



THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO



2015 OHIO COURTS  
**STATISTICAL SUMMARY**

# THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO

2015

OHIO COURTS STATISTICAL SUMMARY



**MAUREEN O'CONNOR**

CHIEF JUSTICE

**PAUL E. PFEIFER**

**TERRENCE O'DONNELL**

**JUDITH ANN LANZINGER**

**SHARON L. KENNEDY**

**JUDITH L. FRENCH**

**WILLIAM M. O'NEILL**

JUSTICES

**MICHAEL L. BUENGER**

ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

**COURT SERVICES DIVISION**

**STEPHANIE E. HESS**

DIRECTOR

**CASE MANAGEMENT SECTION**

**TASHA R. RUTH**

MANAGER OF CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

**CONTENT DEVELOPMENT**

**CHRISTINE BRATTON**

**BRIAN FARRINGTON**

**NIKOLE HOTCHKISS**

**PRODUCTION AND GRAPHICS**

**PHILLIP FARMER**

**KATIE MONAHAN**

**JAMES R. SHROYER**

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT**

**MARK DUTTON**

**RANDY GARRABRANT**

**DONALD TURKLY**



**A MESSAGE**  
From the Chief Justice

The Supreme Court of Ohio issues an annual statistical summary and detailed report designed to inform and identify trends throughout the Ohio judiciary.

For the eighth consecutive year, the total number of incoming cases in Ohio courts declined. The 3,025,094 incoming cases in 2015 represent a 4.5-percent decline from 2014. A major contributor to the overall decrease last year was a substantial reduction in the number of incoming foreclosure cases in which Ohio's courts of common pleas saw 19 percent fewer incoming cases over 2014.

By analyzing case filing patterns and trends, the Ohio Supreme Court attempts to assist in the efficient administration of justice at all levels of the judiciary. We do not, however, examine or analyze larger social and governmental trends that may contribute to or influence changes in case filing volumes.

What the data can tell those of us who work in the court system is how to better allocate our resources given the current case volume. In addition, providing reliable, transparent, and accessible data on the courts assists in enhancing public trust and confidence in the judicial branch.

The Supreme Court of Ohio commends Ohio's courts for their continued assistance in submitting data on caseloads and case terminations.

MAUREEN O'CONNOR  
Chief Justice, The Supreme Court of Ohio



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

An Overview of the Statistical Reporting Process .....	1
Ohio Judicial System Structure Diagram .....	5
All Courts New Filings .....	7
The Supreme Court of Ohio .....	9
Court of Appeals .....	15
Court of Claims .....	19
Courts of Common Pleas .....	23
General Division .....	25
Domestic Relations Division .....	31
Probate Division .....	35
Juvenile Division .....	39
Municipal and County Courts .....	43
Mayor’s Courts .....	49
Glossary of Terms .....	51
Appendix .....	55

**NOTE:** An overview of LanguageLine is displayed on pages 26-27 of this publication.





## AN OVERVIEW of the Statistical Reporting Process

The obligation for Ohio trial and appellate courts to report caseload statistics to the Supreme Court of Ohio Case Management Section is established by Rule 37 of the Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio.

The requirement to submit regular caseload reports is fixed upon each individual judge for the cases assigned to him or her. An exception to this requirement exists in multi-judge municipal and county courts where certain activities are permitted to occur in particular sessions of court in which cases are not assigned to individual judges, but instead are grouped by subject category and presided over by a rotation among the several judges of the court.

The reporting obligations established under Sup.R. 37 are as follows:

### **Court of Appeals**

The presiding judge of each court of appeals district must submit quarterly a presiding judge report that describes the status of all cases pending in that district. In addition, each individual judge must submit quarterly an appellate judge report that provides further details on case terminations, as well as the cases assigned to the judge for authoring the district's opinions.

### **Courts of Common Pleas**

Judges with responsibility over general, domestic relations, and juvenile subject-matter jurisdiction must submit monthly a report describing the number of new cases assigned to them, the number of cases pending at the beginning and end of the month, and the number of cases terminated for reporting purposes over the course of the month. If a judge is responsible for more than one category of subject-matter jurisdiction in his or her court, the judge must submit a report for each such category. For example, a judge with responsibility over domestic relations and juvenile cases must submit two reports: one for domestic relations cases and one for juvenile cases.

Judges with responsibility over probate matters must submit quarterly a report describing the number of cases filed and closed over the quarter, as well as additional statistics.

### **Municipal and County Courts**

As noted above, an exception to the ordinary requirement for judges to submit regular reports of the cases assigned to them exists for multi-judge municipal and county courts. Notwithstanding that exception, all municipal and county court judges must submit monthly an individual judge report describing the number of new cases assigned to them, the number of cases pending at the beginning and end of the month, and the number of cases terminated for reporting purposes over the course of the month.

In addition to the individual judge report, each municipal and county court administrative judge must submit monthly a report including the work performed on felony and small claims cases (which are not individually assigned) and the work performed during particular sessions of court on all other case types.



---

## General Notes Concerning Caseload Statistics

The caseload statistics reported to the Supreme Court are summary in nature and consist only of counts of cases. The Supreme Court does not collect lists of individual cases that constitute the counts reported.

The actual report forms and instructions are available on the Supreme Court website. The instructions include detailed information concerning the proper manner of classifying cases by type, how a “case” is defined and how to properly report incoming cases and terminations.

Regarding terminations, it is essential to understand that not all termination categories are dispositive in nature. Some termination categories simply render a case inactive for reporting purposes until such time as a condition in the case changes. An example is a criminal defendant who fails to appear for trial. The court, as long as it reasonably believes the defendant will not be apprehended in the immediate future, may terminate the case for reporting purposes. The court reactivates the case for reporting purposes when that defendant is arrested. This aspect of counting terminations is important to bear in mind when evaluating a court’s case management performance against a time standard for disposing of cases.

Occasionally, a court will discover errors in its case counts following a physical case inventory or during an update to its case management system. Courts may submit amended reports at any time, and the changed data is entered into the Supreme Court’s caseload statistics system immediately. Accordingly, the caseload statistics reported in a particular static report, such as this document, may change in the future following such amendments.

In order to promote accurate and uniform statewide reporting, the staff of the Supreme Court Case Management Section conducts regular training for court staff responsible for preparing monthly and quarterly reports.

## Describing Data Using Median and Mean

In this document, sets of data are sometimes described using means and medians. Mean and median are measures of central tendency, or what value is “typical” across a set of data. The mean is calculated by dividing the sum of the values in a set of data by the number of values in that set. The resulting value is commonly referred to as the “average.” The median is determined by sorting the values in a set of data from lowest to highest value and identifying the data point in the middle of the range. It is the midpoint of the data at which half the items are higher and half are lower (the 50th percentile). The median is a particularly useful measure of typicality because unlike the mean, medians are not subject to the skewing effect of outliers (data points at an extreme margin on the range of values).

## Population Data and Caseload Measures

Except where noted in the body of this summary, all data shown are statewide figures. Population data are from the 2010 U.S. Census.

Unless noted otherwise, in this edition of the Ohio Courts Statistical Summary, the caseloads of the courts are presented in terms of their total

---

incoming caseloads for the various years shown. Total incoming caseloads consist of new filings as well as reactivated cases (which had been previously placed on inactive reporting status) and reopened cases (which had been previously closed). Prior editions used nearly exclusively the new filings metric. By presenting the data in terms of total incoming caseloads, a more complete picture of the workload imposed on Ohio’s courts can be depicted and analyzed.

## General Notes Concerning Performance Measures

When analyzing the work of Ohio courts and judges, the Case Management Section regularly evaluates two key performance measures readily available using caseload statistics reported by the courts: clearance rates and overage rates. Both measures can be applied to a court’s overall docket, individual case types, or groups of case types. The clearance rates and overage rates presented in this report represent the courts’ monthly averages across the years shown. For example, if the municipal and county courts are reported as demonstrating in 2015 a 3-percent overage rate for a particular case type, that figure represents the average overage rate across each of the 12 months in the year.

### Clearance Rate

This measure identifies how well a court keeps up with its incoming caseload. It is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Clearance Rate} = \frac{\text{Total number of outgoing cases}}{\text{Total number of incoming cases}}$$

Clearance rates can be calculated over any time period, as long as the incoming and outgoing values apply to that same time period. Using the monthly caseload statistical reports submitted by judges, the total number of outgoing cases is determined using the reported “Total Terminations” values. The ratio of outgoing cases to incoming cases (produced using the above formula) is ordinarily multiplied by 100 and expressed as percentage. The target is a clearance rate of 100 percent.

A clearance rate of 100 percent means a court terminated over a given time period exactly as many cases as it took in during that same time period. If a court’s clearance rate is regularly less than 100 percent over an extended period of time, the court will develop a backlog because the pace of incoming cases exceeds the pace of outgoing cases.

While valuable, clearance rates alone do not accurately depict a court’s success in moving its entire docket forward in a timely fashion. A court may regularly demonstrate a 100 percent or greater clearance rate while simultaneously keeping a sizable number of cases from being disposed of within applicable time standards. Accordingly, clearance rates should be viewed alongside a measure that gauges the extent to which a court’s caseload is pending beyond time standards, such as the overage rate.

---

## Overage Rate

This measure identifies the extent to which a court's pending caseload lags past applicable time standards, or, is overage. The overage rate is a measure of the size of a court's backlog. It is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Overage Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of cases pending beyond time guidelines}}{\text{Total number of cases pending}}$$

Using the monthly caseload statistical reports submitted by judges, the total number of active cases pending for longer than the time guideline (the reported "Cases Pending Beyond Time Guideline" value) is divided by the total number of active cases pending (the reported "Pending End of Period" value). The result is multiplied by 100 and expressed as a percentage.

While the application of clearance rates and overage rates affords a reasonable view of a court's case management performance, the numbers provide an incomplete assessment. The National Center for State Courts developed a set of ten core court performance measures, packaged into a set of practical tools named CourTools, which provide a balanced perspective on a court's overall performance. Developed with input from a wide range of court professionals, they are designed to assist courts in laying a solid foundation for self-evaluation and in charting a course for future improvement. The Case Management Section provides CourTools training for court personnel.

## Future Plans


The current configuration of case types and termination categories has remained largely unchanged for 20 years. Changes in the law, changes in society, and changes in the Supreme Court's capacity to collect, analyze, evaluate and report caseload statistics present an opportunity for a careful re-evaluation of the overall caseload statistics reporting process.

In 2011 the Supreme Court established the Advisory Committee on Case Management. The advisory committee is conducting an extensive review of the Supreme Court's entire caseload statistical reporting process, from the data elements collected to the manner in which that data is transformed and communicated back to the courts.

In 2013, the Supreme Court adopted changes to Sup.R. 37 that established a requirement that appellate courts and trial courts submit their statistics to the Supreme Court in electronic format, as and when the technical foundation for each court and division reporting category is developed and made available to the courts. The Case Management Section of the Supreme Court, responsible for collecting statistics from Ohio's judiciary, began implementing this new data collection process, called eStats, in July 2014. Incorporated into eStats are downloadable reports to help courts better understand their performance.

As the Supreme Court continues to move forward in these areas, it will tap into the depth of knowledge and experience shared by the Ohio judiciary, court professionals, and justice system partners to fully explore the best means for advancing Ohio's use of caseload statistics.

# 2015 STRUCTURE OF THE OHIO JUDICIAL SYSTEM







**ALL COURTS**  
New Filings

Shown below in **Table 1** is the total number of new cases filed over each of the past 10 years in Ohio courts. Detailed information concerning the variety of cases constituting these figures is contained in the various court sections of this summary.

In 2015, a total of 3,025,094 incoming cases were reported across Ohio's courts, the fewest in the past 10 years, and 4.5 percent fewer than 2014. Declines were seen within all types of trial courts except the probate divisions of the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Claims. Among the remaining types of trial courts, the general divisions of the courts of common pleas experienced the largest decrease in incoming cases, 4.8 percent less than 2014. The court of claims experienced the largest percentage increase among all courts in Ohio, at 6.6 percent, followed by an increase of 3.2 percent in the probate division of the courts of common pleas

Shown in **Figure 1**, below, are the percentages of the total statewide volume of incoming cases in 2015 broken down by court type, sorted from highest to lowest. The municipal and county courts, hearing most of the state's traffic cases, constitute more than 78 percent of the state's entire court caseload.

TABLE 1

**All Courts, All Case Types**


Total incoming cases

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Supreme Court</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>2,459</b>	<b>2,506</b>	<b>2,363</b>	<b>2,293</b>	<b>2,207</b>	<b>2,187</b>	<b>2,055</b>	<b>2,255</b>	<b>2,107</b>
<b>Courts of Appeals</b>	<b>11,208</b>	<b>10,512</b>	<b>11,115</b>	<b>10,433</b>	<b>10,277</b>	<b>9,508</b>	<b>9,426</b>	<b>9,076</b>	<b>9,196</b>	<b>9,060</b>
<b>Court of Claims</b>	<b>871</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>1,215</b>	<b>1,001</b>	<b>1,327</b>	<b>1,337</b>	<b>865</b>	<b>793</b>	<b>1,007</b>	<b>1,073</b>
<b>Common Pleas</b>	<b>897,224</b>	<b>893,797</b>	<b>862,173</b>	<b>834,299</b>	<b>800,971</b>	<b>763,515</b>	<b>748,919</b>	<b>700,878</b>	<b>669,063</b>	<b>648,717</b>
General	283,683	294,472	297,614	293,096	280,208	257,639	250,237	220,821	208,684	198,760
Domestic Relations	135,674	134,482	137,082	138,889	133,946	130,603	125,773	122,042	117,460	113,413
Probate	91,621	88,021	88,621	88,178	85,152	85,866	88,798	89,125	84,523	87,254
Juvenile	386,246	376,822	338,856	314,136	301,665	289,407	284,111	268,890	258,396	249,290
<b>Municipal and County</b>	<b>2,934,097</b>	<b>2,945,567</b>	<b>2,957,586</b>	<b>2,750,680</b>	<b>2,603,791</b>	<b>2,539,375</b>	<b>2,533,302</b>	<b>2,540,366</b>	<b>2,486,446</b>	<b>2,364,137</b>
Municipal	2,721,998	2,728,505	2,744,959	2,554,422	2,422,099	2,374,445	2,356,711	2,364,898	2,305,255	2,189,978
County	212,099	217,062	212,627	196,258	181,692	164,930	176,591	175,468	181,191	174,159
<b>All Courts Combined</b>	<b>3,845,807</b>	<b>3,853,314</b>	<b>3,834,595</b>	<b>3,598,776</b>	<b>3,418,659</b>	<b>3,315,942</b>	<b>3,294,699</b>	<b>3,253,168</b>	<b>3,167,967</b>	<b>3,025,094</b>

FIGURE 1

**All Courts, All Case Types**

Total incoming cases in 2015, percentage of grand total







## THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

The Supreme Court of Ohio is established by Article IV, Section 1, of the Ohio Constitution, which provides that “the judicial power of the state is vested in a Supreme Court, Courts of Appeals, Courts of Common Pleas and divisions thereof, and such other courts inferior to the Supreme Court as may from time to time be established by law.” Article IV, Section 2, of the Constitution sets the size of the court at seven — a chief justice and six justices — and outlines the jurisdiction of the court.

The Supreme Court is the court of last resort in Ohio. The court may grant leave to appeal criminal cases from the courts of appeals and may direct any court of appeals to certify its record on civil cases found to be “cases of public or great interest.”

The court must accept appeals of cases that originated in the courts of appeals, cases involving the death penalty, cases involving questions arising under the U.S. Constitution or the Ohio Constitution and cases in which there are conflicting opinions from two or more courts of appeals. The court also must accept appeals from such administrative bodies as the Board of Tax Appeals and the Public Utilities Commission.

The court has original jurisdiction for certain special remedies that permit a person to file an action in the Supreme Court. These extraordinary remedies include writs of habeas corpus (involving the release of persons allegedly unlawfully imprisoned or committed), writs of mandamus and procedendo (ordering a public official to do a required act), writs of prohibition (ordering a lower court to cease an unlawful act) and writs of quo warranto (against a person or corporation for usurpation, misuse or abuse of public office or corporate office or franchise).

The Supreme Court makes rules governing practice and procedure in Ohio courts. Procedural rules adopted by the Supreme Court become effective unless both houses of the General Assembly adopt a concurrent resolution of disapproval. The Supreme Court also exercises general superintendence over all Ohio courts through its rule-making authority. The rules of superintendence set minimum standards for court administration. Unlike procedural rules, rules of superintendence do not require General Assembly review or approval to become effective.

The chief justice assigns judges to trial and appellate courts for temporary duty in cases of a court overload, when a judge is removed from a case because of an affidavit of disqualification and when judges recuse themselves from a particular case.

The court has authority over the admission of attorneys to the practice of law in Ohio and may discipline admitted attorneys who violate the rules governing the practice of law.

The chief justice and six justices are elected to six year terms on a nonpartisan ballot. Two justices are chosen at the general election in even-numbered years. In the year when the chief justice runs, voters pick three members of the court. A person must be an attorney with at least six years of experience in the practice of law to be elected or appointed to the court. The governor makes appointments for vacancies occurring between elections.



## Caseloads

The Supreme Court reports detailed caseload statistics each year in its annual report. Readers are encouraged to review those reports to gain further insight into the work of the court. In the court’s annual report, and here, the court presents performance-related statistics concerning the time to dispose of various case types.

For purposes of this analysis, the court’s overall case filings are presented under four categories: All Case Types Combined, Jurisdictional Appeals, Merit Cases and Practice of Law Cases.

### All Case Types Combined

For all case types combined, the court saw the filing of 2,107 new cases in 2015, representing a nearly 7 percent decrease from the 2,255 cases filed in 2014. (See **Table 1** and **Figure 1**).

### Jurisdictional Appeals

In 2015, a total of 1,529 new jurisdictional appeals were filed, a 6-percent decrease from the 1,623 cases filed in 2014. (See **Figure 2**).

### Merit Cases

These are cases the court must hear and render a decision on the merits. The general categories of merit cases consist of the following:

- Original actions
- Habeas corpus cases
- Direct appeals (cases originating in courts of appeals)
- Direct appeals involving termination of parental rights/adoption
- Certified conflicts

TABLE 1

### The Supreme Court of Ohio New Filings

Case Type	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Jurisdictional Appeals	1,667	1,629	1,492	1,623	1,529
Merit Cases	408	424	451	513	457
Practice of Law Cases	132	134	112	119	121
Disciplinary Cases	119	125	96	107	109
All Other	14	9	16	12	12
<b>All Case Types</b>	<b>2,207</b>	<b>2,187</b>	<b>2,055</b>	<b>2,255</b>	<b>2,107</b>

FIGURE 1

### All Case Types Combined New Filings




FIGURE 2

### Jurisdictional Appeals New Filings




FIGURE 3

**Merit Cases**

New Filings





FIGURE 4

**Practice of Law Cases**

New Filings



- Certified conflicts involving termination of parental rights/adoption
- Appeals from Board of Tax Appeals
- Appeals from Public Utilities Commission
- Appeals for Power Siting Board
- Death penalty cases
- Certified questions of state law
- Appeals from App.R. 26(B) application in death penalty cases
- Other merit cases

In 2015, a total of 457 merit cases were filed, nearly an 11 percent decrease from the 513 cases filed in 2014. This is the first decrease in new filings of merit cases in the past five years. (See **Figure 3**).

**Practice of Law Cases**

These cases arise from the court’s responsibility to govern the practice of law in Ohio. Included in this category are disciplinary cases involving allegations of ethical misconduct by attorneys and judges, bar admissions cases involving applications from people seeking admission to the Ohio bar, and cases alleging the unauthorized practice of law. The vast majority of practice of law cases involve attorney discipline. In 2015, a total of 121 practice of law cases were filed, a small 2-percent increase over 2014. Of the 121 cases filed in 2015, a total of 109 (or approximately 90 percent), were disciplinary cases. (See **Figure 4**).

## Time to Disposition Analyses

### All Cases

#### From Filing to Final Disposition

In 2015, the court disposed of 2,256 cases. The mean number of days a case was pending before the court in 2015 increased by 8 percent over 2014 (from 154 days to 167 days). (See **Figure 5**).

### Jurisdictional Appeals Accepted for Merit Review

#### From Filing to Final Disposition

Decisions in 57 jurisdictional appeals following full merit review were released in 2015. The time to disposition averaged 534 days. (See **Figure 6**).

### Jurisdictional Appeals Not Accepted for Merit Review

#### From Filing to Final Disposition

The mean number of days taken by the court to consider and dispose of a jurisdictional appeal not accepted increased to 129 days in 2015 from the 2014 mean of 92 days. (See **Figure 7**).

FIGURE 5

### All Cases

Days from Filing to Final Disposition




FIGURE 6

### Jurisdictional Appeals Accepted for Full Merit Review

Days from Filing to Final Disposition




FIGURE 7

### Jurisdictional Appeals Not Accepted for Full Merit Review

Days from Filing to Final Disposition





FIGURE 8

**Original Actions**

Days from Filing to Final Disposition



**Original Actions**

**From Filing to Final Disposition**

During 2015, a total of 193 original actions were disposed of in an average of 134 days. (See **Figure 8**).


**All Cases Decided with an Opinion  
From Submission to Final Disposition**

The number of cases decided with an opinion decreased slightly between 2014 and 2015. In 2015, the court decided 237 cases with an opinion, 10 percent fewer cases than in 2014. The average number of days to issue an opinion was 163 days. (See **Figure 9**).

FIGURE 9

**All Cases Decided with an Opinion**

Days from Submission to Final Disposition







## COURT OF APPEALS

Ohio's court of appeals is established by Article IV, Section 1, of the Ohio Constitution and its jurisdiction is outlined in Article IV, Section 3. The court is divided regionally into 12 districts. As an intermediate-level appellate court, its primary function is to hear appeals from the courts of common pleas, and municipal and county courts, which may in turn be further appealed to the Supreme Court. Each case is heard and decided by a three-judge panel.

In addition to its appellate jurisdiction, the court of appeals has original jurisdiction, as does the Supreme Court, to hear applications for writs of habeas corpus, mandamus, procedendo, prohibition and quo warranto. The tenth appellate district, consisting solely of Franklin County, also hears appeals from the Court of Claims.

The number of judges in each appellate district depends on a variety of factors, including the district's population and its caseload. Appeals court judges are elected to six year terms in even-numbered years. They must be admitted to the practice of law in Ohio six years prior to the commencement of the term.

## Caseloads

The cases heard in Ohio's court of appeals are classified into four broad types:

- **Criminal appeals** arising from criminal cases heard in the general divisions of the courts of common pleas, and in municipal and county courts.
- **Civil appeals** arising from civil cases heard in the general divisions of the courts of common pleas, and municipal and county courts.
- **Family law appeals** arising from cases heard in the domestic relations, juvenile, and probate divisions of Ohio's courts of common pleas.
- **Miscellaneous appeals** include original actions filed in the courts of appeals, habeas corpus cases and appeals from administrative agencies and the Court of Claims.





FIGURE 1

**All Case Types Combined**

Total incoming cases



The overall number of appeals filed in Ohio’s court of appeals has been declining steadily for the last ten years. In 2006, a 10-year high of 11,208 cases were filed. In 2015, a total of 9,060 cases were filed, representing a 19-percent decline over the 10 years. The number filed in 2015 is also a 1-percent decrease from the number of incoming cases in 2014. (See **Figure 1** and **Table 1**).

TABLE 1

**Court of Appeals**

Total incoming cases

Case Type	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Criminal	5,189	4,807	5,157	4,670	4,714	4,209	4,181	4,056	4,329	4,294
Civil	3,538	3,335	3,521	3,277	3,050	2,955	2,975	2,807	2,595	2,633
Family Law	1,671	1,538	1,580	1,577	1,490	1,430	1,422	1,454	1,526	1,428
Miscellaneous	810	832	857	909	973	914	848	759	746	705
<b>All Case Types</b>	<b>11,208</b>	<b>10,512</b>	<b>11,115</b>	<b>10,433</b>	<b>10,227</b>	<b>9,508</b>	<b>9,426</b>	<b>9,076</b>	<b>9,196</b>	<b>9,060</b>



**Figure 2** shows trends in the number of incoming cases over the past 10 years within the civil and criminal appeals categories. Both criminal and civil appeals exhibit general downward trends over the last ten years. While the appellate courts experienced an increase of 7 percent in the number of criminal appeals being filed in 2014, this trend did not continue as 2015 filings were down 1 percent from 2014. Civil appeals continue to decline fairly steadily from their 10-year high in 2006, though there was a small 1-percent increase from 2014 to 2015.

Family law appeals decreased 6 percent from 2014. A 10-year review of family law appeals reveals a return to filing levels similar to 2011 through 2013, after a small increase in 2014. (See **Figure 3**).

**Figure 4** shows the 10-year trend in the filing of miscellaneous appeals (including original actions, habeas corpus cases, and appeals from administrative agencies and the Court of Claims). The filing of these cases has trended slightly downward since 2006, with the exception of a small increase in filings in 2009 and 2010.

FIGURE 2

**Civil and Criminal Appeals**

Total incoming cases




FIGURE 3

**Family Law Appeals**

Total incoming cases





FIGURE 4

**Miscellaneous Appeals**

Total incoming cases





## COURT OF CLAIMS

The Court of Claims has statewide original jurisdiction over all civil actions filed against the state of Ohio. Created pursuant to the Court of Claims Act in 1976, the Court of Claims sits in Franklin County. Appeals from the Court of Claims are heard by the Tenth District Court of Appeals in Columbus.

Civil actions in the Court of Claims are determined in one of two ways, depending on the amount of monetary damages claimed.

Civil cases involving \$10,000 or less are determined administratively by the clerk or deputy clerk of the court. Cases involving more than \$10,000 are heard by a judge. A judge of the court also may review and enter final judgment in a civil action determined administratively. Judges on the Court of Claims are assigned by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio.

In addition to civil actions against the state of Ohio, the Court of Claims hears appeals from decisions of the Attorney General regarding claims for reparations by victims of crime.

The total incoming cases for the Court of Claims for the past five years is displayed in **Table 1**. The number of incoming judicial cases increased slightly in 2014, following a three-year decline. In 2015, a total of 335 cases were filed, which is 24 percent fewer than the five year high of 441 cases in 2011 but an 8 percent increase over 2014. (See **Figure 1**).

The make-up of the court's incoming caseload in 2015 is shown in **Figure 2**.

TABLE 1

**Court of Claims**  
Total incoming cases

Case Type	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Judicial Cases	441	359	342	309	335
Administrative Determinations	796	447	371	635	659
Victims of Crime Appeals	100	59	80	63	79
<b>All Case Types</b>	<b>1,337</b>	<b>865</b>	<b>793</b>	<b>1,007</b>	<b>1,073</b>

FIGURE 1

**Judicial Cases**  
Total incoming cases




FIGURE 2

**Incoming Cases in 2015**  
All Case Types





FIGURE 3

**Administrative Determinations**  
Total incoming cases




The number of administrative determination cases filed each year typically varies widely, however 2014 and 2015 data suggest this may be stabilizing. In 2015, the court saw the filing of 659 cases, an increase of just 4 percent over 2014. (See **Figure 3**).

The volume of appeals from victims of crime decisions fluctuates from year to year. In 2015, a total of 79 appeals were filed, a 25 percent increase over 2014. (See **Figure 4**).

FIGURE 4

**Victims of Crime Appeals**  
Total incoming cases







## COURTS OF COMMON PLEAS

The court of common pleas, the only trial court created by the Ohio Constitution, is established by Article IV, Section 1, of the Constitution and its duties are outlined in Article IV, Section 4.

There is a court of common pleas in each of Ohio's 88 counties. The courts of common pleas have original jurisdiction in all criminal felony cases and original jurisdiction in all civil cases in which the amount in controversy is generally more than \$15,000. Courts of common pleas have appellate jurisdiction over the decisions of some state administrative agencies.

Common pleas judges are elected to six year terms on a nonpartisan ballot. A person must be an attorney with at least six years of experience in the practice of law to be elected or appointed to the court.

The courts of common pleas in most counties across the state have specialized divisions created by statute to which judges are specifically elected in order to hear criminal and civil, domestic relations, juvenile, or probate cases — or some combination of those categories. The use of the term “division” when describing the jurisdictional structure of the various counties’ common pleas courts sometimes is at odds with how that term is applied when describing caseload statistics. For ease of description, it is common to group cases by their overall type — that is, by division. For example, when describing caseloads of matters generally grouped together as “domestic relations cases,” they may be referred to as “domestic relations division” cases, even though a particular county may not technically have a domestic relations division. The courts of common pleas in Adams, Morgan, Morrow, Noble and Wyandot counties have no divisions and the judges elected to those courts have responsibility over all types of cases that come before the common pleas court.

## Changes in 2015


There were no changes to the jurisdictional structure or number of judgeships in Ohio common pleas courts during 2015.

## Future Changes

On Jan. 1, 2017, the combined general and domestic relations division of the Delaware County Court of Common Pleas will split into a standalone general division and a standalone domestic relation division. In addition, the common pleas court will add a new judgeship, which will be added to the new domestic relations division.

### Courts of Common Pleas Jurisdictional Distribution in 2015

JURISDICTIONAL STRUCTURE	NUMBER OF COUNTIES	NUMBER OF JUDGES
Separately Administered General Division	28	162
Separately Administered Domestic Relations Division	19	30
Separately Administered Probate Division	15	16
Separately Administered Juvenile Division	11	20
Combined General and Domestic Relations Division	53	72
Combined Domestic Relations, and Juvenile Division	6	15
Combined Domestic Relations, Probate, and Juvenile Division	4	7
Combined Probate and Juvenile Division	62	62
Combined General, Domestic Relations, and Probate Division	1	3
Combined General and Probate Division	1	1
Combined General, Domestic Relations, Probate, and Juvenile Division	5	6





## COURTS OF COMMON PLEAS

General Division

The general divisions of the courts of common pleas have original jurisdiction over all criminal felony cases, all civil actions in which the amount in controversy is generally greater than \$15,000 and jurisdiction over the appeals of decisions of certain state administrative agencies.

For statistical reporting purposes, all criminal cases are counted together with no distinction based on specific charges. Civil cases are reported under a number of different case-type categories.

Cases involving tort claims are classified as either:

- Professional Tort — Such as medical and legal malpractice
- Product Liability
- Other Torts — Tort cases not otherwise classifiable as professional tort or product liability cases.

The non-tort case-type categories are:

- Workers' Compensation — Typically involving appeals from a decision of the Industrial Commission
- Foreclosures
- Administrative Appeals
- Complex Litigation — A special case type discussed further below
- Other Civil — Civil cases not otherwise classifiable in other case-type categories.

The complex litigation case type is a special category reserved for civil cases involving novel or complicated issues of law and fact that are not likely to be resolved within the time guidelines established for other cases. A judge assigned to a civil case that meets the criteria prescribed under Sup.R. 42 may reclassify a civil case as a complex litigation case. Accordingly, no cases are filed with the courts as complex litigation cases. Instead, civil cases are first classified under their appropriate case types and then, if applicable, are reclassified as complex litigation cases. Complex litigation cases are rare. Since 2003, on average, approximately one out of every 1,800 civil cases (0.001 percent) in the general divisions of Ohio's common pleas courts are classified each year as complex litigation matters.





## LanguageLine Enables Courts to Connect with Live Interpreters

In the fall of 2013, Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor announced that the Supreme Court was making available to all courts across Ohio access to a telephonic interpretation system. The service, managed through a contract between the Supreme Court and LanguageLine Solutions, provides local courts with free, round-the-clock, over-the-phone interpreting services, covering more than 200 languages.

“The remote interpretation service is intended to operate just as though the interpreter is standing in the courtroom by communicating with the litigant about the judge’s instructions or relaying questions from and answers to the prosecution or defense,” Chief Justice O’Connor said.

“The right to a fair trial requires all participants are fully involved and fully aware of what’s occurring,” she continued. “By providing this service, we are ensuring that every citizen, including those who are limited English proficient, understand fully the court proceedings in which they are involved and truly have their day in court.” She also pointed out that the new service would support judges in their jobs to fulfill this important obligation and in complying with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Sup.R. 88, and other statutory requirements.

The service was rolled out in 2014, and in the first two years of its availability, Ohio courts used LanguageLine

to conduct more than 1,200 telephonic interpretations. In 2015, the service was used 884 times, a 171-percent increase over 2014, the program’s inaugural year. The total usage in 2015 consisted of over 225 hours of telephonic interpretation.

As expected, the majority of the telephonic interpretations were performed in Ohio’s limited jurisdiction trial courts, where most court cases are filed. Nearly two-thirds (61 percent) of the interpretations took place in cases heard in the state’s municipal and county courts.

The extent to which individual courts experience the need to use this vital service hinges greatly upon the local availability of qualified in-person interpreters and the degree to which the courts are encountering parties and case participants whose languages are uncommon.


In 2015, telephonic interpretations were provided covering 63 unique languages, with Spanish leading with 22 percent of the 884 interpretations. Arabic interpretations were the second-most frequent, at 13 percent. Rounding out the remaining top five languages were Nepali, Mandarin, and Russian.

Shown in the map at right are the numbers of telephonic interpretations in 2015 for the various courts in each county. Franklin County lead the state with 278 interpretations.

# Use of LanguageLine in 2015

## Total Number of Interpretations, All Languages Combined

Source: LanguageLine billing records for calendar year 2015.



## Caseloads

**Figure 1** shows the breakdown of incoming cases in 2015 within the general divisions of Ohio’s courts of common pleas. Criminal cases, Foreclosures and Other Civil cases constitute 87 percent of all filings in 2015. See the *Appendix* for a table displaying the number of incoming cases for each individual case type from 2006 through 2015.

**Figure 2** shows 10-year trends in number of filings of Criminal, Foreclosure, and Other Civil cases. These major categories of cases display a degree of volatility over the ten year period. Foreclosure cases rose steadily from 2006 until 2009 when the trend reversed. For the last six years, the number of incoming foreclosure cases has decreased. The 46,725 incoming cases in 2015 represent a 10-percent decline from 2014 and a 52-percent decline from the 10-year high of 94,295 in 2009. Similarly, filings of Other Civil cases continue to steadily decline. In 2015, at total of 48,170 incoming cases were filed, representing a 2-percent decrease from 2014 and a 36-percent decrease from the 10-year high in 2008.

Criminal cases have also been generally declining, though at a lesser rate. In 2015, the courts reported a total of 78,112 incoming criminal cases. This is a decrease of 3-percent over 2014, and a decrease of 18 percent over the 10-year high of 98,387 cases in 2007.

## Performance Measures

A description of court performance measures used by the Supreme Court is available on *page 3*.

As shown in **Table 1**, average monthly clearance rates in 2015 for all case types exceeded 100 percent. Average monthly overage rates over each of the last five years are shown

FIGURE 1

### All Case Types

Total incoming cases in 2015




FIGURE 2

### Major Case Types

Total Incoming cases




TABLE 1

### Clearance Rates

Average per month in 2015

Case Type	Monthly Average
Administrative Appeals	111%
Complex Litigation	207%
Criminal	101%
Foreclosures	104%
Other Civil	101%
Other Torts	103%
Product Liability	109%
Professional Tort	103%
Workers' Compensation	103%

TABLE 2

**Overage Rates**

Percent of caseload pending past time guidelines, average per month

Case Type (Time guideline, in months)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
<b>Civil</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>6%</b>
Administrative Appeals (9)	24%	20%	24%	25%	27%
Complex Litigation (36)	10%	15%	16%	6%	6%
Foreclosures (12)	8%	8%	9%	10%	7%
Other Civil (24)	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Other Torts (24)	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Product Liability (24)	7%	8%	5%	8%	4%
Professional Tort (24)	9%	9%	9%	9%	11%
Workers' Compensation (12)	11%	11%	10%	10%	10%
<b>Criminal (6)</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>17%</b>

in **Table 2**. Average monthly overage rates above 10 percent are seen in four case types (Administrative Appeals, Criminal, Professional Tort, and Workers' Compensation). Other Civil cases, which constitute 24 percent of the statewide general division caseload, are being managed in a timely manner, with only 4 percent of the caseload overage on average each month.

**Trial Rates**

The rate of trials occurring in a court is a useful statistic when assisting courts in understanding the fundamentals of effective caseload management. Although it is not a measure of a court's performance, per se, this statistic routinely is used by the Case Management Section as part of its caseload management training curriculum.

In order to calculate trial rates, the various termination categories reported by the courts first are separated into termination categories that are truly dispositive of the case and categories that instead simply render the case no longer active for reporting purposes. The number of dispositive terminations are then summed. The resulting sum is divided into the number of trials (either by jury, by court, or both) to produce the trial rate, expressed as a percentage.


It is conventionally understood among court observers at the national level that approximately 2 percent of civil cases and 5 percent of criminal cases ultimately go to trial.

Ohio trial rates fall below those figures. As shown in **Figure 3**, the trial rate for civil cases heard in the common pleas, general division courts in 2015 was 1.3 percent and 2.4 percent for criminal cases. When viewed over the last 10 years, the rates of civil and criminal cases proceeding to trial have steadily declined.

FIGURE 3

**Trial Rates**

Trials as a percentage of total dispositions



## Cuyahoga County's Asbestos Docket

Not reflected in the caseload statistics in this report is a special group of asbestos-related cases pending in the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas. This docket chiefly consists of product liability cases involving alleged exposure to products containing asbestos and, to a smaller extent, silica. Also included in this docket are premises liability cases against owners or possessors of property on which plaintiffs allege injury from exposure to asbestos-containing products.

The volume of these cases filed over the years in Cuyahoga County necessitated certain extraordinary means for managing it. The cases are heard by retired assigned judges with special designated staff and are not counted among Cuyahoga County's traditional caseload statistics.

The number of new cases filed each year over the past ten years has declined rapidly from a ten year high in 2006 of 444 new cases to a low of 56 new cases in 2015. (See **Table 3** and **Figure 4**).

The number of cases pending over the past ten years was at its highest in 2006, when there were 44,755 cases pending. The lowest number of pending cases over the past 10 years occurred in 2015, with 1,701 cases pending at the end of the year. The number of pending cases decreased substantially in 2008 when 34,813 cases were terminated. (See **Table 3** and **Figure 5**). The majority (about 31,000) of those terminations were "administrative dismissals" rendering the cases inactive, pursuant to the passage of special asbestos-related tort reform legislation. The court found those cases did not contain the requisite medical evidence to warrant keeping the cases in active status. It should be noted that a given case, which can contain dozens of defendants, cannot be counted as being terminated until every defendant in the case is subject to a condition causing a reportable termination. Consequently, the number of cases terminated each year does not align as typically expected against the number of cases filed.

TABLE 3

**Cuyahoga County Asbestos Docket**  
Overall caseloads

Year	New Filings	Pending at End of Year	Cases Terminated
2006	444	44,755	1,180
2007	266	44,744	279
2008	176	9,966	34,813
2009	152	6,894	3,000
2010	114	6,851	321
2011	105	6,699	490
2012	102	5,174	1,635
2013	113	5,164	120
2014	85	3,067	2,182
2015	56	1,701	1,427

FIGURE 4

**Cuyahoga County Asbestos Docket**  
New Filings





FIGURE 5

**Cuyahoga County Asbestos Docket**  
Pending cases





**COURTS OF  
COMMON PLEAS**  
Domestic Relations Division

**D**omestic relations divisions of the courts of common pleas have jurisdiction over all proceedings involving divorce or dissolution of marriages, annulment, legal separation, spousal support and allocation of parental rights and responsibilities for the care of children. The domestic relations divisions of the courts of common pleas exist in most counties together with another division. The following counties have separately administered domestic relations divisions:

Allen	Lake	Muskingum
Butler	Licking	Portage
Clermont	Lucas	Richland
Cuyahoga	Mahoning	Scioto
Fairfield	Medina	Summit
Greene	Montgomery	Warren
Hamilton		

Domestic relations cases are grouped into three general categories of cases:

**Marriage Terminations and Dissolutions**

Marriage Terminations and Marriage Dissolutions involve the cessation of a marriage relationship. Both of these case categories are further broken down for caseload reporting purposes depending on whether the married couple seeking a divorce or dissolution has any children.

**Post-Decree Case Types**

Following the dissolution or termination of a marriage, further activities can occur subsequent to the final decree and are classified under either the Change of Custody, Visitation Enforcement or Modification (Visitation), or Support Enforcement or Modification categories (Support). In some instances, a person may file a motion under more than one of these categories. For statistical reporting purposes, such matters are counted only under the category of the earliest filed motion. When that motion is resolved, the matter is reclassified under the case type for the motion filed after the first, and so on.

**Miscellaneous Case Types**

The remaining domestic relations case types are:

- Domestic Violence – Petitions for civil protection orders
- Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (U.I.F.S.A.) cases
- Parentage
- All Others – Cases not otherwise classifiable in other case-type categories.

## Caseloads

The core work performed in domestic relations courts involves divorces and dissolutions. In 2015, Ohio's domestic relations courts reported a total 43,698 incoming divorce and dissolution cases. This represents a decrease of 2 percent since 2014 and a 16-percent decline from the 10-year high of 51,764 cases in 2006. Incoming caseloads across the state in all case types from 2006 through 2015 are shown in a table in the *Appendix*.

Of particular note is the difference between new divorce and dissolution filings involving married couples with children and married couples without children. Between 2006 and 2010, a generally equivalent amount of cases were presented each year. However, beginning in 2011 more cases began being filed that do not involve children than cases that do. As seen in **Figure 1**, the gap between the two groups has widened.

FIGURE 1

### Marriage Terminations and Dissolutions

Total incoming cases





FIGURE 2

**Custody and Visitation Cases**

Total incoming cases




Post-decree matters in domestic relations courts have also experienced a decline in the past ten years. During 2015, a total of 6,582 motions seeking a change of custody were filed, representing a decrease of 3 percent from 2014 and a decline of 17 percent from the 10-year high of 7,895 cases in 2005. The rate of filing of incoming visitation matters has remained relatively stable over 10 years. (See **Figure 2**). Between 2006 and 2015, the number of filings seeking the enforcement or modification of a support order declined by 23 percent. (See **Figure 3**).

FIGURE 3

**Support Cases**

Total incoming cases





## Performance Measures

For a description of court performance measures used by the Supreme Court, see *page 3*.

As shown in **Table 1**, average monthly clearance rates in 2015 for all case types reached at least 100 percent. Average monthly overage rates over each of the last five years are shown in **Table 2**. While the overage rates for divorces and dissolutions along with several other case types in 2015 are well below 10 percent, the overage rates for Domestic Violence, Custody, U.I.F.S.A., Visitation, and All Others are above 10 percent. Due to the limitations in the Supreme Court's reporting instructions and time guidelines for Domestic Violence and U.I.F.S.A. cases, the overage rates for those cases can appear particularly elevated, and without conducting additional research at the local court level, the reader is cautioned against interpreting these as accurate measures of the courts' actual case processing timeliness performance for those particular case types.

TABLE 1

### Clearance Rates

Average per month in 2015

Case Type	Monthly Average
All Others	100%
Change of Custody	101%
Domestic Violence	100%
Marriage Dissolutions w/Children	100%
Marriage Dissolutions w/o Children	101%
Marriage Terminations w/Children	104%
Marriage Terminations w/o Children	101%
Parentage	100%
Support - Enforce or Modify	102%
U.I.F.S.A.	101%
Visitation - Enforce or Modify	103%

TABLE 2

### Overage Rates

Percent of caseload pending past time guidelines, average per month

Case Type <i>(Time guideline, in months)</i>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
All Others <i>(6)</i>	17%	18%	16%	15%	15%
Change of Custody <i>(9)</i>	12%	13%	12%	11%	13%
Domestic Violence <i>(1)</i>	33%	36%	36%	34%	34%
Marriage Dissolutions w/Children <i>(3)</i>	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%
Marriage Dissolutions w/o Children <i>(3)</i>	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%
Marriage Terminations w/Children <i>(18)</i>	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Marriage Terminations w/o Children <i>(12)</i>	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%
Parentage <i>(12)</i>	4%	5%	6%	4%	6%
Support - Enforce or Modify <i>(12)</i>	6%	5%	4%	4%	5%
U.I.F.S.A. <i>(3)</i>	26%	25%	26%	25%	22%
Visitation - Enforce or Modify <i>(9)</i>	13%	13%	13%	12%	13%



## COURTS OF COMMON PLEAS

Probate Division

In 1968, the Modern Courts Amendment to the Ohio Constitution transformed probate courts to a division of the courts of common pleas. In addition to jurisdiction over wills, estate matters, and guardianships, probate divisions have jurisdiction over the issuance of marriage licenses, adoption proceedings, determination of sanity or mental competency, and certain eminent domain proceedings. Probate judges also can solemnize marriages within their counties.

The probate divisions of the courts of common pleas exist in most counties together with another division. However, the following counties have separately-administered probate divisions:

Butler	Hamilton	Montgomery
Clark	Lake	Richland
Cuyahoga	Lorain	Stark
Franklin	Lucas	Summit
Greene	Mahoning	Trumbull

## Caseloads

Across the state, probate caseloads generally have declined over the past ten years. As shown in a table in the Appendix, 87,254 new probate cases were filed in 2015, a 3 percent increase over the number of cases filed in 2014, though 5 percent fewer than the 10-year high in 2006.

Filings of Guardianships of Incompetents (adult guardianships), displayed in **Figure 1**, were largely steady between 2006 and 2011. However, beginning in 2012, an upward trend can be seen though 2015 filings decreased slightly from the 2014 level. In 2015, a total of 6,721 Guardianships of Incompetents were filed. Guardianships of Minors, also shown in **Figure 1**, trended downward between 2006 and 2011, remaining relatively stable since 2012. In 2015, a total of 2,333 cases were filed, compared with 2,291 filings in 2014 (an increase of less than 2 percent). Compared to the 10-year high of 3,551 cases in 2006, the 2015 filings represent a decline of 32 percent.

Decedents' Estates cases, shown in **Figure 2**, exhibit a very slight downward trend from 2006 to 2010. Slight increases were seen between 2011 and 2012 and again in 2015. The 55,519 cases filed in 2015 are a 6 percent decline over the 10-year high of 58,932 cases in 2006.

Adoption case filings in 2015 increased slightly over 2014 filings, with 4,217 compared with 3,862 filings. The 2014 filings also represent a 28 percent decline from the 10-year high of 5,375 cases in 2005. (See **Figure 3**).

FIGURE 1

### Guardianships of Adults and Minors

Total incoming cases




FIGURE 2

### Decedents' Estates

Total incoming cases




FIGURE 3

### Adoptions

Total incoming cases





FIGURE 4

**Mental Illness and Mental Retardation Cases**

Total incoming cases




Mental Illness and Mental Retardation matters constitute about 7 percent of the probate division’s incoming cases. In 2015 a total of 6,085 new matters were filed representing a 10-year high and a 20 percent increase over the 10 year low in 2010. (See **Figure 4**).

In 2015, a total of 71,470 marriage applications were granted by the probate courts. This is a 2 percent increase over the 70,232 applications granted in 2014. (See **Figure 5**).

FIGURE 5

**Marriage Applications**

Total applications granted



Performance Measures

For a description of court performance measures used by the Supreme Court, see *page 3*.

As shown in **Table 1**, probate divisions statewide in 2014 exhibited satisfactory clearance rates in many of the case types although in the Mental Illness and Mental Retardation and Wrongful Death case types, average quarterly clearance rates of 92 and 89 percent, respectively, are suggestive of a growth in a backlog. Because the Supreme Court does not promulgate time standards for probate cases, overage rates are not calculable.

TABLE 1

**Clearance Rates**

Average per month in 2015

Case Type	Monthly Average
Birth (Correction or Delayed Reg.)	102%
Change of Name	99%
Civil Actions	105%
Conservatorships	154%
Decedents' Estates	98%
Guardianships of Incompetents	112%
Guardianships of Minors	149%
Mental Illness and Mental Retardation	92%
Minors' Settlements	98%
Testamentary Trusts	178%
Wrongful Death	89%





COURTS OF  
COMMON PLEAS  
Juvenile Division

Juvenile divisions of courts of common pleas hear cases involving delinquent, unruly, and neglected and dependent children, and have jurisdiction in adult cases involving paternity, child abuse, non-support, contributing to the delinquency of minors, and the failure to send children to school.

Juvenile divisions exist in most counties together with another division. However, the following counties have separately-administered juvenile divisions:

Butler	Hamilton	Montgomery
Cuyahoga	Lake	Richland
Erie	Lucas	Summit
Greene	Mahoning	

## Caseloads

The *Appendix* contains a table showing the number of statewide new filings by type of case from 2006 to 2015. Caseloads in the juvenile division have experienced more changes over a 10-year period than other divisions of the courts of common pleas. Overall, the state saw a 4 percent decline in the total number of incoming juvenile cases in 2015 compared to 2014, with the largest decreases in Parentage and All Other case types. Over the past ten years, there was a 35 percent decrease in incoming juvenile cases. Significant drivers of that decline were decreases in Delinquency and Traffic cases which exhibited 10-year declines of 49 and 52 percent, respectively. (See **Figures 1 and 2**).

FIGURE 1

### Delinquency Cases Total incoming cases




FIGURE 2

### Juvenile Traffic Cases Total incoming cases




FIGURE 3

**Child Welfare Cases**  
Total incoming cases





Figure 3 shows incoming child welfare-related cases consisting of Abuse, Neglect and Dependency cases and Motions for Permanent Custody cases. Between 2006 and 2009, a downward trend can be seen in the data, which mirrored the general decline seen nationally in the number of incoming cases of these types over that time period. Between 2010 and 2014, the number of incoming cases were relatively stable until a 7 percent increase in 2015 (for a total of 20,261 filings).

Filing of custody and visitation cases (Custody/Visitation) have exhibited an upward trend over the last 10 years, while support filings (Support Enforcement or Modification) have steadily declined since 2010. (See Figure 4). In 2015, a total of 52,574 support matters were filed, a 19 percent decline from the 10-year high of 64,988 cases in 2010. A total of 31,928 incoming Custody/Visitation cases were reported in 2015, a 10-year high.

FIGURE 4

**Custody/Visitation and Support Cases**  
Total incoming cases



It is notable to mention that the generally upward trends in Custody/Visitation matters within the juvenile divisions align with the downward trends in related case types heard in Ohio's domestic relations divisions. The critical difference here is that the matters heard in juvenile divisions involve unmarried persons, whereas the related case types heard in domestic relations divisions are generally an outgrowth of a divorce or dissolution.



## Performance Measures

For a description of court performance measures used by the Supreme Court, see *page 3*.

**Table 1** shows the average monthly clearance rates over 2015 for each case type. In all case types except Motions for Permanent Custody, the courts exhibited clearance rates at 95 percent or above. The average monthly overage rates over each of the past five years are shown in **Table 2**. For 2015, the overage rates in 6 of the 11 case types heard in Ohio's juvenile courts exceed 10 percent. Due to the limitations in the Supreme Court's reporting instructions for U.I.F.S.A. cases, the overage rates for those cases can appear particularly elevated, and without conducting additional research at the local court level, the reader is cautioned against interpreting these as accurate measures of the courts' actual case processing timeliness performance for those particular case types.

TABLE 1

### Clearance Rates

Average per month in 2015

Case Type	Monthly Average
Abuse, Neglect or Dependency	95%
Adult Cases	98%
All Others	104%
Custody/Visitation	96%
Delinquency	101%
Motion for Permanent Custody	89%
Parentage	112%
Support - Enforce or Modify	100%
Traffic	100%
U.I.F.S.A.	95%
Unruly	103%

TABLE 2

### Overage Rates

Percent of caseload pending past time guidelines, average per month

Case Type <i>(Time guideline, in months)</i>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Abuse, Neglect or Dependency <sup>(3)</sup>	16%	17%	20%	20%	23%
Adult Cases <sup>(6)</sup>	16%	16%	16%	18%	12%
All Others <sup>(6)</sup>	9%	15%	13%	12%	12%
Custody/Visitation <sup>(9)</sup>	9%	9%	9%	11%	9%
Delinquency <sup>(6)</sup>	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
Motion for Permanent Custody <sup>(9)</sup>	13%	12%	7%	11%	7%
Parentage <sup>(12)</sup>	9%	15%	22%	23%	3%
Support - Enforce or Modify <sup>(12)</sup>	4%	6%	6%	5%	4%
Traffic <sup>(3)</sup>	18%	14%	11%	13%	11%
U.I.F.S.A. <sup>(3)</sup>	20%	22%	44%	24%	13%
Unruly <sup>(3)</sup>	17%	18%	18%	16%	17%



## Municipal & County Courts

The Ohio Constitution of 1851 established the Supreme Court and four types of lower courts: district courts of appeals, courts of common pleas, probate courts and justice courts. In 1910, the General Assembly established the first municipal court in Cleveland. In 1957, the General Assembly replaced justice courts with county courts. Each county court was established to have under its territorial jurisdiction those regions of a county not otherwise served by a municipal court. The General Assembly, over the ensuing years, reduced the number of county courts and expanded the territorial jurisdiction and number of municipal courts.

The subject-matter jurisdiction of municipal and county courts is identical. Municipal and county courts have the authority to conduct preliminary hearings in felony cases, and both have jurisdiction over traffic and non-traffic misdemeanors. These courts also have limited civil jurisdiction. They hear civil cases in which the amount of money in dispute does not exceed \$15,000. Judges of municipal and county courts have statewide authority to solemnize marriage ceremonies.

In 2015, there were 129 municipal courts with 215 judges, and 35 county courts with 37 judges. Three municipal courts have specialized divisions: Cleveland Municipal Court, Housing Division; Toledo Municipal Court, Housing Division; and Franklin County Municipal Court, Environmental Division.

Municipal court judges and county court judges must be attorneys with at least six years of experience in the practice of law. They are elected on a non-partisan judicial ballot. Municipal court judges serve on either a full-time or part-time basis, depending on the statutes establishing the individual municipal courts. The statutes provide that all county court judges serve on a part-time basis. A municipal court's territorial jurisdiction may be limited to one municipality or may extend across a range of municipalities, townships, or be countywide. A small number of municipal courts have territories that extend across more than one county. In 2015, statutes provided for the judgeships in the following 12 municipal courts to be part-time.

Bellevue	Lebanon
Campbell	Mason
Franklin	Oakwood
Hardin County	Shelby
Huron	Struthers
Lawrence County	Vermilion

In addition to the 12 courts identified above, two of the four judgeships in Montgomery County Municipal Court in 2015 were part-time judgeships.

## Changes in 2015

In 2015, no changes were made concerning the existence and nature of Ohio’s municipal and county courts.

## Future Changes

In 2010, legislation was enacted converting the Montgomery County Court into the Montgomery County Municipal Court. As a result of a vacancy being created on Dec. 31, 2015, one full-time judgeship was immediately abolished pursuant to that legislation and the remaining part-time judgeships were converted to full-time status, effective Jan. 1, 2016. The 2010 legislation further provides for a judgeship to be abolished on Dec. 31, 2021, which will result in two full-time judgeships remaining in the court from that point forward.

The case types heard in municipal and county courts are grouped into three general categories:

### Civil Cases

Civil cases heard in municipal and county courts are Personal Injury and Property Damage, Contracts, Forcible Entry and Detainer (F.E.D) (filed by landlords for eviction and possible recovery of money), Other Civil (a catchall for civil cases not otherwise classifiable in the other case type categories), and Small Claims cases (involving recovery of small debts and accounts not exceeding \$3,000).

### Criminal Cases

This category includes Felonies (preliminary hearings only) and Misdemeanors.

### Traffic Cases

This category includes Operating a Vehicle While Under the Influence (O.V.I.) and Other Traffic (all other cases involving the use of motor vehicles). Caseload statistics concerning parking violations and other vehicle-related infractions are not reported to the Supreme Court.




FIGURE 1

**Felonies**

Total incoming cases




FIGURE 2

**Misdemeanors**

Total incoming cases





FIGURE 3

**Operating a Vehicle While Under the Influence (O.V.I.)**

Total incoming cases



Caseloads

For purposes of presenting ten year trend data concerning caseloads heard in Ohio municipal and county courts, the data reported by municipal courts and county courts are combined here to present a single unified perspective over the caseloads heard in Ohio's limited jurisdiction trial courts.

As shown in a table in the *Appendix*, the total number of incoming cases each year in Ohio's municipal and county courts has generally decreased overall during the past ten years. Since 2008 (the 10-year high), the number of incoming case has decreased by 20 percent. However, there was growth in certain case types at least during certain periods over the past 10 years.

Felony cases, in which municipal and county courts conduct preliminary hearings only, exhibited a notable shift in their growth rate over the ten year period shown in **Figure 1**. There was an 18-percent decline between 2006 and 2010. In the last five years, however, the volume of incoming cases has remained relatively stable. In 2015, a total of 81,479 incoming cases were reported.

Misdemeanor cases, constituting 20 percent of the courts' total overall caseload, have experienced a slight downward trend over the past ten years. A total of 484,580 incoming cases were reported in 2015, a 7 percent decrease from 2014 and a 16 percent decrease from the 10-year high of 575,755 cases in 2007. (See **Figure 2**).

Operating a Vehicle While Under the Influence (O.V.I.) cases exhibit a downward trend over the last ten years, although since 2010 the number of incoming cases each year has generally leveled off. In 2015, a total of 66,724 incoming cases were reported. (See **Figure 3**).

Other Traffic cases (all moving violations other than O.V.I.), constituted 59 percent of the municipal and county courts' total incoming caseloads in 2015. Other Traffic cases trended downward from 2006 through 2011 and after a reversal of this trend from 2011 to 2013 have resumed a decline. In 2015, there was a total of 1,395,469 incoming Other Traffic cases, representing a 5 percent decline from 2014 when 1,475,103 incoming cases were reported. (See **Figure 4**).

Small Claims case filings have trended downward over the past 10 years, with particularly sharp declines each year beginning in 2008. The 50,736 incoming Small Claims cases in 2015 are down 43 percent from the ten year high of 88,969 cases in 2007. (See **Figure 5**).

Incoming Contracts cases, which in 2015 constituted about 6 percent the courts' total caseloads, have declined noticeably since 2008. In 2015, a total 151,934 incoming cases were reported, representing a 3 percent increase over 2014 and a 46 percent decrease from the 10-year high in 2008 of 278,930 incoming cases. (See **Figure 6**).

FIGURE 4

**Other Traffic**  
Total incoming cases




FIGURE 5

**Small Claims**  
Total incoming cases




FIGURE 6

**Contracts**  
Total incoming cases



TABLE 1

**Clearance Rates**

Average per month in 2015

Case Type	Monthly Average
Contracts	98%
F.E.D.	103%
Other Civil	98%
PI/PD	104%
Small Claims	102%
Felonies	100%
Misdemeanors	100%
O.V.I.	99%
Other Traffic	100%

**Performance Measures**

For a description of court performance measures used by the Supreme Court, see *page 3*.

As shown in **Table 1**, the clearance rates for most cases types in the limited jurisdiction courts in 2015 are near or equal to the 100 percent target, Contracts and Other Civil cases had the lowest statewide clearance rates, at 98 percent. Average monthly overage rates for the last five years are displayed in **Table 2**. The overage rate for Felonies in 2015, at 25 percent, is the only case type with an overage rate above 10 percent.

TABLE 2

**Overage Rates**

Percent of caseload pending past time guidelines, average per month

Case Type (Time guideline, in months)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Contracts (12)	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%
F.E.D. (12)	5%	5%	2%	2%	2%
Other Civil (12)	2%	6%	6%	6%	7%
PI/PD (24)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Small Claims (6)	9%	9%	8%	7%	7%
Felonies (1)	15%	17%	20%	33%	25%
Misdemeanors (6)	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%
O.V.I. (6)	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%
Other Traffic (6)	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%

## Trial Rates

The rate of trials occurring in a court is a useful statistic when assisting courts in understanding the fundamentals of effective caseflow management. Although it is not a measure of a court's performance, per se, this statistic routinely is used by the Supreme Court of Ohio Case Management Section as part of its caseflow management training curriculum.

In order to calculate trial rates, the various termination categories reported by the courts first are separated into termination categories that truly are dispositive of the case and categories that instead simply render the case no longer active for reporting purposes. The number of dispositive terminations are then summed. The resulting sum is divided into the number of trials (either by jury, by court, or both) in order to produce the trial rate, expressed as a percentage.

It is conventionally understood among court observers at the national level that approximately 2 percent of civil cases and 5 percent of criminal cases ultimately go to trial. Ohio trial rates fall below those figures. **Figures 7, 8 and 9** display the trial rates in Ohio's municipal and county courts in Misdemeanors, non-Small Claims civil cases, and traffic cases (O.V.I. and Other Traffic combined).

FIGURE 7

### Misdemeanors (non-traffic)

Trials as a percentage of all dispositions




FIGURE 8

### Civil (non-small claims)

Trials as a percentage of all dispositions





FIGURE 9

### Traffic (O.V.I. and Other Traffic)

Trials as a percentage of all dispositions





## MAYOR'S COURTS

In general, Ohio law allows mayors of municipal corporations populated by more than 200 people to conduct mayor's court where there are no municipal courts. These courts, which are not courts of record, only hear cases involving violations of local ordinances and state traffic laws. A person convicted in a mayor's court may appeal his or her conviction to the municipal or county court having jurisdiction within the municipal corporation.

Mayor's courts are required by law to register annually with and submit caseload statistical reports quarterly to the Supreme Court. At the request of the General Assembly, the Supreme Court adopted rules providing court procedures and basic legal education for mayors. Mayors whose courts hear alcohol- and drug-related traffic offenses have additional educational requirements. A mayor is not required to be a lawyer, but may appoint an attorney who has practiced law for at least three years to hear cases in mayor's court.

Mayor's court caseload statistics are published annually in a separate report.







## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

### A

**Abuse, Neglect and Dependency:** Juvenile cases concerning the neglected child, as defined by R.C. 2151.03; the dependent child, as defined by R.C. 2151.04; or the abused child, as defined by R.C. 2151.031.

**Adult Cases:** Juvenile court cases brought against an adult who is the defendant accused of contributing to the neglect, unruliness, or delinquency of a minor.

**All Others:** Any case that cannot appropriately be recorded in a listed category.

### C

**Change of Custody:** Post-decree domestic relations cases in which the court must adjudicate a motion for change of custody, including requests for change of custody based upon an election by the child and cases where custody is contested. Juvenile cases are included where there is an application for writ of habeas corpus involving the custody of a child or where a motion for change of custody is filed pursuant to Juv.R. 10(A).

**Clearance Rate:** Clearance rates are statistical calculations measuring a court's performance in keeping up with its incoming caseload. A clearance rate of 100 percent indicates the court terminates an equal number of cases as it takes in. It is determined by dividing the total number of terminations by the total number of new filings, reactivations, and transfers. It is expressed as a percentage. For example, if 90 terminations and 100 total incoming cases are reported, the clearance rate is 90 percent.

**Court Trial:** A case is considered terminated by trial to the court (i.e., judge) if judgment is rendered after the first witness is sworn.

**Criminal:** Cases in which a person is charged with violation of a state law or local ordinance other than a traffic law or ordinance. For purposes of tracking the age of the case for these reports, the case begins at arraignment.

### D

**Delinquency:** Juvenile cases filed concerning a delinquent child, as defined by R.C. 2152.02.

**Domestic Violence:** Domestic violence actions filed as separate cases pursuant to R.C. 3113.31. This does not include miscellaneous matters filed in pending cases, such as motions to evict.

### F

**Felony:** This type is defined by R.C. 2901.02 and Crim.R. 2 as an offense specifically classified as a felony, regardless of penalty, or an offense in which imprisonment for more than one year can be imposed. When transferred to the common pleas court, these cases are reported as criminal cases by the receiving court.

---

**Forcible Entry and Detainer (F.E.D.):** A summary proceeding initiated under R.C. 1923 or 5321 for restoring possession of real property to one who is wrongfully kept out or wrongfully deprived of possession.

## J

**Jury Trial:** A case is considered terminated by jury trial if judgment is rendered after the jury is sworn, regardless of the outcome of the trial.

## M

**Marriage Dissolutions:** Domestic relations cases in which a petition for dissolution of marriage is filed pursuant to R.C. 3105.63.

**Marriage Terminations:** Domestic relations cases in which a complaint for divorce is filed pursuant to R.C. 3105.01.

**Misdemeanors:** A misdemeanor is defined by R.C. 2901.02 and Crim.R. 2 as an offense specifically classified as a misdemeanor, or an offense in which imprisonment for not more than one year can be imposed. While traffic offenses fall within this definition, they are reported as operating a vehicle while under the influence or other traffic offenses and not as misdemeanors.

**Motion for Permanent Custody:** Juvenile cases in which a complaint or motion for permanent custody is filed when custody is contested. This does not include voluntary placements.

## O

**Operating a Vehicle While Under the Influence (O.V.I.):** Cases that include violating R.C. 4511.19 or any local ordinance that prohibits operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or any drug of abuse.

**Other Civil:** Civil cases not included within any of the other categories. Ancillary proceedings are not reported as cases.

**Other Traffic:** Cases dealing with matters involving traffic offenders. Juveniles, as defined by R.C. 2152.02(N), and adult traffic cases include any violation of state law or local ordinance arising out of the use of a motor vehicle, except those involving operating a vehicle while under the influence charges.

**Overage Rates:** Overage rates are a measure of a court's backlog. At any point in time, a court will have some number of active pending cases. Of those, some percentage may be pending beyond the time guidelines prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to Sup.R. 39. That percentage of overage cases is referred to as the overage rate.

---

## P

**Parentage:** Cases brought pursuant to R.C. Chapter 3111, the Uniform Parentage Act. Once paternity is established, the parentage case is considered terminated for reporting purposes.

**Personal Injury and Property Damage:** Civil cases in which the principal issue is liability for, or the amount of damages to be received for, allegedly tortious conduct resulting in personal injury.

## S

**Small Claims:** Civil actions brought under R.C. 1925 for the recovery of small debts and accounts, not exceeding \$3,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

**Support Enforcement/Modification:** Post-decree domestic relations cases in which it is alleged there is disobedience of, or resistance to, a lawful judgment of the court requiring the payment of support. A case is reported only once, regardless of the number of pending motions.

## T

**Trial Rate:** Trial rates are statistical calculations describing the rates at which trials occur compared against all other termination categories that are dispositive of a case.

## U

**Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (U.I.F.S.A.):** Cases brought pursuant to R.C. Chapter 3115, the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, handled by the domestic relations or juvenile divisions, including cases initiated in Ohio and cases in which Ohio is the responding state.

**Unruly:** Juvenile cases concerning unruly children, as defined by R.C. 2151.022.

## V

**Visitation Enforcement/Modification:** Post-decree domestic relations cases in which it is alleged there is disobedience of, or resistance to, lawful judgment of the court relative to child-visitation rights. A case is listed only once, regardless of the number of pending motions.

## W

**Workers' Compensation:** Appeals filed under R.C. 4123.512, including noncompliance actions by the state, for recovery of benefits or of premiums, and mandamus actions arising from claims or awards.



**Courts of Common Pleas, General Division**

Total incoming cases

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Administrative Appeals	1,298	1,344	1,748	1,531	1,537	1,488	1,404	1,116	1,183	1,018
Complex Litigation	88	84	106	94	76	59	67	102	149	67
Criminal	97,823	98,387	95,152	86,118	82,857	81,042	81,026	78,612	80,636	78,112
Foreclosures	92,077	91,574	94,295	99,208	97,412	85,629	84,196	63,940	51,697	46,725
Other Civil	56,832	69,444	75,471	74,813	68,907	61,647	56,510	50,392	49,249	48,170
Other Torts	24,098	21,960	20,498	20,666	19,280	18,303	17,981	17,669	17,239	16,153
Product Liability	394	378	328	263	257	203	234	254	184	186
Professional Tort	2,025	1,864	1,719	1,705	1,706	1,509	1,523	1,572	1,555	1,460
Workers' Compensation	9,048	9,437	8,297	8,698	8,176	7,759	7,296	7,164	6,937	6,869
<b>Total</b>	<b>283,683</b>	<b>294,472</b>	<b>297,614</b>	<b>293,096</b>	<b>280,208</b>	<b>257,639</b>	<b>250,237</b>	<b>220,821</b>	<b>208,829</b>	<b>198,760</b>

**Courts of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division**

Total incoming cases

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
All Others	12,456	13,967	15,993	16,271	14,457	14,029	13,582	12,948	12,686	11,892
Change of Custody	7,895	7,591	7,569	7,252	7,223	7,464	7,090	6,909	6,761	6,582
Domestic Violence	19,143	19,864	20,443	21,888	21,178	20,894	19,939	20,019	18,742	18,910
Marriage Dissolutions w/Children	8,346	8,092	8,033	8,031	8,621	8,455	8,028	7,667	7,398	7,370
Marriage Dissolutions w/o Children	11,006	10,420	10,206	10,463	10,732	10,550	10,167	10,316	10,087	10,011
Marriage Terminations w/Children	17,623	16,720	16,137	16,381	16,127	16,158	15,137	14,307	13,829	13,194
Marriage Terminations w/o Children	14,789	14,194	13,751	13,816	14,136	14,555	14,134	13,992	13,178	13,123
Parentage	1,590	1,859	2,181	2,271	2,261	2,133	1,987	1,704	1,577	1,440
Support - Enforce or Modify	37,461	36,854	37,863	37,703	34,751	31,866	31,018	29,975	28,982	26,831
U.I.F.S.A.	1,973	1,542	1,383	1,620	1,123	1,085	1,258	1,088	1,081	1,060
Visitation - Enforce or Modify	3,392	3,379	3,523	3,193	3,337	3,414	3,433	3,117	3,139	3,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>135,674</b>	<b>134,482</b>	<b>137,082</b>	<b>138,889</b>	<b>133,946</b>	<b>130,603</b>	<b>125,773</b>	<b>122,042</b>	<b>117,460</b>	<b>113,413</b>

# APPENDIX

## Courts of Common Pleas, Probate Division

Total incoming cases

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Adoptions	5,323	4,999	4,825	4,487	4,120	4,159	4,060	4,231	3,862	4,217
Birth (Correction or Delayed Reg.)	1,217	1,374	1,159	1,126	1,086	988	1,157	1,109	923	931
Change of Name	5,151	5,154	5,151	5,324	5,514	5,491	5,880	6,076	6,039	6,178
Civil Actions	2,704	2,437	2,332	2,439	2,402	2,462	2,581	2,816	2,848	2,834
Conservatorships	96	86	111	95	91	76	122	105	78	82
Decedents' Estates	58,932	56,487	57,573	56,686	55,199	56,188	57,241	56,669	53,084	55,519
Guardianships of Incompetents	6,646	6,386	6,685	6,668	6,488	6,393	6,993	7,091	7,099	6,721
Guardianships of Minors	3,551	3,291	2,898	2,896	2,608	2,372	2,329	2,447	2,291	2,333
Mental Illness and Mental Retardation	5,139	5,072	5,253	5,360	5,052	5,360	5,923	5,925	5,965	6,085
Minors' Settlements	1,836	1,706	1,535	1,506	1,345	1,287	1,349	1,437	1,327	1,234
Testamentary Trusts	571	499	527	552	530	462	475	511	465	423
Wrongful Death	455	530	572	1,039	717	628	688	708	542	697
<b>Total</b>	<b>91,621</b>	<b>88,021</b>	<b>88,621</b>	<b>88,178</b>	<b>85,152</b>	<b>85,866</b>	<b>88,798</b>	<b>89,125</b>	<b>84,523</b>	<b>87,254</b>
Marriage Applications Granted	75,223	72,601	71,401	68,019	68,248	69,334	70,058	68,446	70,232	71,470

## Courts of Common Pleas, Juvenile Division

Total incoming cases

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Abuse, Neglect or Dependency	29,649	27,220	18,444	16,456	18,114	18,307	18,292	17,183	16,231	17,430
Adult Cases	7,653	7,827	7,131	6,802	6,519	7,087	6,929	7,080	7,296	8,346
All Others	4,030	8,512	8,062	8,665	11,584	13,368	13,066	13,572	12,749	10,082
Custody/Visitation	23,835	25,190	26,263	28,173	29,833	30,756	31,427	30,887	31,379	31,928
Delinquency	127,959	128,210	119,300	97,708	86,448	80,183	78,681	72,078	69,778	64,951
Motion for Permanent Custody	3,452	2,466	2,003	1,946	1,677	2,053	2,218	2,404	2,648	2,831
Parentage	22,102	19,278	12,507	12,746	13,431	11,892	10,621	9,303	8,724	7,617
Support - Enforce or Modify	60,033	58,888	59,852	63,581	64,988	62,375	60,902	59,446	56,271	52,574
Traffic	83,702	76,213	63,296	60,040	52,111	47,747	46,782	42,959	39,082	40,229
U.I.F.S.A.	1,039	1,120	1,128	1,143	1,560	1,487	1,175	1,167	1,218	1,129
Unruly	22,792	21,898	20,870	16,876	15,400	14,152	14,018	12,811	13,020	12,173
<b>Total</b>	<b>386,246</b>	<b>376,822</b>	<b>338,856</b>	<b>314,136</b>	<b>301,665</b>	<b>289,407</b>	<b>284,111</b>	<b>268,890</b>	<b>258,396</b>	<b>249,290</b>

**Municipal and County Courts**

Total incoming cases

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Contracts	217,173	244,603	278,930	232,175	216,751	206,735	193,157	154,500	148,089	151,934
F.E.D.	115,910	118,297	117,644	109,544	108,118	116,007	113,065	114,961	112,480	110,434
Other Civil	133,439	129,156	140,126	124,231	107,879	90,569	24,794	18,397	17,312	18,088
PI/PD	9,326	8,296	7,091	7,074	6,873	7,244	6,212	6,331	5,796	4,693
Small Claims	87,963	88,969	84,499	76,797	69,385	64,240	57,896	55,564	53,216	50,736
Felonies	102,448	98,782	94,988	86,896	83,601	83,805	85,285	84,398	84,070	81,479
Misdemeanors	572,639	575,755	572,066	554,329	535,989	540,906	531,352	534,330	522,281	484,580
O.V.I.	81,897	79,943	78,602	75,299	67,594	67,585	69,247	68,368	68,099	66,724
Other Traffic	1,613,302	1,601,766	1,583,640	1,484,335	1,407,601	1,362,284	1,452,294	1,503,517	1,475,103	1,395,469
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,934,097</b>	<b>2,945,567</b>	<b>2,957,586</b>	<b>2,750,680</b>	<b>2,603,791</b>	<b>2,539,375</b>	<b>2,533,302</b>	<b>2,540,366</b>	<b>2,486,446</b>	<b>2,364,137</b>



Published by  
THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO  
August 2016



# THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO

---

Office of Court Services  
Case Management Section  
65 South Front Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3431