingthelimitfortheexclusiveoriginalciviljurisdictionofgeneral courtfrom\$3,000to\$4,500,thelegislationalsoraisesthethresholdfortheremova lofcases fromgeneraldistrictcourttocircuitcourtbythesameincrease.Whilethislegislationcould resultintheshiftinthenumberofcasesfromthecircuitcourtstothegeneraldistrictcourts,the numberofadditionalcaseswillbearelativ elysmallnumber.AccordingtotheOfficeofthe ExecutiveSecretaryoftheSupremeCourt,pastadjustmentsofthesejurisdictionalamountsonly resultedinaminorimpactonthecaseloadofthegeneraldistrictcourtorthecircuitcourt.								
Therewillbe fewercasesremovedfromgeneraldistrictcourttocircuitcourtandmorecases adjudicatedingeneraldistrictcourt. The Supreme Court's staffing model, which predicts how many judges and clerical staffareneeded in district courts already takes into a count those cases fileding eneral district court and removed to circuit court.								
HB924alsopermitsthejudgetowaivetherequirementforanappealbondwhenanindigent appellantappealsfromgeneraldistrictcourttocircuitcourt.								
Neitherportion of this legislation should have an appreciable impact on the judiciary.								
9. Specificagencyorpoliticalsubdivisionsaffected:Thecourtsystem								
10. Technicalamendmentnecessary:No								

Date: 02/08/02/TMB

11. Othercomments:None

Document:F: \tmb\leg02\hb924E.doc