

THE UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEALS DATA BASE

DOCUMENTATION for PHASE 1

A Multi User Data Base Created by a Grant from the National Science
Foundation (SES-8912678)

Principal Investigator:

Donald R. Songer
Professor of Political Science
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
email: Dsonger @ sc.edu

Table of Contents

General Introduction.....	3
Files Distributed.....	7
Sampling & Weighting.....	8
Reliability Analysis.....	9
Variable list.....	10
DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES	
Basic Case Characteristics	
General Description.....	17
History & Nature of Case.....	21
Participants	
Appellants.....	32
Respondents.....	58
Other Participants.....	66
Issue Coding	
Basic Nature of Issues & Decision.....	68
Provisions Cited in Headnotes.....	95
Threshold Issues.....	102
Criminal Issues.....	109
Civil Law Issues.....	118
Civil Government & Administrative Law.....	127
Diversity Issues.....	134
Judges and Votes.....	135
Appendix 1: Alphabetical List of Variables.....	147
Appendix 2: Variable List in Input Order.....	152
Appendix 3: List of Appeals Court Judge Codes.....	158
Appendix 4: List of District Court Judge Codes.....	173
Appendix 5: Table of Weights for Circuit Years.....	218

General Introduction

Following the initial proposal for the creation of an appeals court data base, the National Science Foundation funded a planning grant that created a committee of distinguished scholars from the law and courts community to design a data base that would serve the diverse needs of the law and social science community. The advisory committee brought together distinguished scholars from political science, sociology, and law who shared an interest in the systematic study of the federal courts.

After a year of development by the advisory board, a revised proposal was submitted to the National Science Foundation by Donald Songer to fund the creation of a multi-user data base consisting of data from a substantial sample of cases from 1925 to 1988. This proposal was funded with a grant from the NSF in 1989 and a new Board of Overseers was created. The new Board, consisting of Professor Gregory Caldeira (Ohio State), Professor Deborah Barrow (Auburn), Professor Micheal Giles (Emory), Professor Lawrence Friedman (Stanford Law School), Donna Stienstra (Federal Judicial Center), and Professor Neal Tate (North Texas), immediately began a year long process of re-examining the proposed design of the study and evaluating the results of the pre-tests of proposed coding instruments. As a result of Board deliberations, the data base project was divided into two phases. The first phase was to involve the coding of a random sample of cases from each circuit for each year for the period 1925 - 1988. The total size of this sample is 15,315 cases. The second phase of the data base was designed to code all the appeals court cases whose decisions were reviewed by the Supreme Court with a decision reported in a full opinion in United States Reports for the period covered by the Supreme Court Data Base, Phase I. This phase was expected to result in the coding of approximately 4,000 additional cases. When completed, it was anticipated that Phase 2 could be merged with the Supreme Court Data Base, enabling scholars to track changes in the nature of the issues and litigants as the case moved up the judicial hierarchy and examine cross-court voting alignments. Since the identity and vote of the district court judge who heard the case below will also be coded, this second data set will allow scholars to track a case thru 5 votes: the district court, the court of appeals, the cert vote in the Supreme Court, the conference vote, and the final Supreme Court vote on the merits.

The Appeals Court Data Base Project was designed to create an extensive data set to facilitate the empirical analysis of the votes of judges and the decisions of the United States Courts of Appeals. In order to increase its utility for a wide variety of

potential users, data on a broad range of variables of theoretical significance to public law scholars were coded. A major concern of the Board of Overseers appointed to advise the PI on the construction of the data base was to insure the collection of data over a sufficiently long period of time to encourage significant longitudinal studies of trends over time in the courts. The paucity of such studies in the past was identified as one of the major weaknesses of recent scholarship. Thus, the data base was designed to code a random sample of cases for the period 1925 - 1988. 1925 marks the beginning of an increased policy role for the courts of appeals brought about by the increase in the discretionary power of the Supreme Court over its docket and also marks the beginning of the second series of the Federal Reporter. The end date (1988) for Phase 1 was dictated by the availability of data at the time the original proposal was submitted. Subsequently, the National Science Foundation funded a proposal for Phase 3 of the Appeals Court Database to bring the data base up to date through the end of 1996.

All three phases of The Appeals Court Data Base Project will be archived at the ICPSR. The second phase of the appeals court data base is expected to be archived at the ICPSR by late 1997. Phase 3 is expected to be archived in 1998. All of the 221 variables described for Phase 1 will be coded for each data set. Thus, each phase will include: a detailed coding of the nature of the issues presented; the statutory, constitutional, and procedural bases of the decision, the votes of the judges, and the nature of the litigants. The coding conventions employed in the collection of the data were designed to make comparisons to the Spaeth Supreme Court data base and the Carp district court data feasible, in addition to providing a wealth of information not available in either of these data bases. The variables included in the data base are divided into four sections: basic case characteristics, participants, issues, and judges and votes.

BASIC CASE CHARACTERISTICS

The first component, generally referred to as the "basic coding" includes a series of miscellaneous variables that provide basic descriptive information about each case and its legal history. Included in this series of variables are the decision date, case citation, first docket number, the number of docket numbers resolved in the opinion, length of the opinion, the procedural history of the case, the circuit, the district and state of origin, a code for the district court judge who heard the case below, the type of district court decision appealed, the citation of the decision below, the identity of any federal regulatory agency that made a prior decision, the decision of the appeals

court (e.g., affirmed, reversed, vacated), the number of dissents and concurrences, the number of amicus briefs filed, the nature of the counsel on each side, whether the case was reviewed by the Supreme Court, and whether the case involved a class action, cross appeals, or an en banc decision.

PARTICIPANTS

The appeals court data base includes a very detailed coding of the nature of the litigants in each case. First, litigants are categorized into seven basic types (natural persons, private business, non-profit groups or associations, federal government and its agencies, state governments and their agencies, units of local government, and fiduciaries or trustees). Then the number of appellants and the number of respondents falling into each of these categories is recorded. Each of the seven general categories is then broken down into a large number of specific categories. These codes for the detailed nature of the litigants are recorded for the first two appellants and the first two respondents. In addition, the data base matches the appellant and respondent to the plaintiff and defendant in the original action, indicates whether any of the formally listed litigants were intervenors, and indicates whether any of the original parties with actual substantive adverse interests are not listed among the formally named litigants.

ISSUES

Three types of variables are coded in order to capture the nature of the issues in the case. First, the appeals court data base includes a traditional categorization of issues that parallels the issue categories in the Spaeth Supreme Court Data Base (These variables are denoted as CASETYP1 and CASETYP2). These issues (casetypes) capture the nature of the dispute that led to the original suit. Eight general categories (criminal, civil rights, First Amendment, due process, privacy, labor relations, economic activity and regulation, and miscellaneous) are subdivided into a total of 220 specific issue categories. For example, specific categories include due process rights of prisoners, school desegregation, gender discrimination in employment, libel or defamation, obscenity, denial of fair hearing or notice in government employment disputes, abortion, right to die, union organizing, federal individual income tax, motor vehicle torts, insurance disputes, government regulation of securities, environmental regulation, admiralty - personal injury, eminent domain, and immigration.

For each of these traditional issues, the directionality of

the court's decision was recorded, using conventional definitions of directionality that are closely analogous to those in the Spaeth Supreme Court data base. For most, but not all issue categories, these will correspond to notions of "liberal" (coded as "3") and "conservative" (coded as "1") that are commonly used in the public law literature. For example, decisions supporting the position of the defendant in a criminal procedure case, the plaintiff who asserts a violation of her First Amendment rights, and the Secretary of Labor who sues a corporation for violation of child labor regulations are all coded as "3."

A second way to capture the issues in a case is the series of variables that are coded from the headnotes describing the West Topics and keynumbers at the beginning of each case. From these headnotes we coded the two most frequently cited: constitutional provisions, titles and sections of the US Code, federal rules of civil procedure, and the federal rules of criminal procedure. This coding should be useful for scholars interested in the application and interpretation of specific elements of law.

Finally, the issues in each case were coded from the standpoint of the judge who wrote the opinion. Each of the 69 variables in this section is phrased in terms of an issue question. For each variable, coders indicated whether or not the issue was discussed in the opinion. If the opinion discussed the issue, the resolution of the issue was also recorded (generally whether the issue was resolved in favor of the position of the appellant or the respondent). All issues discussed in the opinion were recorded (i.e., finding that a given issue was discussed did not preclude the conclusion that any other issue was discussed as well). The first set of variables recorded whether a series of threshold issues were addressed (e.g., standing, failure to state a claim, mootness, jurisdiction). Next, each case was coded for whether or not the opinion engaged in statutory construction, the interpretation of the Constitution, or the interpretation of court doctrine or circuit law. Following these preliminary variables, a long series of variables were recorded to capture whether the court dealt with each of a series of questions relating to civil and criminal procedure (e.g., was there prejudicial conduct by the prosecutor, was there a challenge to jury instructions, was there a challenge to the admissibility of evidence from a search and seizure, did the court rule on the sufficiency of evidence, was there an issue relating to the weight of evidence, was the validity of an injunction at issue, was there an issue relating to discovery procedures, was the application of the substantial evidence rule questioned, did the agency fail to develop an adequate record, were the parties in a diversity of citizenship case truly diverse).

JUDGES AND VOTES

The final section of the data set includes the identity of judges participating on the appeals court panel and the directionality of the vote of each judge on each casetype. A five digit code was created to identify every appeals court judge (including judges on senior status) and every district court judge who participated on an appeals court panel during the period of the data base. Judges from other courts (e.g., retired Supreme Court justices, judges of the Federal Circuit, judges of the Court of Customs and Patents Appeals) who served on appeals court panels are not coded and are treated as missing data. The judge codes for the appeals court data are structured so that the decisional data on each judge can be merged with the personal attribute and background data on each judge collected by Professors Barrow, Gyski, and Zuk at Auburn University.

The Appeals Court Data Base project represents a significant commitment of money by the Law and Social Sciences program of the NSF. From its conception it was designed to create a data base for the benefit of the entire constituency of the Law and Social Science program. The NSF anticipated that the data base created by this grant would be of tremendous benefit and interest to a very wide spectrum of our members. The Board of Overseers took special pains to insure that the project was designed in such a way that it would serve the interests of the widest group of scholars possible. The data base being created will arguably be the richest data base available to public law scholars anywhere in the world.

The data is archived at the ICPSR in three forms: an SPSS file, a SAS file, and an ASCII file (i.e., raw data). Users should select the format that will be easiest for them to utilize. In the variable list below, the acronym listed after the variable number represents the variable name as it appears in both the SPSS and SAS versions of the data. The ASCII file is provided in a fixed column, rectangular format with a logical record length of 609. The size of the data base in its ASCII version is slightly over ten megabytes. The column location of each variable in its ASCII format is provided in the detailed description of each variable that follows the variable list (Note that in the list below the variables are not listed in their column order).

Files Distributed

The complete data base will be available in three files:

SAS2588.SD2	a SAS data file
DAT2588.asc	an ASCII raw data file
SPSS2588.sav	an SPSS data file

The documentation for the data base will be provided in a wordperfect 5.1 file, denoted as:

DOCUMENT.DAT

The word perfect file was produced with a "Courier" 12 point font.

The data presented in Appendix 5, the number of cases decided with published opinions for each circuit/year (i.e., the data to use for the weighting of variables for analysis) is provided in an ASCII (i.e., raw data) file called:

CIRCYR.ASC

Sampling and Weighting

The sampling for Phase 1 was designed to facilitate two important types of analyses which are largely absent from the literature on appellate courts in the United States. First, the sampling was designed to encourage longitudinal analyses of significant time periods. In addition, the data base was designed to encourage examination of similarities and differences among the circuits. The role of circuits as institutional features of the courts of appeals and the role of circuit law in shaping the decisions of the courts has received little prior attention. In order to achieve these goals, the sampling unit chosen was the circuit/year. The universe of cases for each circuit/year was defined as all decisions reported with opinions published in the Federal Reporter for a given circuit in a single calendar year. To be counted as a published opinion the decision must announce a disposition of the case (e.g., affirmed, remanded, dismissed) and must state at least one reason for the decision. If a decision met these criteria, it was included in the universe of cases to be coded regardless of the form of the decision. Thus, the data base includes some decisions denoted as "per curiam" opinions and some listed as "memorandum" decisions. Decisions coded in the database range from those with one sentence opinions (e.g., "The decision of the district court is reversed on the authority of *Furman v Georgia*") to en banc decisions with multiple dissents and opinions of over 50 pages in length. There are 707 circuit/years represented in Phase 1.

For each circuit/year from 1961 thru 1988, a random sample of 30 cases was selected. For each circuit/year from 1925 thru 1960,

a random sample of 15 cases was selected. Since the total number of cases in the 707 circuit/years varies widely, the total sample of cases in Phase 1 is not a random sample of all appeals court decisions from 1925-1988. To analyze a random sample for the entire database, users should consult the table of weights in Appendix 5 and weight each circuit year according to the proportion of the universe of cases contained in the particular circuit/year. The Table of weights in Appendix 5 provides the total number of decisions of the circuit for a given calendar year that were reported with published decisions. These data can be used to create weight variables to approximate a random sample for whatever portion of the database is used in a particular analysis. For example, suppose one wanted to know what proportion of all appeals court decisions in 1925 affirmed the decision appealed. Using the data from Appendix 5 we could construct the following table to assist the analysis:

circuit	<u>sample of circuit</u>		<u>universe of circuit</u>		weight
	# cases	proportion	# cases	proportion	
01	15	.1	095	.049	0.49
02	15	.1	329	.170	1.70
03	15	.1	116	.060	0.60
04	15	.1	099	.051	0.51
05	15	.1	175	.091	0.91
06	15	.1	222	.115	1.15
07	15	.1	081	.042	0.42
08	15	.1	330	.171	1.71
09	15	.1	289	.150	1.50
DC	15	.1	196	.101	1.01
total	150	1.0	1932	1.0	

In this example, column two reflects the fact that for 1925, a random sample of 15 cases was selected for each circuit. Since there were only ten circuits in 1925, the proportion of the sample for the year 1925 is .1 for each circuit (in 1988, when there were 12 circuits the proportion of the sample from each circuit will be .083). The fourth column in the table (cases in universe) is taken directly from the total number of published decisions for each circuit year reported in Appendix 5. The figures in column 5 (proportion in circuit) are derived by taking the total number of cases in a given circuit for 1925 (column 4) and dividing it by the

total number of cases from all circuits for 1925 (1932). To obtain the value for the weight for each circuit, the value in column 5 (proportion of cases in the universe) is divided by the figure in column 3 (proportion of the sample in the universe in the given circuit year). Thus, to estimate what the frequency of a given variable (in this example, the variable TREAT) would be in a random sample of all cases decided in 1925, each case from the First Circuit should be weighted as 0.49 of a case, each case from the Second Circuit counted as 1.70 cases, etc.

Reliability Analysis

The detailed description of variables that follows the variable list below also reports the results of an analysis of intercoder reliability performed before the data base was released. To check the reliability of the coding, a random sample of 250 cases was selected from the 15,315 cases in the data base. This sample of 250 cases was then independently coded by a second coder and the results of the two codings were compared. Three measures of reliability are reported. First, the simple rate of agreement (expressed as a percentage) between the code assigned by the first coder and the code assigned by the second coder is reported. In addition, two bivariate measures of association are reported: gamma and Kendall's tau-c. Kendall's tau-c is most appropriate for variables that have an ordinal level of measurement. Therefore, users should exercise caution in interpreting the meaning of this statistic for variables that are not ordinal. Nevertheless, for some of the variables that can take many values (e.g., CASETYP1), even though the values of the variable are not completely ordinal, many of the values that are close to each other are more similar to each other than they are to values that are numerically distant from them. For such variables, high values of tau will indicate that many of the disagreements in coding were between values that were numerically close.

A few of the variables have rates of agreement that are very high (e.g., above 96%) but still have low or even negative values of gamma and/or tau. All of these variables have highly skewed distributions. The high rates of agreements indicate that for most cases both coders agreed that the variable was in its modal value (typically these were issue variables with a modal value of zero, which indicated that the issue was not discussed in the case) but in the small number of cases in which one of the coders felt that the variable did not fall into the modal category, the second coder generally disagreed.

No reliability statistics are reported for the codes and votes of judges 4 through 15 because no en banc cases were in the reliability sample.

VARIABLE LIST

The variable list that follows is organized by topical categories of variables. The description of variables that follows proceeds in the same order. The acronym associated with each variable is the variable name contained in both the SAS and SPSS versions of the database. A list of variables arranged alphabetically by acronym is provided in Appendix 1. Appendix 1 also provides the location (i.e., page number) in the documentation where the detailed description of the variable is provided. Appendix 2 provides a list of variables in the order in which they appear in the input statement for the ASCII version of the database.

BASIC CASE CHARACTERISTICS

A. General description

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 1. CASENUM | case identification |
| 2. YEAR | year of decision |
| 3. MONTH | month of decision |
| 4. DAY | day of decision |
| 5. CITE | citation in <u>Federal Reporter</u> |
| 6. VOL | volume in which case located |
| 7. BEGINPG | page number of 1st page of case |
| 8. ENDOPIN | page number of last page of majority opinion |
| 9. ENDPAGE | page number of last page of all opinions in case |
| 10. DOCNUM | docket number of first case decided by the opinion |
| 11. METHOD | nature of appeals court decision (e.g., 1st decision by 3 judge panel, en banc) |

B. History and Nature of Case

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 12. CIRCUIT | circuit of court |
| 13. STATE | state of origin of case |
| 14. DISTRICT | district of origin of case |
| 15. ORIGIN | type of court or agency that made original decision |
| 16. SOURCE | forum from which decision appealed |
| 17. DISTJUDG | ID of district judge (if any) deciding case below |
| 18. APPLFROM | type of district court final judgment (if any) appealed from |
| 19. ADMINREV | ID of federal regulatory agency (if any) the case was appealed from |
| 20. PRIORPUB | citation (if any) to prior published opinion in district court |
| 21. OPINSTAT | opinion status of decision |
| 22. CLASSACT | was case a class action? |
| 23. CROSSAPP | were there cross appeals ? |

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 24. SANCTION | were sanctions imposed ? |
| 25. INITIATE | party initiating appeal (e.g., plaintiff, defendant, intervenor) |

PARTICIPANTS

A. Appellants

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 26. NUMAPPEL | total number of appellants |
| 27. APPNATPR | number of appellants who were natural persons |
| 28. APPBUS | number of appellants who were private businesses |
| 29. APPNONP | number of appellants who were non-profit groups |
| 30. APPFED | number of appellants who were federal government agencies |
| 31. APPSUBST | number of appellants who were sub-state governments |
| 32. APPSTATE | number of appellants who were state government agencies |
| 33. APPFIDUC | number of appellants who were fiduciaries or trustees |
| 34. APP_STID | state of appellant (if appellant is state or local govt) |
| 35. GENAPEL1 | general classification of 1st appellant |
| 36. BANK_AP1 | was first appellant bankrupt ? |
| 37. APPEL1 | detailed nature of 1st listed appellant |
| 38. GENAPEL2 | general classification of 2nd appellant |
| 39. BANK_AP2 | was second appellant bankrupt ? |
| 40. APPEL2 | detailed nature of 2nd listed appellant whose code is not identical to the code of the first appellant |
| 41. REALAPP | are the appellants coded in var 37 and var 40 the real parties in this case ? |

B. Respondents

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 42. NUMRESP | total number of respondents |
| 43. R_NATPR | number of respondents who were natural persons |
| 44. R_BUS | number of respondents who were private businesses |
| 45. R_NONP | number of respondents who were non-profit groups |
| 46. R_FED | number of respondents who were federal government agencies |
| 47. R_SUBST | number of respondents who were sub-state governments |
| 48. R_STATE | number of respondents who were state government agencies |
| 49. R_FIDUC | number of respondents who were fiduciaries or |

	trustees
50. R_STID	state of respondent (if respondent is state or local govt)
51. GENRESP1	general classification of 1st respondent
52. BANK_R1	was first respondent bankrupt ?
53. RESPOND1	detailed nature of 1st listed respondent
54. GENRESP2	general classification of 2nd respondent
55. BANK_R2	was second respondent bankrupt ?
56. RESPOND2	detailed nature of 2nd listed respondent whose code is not identical to the code of the first respondent
57. REALRESP	are the respondents coded in field 53 and field 56 the real parties in this case ?

C. Other Participants

58. COUNSEL1	counsel for appellant
59. COUNSEL2	counsel for respondent
60. AMICUS	number of amicus curiae briefs filed
61. INTERVEN	was there an intervenor ?

ISSUES CODING

A. Basic Nature of Issue and Decision

62. CASETYP1	first case type - substantive policy (analogous to Spaeth issue codes)
63. GENISS	eight summary issue categories based on CASETYP1
64. DIRECT1	directionality of decision on 1st case type
65. CASETYP2	second case type
66. DIRECT2	directionality of decision on 2nd case type
67. TREAT	treatment of decision below by appeals court
68. MAJVOTES	number of majority votes
69. DISSENT	number of dissenting votes
70. CONCUR	number of concurrences
71. HABEAS	was this a habeas corpus case ?
72. DECUNCON	was law or administrative action declared unconstitutional ?
73. CONSTIT	was there an issue about the constitutionality of a law or administrative action ?
74. FEDLAW	did the court engage in statutory interpretation ?
75. PROCEDUR	was there an interpretation of precedent that did not involve statutory or constitutional interpretation ?
76. TYPEISS	general nature of proceedings (criminal, civil-government, civil - private, diversity)

B. Most Frequently Cited Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Procedural Rules

77. CONST1	constitutional provision most frequently cited in headnotes
78. CONST2	constitutional provision 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
79. USC1	title of US Code most frequently cited in headnotes
80. USC1SECT	section of USC1 most frequently cited in headnotes
81. USC2	title of US Code 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
82. USC2SECT	section of USC2 most frequently cited in headnotes
83. CIVPROC1	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure most frequently cited in headnotes
84. CIVPROC2	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
85. CRMPROC1	Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure most frequently cited in headnotes
86. CRMPROC2	Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes

C. Threshold issues

87. JURIS	was there a jurisdiction issue ?
88. STATECL	was there an issue about failure to state a claim ?
89. STANDING	was there an issue about standing ?
90. MOOTNESS	was there an issue about mootness ?
91. EXHAUST	was there an issue about ripeness or failure to exhaust administrative remedies ?
92. TIMELY	was there an issue about whether litigants complied with a rule about timeliness, filing fees, or statutes of limitation ?
93. IMMUNITY	was there an issue about governmental immunity ?
94. FRIVOL	was there an issue about whether the case was frivolous ?
95. POLQUEST	was there an issue about the political question doctrine ?
96. OTHTHRES	was there some other threshold issue at the trial level ?
97. LATE	was there an issue relating to the timeliness of the appeal ?
98. FRIVAPP	was there an allegation that the appeal was frivolous ?
99. OTHAPPTH	was there some other threshold issue at the appellate level ?

D. Criminal issues (for each of the issues below, the coding

captures whether the issue was discussed in the opinion and if so whether the resolution of the issue favored the appellant or the respondent)

100. PREJUD	prejudicial conduct by prosecutor
101. INSANE	insanity defense
102. IMPROPER	improper influence on jury
103. JURYINST	jury instructions
104. OTHJURY	other issues relating to juries
105. DEATHPEN	death penalty
106. SENTENCE	issue relating to sentence other than death penalty
107. INDICT	was indictment defective
108. CONFESS	admissibility of confession or incriminating statement
109. SEARCH	admissibility of evidence from search or seizure
110. OTHADMIS	admissibility of evidence other than search or confession
111. PLEA	issue relating to plea bargaining
112. COUNSEL	ineffective counsel
113. RTCOUNS	right to counsel
114. SUFFIC	sufficiency of evidence
115. INDIGENT	violation of rights of indigent
116. ENTRAP	entrapment
117. PROCDIS	dismissal by district court on procedural grounds
118. OTHCRIM	other criminal issue

E. Civil Law Issues

119. DUEPROC	due process
120. EXECORD	interpretation of executive order or administrative regulation
121. STPOLICY	interpretation of state or local law, executive order or administrative regulation
122. WEIGHTEV	interpretation of weight of evidence issues
123. PRETRIAL	trial court rulings on pre-trial procedure, (but not motions for summary judgment or discovery which are covered in separate variables - see fields 130 & 135)
124. TRIALPRO	court rulings on trial procedure
125. POST_TRL	post-trial procedures and motions (including court costs and motions to set aside jury decisions)
126. ATTYFEE	attorney's fees
127. JUDGDISC	abuse of discretion by trial judge
128. ALTDISP	issue relating to alternative dispute resolution process (includes ADR, settlement conference, mediation, arbitration)
129. INJUNCT	validity or appropriateness of injunction
130. SUMMARY	summary judgment
131. FEDVST	conflict of laws or dispute over whether federal vs

	state law governs
132. FOREIGN	conflict over whether foreign or domestic law applies
133. INT_LAW	application of international law
134. ST_V_ST	conflict over which state's laws apply
135. DISCOVER	conflict over discovery procedures
136. OTHCIVIL	other civil law issue

F. Civil Law Issues Involving Government Actors, Administrative Law

137. SUBEVID	substantial evidence doctrine
138. DENOVO	use of standard of review, "de novo on facts"
139. ERRON	clearly erroneous standard
140. CAPRIC	arbitrary or capricious standard
141. ABUSEDIS	should court defer to agency discretion ?
142. JUDREV	conflict over whether agency decision was subject to judicial review ?
143. GENSTAND	did agency articulate the appropriate general standard ?
144. NOTICE	did agency give proper notice ?
145. ALJ	did court support decision of administrative law judge ?
146. AGEN_ACQ	issue related to agency acquisition of information
147. FREEINFO	administrative denial of information to those requesting it, freedom of information, sunshine laws
148. COMMENT	did agency give proper opportunity to comment ?
149. RECORD	did agency fail to develop an adequate record ?

G. Diversity Issues

150. DIVERSE	were the parties truly diverse ?
151. WHLAWS	which state's laws should govern dispute ?

JUDGES AND VOTES

160. CODEJ1	code for the judge who wrote the court opinion
161. CODEJ2	code for 2nd judge on panel
162. J2VOTE1	vote of 2nd judge on 1st case type
163. J2VOTE2	vote of 2nd judge on 2nd case type
164. J2MAJ1	was 2nd judge in majority on 1st case type ?
165. J2MAJ2	was 2nd judge in majority on 2nd case type ?
166. CODEJ3	code for 3rd judge on panel
167. J3VOTE1	vote of 3rd judge on 1st case type
168. J3VOTE2	vote of 3rd judge on 2nd case type
169. J3MAJ1	was 3rd judge in majority on 1st case type ?

170. J3MAJ2 was 3rd judge in majority on 2nd case type ?
 171. CODEJ4 code for 4th judge on panel
 172. J4VOTE1 vote of 4th judge on 1st case type
 173. J4VOTE2 vote of 4th judge on 2nd case type
 174. J4MAJ1 was 4th judge in majority on 1st case type ?
 175. J4MAJ2 was 4th judge in majority on 2nd case type ?
 176. CODEJ5 code for 5th judge on panel
 177. J5VOTE1 vote of 5th judge on 1st case type
 178. J5VOTE2 vote of 5th judge on 2nd case type
 179. J5MAJ1 was 5th judge in majority on 1st case type ?
 180. J5MAJ2 was 5th judge in majority on 2nd case type ?
 .
 .
 .
 225. CODEJ15 code for 15th judge on panel
 226. J15VOTE1 vote of 15th judge on 1st case type
 227. J15VOTE2 vote of 15th judge on 2nd case type
 228. J15MAJ1 was 15th judge in majority on 1st case type ?
 229. J15MAJ2 was 15th judge in majority on 2nd case type ?

DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

BASIC CASE CHARACTERISTICS

A. General description

Field 1

CASENUM

5 columns wide (1-5)
numeric

This field represents a simple unique identifier for each case, beginning with 1 for the first case coded from 1988 and proceeding consecutively to 15,315 for the last case coded from 1925.

Fields 2-4

YEAR

4 columns wide (16-19)
numeric

MONTH

2 columns wide (20-21)
numeric

DAY

2 columns wide (22-23)
numeric

These variables record the date on which the decision was announced. If only one date was listed in the syllabus of the case and the date was not described, it was assumed to be the decision date.

Fields 5-7

CITE
9 columns wide (25-33)
alphanumeric
VOL
4 columns wide (25-28)
numeric
BEGINPG
4 columns wide (30-33)
numeric

These variables record the citation of the case. The format of the variable CITE is: 4 digit volume number, slash, 4 digit page number. In the ASCII version, the variables are zero filled. All references are to the second series of the Federal Reporter. Thus, for the case cited as 123 F2nd 52, the variables would have the following values: CITE = 0123\0052, VOL = 0123, BEGINPG = 0052. BEGINPG is the page on which the case begins in the Federal Reporter.

Fields 8-9

ENDOPIN
4 columns wide (34-37)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	95.2%
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.00

ENDPAGE
4 columns wide (39-42)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.4%
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.00

These variables indicate the last page of the opinion of the court (i.e., the majority opinion) and the last page in the case

(e.g., the last page of a dissenting or concurring opinion). These two variables will generally be the same in decisions with no dissents and no concurrences. However, ENDPAGE may also be greater than ENDOPIN because there is an appendix or some memorandum at the end of the majority opinion.

Field 10

DOCNUM

8 columns wide (44-51)
alphanumeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	94.8%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.99

This variable lists the docket number of the case coded. For opinions that resolved more than one docket number, the first docket number listed is coded. Unfortunately, the appeals courts have not provided a consistent format for reporting docket numbers. Most frequently, the format listed in the Federal Reporter is: "2 digit year, hyphen, 4 digit id number" (note that the year is presumably the year in which the case was docketed, which may be earlier than the year of the decision date). But this format is not uniformly followed, especially in the earlier years of the data base when a single unhyphenated number (of up to 5 digits) may be listed.

The format followed for the database was designed to provide a standardized form that was compatible with the data base maintained by the Administrative Office of the Courts (to facilitate users who wished to merge this database with the AO data). Following the AO format, DOCKNUM has the format: 2 digit year, zero, 5 digit number. If the docket number listed in the Federal Reporter does not have a 2 digit designation for year, we inserted the year of the decision as the first two digits. For example, a recent case listed in F2nd as: "88-1234" would be recorded in the database as "88001234". Alternatively, a case decided in 1933 with a docket number of "12345" in F2nd would be coded as "33012345".

Field 11

METHOD

1 column wide (57)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	91.2%
Gamma:	.71
Kendall's Tau-b:	.25

This variable records the nature of the proceeding in the court of appeals for the particular citation selected for the random sample. In effect, this variable records something of the legal history of the case, indicating whether there had been prior appellate court proceeding on the same case prior to the decision currently coded. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = decided by panel for first time (no indication of re-hearing or remand).
- 2 = decided by panel after re-hearing (i.e., this is the second time this case has been heard by this same panel).
- 3 = decided by panel after remand from Supreme Court
- 4 = decided by court en banc, after single panel decision
- 5 = decided by court en banc, after multiple panel decisions
- 6 = decided by court en banc, no prior panel decisions
- 7 = decided by panel after remand to lower court (e.g., an earlier decision of the court of appeals remanded the case back to the district court which made another decision. That second decision of the district court is now before the court of appeals on appeal).
- 8 = other
- 9 = not ascertained

Note:

i) coders generally assumed that the case had been decided by the panel for the first time if there was no indication to the contrary in the opinion.

ii) the opinion usually, but not always explicitly indicates when a decision was made "en banc" (though the spelling of "en banc" varies). However, if more than 3 judges were listed as participating in the decision, the decision was coded as enbanc even if there was no explicit description of the proceeding as en banc.

B. History and Nature of Case

Field 12

CIRCUIT

2 columns wide (59-60)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.00

This field records the circuit of the court that decided the case. The District of Columbia circuit is coded as 00 and all other circuits by their number (e.g., the Second Circuit is 02).

Field 13

STATE

2 columns wide (62-63)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.97

This field records the state or territory in which the case was first heard. If the case began in the federal district court, it is the state of that district court. If it is a habeas corpus case, it is the state of the state court that first heard the case. If the case originated in a federal administrative agency, the variable is coded as "not applicable." States were assigned a two digit number in alphabetical order. The variable takes the following values:

00 not determined
01 Alabama
02 Alaska
03 Arizona

04 Arkansas
05 California
06 Colorado
07 Connecticut
08 Delaware
09 Florida
10 Georgia
11 Hawaii
12 Idaho
13 Illinois
14 Indiana
15 Iowa
16 Kansas
17 Kentucky
18 Louisiana
19 Maine
20 Maryland
21 Massachussets
22 Michigan
23 Minnesota
24 Mississippi
25 Missouri
26 Montana
27 Nebraska
28 Nevada
29 New Hampshire
30 New Jersey
31 New Mexico
32 New York
33 North Carolina
34 North Dakota
35 Ohio
36 Oklahoma
37 Oregon
38 Pennsylvania
39 Rhode Island
40 South Carolina
41 South Dakota
42 Tennessee
43 Texas
44 Utah
45 Vermont
46 Virginia
47 Washington
48 West Virginia
49 Wisconsin
50 Wyoming
51 Virgin Island
52 Puerto Rico

53 District of Columbia
54 Guam
55 not applicable - case from court other than US District
Court or state court (e.g., appealed from regulatory agency)
56 Panama Canal Zone

Field 14

DISTRICT
1 column wide (65)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 94.4%
Gamma: .93
Kendall's Tau-b: .91

For all cases that were appealed to the courts of appeals from the federal district court, this variable records which district in the state the case came from. Thus, to identify a particular district court of interest, one would have to combine this variable with the preceeding variable (STATE). For cases that did not come from a federal district court, the variable is coded as not applicable. The variable takes the following values:

0 = not applicable - not in district court
1 = eastern
2 = western
3 = central
4 = middle
5 = southern
6 = northern
7 = whole state is one judicial district
8 = not ascertained

Field 15

ORIGIN

1 column wide (67)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	83.2%
Gamma:	.87
Kendall's Tau-b:	.70

This field records the type of court which made the original decision (cases removed from a state court are coded as originating in federal district court). The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = federal district court (single judge)
 - 2 = 3 judge district court
 - 3 = state court (includes habeas corpus petitions after conviction in state court; also includes petitions from courts of territories other than the U.S. District Courts)
 - 4 = bankruptcy court, referee in bankruptcy, special master
 - 5 = federal magistrate
 - 6 = originated in federal administrative agency
 - 7 = special DC court (i.e., not US District Court for DC)
 - 8 = other (e.g., Tax Court, a court martial)
 - 9 = not ascertained
-

Field 16

SOURCE

2 columns wide (69-70)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	94.8%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.86

This field identifies the forum that heard this case immediately before the case came to the court of appeals. Note that often the SOURCE and ORIGIN will be the same. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = federal district court (single judge)
 - 2 = 3 judge district court
 - 3 = state court
 - 4 = bankruptcy court or referee in bankruptcy
 - 5 = federal magistrate
 - 6 = federal administrative agency
 - 7 = Court of Customs & Patent Appeals
 - 8 = Court of Claims
 - 9 = Court of Military Appeals
 - 10 = Tax Court or Tax Board
 - 11 = administrative law judge
 - 12 = U.S. Supreme Court (remand)
 - 13 = special DC court (i.e., not the US District Court for DC)
 - 14 = earlier appeals court panel
 - 15 = other
 - 16 = not ascertained
-

Field 17

DISTJUDG

6 columns wide (72-77)

numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement: 94.8%

Gamma: .94

Kendall's Tau-b: .94

This field identifies the federal district court judge (if any) that heard the case in the original trial. See the separate list of district judge codes in Appendix 4 for the identity of the district judge. The variable takes the value "99999" if the name of the district judge could not be ascertained.

Field 18

APPLFROM

2 columns wide (79-80)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	90.0%
Gamma:	.92
Kendall's Tau-b:	.87

This field records the type of district court decision or judgment appealed from (i.e., the nature of the decision below in the district court). If there was no prior district court action, the variable is coded as not applicable. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = trial (either jury or bench trial)
 - 2 = injunction or denial of injunction or stay of injunction
 - 3 = summary judgment or denial of summary judgment
 - 4 = guilty plea or denial of motion to withdraw plea
 - 5 = dismissal (include dismissal of petition for habeas corpus)
 - 6 = appeals of post judgment orders (e.g., attorneys' fees, costs, damages, JNOV - judgment notwithstanding the verdict)
 - 7 = appeal of post settlement orders
 - 8 = not a final judgment: interlocutory appeal
 - 9 = not a final judgment : mandamus
 - 10 = other (e.g., pre-trial orders, rulings on motions, directed verdicts) or could not determine nature of final judgment.
 - 11 = does not fit any of the above categories, but opinion mentions a "trial judge"
 - 12 = not applicable (e.g., decision below was by a federal administrative agency, tax court)
-

Field 19

ADMINREV

2 columns wide (82-83)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.86

This field records the federal agency (if any) whose decision was reviewed by the court of appeals. If there was no prior agency action, the variable is coded as not applicable. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = Benefits Review Board
 - 2 = Civil Aeronautics Board
 - 3 = Civil Service Commission
 - 4 = Federal Communications Commission
 - 5 = Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 - 6 = Federal Power Commission
 - 7 = Federal Maritime Commission
 - 8 = Federal Trade Commission
 - 9 = Interstate Commerce Commission
 - 10 = National Labor Relations Board
 - 11 = Atomic Energy Commission
 - 12 = Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 - 13 = Securities & Exchange Commission
 - 14 = other federal agency
 - 15 = not ascertained or not applicable
-

Field 20

PRIORPUB

10 columns wide (85-94)
alphanumeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	.92
Kendall's Tau-b:	.69

This field records the citation of the most recent (if any) published opinion of some other court or a prior decision of the courts of appeals for this same case. If there was no prior published opinion, the field will be treated as a missing value. Each citation takes the following form: a numeric volume number, followed by an alphanumeric abbreviation of the reporter, followed by a numeric page number on which the decision starts. The following were the most frequently used abbreviations for reporters:

FS	Federal Supplement
F2nd	Federal Reporter, 2nd series
TC	Tax Court
SC	United States Supreme Court
BR	Bankruptcy Court
FRD	Federal Rules Decisions

All other abbreviations that appear use the format of the Blue Book of the Uniform System of Citation.

Field 21

OPINSTAT

1 column wide (96)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.4%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.89

This field records whether there was an opinion in which the opinion writer was identified or whether the opinion was per curiam. The variable takes the following values:

1= signed, with reasons
2= per curiam, with reasons
9=not ascertained

Field 22

CLASSACT

1 column wide (101)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.00

This field is a dummy variable that records whether the case was described in the opinion as a class action suit. The variable takes the following values:

0 = the opinion does not indicate that this was a class action suit

1 = the opinion specifically indicates that the action was filed as a representative of a class or of "all others similarly situated."

Field 23

CROSSAPP

1 column wide (103)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	95.2%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.66

This field is a dummy variable that records whether there were cross appeals from the decision below to the court of appeals that were consolidated in the present case. The variable takes the following values:

0=no cross appeals
1=yes, cross appeals were filed
2=not ascertained

Field 24

SANCTION

1 column wide (120)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

This field records whether there were sanctions imposed on one of the litigants by the court of appeals. The variable takes the following values:

0 = no sanctions
1 = sanctions imposed on appellant
2 = sanctions imposed on respondent
3 = sanctions imposed on both appellant and respondent
4 = not ascertained

Field 25

INITIATE

1 column wide (126)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	92.4%
Gamma:	.90
Kendall's Tau-b:	.83

This field records which of the parties below initiated the appeal. For cases with cross appeals or multiple docket numbers, if the opinion does not explicitly indicate which appeal was filed first, the coding assumes that the first litigant listed as the "appellant" or "petitioner" was the first to file the appeal. In federal habeas corpus petitions, the prisoner is considered to be the plaintiff for purposes of this variable. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = original plaintiff
- 2 = original defendant
- 3 = federal agency representing plaintiff
- 4 = federal agency representing defendant
- 5 = intervenor
- 8 = not applicable
- 9 = not ascertained

PARTICIPANTS

Note: for fields 27-58, intervenors who participated as parties at the courts of appeals are counted as either appellants or respondents when it could be determined whose position they supported. For example, if there were two plaintiffs who lost in district court, appealed, and were joined by four intervenors who also asked the court of appeals to reverse the district court, the number of appellants was coded as six. Field 61 records whether or not any of the parties were intervenors

A. Appellants

In some cases there is some confusion over who should be listed as the appellant and who as the respondent. This confusion is primarily the result of the presence of multiple docket numbers consolidated into a single appeal that is disposed of by a single opinion. Most frequently, this occurs when there are cross appeals

and/or when one litigant sued (or was sued by) multiple litigants that were originally filed in district court as separate actions. The coding rule followed in such cases was to go strictly by the designation provided in the title of the case. The first person listed in the title as the appellant was coded as the appellant even if they subsequently appeared in a second docket number as the respondent and regardless of who was characterized as the appellant in the opinion.

To clarify the coding conventions, consider the following hypothetical case in which the US Justice Department sues a labor union to strike down a racially discriminatory seniority system and the corporation (siding with the position of its union) simultaneously sues the government to get an injunction to block enforcement of the relevant civil rights law. From a district court decision that consolidated the two suits and declared the seniority system illegal but refused to impose financial penalties on the union, the corporation appeals and the government and union file cross appeals from the decision in the suit brought by the government. Assume the case was listed in the Federal Reporter as follows:

United States of America,
Plaintiff, Appellant

v

International Brotherhood of Widget Workers,AFL-CIO
Defendant, Appellee.

International Brotherhood of Widget Workers,AFL-CIO
Defendants, Cross-appellants

v

United States of America.

Widgets, Inc. & Susan Kuersten Sheehan, President & Chairman
of the Board
Plaintiff, Appellants,

v

United States of America,
Defendant, Appellee.

This case would be coded as follows:
Appellant = United States
Respondents= International Brotherhood of Widget Workers
Widgets, Inc.

NUMAPPEL = 1
APPFED=1
NUMRESP=3
R_BUS=2
R_NONP=1
APPEL1=31010
RESPOND1=21006

RESPOND2=14400

Field 26

NUMAPPEL

3 columns wide (130-132)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.8%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.95

This field records the total number of appellants in the case. If the total number cannot be determined (e.g., if the appellant is listed as "Smith, et. al." and the opinion does not specify who is included in the "et.al.") then 99 is recorded. This variable was directly recorded by the coders - it was not generated by taking the sum of the next seven variables that record the number of appellants falling into seven specific categories. The value for this variable sometimes does not equal the sum of the next seven variables. The most common reasons that NUMAPPEL does not equal the sum of the specific categories (in approximate order of frequency) are: a) NUMAPPEL will equal 99 whenever any one of the next seven variables equals 99; b) there is an error in one of the eight variables; 3) there were appellants who did not fit any of the specific categories (e.g., the first appellant is an Indian tribe, APPEL1 = 82001).

Fields 27 - 34

APPNATPR (Natural Persons)

3 columns wide (134-136)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	94.4%
Gamma:	.94
Kendall's Tau-b:	.89

APPBUS (Business)
3 columns wide (138-140)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	92.8%
Gamma:	.93
Kendall's Tau-b:	.84

APPNONP (groups & associations)
3 columns wide (142-144)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	96.8%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.67

APPFED (federal government)
3 columns wide (146-148)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	.99
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	.97

APPSUBST (substate government)
3 columns wide (150-152)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.00

Kendall's Tau-b:	1.00
------------------	------

APPSTATE (state government)
3 columns wide (154-156)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	.99

APPFIDUC (fiduciaries)
3 columns wide (158-160)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.2%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.73

The structure of each field in this group is the same as the structure of the preceding variable (NUMAPPEL). Each field records the number of appellants in the present case that fell into the designated general category of appellants. If the total number cannot be determined (e.g., if the appellant is listed as "Smith, et. al." and the opinion does not specify who is included in the "et.al.") then 99 is recorded in the category (in this example APPNATPR=99). The types of appellants recorded in each field are as follows:

APPNATPR = natural persons

APPBUS = private business and its executives

APPNONP = groups and associations

APPFED = the federal government, its agencies, and officials

APPSUBST = sub-state governments, their agencies, and officials

APPSTATE = state governments, their agencies, and officials

APPFIDUC = fiduciaries

Note that if an individual is listed by name, but their appearance in the case is as a government official, then they are counted as a government rather than as a private person. For example, in the case "Billy Jones & Alfredo Ruiz v Joe Smith" where

Smith is a state prisoner who brought a civil rights suit against two of the wardens in the prison (Jones & Ruiz), the following values would be coded: APPNATPR=0 and APPSTATE=2. A similar logic is applied to businesses and associations. Officers of a company or association whose role in the case is as a representative of their company or association are coded as being a business or association rather than as a natural person. However, employees of a business or a government who are suing their employer are coded as natural persons. Likewise, employees who are charged with criminal conduct for action that was contrary to the company's policies are considered natural persons.

If the title of a case listed a corporation by name and then listed the names of two individuals that the opinion indicated were top officers of the same corporation as the appellants, then the number of appellants was coded as three and all three were coded as a business (with the identical detailed code). Similar logic was applied when government officials or officers of an association were listed by name.

Field 34

APP_STID

2 columns wide (162-163)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.81

This field uses the numerical codes for the states (see field 13, STATE, for a listing of the codes) to indicate the state of the first listed state or local government agency that is an appellant.

Field 35

GENAPEL1

1 column wide (166)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.8%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.94

This field reports the coding of the first listed appellant. The 9 categories are the same as the first digit of the detailed coding of the appellants (Note that fields 38, GENAPEL2; 51, GENRESP1; and 54, GENRESP2 use the same categories. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = private business (including criminal enterprises)
 - 2 = private organization or association
 - 3 = federal government (includes DC)
 - 4 = sub-state government (e.g., county, local, special district)
 - 5 = state government (includes territories & commonwealths)
 - 6 = government - level not ascertained
 - 7 = natural person (excludes persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)
 - 8 = miscellaneous
 - 9 = not ascertained
-

Field 36

BANK_AP1

1 column wide (165)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.31

This field records a dichotomous variable to indicate whether or not the first listed appellant is bankrupt. If there is no indication of whether or not the appellant is bankrupt, the appellant is presumed to be not bankrupt. The variable takes the following values:

1 = bankrupt
2 = not bankrupt

Field 37

APPEL1

5 columns wide (166-170)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	84.8%
Gamma:	.91
Kendall's Tau-b:	.89

This field records a five digit code to represent a more detailed coding of the nature of the first listed appellant than is provided in field 35 (GENAPEL1). The first digit of this variable is the same as that for field 35. The variable takes the following values:

PARTY DETAIL -The following coding scheme is used for the detailed nature of the appellants and respondents (i.e., fields 37, APPEL1; 40, APPEL2; 53, RESPOND1; and 56, RESPOND2).

Each detailed code has five digits, with different digits representing different subcategories of information. However, the specific subdivisions (i.e., what information is provided by each digit of the code) are different for different categories of litigants (e.g., it would make no sense to try to use the same subdivisions for businesses and governments) Therefore, instead of presenting a list of 5 digit codes in numerical order, the following listing is presented by general categories of litigants with the subcategories within each general category listed separately.

When coding the detailed nature of participants coders were instructed to use personal knowledge they had about the participants, if they were completely confident of the accuracy of their knowledge, even if the specific information used was not in the opinion. For example, if "IBM" was listed as the appellant it could be classified as "clearly national or international in scope" even if the opinion did not indicate the scope of the business.

Private Business (general category 1)

Digit 2 = what is the scope of this business ?

1 = clearly local (individual or family owned business - scope limited to single community; generally proprietors, who are not incorporated, are in this category)

2 = other-intermediate; neither local nor national (e.g., an electrical power company whose operations cover one-third of the state)

3 = clearly national or multi-national in scope (note: insurance companies and railroads were assumed to be national in scope)

4 = not ascertained

Digit 3 = what category of business best describes the area of activity of this litigant which is involved in this case ?

Digits 4 & 5 provide subcategories of each of these business categories. These subcategories are listed under the appropriate category.

Example: a single family farm is coded as 11101

1 Agriculture

- 01 single family farm
- 02 commercial farm, agri-business
- 03 farm - other
- 00 not able to classify subcategory

2 mining

- 01 oil and gas
- 02 coal
- 03 metals
- 04 other
- 00 not able to classify subcategory

3 construction

- 01 residential
- 02 commercial or industrial
- 03 other
- 00 not able to classify subcategory

4 manufacturing

- 01 auto
- 02 chemical
- 03 drug
- 04 food processing
- 05 oil refining
- 06 textile
- 07 electronic
- 08 alcohol or tobacco
- 09 other
- 00 not able to classify subcategory

Example: General Motors, when appearing in case as an automobile manufacturer is coded 13401.

5 transportation

- 01 railroad
- 02 boat, shipping
- 03 shipping freight, UPS, flying tigers
- 04 airline
- 05 truck (includes armored cars)
- 06 other
- 00 not able to classify subcategory

6 trade - wholesale and retail

- 01 auto, auto parts, auto repairs
- 02 chemical
- 03 drug
- 04 food
- 05 oil, natural gas, gasoline
- 06 textile, clothing
- 07 electronic
- 08 alcohol or tobacco
- 09 general merchandise
- 10 other
- 00 unable to classify subcategory

7 financial institution

- 01 bank
- 02 insurance
- 03 savings and loan
- 04 credit union
- 06 other pension fund
- 07 other financial institution or investment company
- 00 not able to classify subcategory

- 8 utilities
 - 01 nuclear power plants
 - 02 other producers of power (or producers of power where means of production is not clear)
 - 03 telephone
 - 04 other utilities
 - 00 not able to classify subcategory
 - 9 other (includes service industries)
 - 01 medical clinics, health organizations, nursing homes, medical doctors, medical labs, or other private health care facilities
 - 02 private attorney or law firm
 - 03 media - includes magazines, newspapers, radio & TV stations and networks, cable TV, news organizations
 - 04 school - for profit private educational enterprise (includes business and trade schools)
 - 05 housing, car, or durable goods rental or lease; long term typically includes contract
 - 06 entertainment: amusement parks, race tracks, for profit camps, record companies, movie theaters and producers, ski resorts, hotels, restaurants, etc.
 - 07 information processing
 - 08 consulting
 - 09 security and/or maintenance service
 - 10 other service (includes accounting)
 - 11 other (includes a business pension fund)
 - 00 not able to categorize
 - 0 unclear (not ascertained)
 - 01 auto industry - unclear whether manufacturing, trade, etc.
 - 02 chemical industry - unclear whether manufacturing, trade, etc.
 - 03 drug industry- unclear whether manufacturing, trade, etc.
 - 04 food industry - unclear whether manufacturing, trade, etc.
 - 05 oil & gas industry - unclear whether manufacturing, trade, etc.
 - 06 clothing & textile industry - unclear whether manufacturing, trade, etc.
 - 07 electronic industry - unclear whether manufacturing, trade, etc.
 - 08 alcohol and tobacco industry - unclear whether manufacturing, etc.
 - 09 other
 - 00 unable to classify litigant
-

Private Organization or Association (general category 2)

Digit 2 -what category of private associations best describes this litigant ?

Digits 3-5 describe specific subcategories of organizations

- 1 = business, trade, professional, or union (BTPU)
 - 001 = Business or trade association
 - 002 = utilities co-ops
 - 003 = Professional association - other than law or medicine -
 - 004 = Legal professional association
 - 005 = Medical professional association
 - 006 = AFL-CIO union (private)
 - 007 = Other private union
 - 008 = Private Union - unable to determine whether in AFL-CIO
 - 009 = Public employee union- in AFL-CIO
(include groups called professional organizations if their role includes bargaining over wages and work conditions)
 - 010 = Public Employee Union - not in AFL-CIO
 - 011 = Public Employee Union - unable to determine if in AFL-CIO
 - 012 = Union pension fund; other union funds (e.g., vacation funds)
 - 013 = Other
 - 000 = Not able to categorize subcategory

Example: American Bar Association = 21004

- 2 = other
 - 001 = Civic, social, fraternal organization
 - 002 = Political organizations - Other than political parties
Examples: Civil rights focus; Public Interest - broad, civil liberties focus (ACLU) or broad, multi-issue focus (Common Cause, Heritage Foundation, ADA) or single issue - Environmental ENV, Abortion, etc. (prolife, pro-abortion), elderly, consumer interests: Consumer Federation of America, Consumer's Union, National Railroad Passenger Association; PAC
 - 003 = Political party
 - 004 = Educational organization - Private, non-profit school
 - 005 = Educational organization - Association, not individual school - PTA or PTO
 - 006 = Religious or non-profit hospital or medical care facility (e.g., nursing home)
 - 007 = Other religious organization (includes religious foundations)

008 = Charitable or philanthropic organization (including foundations, funds, private museums, private libraries)
009 = Other
000 = Not able to categorize subcategory

Federal government (General category 3)

Digit 2 -which category of federal government agencies and activities best describes this litigant ?

Digits 3 - 5 list specific government agencies falling into the categories in digit 2.

1 cabinet level department

001 = Department of Agriculture
002 = Department of Commerce
003 = Department of Defense (includes War Department and Navy Department)
004 = Department of Education
005 = Department of Energy
006 = Department of Health, Education and Welfare
007 = Department of Health & Human Services
008 = Department of Housing and Urban Development
009 = Department of Interior
010 = Department of Justice (does not include FBI or parole boards; does include US Attorneys)
011 = Department of Labor (except OSHA)
012 = Post Office Department
013 = Department of State
014 = Department of Transportation, National Transportation Safety Board
015 = Department of the Treasury (except IRS)
016 = Department of Veterans Affairs

Example: Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff = 31003

2 courts or legislative

001 = one or both houses of Congress
002 = congressional committee
003 = officer of Congress or other Congress related actor
004 = Federal District Court (or judge)
005 = Federal Circuit Court of Appeals (or judge)
006 = Court of Claims (or judge)
007 = Tax Court (or judge)
008 = Bankruptcy Court (or judge)

009 = other court or judge

- 3 agency whose first word is "federal"
- 001 = Federal Aviation Administration
 - 002 = Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
 - 003 = Federal Coal Mine Safety Board
 - 004 = Federal Communications Commission
 - 005 = Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and FSLIC
 - 006 = Federal Election Commission
 - 007 = Federal Energy Agency (Federal Power Commission)
 - 008 = Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 - 009 = Federal Home Loan Bank Board
 - 010 = Federal Housing Authority (FHA)
 - 011 = Federal Labor Relations Authority
 - 012 = Federal Maritime Board
 - 013 = Federal Maritime Commission
 - 014 = Federal Mine Safety & Health Administration
 - 015 = Federal Mine Safety & Health Review Commission
 - 016 = Federal Reserve System
 - 017 = Federal Trade Commission
- 4 other agency, beginning with "A" thru "E"
- 001 = Benefits Review Board
 - 002 = Civil Aeronautics Board
 - 003 = Civil Service Commission (U.S.)
 - 004 = Commodity Futures Trading Commission
 - 005 = Consumer Products Safety Commission
 - 006 = Copyright Royalty Tribunal
 - 007 = Drug Enforcement Agency
 - 008 = Environmental Protection Agency
 - 009 = Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
- 5 other agency, beginning with "F" thru "N"
- 001 = Food & Drug Administration
 - 002 = General Services Administration
 - 003 = Government Accounting Office (GAO)
 - 004 = Health Care Financing Administration
 - 005 = Immigration & Naturalization Service (includes border patrol)
 - 006 = Internal Revenue Service (IRS)
 - 007 = Interstate Commerce Commission
 - 008 = Merit Systems Protection Board
 - 009 = National Credit Union Association
 - 010 = National Labor Relations Board
 - 011 = Nuclear Regulatory Commission

- 6 other agency, beginning with "O" thru "R"
- 001 = Occupational Safety & Health Administration
 - 002 = Occupational Safety & Health Review Commission
 - 003 = Office of the Federal Inspector
 - 004 = Office of Management & Budget
 - 005 = Office of Personnel Management
 - 006 = Office of Workers Compensation Program
 - 007 = Parole board or parole commisssion, or prison official,
or US Bureau of Prisons
 - 008 = Patent Office
 - 009 = Postal Rate Commission (U.S.)
 - 010 = Postal Service (U.S.)
 - 011 = RR Adjustment Board
 - 012 = RR Retirement Board
- 7 other agency, beginning with "S" thru "Z"
- 001 = Securities & Exchange Commission
 - 002 = Small Business Administration
 - 003 = Veterans Administration
- 8 Distric of Columbia
- 000 = DC in its corporate capacity
 - 001 = legislative body for DC local government
 - 002 = mayor, agency head or top administrator
 - 003 = bureaucracy providing service
 - 004 = bureaucracy in charge of regulation
 - 005 = bureaucracy in charge of general administration
 - 006 = judicial
 - 007 = other
- 9 other, not listed, not able to classify
- 000 = United States - in corporate capacity (i.e., as
representative of "the people") - in criminal
cases
 - 001 = United States - in corporate capacity - civil cases
 - 002 = special wartime agency
 - 003 = Unlisted federal corporation (TVA, FNMA (fannie mae),
GNMA (ginny mae))
 - 004 = Other unlisted federal agency (includes the President of
the US)
 - 005 = Unclear or nature not ascertainable

**Example: in a criminal case entitled, "United states v Songer" the
US = 39000**

NOTE: If party is listed as "United States" but the opinion indicates a particular agency, the specific agency was coded (e.g., if in "U.S. v. Jones, the government is appealing an adverse

decision of the Tax Court reducing Jones' taxes, the appellant was coded as the IRS).

Substate Government (general category 4)

Digit 2 = which category of substate government best describes this litigant ?

Digits 3 - 5 list specific government agencies falling into the categories in digit 2.

1 legislative

- 001 = City/county council
- 002 = School Board, board of trustees for college or junior college
- 003 = Other legislative body
- 000 = not ascertained

2 executive/administrative

- 001 = CEO or officials in charge of agency
- 002 = Mayor/county executive
- 003 = Primary or secondary school system CEO
- 004 = Other CEO or administrative official (except prison)
- 000 = not ascertained

3 bureaucracy providing services

- 001 = Police, Sheriff
- 002 = Fire
- 003 = Taxation
- 004 = Human Services/Welfare/Health Care
- 005 = Streets and Highways
- 006 = Transportation
- 007 = Election Processes
- 008 = Education - Not School Board
- 009 = Other Service Activity
- 000 = not ascertained

4 bureaucracy in charge of regulation

- 001 = Environment
- 002 = Market Practices
- 003 = Transportation
- 004 = Professions (licensing)
- 005 = Labor-Management
- 006 = Communications

007 = Zoning/Land Use
008 = Building and Housing
009 = Other Regulating Activity
000 = not ascertained

Examples: 1) a municipally owned bus company = 43006
2) a county automobile inspection agency = 44003

5 bureaucracy in charge of general administration

001 = Personnel

002 = Other General Administration

000 = not ascertained

6 judicial

001 = Judge or Court (local trial court judge or justice of peace)

002 = Prosecutor/district attorney

003 = Jail/Prison/Probation Official and Organization
(includes prison hospitals; includes juvenile correction officials)

004 = Other Judicial Official

000 = not ascertained

7 other

001 = City of, county of, etc. - in corporate capacity - criminal case

002 = city of, county of, etc. - in corporate capacity - civil case

003 = Other sub-state activity

000 = not ascertained

State Government (general category 5)

Digit 2 =which subcategory of state government best describes this litigant ?

Digits 3 - 5 list specific government agencies falling into the categories in digit 2.

1 legislative

- 001 = Legislature or separate house as an organization
- 002 = Legislative Committee or Commission
- 003 = Other Legislative Unit
- 000 = not ascertained

2 executive/administrative

- 001 = Governor
- 002 = Attorney General
- 003 = Secretary of State
- 004 = Other Administrative Officer NOT detailed below

3 bureaucracy providing services

- 001 = Police
- 002 = Fire
- 003 = Taxation
- 004 = Human Services/Welfare/Health Care
- 005 = Streets and Highways
- 006 = Transportation
- 007 = Election processes
- 008 = Education
- 009 = Other Service Activity
- 000 = not ascertained

Example: For a case listed as "David Beasley, Charlie Condon, et. al. v the Widget Company" and all the opinion says about the appellants is, " The governor of South Carolina and other state officials appeal the adverse ruling of the district court," the following variables would be coded:

NUMAPPEL = 99

APPNATPR = 0

APPSTATE = 99

APPEL1 = 52001

APPEL2 = 52002 (if the coder knew that Charlie Condon was the state attorney general. In the absence of this personal knowledge, the coding would be APPEL2 = 52004)

4 bureaucracy in charge of regulation

- 001 = Environment
- 002 = Market Practices
- 003 = Transportation
- 004 = Professions (licensing)
- 005 = Labor-Management
- 006 = Communications
- 007 = Zoning/Land Use
- 008 = Building and Housing
- 009 = Other Regulating Activity
- 000 = not ascertained

5 bureaucracy in charge of general administration

- 001 = Personnel
- 002 = Other General Administration
- 000 = not ascertained

6 judicial

- 001 = Judge (non-local judge; appellate judge)
- 002 = Prosecutor/district attorney (non-local, e.g., special prosecutor)
- 003 = Jail/Prison/Probation Official (includes juvenile officials)
- 004 = Other judicial official
- 000 = not ascertained

7 other

- 001 = state of ____ - state in its corporate capacity in criminal cases
 - 002 = state of ____ - state in its corporate capacity in civil cases
 - 003 = other state level activity
 - 000 = not ascertained
-

Government - Level Not Ascertained (General category 6)

All litigants falling into this class are coded 69999.

Natural Person Codes (General Category 7)

Digit 2 = what is the gender of this litigant ?

0 = not ascertained

1 = male - indication in opinion (e.g., use of masculine pronoun)

2 = male - assumed because of name

3 = female - indication in opinion of gender

4 = female - assumed because of name

Note names were used to classify the party's sex only if there was little ambiguity (e.g., the sex of "Chris" would be coded as "0").

Digit 3 = is the race/ ethnic identity of this litigant identified in the opinion ?

0 = not ascertained, not applicable (e.g. - an alien)

1 = caucasian - specific indication in opinion

2 = black - specific indication in opinion

3 = native american - specific indication in opinion

4 = native american - assumed from name

5 = asian - specific indication in opinion

6 = asian - assumed from name

7 = hispanic - specific indication in opinion

8 = hispanic - assumed from name

9 = other

Note: names may be used to classify a person as hispanic if there is little ambiguity.

Note: all aliens are coded as race/ethnic=0.

Digit 4 = is the citizenship of this litigant indicated in the opinion ?

0 = not ascertained

1 = US citizen

2 = alien

Digit 5 = which of these categories best describes the income of the litigant ?

0 = not ascertained

1 = poor + wards of state (e.g., patients at state mental hospital; not prisoner unless specific indication that poor).

2 = presumed poor (e.g., migrant farm worker)

3 = presumed wealthy (e.g., high status job - like medical doctors, executives of corporations that are national in scope, professional athletes in the NBA or NFL; upper 1/5 of income bracket)

4 = clear indication of wealth in opinion

5 = other- above poverty line but not clearly wealthy (e.g., public school teachers, federal government employees)

notes:

a) "poor" means below the federal poverty line; e.g., welfare or food stamp recipients.

b) there must be some specific indication in the opinion that you can point to before anyone is classified anything other than "0"

c) prisoners filing "pro se" were classified as poor, but litigants in civil cases who proceed pro se were not presumed to be poor.

d) wealth obtained from the crime at issue in a criminal case was not counted when determining the wealth of the criminal defendant (e.g., drug dealers).

Examples: 1) Michael Jordan = 71214

2) A criminal defendant named Fred Songer who is not described in the opinion but is represented by appointed counsel = 72001.

Miscellaneous (General Category 8)

Digit 2 = which of the following categories best describes the litigant ?

Digits 3-5 indicate specific subcategories for each category

1 = fiduciary, executor, or trustee

001 = trustee in bankruptcy - institution

002 = trustee in bankruptcy - individual

003 = executor or administrator of estate - institution

004 = executor or administrator of estate - individual

005 = trustees of private and charitable trusts - institution

006 = trustee of private and charitable trust - individual

007 = conservators, guardians and court appointed trustees for minors, mentally incompetent (Note: a parent suing on behalf of their injured child is generally coded as a natural person rather than as a fiduciary, unless there is some specific indication in the opinion that there has been some legal process that has created a role as trustee, guardian, etc)

008 = other fiduciary or trustee

000 = specific subcategory not ascertained

2 = other

001 = Indian Tribes

002 = Foreign Government

003 = Multi-state agencies, boards, etc. (e.g., Port Authority of NY)

004 = International Organizations

005 = Other (e.g., an animal)

000 = Not ascertained

Not Ascertained (General Category 9)

If even the general category of the appellant or respondent cannot be ascertained, they are coded: 99999.

Example: The federal district court rules against the government in its attempt to seize a car abandoned in a drug raid, and the government appeals in a case titled, " United States v a 1987 Cadillac Seville"

APPEL1 = 39001
RESPOND1 = 82005

Field 38

GENAPEL2
1 column wide (173)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 89.6%
Gamma: .95
Kendall's Tau-b: .82

This field reports the coding of the second listed appellant whose detailed code is not identical to the code for the first listed appellant. The 9 categories are the same as the first digit of the detailed coding of the appellants. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = private business (Including criminal enterprises)
 - 2 = private organization or association
 - 3 = federal government (includes DC)
 - 4 = sub-state government (e.g., county, local, special district)
 - 5 = state government (includes territories & commonwealths)
 - 6 = government - level not ascertained
 - 7 = natural person (Exclude persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)
 - 8 = miscellaneous
 - 9 = not ascertained
-

Field 39

BANK_AP2
1 column wide (172)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 93.6%
Gamma: .99
Kendall's Tau-b: .82

This field records a dichotomous variable to indicate whether or not the second listed appellant is bankrupt. If there is no indication of whether or not the appellant is bankrupt, the appellant is presumed to be not bankrupt. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = bankrupt
- 2 = not bankrupt

Field 40

APPEL2

5 columns wide (173-177)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	87.2%
Gamma:	.91
Kendall's Tau-b:	.82

This field records a five digit code to represent a more detailed coding of the nature of the second listed appellant than is provided in field 38 (GENAPEL2). The first digit of this variable is the same as that for field 38. The variable takes the same values as those reported above for APPEL1. If there are more than two appellants and at least one of the additional appellants has a different general category from the first appellant, then the first appellant with a different general category will be coded as GENAPEL2 and APPEL2.

Example: the appellants are listed as, "Widget Manufacturing Corporation, Widget Distributors, Inc., and Richard Riley, U.S. Secretary of State"

APPEL1 = 14409

APPEL2 = 31004

Field 41

REALAPP

1 column wide (179)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	-1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	-0.04

This field codes whether or not the formally listed appellants in the case (i.e., the appellants listed at the top of the case in F2nd) are the "real parties." That is, are they the parties whose real interests are most directly at stake? (e.g., in some appeals of adverse habeas corpus petition decisions, the respondent is listed as the judge who denied the petition, but the real parties are the prisoner and the warden of the prison) (another example would be "Jones v A 1990 Rolls Royce" where Jones is a drug agent trying to seize a car which was transporting drugs - the real party would be the owner of the car).

For cases in which an independent regulatory agency is the listed appellant, the following rule was adopted: If the agency initiated the action to enforce a federal rule or the agency was sued by a litigant contesting an agency action, then the agency was coded as a real party. However, if the agency initially only acted as a forum to settle a dispute between two other litigants, and the agency is only listed as a party because its ruling in that dispute is at issue, then the agency is considered not to be a real party. For example, if a union files an unfair labor practices charge against a corporation, the NLRB hears the dispute and rules for the union, and then the NLRB petitions the court of appeals for enforcement of its ruling in an appeal entitled "NLRB v Widget Manufacturing, INC." the NLRB would be coded as not a real party.

Note that under these definitions, trustees are usually "real parties" and parents suing on behalf of their children and a spouse suing on behalf of their injured or dead spouse are also "real parties."

The variable takes the following values:

- 0 = both 1st and 2nd listed appellants are real parties
(or if there is only one appellant, and that appellant is a real party)
 - 1 = the 1st appellant is not a real party
 - 2 = the 2nd appellant is not a real party
 - 3 = neither the 1st nor the 2nd appellants are real parties
 - 4 = not ascertained
-

B. Respondents

Field 42

NUMRESP

3 columns wide (181-183)

numeric

Reliability:

Rate of InterCoder Agreement: 95.2%

Gamma: .96

Kendall's Tau-b: .92

This field records the total number of respondents in the case. If the total number cannot be determined then 99 is recorded.

Fields 43-49

R_NATPR (Natural persons)

3 columns wide (185-187)

numeric

Reliability:

Rate of InterCoder Agreement: 93.6%

Gamma: .92

Kendall's Tau-b: .75

R_BUS (Business)

3 columns wide (189-191)

numeric

Reliability:

Rate of InterCoder Agreement: 92.4%

Gamma: .91

Kendall's Tau-b: .82

R_NONP (Groups and associations)
3 columns wide (193-195)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	95.6%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.72

R_FED (Federal government)
3 columns wide (197-199)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.4%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.95

R_SUBST (Substate government)
3 columns wide (201-203)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.2%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.83

R_STATE (State government)
3 columns wide (205-207)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.8%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.93

R_FIDUC (Fiduciaries)
3 columns wide (209-211)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.0%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.70

The structure of each field in this group is the same as the structure of the analogous appellant variables (e.g., APPNATPR, APPBUS). Each field records the number of respondents in the present case that fell into the designated general category of respondents. If the total number cannot be determined then 99 is recorded in the category. The types of respondents recorded in each field are as follows:

R_NATPR = natural persons

R_BUS = private business and its executives

R_NONP = groups and associations

R_FED = the federal government, its agencies, and officials

R_STATE = state governments, their agencies, and officials

R_FIDUC = fiduciaries

Note: if an individual is listed by name, but their appearance in the case is as a government official, then they are counted as a government rather than as a private person. (see example under appellants). Similar logic is applied to businesses and associations. Officers of a company or association whose role in the case is as a representative of their company or association are coded as being a business or association rather than as a natural person. However, employees of a business or a government who are suing their employer are coded as natural persons.

Field 50

R_STID
2 columns wide (213-214)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.90

This field uses the numerical codes for the states (see field 13, STATE, for a listing of the codes) to indicate the state of the first listed state or local government agency that is a respondent.

Field 51

GENRESP1
1 column wide (217)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.98

This field reports the coding of the first listed respondent. The 9 categories are the same as the first digit of the detailed coding of the appellants (Note that fields 35, GENAPPEL1; 38, GENAPEL2; and 54, GENRESP2 use the same categories). The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = private business (Including criminal enterprises)
- 2 = private organization or association
- 3 = federal government (includes DC)
- 4 = sub-state government (e.g., county, local, special district)
- 5 = state government (includes territories & commonwealths)
- 6 = government - level not ascertained
- 7 = natural person (Exclude persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)
- 8 = miscellaneous

9 = not ascertained
0 = not applicable (only possible for respondent; e.g. in cases such as "ex parte jones" which list only one party)

Field 52

BANK_R1
1 column wide (216)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	.77

This field records a dichotomous variable to indicate whether or not the first listed respondent is bankrupt. If there is no indication of whether or not the respondent is bankrupt, the respondent is presumed to be not bankrupt. The variable takes the following values:

1 = bankrupt
2 = not bankrupt

Field 53

RESPOND1
5 columns wide (217-221)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	88.8%
Gamma:	.94
Kendall's Tau-b:	.94

This field records a five digit code to represent a more detailed coding of the nature of the first listed respondent than is provided in field 51 (GENRESP1). The first digit of this variable is the same as that for field 51. The variable uses the same categories as those used in the coding of the detailed nature of the appellants listed above.

(see codes for field 37 above).

Field 54

GENRESP2

1 column wide (224)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	90.4%
Gamma:	.94
Kendall's Tau-b:	.87

This field reports the coding of the second listed respondent whose detailed code is not identical to the code for the first listed respondent. The 9 categories are the same as the first digit of the detailed coding of the respondents. The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = private business (Including criminal enterprises)
 - 2 = private organization or association
 - 3 = federal government (includes DC)
 - 4 = sub-state government (e.g., county, local, special district)
 - 5 = state government (includes territories & commonwealths)
 - 6 = government - level not ascertained
 - 7 = natural person (Exclude persons named in their official capacity or who appear because of a role in a private organization)
 - 8 = miscellaneous
 - 9 = not ascertained
 - 0 = not applicable (only possible for respondent; e.g. in cases such as "ex parte jones" which list only one party)
-

Field 55

BANK_R2
 1 column wide (223)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	94.0%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.86

This field records a dichotomous variable to indicate whether or not the second listed respondent is bankrupt. If there is no indication of whether or not the respondent is bankrupt, the respondent is presumed to be not bankrupt. The variable takes the following values:

1 = bankrupt
 2 = not bankrupt

Field 56

RESPOND2
 5 columns wide (224-228)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	88.0%
Gamma:	.91
Kendall's Tau-b:	.86

This field records a five digit code to represent a more detailed coding of the nature of the second listed respondent than is provided in field 54 (GENRESP2). The first digit of this variable is the same as that for field 54. The variable takes the same values as those reported above for APPEL1 and RESPOND1. If there are more than two respondents and at least one of the additional respondents has a different general category from the first respondent, then the first respondent with a different general category will be coded as GENRESP2 and RESPOND2.

Field 57

REALRESP

1 column wide (230)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.4%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.51

This field codes whether or not the formally listed respondents in the case (i.e., the respondents listed at the top of the case in F2nd) are the "real parties." That is, are they the parties whose real interests are most directly at stake? (e.g., in some appeals of adverse habeas corpus petition decisions, the respondent is listed as the judge who denied the petition, but the real parties are the prisoner and the warden of the prison) (another example would be "Jones v A 1990 Rolls Royce" where Jones is a drug agent trying to seize a car which was transporting drugs - the real party would be the owner of the car).

For cases in which an independent regulatory agency is the listed respondent, we adopted the following rule: If the agency initiated the action to enforce a federal rule or the agency was sued by a litigant contesting an agency action, then the agency was coded as a real party. However, if the agency initially only acted as a forum to settle a dispute between two other litigants, and the agency is only listed as a party because its ruling in that dispute is at issue, then the agency is considered not to be a real party. For example, if a union files an unfair labor practices charge against a corporation, the NLRB hears the dispute and rules for the union, and then the corporation petitions the court of appeals to overturn the agency decision in an appeal entitled "Widget Manufacturing, INC v NLRB" the NLRB would be coded as not a real party.

The variable takes the following values:

- 0 = both 1st and 2nd listed respondents are real parties
(or if there is only one respondent, and that respondent is a real party)
 - 1 = the 1st respondent is not a real party
 - 2 = the 2nd respondent is not a real party
 - 3 = neither the 1st nor the 2nd respondents are real parties
 - 4 = not ascertained
-

C. Other Participants

Field 58-59

COUNSEL1

1 column wide (114)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	92.4%
Gamma:	.87
Kendall's Tau-b:	.79

COUNSEL2

1 column wide (116)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	92.4%
Gamma:	.83
Kendall's Tau-b:	.78

These fields record the nature of the counsel for appellant (COUNSEL1) and the respondent (COUNSEL2). The variable takes the following values:

- 1 = none (pro se)
- 2 = court appointed
- 3 = legal aid or public defender
- 4 = private
- 5 = government - US
- 6 = government - state or local
- 7 = interest group, union, professional group
- 8 = other or not ascertained

(note: if name of attorney was given with no other indication of affiliation, we assumed it is private - unless a government agency was the party)

Field 60

AMICUS

1 column wide (118)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.00
Kendall's Tau-b:	.89

This field acts as a flag to indicate whether or not there was any amicus participation before the court of appeals. The opinions typically do not indicate anything about the position taken by the amici, and therefore we did not code on whose behalf the amicus appeared. The variable takes the following values:

0 = no amicus participation on either side
1 -7 = the number of separate amicus briefs that were filed
8 = 8 or more briefs filed
9 = not ascertained

Field 61

INTERVEN

1 column wide (128)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.67

This field records whether one or more individuals or groups sought to formally intervene in the appeals court consideration of the case. The variable takes the following values:

0= no intervenor in case
1= intervenor= appellant
2= intervenor = respondent
3= yes,both appellant & respondent
9 = not applicable

ISSUES CODING

A. Basic Nature of Issue and Decision

Field 62

CASETYP1

3 columns wide (432-434)

numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 88.4%

Gamma: .95

Kendall's Tau-b: .95

This field represents a conventional way of identifying the issue in the case. To avoid confusion of this field with other ways of conceptualizing the issue in the case, this variable is referred to as the first case type. The field identifies the social and/or political context of the litigation in which more purely legal issues are argued. Put somewhat differently, this field identifies the nature of the conflict between the litigants. Many of the categories closely parallel the issue categories in the Spaeth Supreme Court database (Phase I). As in the Supreme Court database, the focus here is on the subject matter of the controversy rather than its legal basis. However, since the agenda of the courts of appeals is somewhat different from the agenda of the Supreme Court, the two sets of issue categories are not identical. In addition, whereas most of the Spaeth issue codes in the general area of criminal cases refer to procedural issues that are frequently resolved in criminal cases, the criminal case types defined below are based on the nature of the criminal offense in the case.

The 220 case type categories are organized into eight major categories (these eight categories make up the values of the variable GENISS):

1. criminal
2. civil rights
3. First Amendment
4. due process
5. privacy

- 6. labor relations
- 7. economic activity and regulation
- 9. miscellaneous

Up to two case types (the second case type is coded as field 65, CASETYP2) are coded for each case, though the majority of cases have only one case type. No decision was made in coding about which issue was the most important when two or more case types were present. Therefore, CASETYP1 should not be considered more important than CASETYP2. In the rare cases in which three casetypes were present, coders attempted to choose two casetypes that were in different major categories rather than coding two casetypes from the same general category.

The variable takes the following values:

The listing of specific case type codes that follows is broken down into the eight general categories listed above and then each general category is further divided into several subcategories (abbreviated SC) noted below. Note that the first digit of all specific case types within the same general category have the same first digit.

GENERAL CATEGORY 1: CRIMINAL -

includes appeals of conviction, petitions for post conviction relief, habeas corpus petitions, and other prisoner petitions which challenge the validity of the conviction or the sentence

SC 1 - federal offenses

- 101 murder
- 102 rape
- 103 arson
- 104 aggravated assault
- 105 robbery
- 106 burglary
- 107 auto theft
- 108 larceny (over \$50)

***note - the 8 crimes listed above are the FBI's "index crimes"**

- 109 other violent crimes
- 110 narcotics
- 111 alcohol related crimes, prohibition
- 112 tax fraud
- 113 firearm violations

114 morals charges (e.g., gambling, prostitution, obscenity)
115 criminal violations of government regulations of business
116 other white collar crime (involving no force or threat of
force; e.g., embezzlement, computer fraud, bribery)
117 other crimes
118 federal offense, but specific crime not ascertained

SC 2- state offenses

- 121 murder
- 122 rape
- 123 arson
- 124 aggravated assault
- 125 robbery
- 126 burglary
- 127 auto theft
- 128 larceny (over \$50)

***note - the 8 crimes listed above are the FBI's "index crimes"**

- 129 other violent crimes
- 130 narcotics
- 131 alcohol related crimes, prohibition
- 132 tax fraud
- 133 firearm violations
- 134 morals charges (e.g., gambling, prostitution, obscenity)
- 135 criminal violations of government regulations of business
- 136 other white collar crime (involving no force or threat of force; e.g., embezzlement, computer fraud, bribery)
- 137 other state crimes
- 138 state offense, but specific crime not ascertained

SC 3 - not determined whether state or federal offense

- 141 murder
- 142 rape
- 143 arson
- 144 aggravated assault
- 145 robbery
- 146 burglary
- 147 auto theft
- 148 larceny (over \$50)

***note - the 8 crimes listed above are the FBI's "index crimes"**

- 149 other violent crimes
- 150 narcotics
- 151 alcohol related crimes, prohibition
- 152 tax fraud
- 153 firearm violations
- 154 morals charges (e.g., gambling, prostitution, obscenity)
- 155 criminal violations of government regulations of business
- 156 other white collar crime (involving no force or threat of force; e.g., embezzlement, computer fraud, bribery)

157 other crimes
158 specific crime not ascertained

GENERAL CATEGORY 2: CIVIL RIGHTS

Excluding First Amendment or due process; also excluding claims of denial of rights in criminal proceeding or claims by prisoners that challenge their conviction or their sentence (e.g., habeas corpus petitions are coded under the criminal category); does include civil suits instituted by both prisoners and non-prisoners alleging denial of rights by criminal justice officials.

SC 1 - civil rights claims by prisoners and those accused of crimes

-contesting the condition of their imprisonment or the denial of their rights in prison (not used for petitions filed while in prison which contest their sentence or conviction)

201 suit for damages for false arrest or false confinement
202 cruel and unusual punishment
203 due process rights in prison
204 denial of other rights of prisoners -42 USC 1983 suits
(Note: if a prisoner sought damages under 42 USC 1983 alleging that some action of prison officials was "cruel & unusual punishment" the normal coding would be casetyp1=204 and casetyp2=202)
205 denial or revocation of parole -due process grounds
206 other denial or revocation of parole
207 other prisoner petitions
208 excessive force used in arrest
209 other civil rights violations alleged
by criminal defendants

SC 2 - voting rights, race discrimination, sex discrimination

210 voting rights - reapportionment & districting
211 participation rights - rights of candidates or groups to fully participate in the political process; access to ballot
212 voting rights - other (includes race discrimination in voting)
213 desegregation of schools
214 other desegregation
221 employment race discrimination - alleged by minority
222 other race discrimination -alleged by minority
223 employment: race discrimination - alleged by caucasin
(or opposition to affirmative action plan which benefits minority)

224 other reverse race discrimination claims
231 employment: sex discrimination -alleged by woman
232 pregnancy discrimination
233 other sex discrimination - alleged by woman
234 employment: sex discrimination - alleged by man
 (or opposition to affirmative action plan which
benefits women)
235 other sex discrimination - alleged by man
239 suits raising 42 USC 1983 claims
 based on race or sex discrimination
 (if raised as part of opposition to government economic
regulation, code the economic issue as the 1st issue and
239 as the 2nd issue)

SC 2 - other civil rights

241 alien petitions - (includes disputes over attempts at
deportation)
251 indian rights and law (note: under this code,
only civil rights claims under Indian law are recorded;
see categories 910-916 for other Indian law case types)
261 juveniles
271 poverty law, rights of indigents (civil)
281 rights of handicapped (includes employment)
282 age discrimination (includes employment)
283 discrimination based on religion or nationality
284 discrimination based on sexual preference (except for
category 502)
290 challenge to hiring, firing, promotion decision of
federal government (other than categories above)
291 other 14th amendment and civil rights act cases
299 other civil rights

GENERAL CATEGORY 3: FIRST AMENDMENT

SC 1 - religion, press, commercial

301 commercial speech
302 libel, slander, defamation
303 free exercise of religion
304 establishment of religion
 (other than aid to parochial schools)
305 aid to parochial schools
306 press

SC 2 - speech and other expression

- 307 obscenity (note: if challenge to obscenity law is part of appeal of criminal conviction or as part of challenge to a zoning law, two case types should be coded- 307 plus the appropriate criminal or economic category)
- 308 association
- 309 federal internal security and communist control acts, loyalty oaths, security risks
- 310 legality of expression in context of overt acts (speeches, parades, picketing, etc.) protesting race discrimination
- 311 overt acts -opposition to war and the military
- 312 conscientious objection to military service or other first amendment challenges to the military
- 313 expression of political or social beliefs conflicting with regulation of physical activity (includes demonstrations, parades, canvassing, picketing)
- 314 threats to peace, safety ,and order (except those covered above) (includes fighting words, clear and present danger, incitement to riot)
- 315 challenges to campaign spending limits or other limits on expression in political campaigns
- 399 other (includes tests of belief)

GENERAL CATEGORY 4: DUE PROCESS

Claims in civil cases by persons other than prisoners. This category does not include due process challenges to government economic regulation (those challenges are included in category 7 - Economic Activity and Regulation).

- 410 denial of fair hearing or notice - government employees (includes claims of terminated government workers)
- 411 denial of hearing or notice in non-employment context
- 412 taking clause (i.e., denial of due process under the "taking" clause of the 5th or 14th Amendments)
- 413 freedom of information act and other claims of rights of access (includes all cases involving dispute over requests for information even if it does not involve the freedom of information act)
- 499 other due process issues

GENERAL CATEGORY 5: PRIVACY

- 501 abortion rights

502 homosexual rights where privacy claim raised
503 contraception and other privacy claims related to marital
 relations or sexual behavior (not in 501 or 502)
504 suits demanding compensation for violation of privacy
 rights (e.g., 1983 suits)
505 mandatory testing (for drugs, AIDs, etc)
506 mandatory sterilization
507 right to die or right to refuse medical help
599 other

GENERAL CATEGORY 6: LABOR

- 601 union organizing
- 602 unfair labor practices
- 603 Fair Labor Standards Act issues
- 604 Occupational Safety and Health Act issues
(including OSHA enforcement)
- 605 collective bargaining
- 606 conditions of employment
- 607 employment of aliens
- 608 which union has a right to represent workers
- 609 non civil rights grievances by worker against union (e.g.,
union did not adequately represent individual)
- 610 other labor relations

GENERAL CATEGORY 7: ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND REGULATION

SC 1 taxes, patents, copyright

- 701 state or local tax
- 702 federal taxation - individual income tax
(includes taxes of individuals, fiduciaries, &
estates)
- 703 federal tax - business income tax
(includes corporate and partnership)
- 704 federal tax -excess profits
- 705 federal estate and gift tax
- 706 federal tax - other
- 710 patents
- 711 copyrights
- 712 trademarks
- 713 trade secrets, personal intellectual property

Note: 703- business income tax is generally a tax on the profits of a business or corporation before they have been distributed to stockholders or owners; a dispute between the IRS and a receiver of dividend income will generally be coded as 702 - individual income tax.

SC 2 torts

- 720 motor vehicle
- 721 airplane
- 722 product liability
- 723 federal employer liability; injuries to dockworkers and longshoremen
- 724 other government tort liability
- 725 workers compensation
- 726 medical malpractice
- 727 other personal injury
- 728 fraud
- 729 other property damage
- 730 other torts

SC 3 - commercial disputes

- 731 contract disputes-general (private parties)
(includes breach of contract, disputes over meaning of contracts, suits for specific performance, disputes over whether contract fulfilled, claims that money owed on contract)
(Note: this category is not used when the dispute fits one of the more specific categories below).
- 732 disputes over government contracts
- 733 insurance disputes
- 734 debt collection, disputes over loans
- 735 consumer disputes with retail business or providers of services
- 736 breach of fiduciary duty; disputes over franchise agreements
- 737 contract disputes - was there a contract, was it a valid contract ?
- 738 commerce clause challenges to state or local government action
- 739 other contract disputes-
(includes misrepresentation or deception in contract, disputes among contractors or contractors and subcontractors, indemnification claims)
- 740 private economic disputes (other than contract disputes)

SC 4 - bankruptcy, antitrust, securities

- 741 bankruptcy - private individual (e.g., chapter 7)
- 742 bankruptcy - business reorganization (e.g., chapter 11)
- 743 other bankruptcy
- 744 antitrust - brought by individual or private business
(includes Clayton Act; Sherman Act; and Wright-Patman)
- 745 antitrust - brought by government
- 746 regulation of, or opposition to mergers

on other than anti-trust grounds
747 securities - conflicts between private
parties (including corporations)
748 government regulation of securities

SC 5 - misc economic regulation and benefits

750 social security benefits (including SS disability
payments)
751 other government benefit programs (e.g., welfare, RR
retirement, veterans benefits, war risk insurance, food
stamps)
752 state or local economic regulation
753 federal environmental regulation

754 federal consumer protection regulation (includes pure food
and drug, false advertising)
755 rent control; excessive profits;
government price controls
756 federal regulation of transportation
757 oil, gas, and mineral regulation by federal government
758 federal regulation of utilities (includes telephone,
radio, TV, power generation)
759 other commercial regulation (e.g., agriculture, independent
regulatory agencies) by federal government
760 civil RICO suits
761 admiralty - personal injury (note:suits against
government under admiralty should be classified
under the government tort category above)
762 admiralty - seamens' wage disputes
763 admiralty - maritime contracts, charter contracts
764 admiralty other

SC 6 - property disputes

770 disputes over real property (private)
771 eminent domain and disputes with government over real
property
772 landlord - tenant disputes
773 government seizure of property - as part of enforcement of
criminal statutes
774 government seizure of property - civil (e.g., for
deliquent taxes, liens)

other

799 other economic activity

GENERAL CATEGORY 9: MISCELLANEOUS

- 901 miscellaneous interstate conflict
 - 902 other federalism issue (only code as issue if opinion explicitly discusses federalism as an important issue - or if opinion explicitly discusses conflict of state power vs federal power)
 - 903 attorneys (disbarment; etc)
 - 904 selective service or draft issues (which do not include 1st amendment challenges)
 - 905 challenge to authority of magistrates, special masters, etc.
 - 906 challenge to authority of bankruptcy judge or referees in bankruptcy
 - 910 Indian law - criminal verdict challenged due to interpretation of tribal statutes or other indian law
 - 911 Indian law - commercial disputes based on interpretation of Indian treaties or law (includes disputes over mineral rights)
 - 912 Indian law - indian claims acts and disputes over real property (includes Alaska Native Claims Act)
 - 913 Indian law - federal regulation of Indian land and affairs
 - 914 Indian law -state/local authority over Indian land and affairs
 - 915 Indian law - tribal regulation of economic activities (includes tribal taxation)
 - 916 other Indian law
 - 920 international law
 - 921 immigration (except civil rights claims of immigrants and aliens)
 - 999 other
 - 000 not ascertained
-

Field 63

GENISS

1 column wide (431)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.97

This field records the general issue categories of the more detailed categories of CASETYP1. The variable takes the following values:

1. criminal
 2. civil rights
 3. First Amendment
 4. due process
 5. privacy
 6. labor relations
 7. economic activity and regulation
 9. miscellaneous
 0. not ascertained
-

Field 64

DIRECT1

1 column wide (436)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	94.0%
Gamma:	.94
Kendall's Tau-b:	.89

This field reports the directionality of the decision of the court. Many of the directionality codes are consistent with commonly used definitions of "liberal" and "conservative." (A "3" is often a liberal vote and a "1" is a conservative vote. For example, votes in favor of the defendant in a criminal case, or for a newspaper editor opposing an attempt at censorship, or for a union that claims that management violated labor laws when it fired a worker for union organizing activities would all be coded as "3"). However, some issues are not easily categorized along a liberal/conservative dimension (e.g., attorney discipline cases). The directionality codes parallel closely the directionality codes in the Spaeth Supreme Court database. However, some users may want to define liberal and conservative in at least partially different ways or may want to define directionality for some set of case type categories along different dimensions. Therefore, each user should pay close attention to the way directionality is defined for each particular case type.

The definitions of directionality are specified below for each case type. For each case type, the outcome defined as a directionality of "3" is specified. A "1" represents the opposite outcome. Note that although not explicitly listed under each individual case type, a directionality of "2" means that the outcome was "mixed." An outcome coded as "0" means either that the directionality could not be determined or that the outcome could not be classified according to any conventional outcome standards.

CRIMINAL AND PRISONER PETITIONS

101 - 158 criminal

3=for the defendant
1=opposite

CIVIL RIGHTS

201- 209 prisoner petitions

3=for the position of the prisoner
1=opposite

210 -212 voting rights

3=for those who claim their voting rights have been violated
1=opposite

213, 214 desegregation

3=for desegregation or for the most extensive desegregation if
alternative plans are at issue
1= opposite

223, 224, 234, 235 reverse discrimination claims

3=for the rights of the racial minority or women
(i.e., opposing the claim of reverse discrimination)
1=opposite

All other civil rights:

3=upholding the position of the person asserting the denial
of their rights
1=opposite

FIRST AMENDMENT

301 - 399 (all first amendment cases)

3=for assertion of broadest interpretation of First Amendment
protection
1=opposite

DUE PROCESS

410 - 499 (all due process cases)

3=for interest of person asserting due process rights violated

1=opposite

PRIVACY

501 - 599 (all privacy cases)

3= for interest of person asserting privacy rights violated
1= opposite

LABOR

a) Suits against management

3= for union, individual worker, or government in suit against
management
1= opposite (for management)

b) government enforcement of labor laws

3=for the federal government or the validity of federal
regulations
1=opposite

c) Executive branch vs union or workers

3=for executive branch
1=for union

d) worker vs union (non-civil rights)

3=for union
1=for individual worker

e) conflicts between rival unions

3=for union which opposed by management
1=for union which supported by management
0=if neither union supported by management or if unclear

f) injured workers or consumers vs management
3=against management
1=for management

g) other labor issues

3=for economic underdog if no civil rights issue is present;
for support of person claiming denial of civil rights
1=opposite
0=unclear

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND REGULATION

701 - 707 Taxes

3= for government tax claim
1= opposite (for taxpayer)

710-713 patents and copyrights, etc.

3= for person claiming patent or copyright infringement
1= opposite

720 - 730 torts

3= for the plaintiff alleging the injury
1 = opposite

731- 740 commercial disputes (private parties)

3= for economic underdog if one party is clearly an underdog
in comparison to the other
1=opposite
0=neither party is clearly an economic underdog
(Note: in cases pitting an individual against a business, the
individual is presumed to be the economic underdog unless there is
a clear indication in the opinion to the contrary)

741 - 743 bankruptcy

3=for debtor or bankrupt
1=opposite

744 -746 antitrust, mergers

3= for government or private party raising claim of violation
of antitrust laws, or party opposing merger
1=opposite

747 private conflict over securities

3=for the economic underdog
1=opposite
0=no clear economic underdog

750 - 751 individual benefits

3=for individual claiming a benefit from government
1=for the government

disputes over government contracts and government
seizure of property

3=for government
1=opposite

government regulation of business (except 753,754)

3=for government regulation
1=opposite

753, 754 environment and consumer protection

3=for greater protection of the environment or greater
consumer protection (even if anti-government)

1=opposite

761 admiralty - personal injury
3 = for the injured party
1 = opposite

762- 764, 790 admiralty and miscellaneous economic cases
3=for economic underdog
1=opposite
0=if no clear underdog

MISCELLANEOUS

902 federalism

3=for assertion of federal power
1=opposite

901 conflict between states

0=for all decisions

903 attorneys

3=for attorney
1=opposite

904 selective service

3=for the validity of challenged selective service regulation
or for the government interest in dispute with someone
attempting to resist induction
1=opposite

905,906 challenge to magistrates or referees

3=for the authority of the challenged official
1=opposite

910 Indian law - criminal

3 = for defendant
1 = opposite

911,912 Indian law

3 = for the claim of the Indian or tribal rights
1 = opposite

913,914 Indian law vs state and federal authority

3 = for federal or state authority
1 = opposite

915 Indian law

3 = for tribal regulation
1 = other

920 international law
3 = for interest of US or US firms when opposed by foreign
firms or government;
for US government if opposed to either US or foreign
business
1 = opposite
0 = other

921 immigration
3 = for government regulation
1 = other

999, 000 other, not ascertained

0=for all decisions

* Note: the directionality coding does not impose any definition of "liberal", "conservative", or any other ideological label on any user. For categories which are included in the Carp district court data set a "3" defines the position which Carp and Rowland (1983) have labelled "liberal". Therefore, users may run comparable analyses of the district and appeals courts without any recoding. However, users may easily develop their alternative definitions of liberal, conservative, etc., by simply recoding whichever issue categories they choose or by excluding certain issue categories altogether.

** Note: For all categories, a "2" was coded if the directionality of the decision was intermediate to the extremes defined above or if the decision was mixed (e.g., the conviction of defendant in a criminal trial was affirmed on one count but reversed on a second count or if the conviction was affirmed but the sentence was reduced. A "0" indicates that the directionality was not ascertained.

Field 65

CASETYP2

3 columns wide (438-440)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

See the specific codes listed under field 62, CASEYTP1.

Field 66

DIRECT2

1 column wide (442)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	85.6%
Gamma:	.88
Kendall's Tau-b:	.71

See the specific codes listed under field 64, DIRECT1.

Field 67

TREAT

2 columns wide (98-99)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	95.2%
Gamma:	.93
Kendall's Tau-b:	.90

This field records the disposition by the court of appeals of the decision of the court or agency below; i.e., how the decision below is "treated" by the appeals court. That is, this variable represents the basic outcome of the case for the litigants and indicates whether the appellant or respondent "won" in the court of appeals. The variable takes the following values:

- 0= stay, petition, or motion granted
 - 1= affirmed; or affirmed and petition denied
 - 2= reversed (include reversed & vacated)
 - 3= reversed and remanded (or just remanded)
 - 4= vacated and remanded (also set aside & remanded; modified and remanded)
 - 5= affirmed in part and reversed in part (or modified or affirmed and modified)
 - 6= affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded;
affirmed in part, vacated in part, and remanded
 - 7= vacated
 - 8= petition denied or appeal dismissed
 - 9= certification to another court
 - 10= not ascertained
-

Field 68

MAJVOTES

2 columns wide (105-106)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	98.4%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.92

The value for this variable is simply the number of judges who voted in favor of the disposition favored by the majority. Judges who concurred in the outcome but wrote a separate concurring opinion are counted as part of the majority. For most cases this variable takes the value "2" or "3." However, for cases decided en banc the value may be as high as 15.

Note: in the typical case, a list of the judges who heard the case is printed immediately before the opinion. If there is no indication that any of the judges dissented and no indication that one or more of the judges did not participate in the final decision, then all of the judges listed as participating in the decision are assumed to have cast votes with the majority. If there is missing data for this variable it is usually because the opinion did not indicate how many judges heard the case. The number of majority votes recorded includes district judges or other judges sitting by designation who participated on the appeals court panel. If there is an indication that a judge heard argument in the case but did not participate in the final opinion (e.g., the judge died before the decision was reached), that judge is not counted in the number of majority votes.

Field 69

DISSENT

2 columns wide (108-109)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.8%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.93

The value for this variable is the number of judges who dissented from the majority (either with or without opinion). Judges who dissented in part and concurred in part are counted as dissenting.

Field 70

CONCUR

2 columns wide (111-112)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.8%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.82

The value for this field is the number of judges who either wrote a concurring opinion, joined a concurring opinion, or who indicated that they concurred in the result but not in the opinion of the court.

Field 71

HABEAS

1 column wide (444)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.94

This field records whether the case was an appeal of a decision by the district court on a petition for habeas corpus. A state habeas corpus case is one in which a state inmate has petitioned the federal courts. The variable takes the following values:

- 0 = no
 - 1 = yes, state habeas corpus (criminal)
 - 2 = yes, federal habeas corpus (criminal)
 - 3 = yes, federal habeas corpus relating to deportation
-

Field 72

DECUNCON

2 columns wide (446-447)

numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 99.6%

Gamma: 1.0

Kendall's Tau-b: .71

This field identifies cases in which the court utilizes judicial review with a declaration that some specific statute or administrative action is unconstitutional. Only explicit statements in the opinion that some provision is unconstitutional were used. Procedural violations of the constitution in the courts below were not counted as judicial review (e.g., if the trial court threw out evidence obtained in a search and seizure because of a 4th Amendment violation, the action would not count as judicial review). The variable takes the following values:

- 0= no declarations of unconstitutionality
 - 1= act of Congress declared unconstitutional
(facial invalidity)
 - 2=interpretation/application of federal law invalid
 - 3=federal administrative action or regulation
unconstitutional on its face
 - 4=interpretation/application
of administrative regs unconstitutional
 - 5= state constitution declared
unconstitutional on its face
 - 6=interpretation/application
of state constitution unconstitutional
 - 7=state law or regulation
unconstitutional on its face
 - 8=interpretation/application of state law/regulation
unconstitutional
 - 9= substate law or regulation
unconstitutional on its face
 - 10=interpretation/application of substate law/regulation
unconstitutional
-

Fields 73 - 75

CONSTIT

1 column wide (320)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 94.0%
Gamma: .93
Kendall's Tau-b: .53

FEDLAW

1 column wide (322)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 90.8%
Gamma: .92
Kendall's Tau-b: .75

PROCEDUR

1 column wide (324)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement: 78.0%
Gamma: .72
Kendall's Tau-b: .61

The coding for these three fields provides two pieces of information: first, whether there was an issue discussed in the opinion of the court about the interpretation of the U.S. constitution, federal statute, or court precedent or doctrine. Second, if the issue was present the coding indicates the directionality of the decision. In these issues, directionality refers to the way in which the legal question was answered in terms of who benefitted from the treatment of the issue.

For each question, the coding reflects one of four possible answers to the issue question:

2 yes, the issue was discussed in the opinion and the resolution of the issue by the court favored the appellant.

1 the issue was discussed in the opinion and the resolution of the issue by the court favored the respondent

0 issue was not discussed in the opinion

9 the resolution of the issue had mixed results for the appellant and respondent

Note, that values 1,2 and 9 all indicate that the issue was discussed in the opinion. So if you want to simply identify all cases in which the issue was discussed, select all cases in which the value of the variable is greater than zero.

The specific issues for the three issues are:

CONSTIT -

Did the court's conclusion about the constitutionality of a law or administrative action favor the appellant ?

(a code of "0" means that there was no discussion in the opinion about the constitutionality of a law or administrative action)

FEDLAW -

Did the interpretation of federal statute by the court favor the appellant?

(a code of "0" means that there was no discussion in the opinion about the interpretation of federal statute).

PROCEDUR -

Did the interpretation of federal rule of procedures, judicial doctrine, or case law by the court favor the appellant ?

(note: this issue should not be considered to be present if the case law discussed in the opinion was related only to the interpretation of statute) (does include consideration of agency doctrines and precedents).

Field 76

TYPEISS

1 column wide (326)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	93.6%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.93

This field records the general category of issues discussed in the opinion of the court. The variable takes the following values:

- 0 not ascertained
- 1 criminal and prisoner petitions
- 2 civil - government
- 3 diversity
- 4 civil - private
- 5 other, not applicable

These four categories are used below as the general categories for specification of the specific issues discussed in the opinion of the court.

Definitions of Categories:

1 criminal - includes appeals of conviction, petitions for post conviction relief, habeas corpus petitions, and other prisoner petitions which challenge the validity of the conviction or the sentence or the validity of continued confinement. includes parole revocation.

2. Civil - Government - these will include appeals from administrative agencies (e.g., OSHA,FDA), the decisions of administrative law judges, or the decisions of independent regulatory agencies (e.g., NLRB, FCC,SEC). The focus in administrative law is usually on procedural principles that apply to administrative agencies as they affect private interests, primarily through rulemaking and adjudication. Tort actions against the government, including petitions by prisoners which challenge the conditions of their confinement or which seek damages for torts committed by prison officials or by police fit in this category. In addition, this category will include suits over taxes and claims for benefits from government.

3 Diversity of Citizenship - civil cases involving disputes

between citizens of different states (remember that businesses have state citizenship). These cases will always involve the application of state or local law. If the case is centrally concerned with the application or interpretation of federal law then it is not a diversity case.

4. Civil Disputes- Private - includes all civil cases that do not fit in any of the above categories. The opposing litigants will be individuals, businesses or groups.

B. Most Frequently Cited Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Procedural Rules

The coding of the ten fields in this section was based on the headnotes which summarize the points of law in the West Topic and Key Number System (Note that when the same headnote has a constitutional provision, a section of the US code, and a rule of civil or criminal procedure, all were coded under the appropriate field):

There are four sets of variables coded: constitutional provisions cited, titles and sections of the U.S. Code cited, Federal rules of Civil Procedure cited, and Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure cited. In each case, coders first counted the number of times each constitutional, statutory, or federal rule provision was cited in the headnotes (i.e., a count of the number of headnote entries that contained a reference to a given provision). Then the most frequent and second most frequently cited provision in each category was coded.

Field 77

CONST1

3 columns wide (250-252)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.4%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.96

This field records the most frequently cited provision of the U.S. Constitution in the headnotes to this case. If no constitutional provisions are cited, a zero is entered. If one or more are cited, the article or amendment to the constitution which is mentioned in the greatest number of headnotes is coded. In case of a tie, the first mentioned provision of those that are tied is coded.

If it is one of the original articles of the constitution, the number of the article is preceded by two zeros.

If it is an amendment to the constitution, the number of the amendment (zero filled to two places) is preceded by a "one."

Examples: 001 = Article 1 of the original constitution
101 = 1st Amendment
114 = 14th Amendment

Field 78

CONST2

3 columns wide (254-256)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.9%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.96

This field records the second most frequently cited constitutional provision, using the same codes as those for CONST1

above

Field 79

USC1

3 columns wide (258-260)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.97

This field records the most frequently cited title of the U.S. Code in the headnotes to this case. If none, then a "0" is entered. If one or more provisions are cited, the number of the most frequently cited title is entered.

Field 80

USC1SECT

5 column wide (262-266)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	95.2%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.79

This field records the number of the section from the title of the US Code selected for field 79, USC1, which was the most frequently cited section of that title. In case of ties, the first to be cited was coded. The section number will have up to four digits and will follow "USC" or "USCA."

Field 81

USC2

3 columns wide (268-270)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	96.0%
Gamma:	.94
Kendall's Tau-b:	.91

This field codes the second most frequently cited title of the US Code (if fewer than two titles were cited, a "0" was recorded).

To choose the second title, the following rule was used: If two or more titles of USC or USCA are cited, choose the second most frequently cited title, even if there are other sections of the title already coded which are mentioned more frequently. If the title already coded is the only title cited in the headnotes, choose the section of that title which is cited the second greatest number of times.

Field 82

USC2SECT

5 column wide (272-276)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	92.4%
Gamma:	.94
Kendall's Tau-b:	.91

this field records the most frequently cited section of the title selected in field 81, USC2.

Field 83

CIVPROC1

3 columns wide (278-280)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.94

Was a federal rule of civil procedure cited in the headnotes ?

If no, then "0" was entered.

If yes, then the number of the rule cited in the most headnotes was recorded. For ties, the first rule cited was selected

Field 84

CIVPROC2

3 columns wide (282-284)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.8%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.87

Was a second federal rule of civil procedure cited in the headnotes ?

If no, then "0" was entered.

If yes, then the number of the rule cited in the second most headnotes was recorded. For ties, the first rule cited was selected

Field 85

CRMPROC1

3 columns wide (286-288)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.96

Was a federal rule of criminal procedure cited in the headnotes ?
 If no, then "0" was entered.
 If yes, then the number of the rule cited in the most headnotes was
 recorded. For ties, the first rule cited was selected.

Field 86

CRMPROC2

3 columns wide (290-292)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Was a second federal rule of criminal procedure cited in the
 headnotes ?
 If no, then "0" was entered.
 If yes, then the number of the rule cited in the second most
 headnotes was recorded. For ties, the first rule cited was
 selected

GENERAL NOTES FOR FIELDS 87 - 151 (ISSUE CODING SECTIONS C, D, E, F, G):

Each of these issues is stated in terms of a question which can be answered yes or no if the issue was addressed by the court. All issues were coded from the perspective of the court of appeals majority opinion. If the court discussed the issue in its opinion and answered the related question in the affirmative, a "2" was entered. If the issue was discussed and the opinion answered the question negatively, a "1" was entered. If the opinion considered the question but gave a "mixed" answer, supporting the respondent in part and supporting the appellant in part (or if two issues treated separately by the court both fell within the area covered by one question and the court answered one question affirmatively and one negatively), then a "9" was entered. If the opinion either did not consider or discuss the issue at all or if the opinion indicates that this issue was not worthy of consideration by the court of appeals even though it was discussed by the lower court or was raised in one of the briefs, a "0" was entered. For criminal issues, one additional answer was coded. If the question was answered in the affirmative (which typically meant the position of the defendant was supported), but the error articulated by the court was judged to be harmless, then a "3" was recorded. Thus the answers to these questions provide two discrete pieces of information: i) was a given issue discussed in the opinion of the court; and ii) if discussed, the directionality of the treatment of the answer. For most issues, the directionality is phrased in terms of whether the treatment by the court of the legal issue favored the position of the appellant or the respondent.

In summary, for fields 87-151, the variable may take one of the following values:

- 9 court gave mixed answer to question
- 3 yes, but error was harmless (criminal cases only) (or court did not decide the issue because even if the alleged error occurred, it was harmless)
- 2 yes, court answered question in affirmative
- 1 no, court answered question negatively
- 0 issue not discussed

Only issues actually discussed in the opinion were coded. If the opinion notes that a particular issue was raised by one of the litigants but the court dismisses the issue as frivolous or trivial or not worthy of discussion for some other reason, then the answer to that issue question was coded as "0".

C. Threshold Issues

Fields 87 - 96 all refer to threshold issues at the trial court level. These issues are only considered to be present if the court of appeals is reviewing whether or not the litigants should properly have been allowed to get a trial court decision on the merits. That is, the issue is whether or not the issue crossed properly the threshold to get on the district court agenda. (But remember that the answer to each question ("yes" or "no") is based on the directionality of the appeals court decision; (e.g., for field 87, JURIS, a "2" was entered if the appeals court concluded either that the district court was wrong in dismissing the suit for lack of jurisdiction or if the appeals court affirmed the conclusion of the district court that it had jurisdiction.) If it is conceded that the trial court properly reached the merits, but the issue is whether, in spite of that concession, the appellant has a right to an appeals court decision on the merits (e.g., the issue became moot after the trial), the issue is coded as a threshold issue at the appeals court level (see fields 97-99).

Field 87

JURIS

1 column wide (294)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.80

Did the court determine that it had jurisdiction to hear this case ?

Note: a "9" is used for this variable when the opinion discussed challenges to the jurisdiction of the court to hear several different issues and the court ruled that it had jurisdiction to hear some of the issues but did not have jurisdiction to hear other issues.

Field 88

STATECL

1 column wide (296)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.0%
Gamma:	.82
Kendall's Tau-b:	.15

Did the court dismiss the case because of the failure of the plaintiff to state a claim upon which relief could be granted ?

Note: this variable also includes cases where the court concluded that there was no proper cause of action.

Field 89

STANDING

1 column wide (298)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.89

Did the court determine that the parties had standing ?

Field 90

MOOTNESS

1 column wide (300)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.67

Did the court conclude that an issue was moot ?

Field 91

EXHAUST

1 column wide (302)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.71

Did the court determine that it would not hear the appeal for one of the following reasons : a) administrative remedies had not been exhausted; or b) the issue was not ripe for judicial action ?

Field 92

TIMELY

1 column wide (304)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.4%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.80

Did the court conclude that it could not reach the merits of the case because the litigants had not complied with some rule relating to timeliness, a filing fee, or because a statute of limitations had expired ?

Field 93

IMMUNITY

1 column wide (306)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.56

Did the court refuse to reach the merits of the appeal because it concluded that the defendant had immunity (e.g., the governmental immunity doctrine) ?

Field 94

FRIVOL

1 column wide (308)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court conclude that either the original case was frivolous or raised only trivial issues and therefore was not suitable for actions on the merits ?

Field 95

POLQUEST

1 column wide (310)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court refuse to rule on the merits of the case because it was considered to be a nonjusticiable "political question" ?

Field 96

OTHTHRES

1 column wide (312)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of InterCoder Agreement: 96.0%
Gamma: .89
Kendall's Tau-b: .29

Did the court refuse to rule on the merits of the appeal because of some other threshold issue (at the trial level) ?
(includes collateral estoppel)

REMINDER: Fields 97-99 are threshold issues at the appellate level.

Field 97

LATE

1 column wide (314)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of InterCoder Agreement: 99.6%
Gamma: 1.0
Kendall's Tau-b: .82

Did the court refuse to decide the appeal because the appellant failed to comply with some rule relating to timeliness of the appeal (e.g., failed to pay the filing fee on time or missed the deadline to file the appeal)?

Field 98

FRIVAPP

1 column wide (316)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.57

Did the court conclude that it could not reach the merits of the case because the motion or appeal was frivolous or raised only trivial issues and was therefore not suitable for appellate review ?

Field 99

OTHAPPTH

1 column wide (318)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	96.0%
Gamma:	.89
Kendall's Tau-b:	.29

Did the court refuse to rule on the merits of the appeal because of some other threshold issue that was relevant on appeal but not at the original trial ? (e.g., the case became moot after the original trial)

D. CRIMINAL Issues

Note that in the criminal category, but in no other category, the response: 3= yes, but error was harmless, is possible for most questions.

Field 100

PREJUD

1 column wide (328)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoader Agreement: 96.8%
Gamma: .97
Kendall's Tau-b: .49

Was there prejudicial conduct by prosecution ?
(including prosecutor refusing to produce
evidence which would aid defendant)

Field 101

INSANE

1 column wide (330)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoader Agreement: 99.2%
Gamma: .99
Kendall's Tau-b: .57

Did the court below err in not permitting an insanity defense?
(or did the court err in its conclusion about whether the defendant

was mentally competent to stand trial)

Field 102

IMPROPER

1 column wide (332)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	-1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	-.04

Did the court conclude that there was improper influence on the jury ?
(other than the prejudicial conduct by the prosecutor coded above in field 100. Includes jury tampering and failure to shield jury from prejudicial media accounts).

Field 103

JURYINST

1 column wide (334)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.81

Did the court conclude that the jury instructions were improper ?

Field 104

OTHJURY

1 column wide (336)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.81

Did the court conclude that the jury composition or selection was invalid or that the jury was biased or tampered with?

Field 105

DEATHPEN

1 column wide (338)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.81

Did the court conclude that the death penalty was improperly imposed (i.e., this questions deals only with the validity of the sentence, and is not related to whether or not the conviction was proper) ?

Field 106

SENTENCE

1 column wide (340)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement: 97.6%
Gamma: .96
Kendall's Tau-b: .40

Did the court conclude that some other penalty was improperly imposed ?

Field 107

INDICT

1 column wide (342)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement: 98.8%
Gamma: 1.0
Kendall's Tau-b: .63

Did the court rule that the indictment was defective ?

Field 108

CONFESS

1 column wide (344)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.4%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.53

Did the court conclude that a confession or an incriminating statement was improperly admitted ?

Note: this applies only to an incriminating statement made by the defendant.

Field 109

SEARCH

1 column wide (346)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.85

Did the court below improperly rule for the prosecution on an issue related to an alleged illegal search and seizure ?

(Note: this issue will also be coded as present if a civil suit brought by a prisoner or a criminal defendant in another action that alleges a tort based on an illegal search and seizure)

Field 110

OTHADMIS

1 column wide (348)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	95.2%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.64

Did the court rule that some other evidence was inadmissible
(or did ruling on appropriateness of evidentiary hearing benefit the
defendant)?

Field 111

PLEA

1 column wide (350)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

(PLEA BARGAIN- includes all challenges to plea)

Did the court rule for the defendant on an issue related to
plea bargaining?

Field 112

COUNSEL

1 column wide (352)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.83

Did the court rule that the defendant had inadequate counsel?

Field 113

RTCOUNS

1 column wide (354)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.44

Did the court rule that the defendant's right to counsel was violated (for some reason other than inadequate counsel) ?

Field 114

SUFFIC

1 column wide (356)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.78

Did the court rule that there was insufficient evidence for conviction ?

Field 115

INDIGENT

1 column wide (358)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court rule that the defendant's rights as an indigent were violated?

Field 116

ENTRAP

1 column wide (360)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.99

Did the court rule that the defendant was the victim of
illegal entrapment?

Field 117

PROCDIS

1 column wide (362)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court uphold the dismissal by district court on
procedural grounds ?

Field 118

OTHCRIM

1 column wide (364)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	92.0%
Gamma:	.87
Kendall's Tau-b:	.46

Did the court rule for the defendant on other grounds (e.g., right to speedy trial, double jeopardy, confrontation, retroactivity, self defense; includes the question of whether the defendant waived the right to raise some claim) ?
 (note: if there are two other issues and the court ruled for the defendant on one and against the defendant on the other, then code direction as "2" = yes).

E. Civil Law Issues

This section includes questions about issues that may appear in any civil law cases including civil government, civil private, and diversity cases.

Field 119

DUEPROC

1 column wide (366)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.4%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.59

Did the interpretation of the requirements of due process by

the court favor the appellant ?

Field 120

EXECORD

1 column wide (368)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.4%
Gamma:	-1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	-0.02

Did the interpretation of executive order or administrative regulation by the court favor the appellant ? (does not include whether or not an executive order was lawful)

Field 121

STPOLICY

1 column wide (370)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	89.2%
Gamma:	.90
Kendall's Tau-b:	.64

Did the interpretation of state or local law, executive order, administrative regulation, doctrine, or rule of procedure by the court favor the appellant ?

Field 122

WEIGHTEV

1 column wide (372)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	76.0%
Gamma:	.61
Kendall's Tau-b:	.32

Did the factual interpretation by the court or its conclusions (e.g., regarding the weight of evidence or the sufficiency of evidence) favor the appellant ?
 (includes discussions of whether the litigant met the burden of proof)

Field 123

PRETRIAL

1 column wide (374)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.2%
Gamma:	.95
Kendall's Tau-b:	.46

Did the court's rulings on pre-trial procedure favor the appellant ?
 (does not include rulings on motions for summary judgment; but does include whether or not there is a right to jury trial, whether the case should be certified as a class action, or whether a prospective party has a right to intervene in the case)

Field 124

TRIALPRO

1 column wide (376)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	93.6%
Gamma:	.91
Kendall's Tau-b:	.44

Did the court's ruling on procedure at trial favor the appellant ?
(includes jury instructions and motions for directed verdicts made during trial).

Field 125

POST_TRL

1 column wide (378)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.2%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.49

Did the court's ruling on some post-trial procedure or motion (e.g., allocating court costs or post award relief) favor the appellant ? (does not include attorneys' fees; but does include motions to set aside a jury verdict)

Field 126

ATTYFEE

1 column wide (380)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.2%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.66

Did the court's ruling on attorneys' fees favor the appellant?

Field 127

JUDGDISC

1 column wide (382)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	96.8%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.57

Did the court's ruling on the abuse of discretion by the trial judge favor the appellant ? (includes issue of whether the judge actually had the authority for the action taken; does not include questions of discretion of administrative law judges - see field 145).

Field 128

ALTDISP

1 column wide (384)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.8%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.40

Did the court's ruling on an issue arising out of an alternative dispute resolution process (ADR, settlement conference, role of mediator or arbitrator, etc.) favor the appellant ?

Field 129

INJUNCT

1 column wide (386)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.70

Did the court's ruling on the validity of an injunction or the denial of an injunction or a stay of injunction favor the appellant ?

Field 130

SUMMARY

1 column wide (388)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.51

Did the court's ruling on the appropriateness of summary judgment or the denial of summary judgment favor the appellant ?

Field 131

FEDVST

1 column wide (390)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.8%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.63

Did the court rule that federal law should take precedence over state or local laws in a case involving the conflict of laws (i.e., which laws or rules apply) ?

Field 132

FOREIGN

1 column wide (392)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court rule that domestic law (federal, state or local) should take precedence over foreign law in a case involving the conflict of laws (i.e., which laws or rules apply- foreign country vs federal, state, or local) ?

Field 133

INT_LAW

1 column wide (394)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court rule in favor of the appellant on an issue related to the interpretation of a treaty or international law ?

Field 134

ST_V_ST

1 column wide (396)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.50

Did the court rule in favor of the appellant on the issue of a conflict of laws (which laws or rules apply) other than federal v state or foreign v domestic (e.g., one state vs second state) ?

Field 135

DISCOVER

1 column wide (398)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.49

Did the court's interpretation of rules relating to discovery or other issues related to obtaining evidence favor the appellant?

Field 136

OTHCCIVIL

1 column wide (400)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	94.8%
Gamma:	-1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	-0.1

Was there a significant other issue that does not fall into one of the specifically enumerated categories ?

F.CIVIL - GOVERNMENT (Civil law issues involving government actors)

Field 137

SUBEVID

1 column wide (402)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.2%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.69

Did the court's interpretation of the substantial evidence rule support the government ? ("such evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion"; "more than a mere scintilla") (Note: this issue is present only when the court indicates that it is using this doctrine. When the court is merely discussing the evidence to determine whether the evidence supports the position of the appellant or respondent, you should choose field 122 - weight of evidence- instead of this issue).

Field 138

DENOVO

1 column wide (404)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court's use of the standard of review, "de novo on facts" support the government ? (the courts generally recognize that de novo review is impractical for the bulk of agency decisions so the substantial evidence standard helps provide a middle course) (this is de novo review of administrative action - not de novo review of trial court by appeals court)

Field 139

ERRON

1 column wide (406)
numeric

Did the court's use of the clearly erroneous standard support the government ? (a somewhat narrower standard than substantial evidence) (or ignore usual agency standards)

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	97.6%
Gamma:	-1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	-0.01

Field 140

CAPRIC

1 column wide (408)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.46

Did the courts's use or interpretation of the arbitrary and capricious standard support the government ? (APA allows courts to overturn agency actions deemed to be arbitrary or capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; Overton Park emphasized this is a narrow standard--one must prove that agency's action is without a rational basis) (also includes the "substantial justification" doctrine)

Field 141

ABUSEDIS

1 column wide (410)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.0%
Gamma:	.97
Kendall's Tau-b:	.31

Did the court conclude that it should defer to agency discretion ? (for example, if the action was committed to agency discretion)

Field 142

JUDREV

1 column wide (412)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court conclude the decision was subject to judicial review? (While questions of fact are subject to limited review, questions of law are subject to full review. The problem becomes determining which are clear questions of law or fact as they are often "mixed")

Field 143

GENSTAND

1 column wide (414)
 numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	94.4%
Gamma:	.89
Kendall's Tau-b:	.38

Did the agency articulate the appropriate general standard? [this question includes--did the agency interpret the statute "correctly"--the courts often refer here to the rational basis test, plain meaning, reasonable construction of the statute, congressional intent, etc.] (also includes question of which law applies or whether amended law vs law before amendment applies)

Field 144

NOTICE

1 column wide (416)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the agency give proper notice?
(decisions that affect life, liberty, or property must be preceded
by adequate notice and an opportunity for a fair hearing)

Field 145

ALJ

1 column wide (418)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.89

Did the court support the decision of an administrative law
judge ?

Field 146

AGEN_ACQ

1 column wide (420)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	99.2%
Gamma:	-1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	-0.01

Did the court rule for the government in an issue related to agency acquisition of information (e.g. physical inspections, searches, subpoenas, records, etc) ?

Field 147

FREEINFO

1 column wide (422)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court rule in favor of the government when the administrative action in question related to the agency's providing information to those who request it? (e.g. Freedom of Information, issues of governmental confidentiality, "government in the sunshine")

Field 148

COMMENT

1 column wide (424)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	100%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did agency give proper opportunity to comment?

Field 149

RECORD

1 column wide (426)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	98.4%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.44

Did the agency fail to develop an adequate record ? (e.g.,
court unable to determine what doctrine was used for the decision
or unable to determine the basis of the decision)

G. DIVERSITY ISSUES

Field 150

DIVERSE

1 column wide (428)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	99.6%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	1.0

Did the court conclude that the parties were truly diverse ?

Field 151

WHLAWS

1 column wide (430)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	98.8%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.41

Did the court's discussion of which state's laws should control their ruling in the case support the position taken by the appellant ?

JUDGES AND VOTES

The remaining fields record an identifying code for each judge who participated on the courts of appeals panel and four indicators of their voting: i) the directionality of their vote on the first casetype; ii) the directionality of their vote on the second casetype; iii) whether they voted with the court majority or dissented in the resolution of the first casetype; and iv) whether they voted with the court majority or dissented in the resolution of the second casetype. Thus, there are five fields for each judge.

A large majority of the cases were decided by 3 judge panels. Therefore only 11 fields (Field 160-170) have data for most cases. Fields 171-228 have missing values for most cases. However, for cases decided en banc, fields for as many as 15 judges (i.e., 71 fields) have data.

A judge code will normally be recorded for the first three judges. For appeals court judges, the values of these codes will range from 101 to 1252. For district judges who sat on appeals court panels, the judge codes will have five digits. There will be a missing value code for one of the first three judges in the following circumstances: a) when only two judges participated in the final decision of the court (e.g., occasionally only two judges are appointed to the panel or one of the original three judges dies before the decision was announced); b) when one of the judges on the panel was from some court other than the U.S. Courts of Appeals or the U.S. District Courts (e.g., from the Court of Customs and Patents Appeals); c) the names of the judges were not listed in the Federal Reporter (this occurs primarily in short per curiam opinions in the 1920s and 1930s). In a few cases, primarily but not exclusively from the 1920s and 1930s, only one judge sat on the appeals court "panel" deciding the case.

For all of the judges on the panels who have served on the U.S. Courts of Appeals (including those who were on senior status at the time of their participation) the five digit judge codes recorded in these fields can be merged with the United States Courts of Appeals Judge Data Base¹ (the "Auburn" data) to permit the analysis of the relationship of a wide variety of judicial attributes to patterns of judicial voting. Appendix 3 provides an alphabetical list by circuit of judges who served on the courts of

¹ The United States Courts of Appeals Judge Data Base, Gary Zuk, Deborah J. Barrow, and Gerard S. Gryski (Co-Principal Investigators), NSF # SBR-93-11999.

appeals between 1925 and 1996. This judge list in Appendix 3 also records the numerical code for each judge (i.e., the values recorded in the variables CODEJ1, CODEJ2, CODEJ3, CODEJ4, CODEJ5, etc.) and presents the correspondence between these five digit codes and the names of the appeals court judges.

The Auburn data provides a wealth of data on the personal attributes and career history of each appeals court judge. Included in this data base are the dates of appointment to and leaving the courts of appeals, the political party and religion of the judge, the name and party of the appointing president, the state of appointment, and a wealth of data on the prior career and educational record of each judge.

The Auburn data contains a variable called "IDS" that is designed to match the values of CODEJ1, CODEJ2, CODEJ3, etc. in the appeals court data base. To combine the Auburn data with the appeals court data, one should first convert the unit of analysis of the data base from case to judge vote. Then, create a variable in the appeals court data called "IDS" with the values of CODEJ and merge the two data bases using that variable.

Note:if a district court judge or a senior district court judge participates on the panel, see the separate list of district court judges in Appendix 4 for the five digit judge code. However, note that no background data is available for these judges. Occasionally someone other than an appeals court judge or a district court judge sits on a panel of the courts of appeals. Since we have no identification codes for such judges, the judge code variable has missing data.

Merger of appeals court data and the judge background data

To merge the appeals court data and the background data using SAS, use the SAS statements below (assume that the appeals court data is in a prior data step called "one" and that the background data is in a data step called "back"). This merger should be run after the cleanup described below has been run.

Before the two data bases are merged, some clean-up is necessary. This cleanup is due primarily because some judges served on more than one circuit at different points in their career. Such judges received separate codes in the appeals court data for each circuit, but in the Auburn data they received a single unique code. The statements below, written in SAS, provide the necessary clean-up. Users employing some other statistical package can utilize the logic of these statements to make the conversion. Statements in regular print are the actual SAS statements. Statements in **bold** are explanantions to the reader and should not be part of the actual program.

SAS statements

```
data back;  
proc sort; by ids;  
run;
```

```
data two; set one;  
codej=codej1; jvote=direct1; marker=1; output;  
codej=codej2; jvote=j2vot1; marker=2; output;  
codej=codej3; jvote=j3vot1; marker=3; output;  
codej=codej4; jvote=j4vot1; marker=4; output;  
codej=codej5; jvote=j5vot1; marker=5; output;  
codej=codej6; jvote=j6vot1; marker=6; output;  
codej=codej7; jvote=j7vot1; marker=7; output;  
codej=codej8; jvote=j8vot1; marker=8; output;  
codej=codej9; jvote=j9vot1; marker=9; output;  
codej=codej10; jvote=j10vot1; marker=10; output;  
codej=codej11; jvote=j11vot1; marker=11; output;  
codej=codej12; jvote=j12vot1; marker=12; output;  
codej=codej13; jvote=j13vot1; marker=13; output;  
codej=codej14; jvote=j14vot1; marker=14; output;  
codej=codej15; jvote=j15vot1; marker=15; output;
```

/* the above statements essentially create 15 lines of data for every original line (each line was a case) of data. Each new line has all of the original data plus the values for three new variables: "codej", "jvote", and "marker." If you want to switch back to case (rather than judge) as the unit of analysis, simply select only data lines with marker=1 */

```
data three; set two;  
if codej gt 0; if codej lt 1300;
```

/* "if codej gt 0" eliminates all the data lines with missing values -e.g., it means that if a case was decided by a 3 judge panel, only 3 new data lines (one for each judge on the panel) rather than 15 will be created. */

/* "if codej lt 1300" eliminates all judges who are not appeals court judges */

```
if codej gt 0 then ids=codej;  
  
if codej= 218 then ids=722;  
if codej= 346 then ids=0;  
if codej= 536 then ids=542;  
if codej= 624 then ids=722;  
if codej= 970 then ids=971;  
if codej= 973 then ids=970;
```

```
if codej= 1007 then ids=808;
if codej= 1015 then ids=819;
```

```
if codej=1101 then ids=502;
if codej=1102 then ids=510;
if codej=1104 then ids=514;
if codej=1106 then ids=516;
if codej=1107 then ids=521;
if codej=1108 then ids=523;
if codej=1109 then ids=524;
if codej=1110 then ids=570;
if codej=1111 then ids=530;
if codej=1112 then ids=534;
if codej=1113 then ids=537;
if codej=1114 then ids=540;
if codej=1115 then ids=545;
if codej=1116 then ids=554;
if codej=1117 then ids=555;
if codej=1118 then ids=556;
```

/* the lines above clean up the discrepancies so that all of our judge codes get matched up with the correct set of background data */

```
proc sort; by ids;
run;
```

```
data combine; merge three back; by ids;
```

Field 160

CODEJ1
 5 column wide (453-458)
 numeric

Reliability:
 Rate of Inter-coder Agreement: 99.6%
 Gamma: .99
 Kendall's Tau-b: .98

Code for judge 1 (see separate judge codes). Note that if the opinion is signed, the opinion author is always listed as judge 1.

If the decision is per curiam, judge 1 will be any member of the majority. Since the first judge is thus by definition part of the majority, the directionality of the votes of judge 1 are always the same as the directionality of the court's decision. Therefore, separate variables were not created for the votes and majority status of judge 1.

Field 161

CODEJ2

5 column wide (460-465)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	98.4%
Gamma:	.98
Kendall's Tau-b:	.98

The code for the second judge on the panel (note: any judge other than the author of the majority opinion could be coded as judge 2. There is no significance to the designation as the second rather than the third judge on the panel).

Field 162

J2VOTE1

1 column wide (468)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Inter-coder Agreement:	92.4%
Gamma:	.92
Kendall's Tau-b:	.86

Vote of the second judge on the first casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT1)

Field 163

J2VOTE2

1 column wide (471)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	86.4%
Gamma:	.85
Kendall's Tau-b:	.70

Vote of the second judge on the 2nd casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT2)

Field 164

J2MAJ1

1 column wide (467)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	95.2%
Gamma:	.96
Kendall's Tau-b:	.31

This field records whether judge 2 voted with the majority on the first casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

Field 165

J2MAJ2

1 column wide (470)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	82.4%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.68

This field records whether judge 2 voted with the majority on the second casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

Field 166

CODEJ3

5 column wide (473-478)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	97.2%
Gamma:	.92
Kendall's Tau-b:	.92

The code for the third judge on the panel (note: any judge other than the author of the majority opinion could be coded as judge 3. There is no significance to the designation as the second rather than the third judge on the panel).

Field 167

J3VOTE1

1 column wide (481)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	92.0%
Gamma:	.91
Kendall's Tau-b:	.83

Vote of the third judge on the first casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT1)

Field 168

J3VOTE2

1 column wide (484)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	86.0%
Gamma:	.76
Kendall's Tau-b:	.58

Vote of the third judge on the 2nd casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT2)

Field 169

J3MAJ1

1 column wide (480)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	94.4%
Gamma:	.99
Kendall's Tau-b:	.81

This field records whether judge 3 voted with the majority on the first casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

Field 170

J3MAJ2

1 column wide (483)
numeric

Reliability:

Rate of Intercoder Agreement:	82.4%
Gamma:	1.0
Kendall's Tau-b:	.68

This field records whether judge 3 voted with the majority on the second casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

Field 171

CODEJ4

5 column wide (490-495)
numeric

The code for the fourth judge on the panel (note: any judge other than the author of the majority opinion could be coded as judge 4.).

Field 172

J4VOTE1

1 column wide (497)
numeric

Vote of the fourth judge on the first casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT1)

Field 173

J4VOTE2

1 column wide (499)
numeric

Vote of the fourth judge on the 2nd casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT2)

Field 174

J4MAJ1

1 column wide (496)
numeric

This field records whether judge 4 voted with the majority on the first casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

Field 175

J4MAJ2

1 column wide (498)
numeric

This field records whether judge 4 voted with the majority on the second casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

.
.
.
.

Field 225

CODEJ15

5 column wide (600-605)
numeric

The code for the fifteenth judge on the panel (note: any judge other than the author of the majority opinion could be coded as judge 15.).

Field 226

J15VOTE1

1 column wide (607)
numeric

Vote of the fifteenth judge on the first casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT1)

Field 227

J15VOTE2

1 column wide (609)
numeric

Vote of the fifteenth judge on the 2nd casetype. Using the same directionality coding as used for the directionality of the court's decision (i.e., DIRECT2)

Field 228

J15MAJ1

1 column wide (606)
numeric

This field records whether judge 15 voted with the majority on the first casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

Field 229

J15MAJ2

1 column wide (608)
numeric

This field records whether judge 15 voted with the majority on the second casetype. The variable takes the following values:

1=voted with majority
2=dissented

APPENDIX 1

ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF VARIABLES

Documentation

Page

Num	Acronym	Brief Description of Variable
129	ABUSEDIS	should court defer to agency discretion
28	ADMINREV	ID of federal regulatory agency (if any) the case was appealed from
132	AGEN_ACQ	issue related to agency acquisition of information
131	ALJ	did court support decision of administrative law judge
123	ALTDISP	issue relating to alternative dispute resolution process (includes ADR, settlement conference, mediation, arbitration)
67	AMICUS	number of amicus curiae briefs filed
35	APPBUS	number of appellants who were private businesses
40	APPEL1	Detailed Nature of 1st listed appellant
56	APPEL2	Detailed Nature of 2nd listed appellant whose code is not identical to the code of the first
35	APPFED	number of appellants who were federal government agencies
36	APPFIDUC	number of appellants who were fiduciaries or trustees
27	APPLFROM	type of district court final judgment (if any) appealed from
34	APPNATPR	number of appellants who were natural persons
35	APPNONP	number of appellants who were non-profit groups
36	APPSTATE	number of appellants who were state government agencies
35	APPSUBST	number of appellants who were sub-state governments
37	APP_STID	state of appellant (if appellant is state or local govt)
122	ATTYFEE	attorney fees
39	BANK_AP1	was first appellant bankrupt ?
55	BANK_AP2	was second appellant bankrupt ?
62	BANK_R1	was first respondent bankrupt ?
64	BANK_R2	was second respondent bankrupt ?
18	BEGINPG	page number of 1st page of case
129	CAPRIC	arbitrary or capricious standard
17	CASENUM	case identification
68	CASETYP1	first case type - substantive policy (analogous to Spaeth issue codes)
86	CASETYP2	second case type
21	CIRCUIT	circuit of court
18	CITE	citation in <u>Federal Reporter</u>
99	CIVPROC1	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure most frequently

		cited in headnotes
99	CIVPROC2	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
30	CLASSACT	was case a class action?
138	CODEJ1	code for the judge who wrote the court opinion
139	CODEJ2	code for 2nd judge on panel
141	CODEJ3	code for 3rd judge on panel
144	CODEJ4	code for 4th judge on panel
145	CODEJ15	code for 15th judge on panel
133	COMMENT	did agency give proper opportunity to comment
89	CONCUR	number of concurrences
113	CONFESS	admissibility of confession or incriminating statement
92	CONSTIT	Was there an issue about the constitutionality of a law or administrative action
96	CONST1	Constitutional provision most frequently cited in headnotes
96	CONST2	Constitutional provision 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
115	COUNSEL	ineffective counsel
66	COUNSEL1	counsel for appellant
66	COUNSEL2	counsel for respondent
100	CRMPROC1	Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure most frequently cited in headnotes
100	CRMPROC2	Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
31	CROSSAPP	were there cross appeals ?
17	DAY	Day of decision
111	DEATHPEN	death penalty
91	DECUNCON	was law or administrative action declared unconstitutional ?
128	DENOVO	use of standard of review, "de novo on facts"
79	DIRECT1	directionality of decision on 1st case type
86	DIRECT2	directionality of decision on 2nd case type
126	DISCOVER	conflict over discovery procedures
89	DISSENT	number of dissenting votes
26	DISTJUDG	ID of district judge (if any) deciding case below
23	DISTRICT	district of origin of case
134	DIVERSE	were the parties truly diverse
19	DOCKNUM	docket number of first case decided by the opinion
118	DUEPROC	due process
18	ENDOPIN	page number of last page of majority opinion
18	ENDPAGE	page number of last page of all opinions in case
117	ENTRAP	entrapment
128	ERRON	clearly erroneous standard
119	EXECORD	interpretation of executive order or administrative regulation
104	EXHAUST	was there an issue about ripeness or failure to

		exhaust administrative remedies
92	FEDLAW	did the court engage in statutory interpretation
124	FEDVST	conflict of laws or dispute over whether federal vs state law governs
125	FOREIGN	conflict over whether foreign or domestic law applies
132	FREEINFO	administrative denial of information to those requesting it, freedom of information, sunshine laws
108	FRIVAPP	was there an allegation that the appeal was frivolous
106	FRIVOL	was there an issue about whether the case was frivolous
38	GENAPEL1	general classification of 1st appellant
55	GENAPEL2	general classification of 2nd appellant
78	GENISS	eight summary issue categories based on CASETYP1
61	GENRESP1	general classification of 1st respondent
63	GENRESP2	general classification of 2nd respondent
130	GENSTAND	did agency articulate the appropriate general standard
90	HABEAS	was this a habeas corpus case
105	IMMUNITY	was there an issue about governmental immunity
110	IMPROPER	improper influence on jury
112	INDICT	was indictment defective
116	INDIGENT	violation of rights of indigent
25	INITIATE	party initiating appeal (e.g., plaintiff, defendant, intervenor)
123	INJUNCT	validity or appropriateness of injunction
109	INSANE	insanity defense
67	INTERVEN	was there an intervenor ?
125	INT_LAW	application of international law
122	JUDGDISC	abuse of discretion by trial judge
130	JUDREV	conflict over whether agency decision was subject to judicial review
102	JURIS	was there a jurisdiction issue ?
110	JURYINST	jury instructions
139	J2VOTE1	vote of 2nd judge on 1st case type
140	J2VOTE2	vote of 2nd judge on 2nd case type
140	J2MAJ1	was 2nd judge in majority on 1st case type ?
141	J2MAJ2	was 2nd judge in majority on 2nd case type ?
142	J3VOTE1	vote of 3rd judge on 1st case type
142	J3VOTE2	vote of 3rd judge on 2nd case type
143	J3MAJ1	was 3rd judge in majority on 1st case type ?
143	J3MAJ2	was 3rd judge in majority on 2nd case type ?
144	J4VOTE1	vote of 4th judge on 1st case type
144	J4VOTE2	vote of 4th judge on 2nd case type
144	J4MAJ1	was 4th judge in majority on 1st case type ?
145	J4MAJ2	was 4th judge in majority on 2nd case type ?

.

.

.

145	J15VOTE1	vote of 15th judge on 1st case type
146	J15VOTE2	vote of 15th judge on 2nd case type
146	J15MAJ1	was 15th judge in majority on 1st case type ?
146	J15MAJ2	was 15th judge in majority on 2nd case type ?
107	LATE	was there an issue relating to the timeliness of the appeal ?
88	MAJVOTES	number of majority votes
20	METHOD	nature of appeals court decision (e.g., 1st decision by 3 judge panel, en banc)
17	MONTH	month of decision
104	MOOTNESS	was there an issue about mootness ?
131	NOTICE	did agency give proper notice ?
34	NUMAPPEL	total number of appellants
58	NUMRESP	total number of respondents
30	OPINSTAT	opinion status of decision
24	ORIGIN	type of court or agency that made original decision
114	OTHADMIS	admissibility of evidence other than search or confession
108	OTHAPPTH	was there some other threshold issue at the appellate level ?
127	OTHCIVIL	other civil law issue
118	OTHCIM	other criminal issue
111	OTHJURY	other issues relating to juries
107	OTHTHRES	was there some other threshold issue at the trial level ?
114	PLEA	issue relating to plea bargaining
106	POLQUEST	was there an issue about the political question doctrine ?
121	POST_TRL	post trial procedures and motions (including court costs and motions to set aside jury decisions)
109	PREJUD	prejudicial conduct by prosecutor
120	PRETRIAL	trial court rulings on pre-trial procedure,
29	PRIORPUB	citation (if any) to prior published opinion in district court
117	PROCDIS	dismissal by district court on procedural grounds
92	PROCEDUR	was there an interpretation of precedent that did not involve statutory or constitutional interpretation ?
57	REALAPP	are the appellants coded in var 38 and var 41 the real parties in this case ?
65	REALRESP	are the respondents coded in field 54 and field 57 the real parties in this case ?
133	RECORD	did agency fail to develop an adequate record ?
62	RESPOND1	detailed Nature of 1st listed respondent
64	RESPOND2	detailed Nature of 2nd listed respondent whose code

		is not identical to the code of the first respondent ?
115	RTCOUNS	right to counsel
58	R_BUS	number of respondents who were private businesses
59	R_FED	number of respondents who were federal government agencies
60	R_FIDUC	number of respondents who were fiduciaries or trustees
58	R_NATPR	number of respondents who were natural persons
59	R_NONP	number of respondents who were non-profit groups
59	R_STATE	number of respondents who were state government agencies
61	R_STID	state of respondent (if respondent is state or local govt)
59	R_SUBST	number of respondents who were sub-state governments
31	SANCTION	were sanctions imposed ?
113	SEARCH	admissibility of evidence from search or seizure
112	SENTENCE	issue relating to sentence other than death penalty
25	SOURCE	forum from which decision appealed
103	STANDING	was there an issue about standing ?
21	STATE	state of origin of case
103	STATECL	was there an issue about failure to state a claim ?
119	STPOLICY	interpretation of state or local law, executive order or administrative regulation
126	ST_V_ST	conflict over which state's laws apply
127	SUBEVID	substantial evidence doctrine
116	SUFFIC	sufficiency of evidence
124	SUMMARY	summary judgment
105	TIMELY	was there an issue about whether litigants complied with a rule about timeliness, filing fees, or statutes of limitation ?
87	TREAT	treatment of decision below by appeals court
121	TRIALPRO	court rulings on trial procedure
94	TYPEISS	general nature of proceedings (criminal, civil-government, civil - private, diversity)
97	USC1	title of US Code most frequently cited in headnotes
97	USC1SECT	section of USC1 most frequently cited in headnotes
98	USC2	title of US Code 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
98	USC2SECT	section of USC2 most frequently cited in headnotes
18	VOL	volume in which case located
120	WEIGHTEV	interpretation of weight of evidence issues
134	WHLAWS	which state's laws should govern dispute
17	YEAR	year of decision

APPENDIX 2

LISTING OF VARIABLES FOR ASCII INPUT STATEMENT

F i e l d #			
	Acronym	column location	variable description
<hr/>			
1.	CASENUM	1-5	case identification
2.	YEAR	16-19	year of decision
3.	MONTH	20-21	month of decision
4.	DAY	22-23	Day of decision
5.	CITE	25-33	citation in <u>Federal Reporter</u>
6.	VOL	25-28	volume in which case located
7.	BEGINPG	30-33	page number of 1st page of case
8.	ENDOPIN	34-37	page number of last page of majority opinion
9.	ENDPAGE	39-42	page number of last page of all opinions in case
10.	DOCNUM	44-51	docket number of first case decided by the opinion
11.	METHOD	57	nature of appeals court decision (e.g., 1st decision by 3 judge panel, en banc)
12.	CIRCUIT	59-60	circuit of court
13.	STATE	62-63	state of origin of case
14.	DISTRICT	65	district of origin of case
15.	ORIGIN	67	type of court or agency that made original decision
16.	SOURCE	69	forum from which decision appealed
17.	DISTJUDG	72-77	ID of district judge (if any) deciding case below
18.	APPLFROM	79-80	type of district court final judgment (if any) appealed from
19.	ADMINREV	82-83	ID of federal regulatory agency (if any) the case was appealed from
20.	PRIORPUB	85-94	citation (if any) to prior published opinion in district court
21.	OPINSTAT	96	opinion status of decision
67.	TREAT	98-99	treatment of decision below by appeals court
22.	CLASSACT	101	was case a class action?
23.	CROSSAPP	103	were there cross appeals ?
68.	MAJVOTES	105-106	number of majority votes
69.	DISSENT	108-109	number of dissenting votes

70. CONCUR	111-112	number of concurrences
58. COUNSEL1	114	counsel for appellant
59. COUNSEL2	116	counsel for respondent
60. AMICUS	118	number of amicus curiae briefs filed
24. SANCTION	120	were sanctions imposed ?
25. INITIATE	126	party initiating appeal (e.g., plaintiff, defendant, intervenor)
61. INTERVEN	128	was there an intervenor ?
26. NUMAPPEL	130-132	total number of appellants
27. APPNATPR	134-136	number of appellants who were natural persons
28. APPBUS	138-140	number of appellants who were private businesses
29. APPNONP	142-144	number of appellants who were non-profit groups
30. APPFED	146-148	number of appellants who were federal government agencies
31. APPSUBST	150-152	number of appellants who were sub-state governments
32. APPSTATE	154-156	number of appellants who were state government agencies
33. APPFIDUC	158-160	number of appellants who were fiduciaries or trustees
34. APP_STID	162-163	state of appellant (if appellant is state or local govt)
36. BANK_AP1	165	was first appellant bankrupt
35. GENAPEL1	166	general classification of 1st appellant
37. APPEL1	166-170	Detailed Nature of 1st listed appellant
39. BANK_AP2	172	was second appellant bankrupt
38. GENAPEL2	173	general classification of 2nd appellant
40. APPEL2	173-177	Detailed Nature of 2nd listed appellant whose code is not identical to the code of the first appellant
41. REALAPP	179	Are the appellants coded in var 38 and var 41 the real parties in this case ?
42. NUMRESP	181-183	total number of respondents
43. R_NATPR	185-187	number of respondents who were natural persons
44. R_BUS	189-191	number of respondents who were private businesses
45. R_NONP	193-195	number of respondents who were non-profit groups
46. R_FED	197-199	number of respondents who were federal government agencies
47. R_SUBST	201-203	number of respondents who were sub-state governments
48. R_STATE	205-207	number of respondents who were state government agencies
49. R_FIDUC	209-211	number of respondents who were fiduciaries

		or trustees
50. R_STID	213-214	state of respondent (if respondent is state or local govt)
51. GENRESP1	217	general classification of 1st respondent
52. BANK_R1	216	was first respondent bankrupt ?
53. RESPOND1	217-221	Detailed Nature of 1st listed respondent
54. GENRESP2	224	general classification of 2nd respondent
55. BANK_R2	223	was second respondent bankrupt ?
56. RESPOND2	224-228	Detailed Nature of 2nd listed respondent whose code is not identical to the code of the first respondent
57. REALRESP	230	Are the respondents coded in field 54 and field 57 the real parties in this case ?
77. CONST1	250-252	Constitutional provision most frequently cited in headnotes
78. CONST2	254-256	Constitutional provision 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
79. USC1	258-260	Title of US Code most frequently cited in headnotes
80. USC1SECT	262-266	Section of USC1 most frequently cited in headnotes
81. USC2	268-270	Title of US Code 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
82. USC2SECT	272-276	Section of USC2 most frequently cited in headnotes
83. CIVPROC1	278-280	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure most frequently cited in headnotes
84. CIVPROC2	282-284	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
85. CRMPROC1	286-288	Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure most frequently cited in headnotes
86. CRMPROC2	290-292	Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 2nd most frequently cited in headnotes
87. JURIS	294	Was there a jurisdiction issue
88. STATECL	296	Was there an issue about failure to state a claim
89. STANDING	298	Was there an issue about standing
90. MOOTNESS	300	Was there an issue about mootness
91. EXHAUST	302	Was there an issue about ripeness or failure to exhaust administrative remedies
92. TIMELY	304	Was there an issue about whether litigants complied with a rule about timeliness, filing fees, or statutes of limitation
93. IMMUNITY	306	Was there an issue about governmental immunity
94. FRIVOL	308	Was there an issue about whether the case was frivolous
95. POLQUEST	310	Was there an issue about the political question doctrine

96.	OTHTHRES	312	Was there some other threshold issue at the trial level
97.	LATE	314	Was there an issue relating to the timeliness of the appeal
98.	FRIVAPP	316	Was there an allegation that the appeal was frivolous
99.	OTHAPPTH	318	Was there some other threshold issue at the appellate level
73.	CONSTIT	320	Was there an issue about the constitutionality of a law or administrative action
74.	FEDLAW	322	Did the court engage in statutory interpretation
75.	PROCEDUR	324	Was there an interpretation of precedent that did not involve statutory or constitutional interpretation
76.	TYPEISS	326	General nature of proceedings (criminal, civil-government, civil - private, diversity)
100	PREJUD	328	prejudicial conduct by prosecutor
101	INSANE	330	insanity defense
102	IMPROPER	332	improper influence on jury
103	JURYINST	334	jury instructions
104	OTHJURY	336	other issues relating to juries
105	DEATHPEN	338	death penalty
106	SENTENCE	340	issue relating to sentence other than death penalty
107	INDICT	342	was indictment defective
108	CONFESS	344	admissibility of confession or incriminating statement
109	SEARCH	346	admissibility of evidence from search or seizure
110	OTHADMIS	348	admissibility of evidence other than search or confession
111	PLEA	350	issue relating to plea bargaining
112	COUNSEL	352	ineffective counsel
113	RTCOUNS	354	right to counsel
114	SUFFIC	356	sufficiency of evidence
115	INDIGENT	358	violation of rights of indigent
116	ENTRAP	360	entrapment
117	PROCDIS	362	dismissal by district court on procedural grounds
118	OTHCrim	364	other criminal issue
119	DUEPROC	366	due process
120	EXECORD	368	interpretation of executive order or administrative regulation
121	STPOLICY	370	interpretation of state or local law, executive order or administrative regulation

122	WEIGHTEV	372	interpretation of weight of evidence issues
123	PRETRIAL	374	trial court rulings on pre-trial procedure, (but not motions for summary judgment or discovery which are covered in separate variables - see fields 130 & 135)
124	TRIALPRO	376	court rulings on trial procedure
125	POST_TRL	378	post trial procedures and motions (including court costs and motions to set aside jury decisions)
126	ATTYFEE	380	attorney's fees
127	JUDGDISC	382	abuse of discretion by trial judge
128	ALTDISP	384	issue relating to alternative dispute resolution process (includes ADR, settlement conference, mediation, arbitration)
129	INJUNCT	386	validity or appropriateness of injunction
130	SUMMARY	388	summary judgment
131	FEDVST	390	conflict of laws or dispute over whether federal vs state law governs
132	FOREIGN	392	conflict over whether foreign or domestic law applies
133	INT_LAW	394	application of international law
134	ST_V_ST	396	conflict over which state's laws apply
135	DISCOVER	398	conflict over discovery procedures
136	OTHCIVIL	400	other civil law issue
137	SUBEVID	402	substantial evidence doctrine
138	DENOVO	404	use of standard of review, "de novo on facts"
139	ERRON	406	clearly erroneous standard
140	CAPRIC	408	arbitrary or capricious standard
141	ABUSEDIS	410	should court defer to agency discretion
142	JUDREV	412	conflict over whether agency decision was subject to judicial review
143	GENSTAND	414	did agency articulate the appropriate general standard
144	NOTICE	416	did agency give proper notice
145	ALJ	418	did court support decision of administrative law judge
146	AGEN_ACQ	420	issue related to agency acquisition of information
147	FREEINFO	422	administrative denial of information to those requesting it, freedom of information, sunshine laws
148	COMMENT	424	did agency give proper opportunity to comment
149	RECORD	426	did agency fail to develop an adequate record

150 DIVERSE	428	were the parties truly diverse
151 WHLAWS	430	which state's laws should govern dispute
62. CASETYP1	432-434	first case type - substantive policy (analogous to Spaeth issue codes)
63. GENISS	432	eight summary issue categories based on CASETYP1
64. DIRECT1	436	directionality of decision on 1st case type
65. CASETYP2	438-440	second case type
66. DIRECT2	442	directionality of decision on 2nd case type
71. HABEAS	444	was this a habeas corpus case
72. DECUNCON	446-447	was law or administrative action declared unconstitutional
160 CODEJ1	453-458	code for the judge who wrote the court opinion
161 CODEJ2	460-465	code for 2nd judge on panel
162 J2VOTE1	468	vote of 2nd judge on 1st case type
163 J2VOTE2	471	vote of 2nd judge on 2nd case type
164 J2MAJ1	467	was 2nd judge in majority on 1st case type
165 J2MAJ2	470	was 2nd judge in majority on 2nd case type
166 CODEJ3	473-478	code for 3rd judge on panel
167 J3VOTE1	481	vote of 3rd judge on 1st case type
168 J3VOTE2	484	vote of 3rd judge on 2nd case type
169 J3MAJ1	480	was 3rd judge in majority on 1st case type
170 J3MAJ2	483	was 3rd judge in majority on 2nd case type
171 CODEJ4	490-495	code for 4th judge on panel
172 J4VOTE1	497	vote of 4th judge on 1st case type
173 J4VOTE2	499	vote of 4th judge on 2nd case type
174 J4MAJ1	496	was 4th judge in majority on 1st case type
175 J4MAJ2	498	was 4th judge in majority on 2nd case type
176 CODEJ5	500-505	code for 5th judge on panel
177 J5VOTE1	507	vote of 5th judge on 1st case type
178 J5VOTE2	509	vote of 5th judge on 2nd case type
179 J5MAJ1	506	was 5th judge in majority on 1st case type
180 J5MAJ2	508	was 5th judge in majority on 2nd case type
.		
.		
.		
225 CODEJ15	600-605	code for 15th judge on panel
226 J15VOTE1	607	vote of 15th judge on 1st case type
227 J15VOTE2	609	vote of 15th judge on 2nd case type
228 J15MAJ1	606	was 15th judge in majority on 1st case type
229 J15MAJ2	608	was 15th judge in majority on 2nd case type

Appendix 3

APPEALS COURT JUDGES: Judge Codes and Names

First Circuit

00101	Aldrich, Barley
00102	Anderson, George
00103	Bingham, George
00104	Bownes, Hugh
00120	Boudin, Michael
00105	Breyer, Stephen
00106	Campbell, Levin
00107	Coffin, Frank
00118	Cyr, Conrad
00108	Hartigan, John
00109	Johnson, Charles
00122	Lynch, Sandra L.
00110	Magruder, Calvert
00111	Mahoney, John
00112	McEntee, Edward
00113	Morton, James
00114	Selya, Bruce
00119	Souter, David H.
00121	Stahl, Norman H.
00115	Torruella, Juan
00116	Wilson, Scott
00117	Woodbury, Peter

Second Circuit

00201	Altimari, Frank
00202	Anderson, Robert
00246	Cabranes, Jose A.
00245	Calbresi, Guido
00203	Cardamone, Richard
00204	Chase, Harrie
00205	Clark, Charles
00206	Feinberg, Wilfred
00207	Frank, Jereme
00208	Friendly, Henry
00209	Gurfein, Murray
00210	Hand, Augustus
00211	Hand, Learned
00212	Hays, Paul
00213	Hincks, Carroll
00214	Hough, Charles
00243	Jacobs, Dennis G.
00215	Kaufman, Irving
00216	Kearse, Amalya
00244	Leval, Pierre N.
00217	Lumbard, Edward
00218	Mack, Julian
00219	Mahoney, Daniel
00220	Mansfield, Walter
00221	Manten, Martin
00222	Marshall, Thurgood
00241	McLaughlin, Joseph M.
00223	Medina, Harold
00224	Meskill, Thomas
00225	Miner, Roger
00226	Moore, Leonard
00227	Mulligan, William
00228	Newman, Jon
00229	Oakes, James
00247	Parker, Fred I.
00230	Patterson, Robert
00231	Pierce, Lawrence
00232	Pratt, George
00233	Rogers, Henry
00234	Smith, Joseph
00235	Swan, Thomas
00236	Timbers, William
00237	Van Graafeiland, Ellsworth
00242	Walker, John M., Jr.
00238	Ward, Henry
00239	Waterman, Sterry
00240	Winter, Ralph

Third Circuit

00301	Adams, Arlin
00302	Aldisert, Ruggero
00340	Alito, Samuel A., Jr.
00303	Becker, Edward
00304	Biddle, Francis
00305	Biggs, John
00306	Buffington, Joseph
00307	Clark, William
00308	Cowen, Robert
00309	Davis, Warren
00310	Forman, Phillip
00311	Freedman, Abraham
00345	Ganey, James Cullen
00312	Garth, Leonard
00313	Gibbons, John
00314	Goodrich, Herbert
00315	Greenberg, Morton
00316	Hastie, William
00317	Higginbotham, Leon
00318	Hunter, James
00319	Hutchinson, William
00320	Jones, Charles
00321	Kalodner, Harry
00342	Lewis, Timothy K.
00322	Los Mansmann, Carol
00323	Mares, Albert
00343	McKee, Theodore A.
00324	McLaughlen, Gerald
00344	Nygaard, Richard L.
00325	O'Connell, John
00326	Roberts, Owen
00327	Rosen, James
00328	Rosenn, Max
00341	Roth, Jane R.
00346	Sarokin, Haddon Lee
00329	Scirica, Anthony
00330	Seitz, Collins
00331	Sloviter, Delores
00332	Smith, William
00333	Stahl, David
00334	Staley, Austin
00335	Stapleton, Walter
00336	Thompson, Whitaker
00337	Van Dusen, Francis
00338	Weis, Joseph
00339	Wooley, Victor

Fourth Circuit

00401	Bell, Spencer
00402	Boreman, Herbert
00403	Bryan, Albert
00404	Butzner, John
00405	Chapman, Robert
00406	Craven, Braxton
00407	Dobie, Armistead
00408	Ervin, Sam
00409	Field, John
00410	Hall, Kenneth
00429	Hamilton, Clyde H.
00411	Haynsworth, Clement
00430	Luttig, J. Michael
00432	Michael, M. Blane
00433	Motz, Diana G.
00412	Murnaghan, Francis
00428	Niemeyer, Paul V.
00413	Northcott, Elliot
00414	Parker, John
00415	Phillips, James
00416	Rose, John
00417	Russell, Donald
00418	Sneeden, Emory
00419	Sobeloff, Simon
00420	Soper, Morris
00421	Sprouse, James
00422	Waddill, Edmund
00423	Widener, Emory
00424	Wilkins, William
00425	Wilkinson, James
00431	Williams, Karen J.
00426	Winter, Harrison
00427	Woods, Charles

Fifth Circuit

00501	Ainsworth, Robert
00502	Anderson, Lanier
00564	Barksdale, Rhesa H.
00503	Bell, Griffin
00504	Barah, Wayne
00566	Benavides, Fortunado P.
00505	Brown, John
00506	Bryan, Nathan
00507	Cameron, Ben
00508	Carswell, George
00509	Clark, Charles
00510	Clark, Thomas
00511	Clayton, Claude
00512	Coleman, James
00513	Davis, Eugene
00563	DeMoss, Harold
00569	Dennis, James L.
00561	Duhe, John M.
00514	Dyer, David
00515	Fay, Peter
00516	Foster, Rufus
00517	Garwood, William
00518	Garza, Reynaldo
00519	Gee, Thomas
00565	Garza, Emelio
00520	Gewin, Walter
00521	Godbold, John
00522	Goldberg, Elwing
00523	Hatchett, Joseph
00524	Henderson, Albert
00525	Higginbotham, Patrick
00526	Hill, Robert
00527	Holmes, Edwin
00528	Hutcheson, Joseph
00529	Ingraham, Joe
00530	Johnson, Frank
00531	Johnson, Sam
00532	Jolly, Grady
00533	Jones, Edith
00534	Jones, Warren
00535	King, Alexander
00536	King, Carolyn Randall
00537	Kravitch, Phyllis
00538	Lee, Elmo
00539	McCord, Leon
00540	Morgan, Lewis
00568	Parker, Robert M.

00541	Politz, Henry
00543	Reavley, Thomas
00544	Rives, Richard
00545	Roney, Paul
00546	Rubin, Alvin
00547	Russell, Robert
00548	Sibley, Samuel
00549	Simpson, Bryan
00550	Smith, Jerry
00567	Stewart, Carl E.
00551	Strum, Louie
00552	Tate, Albert
00553	Thornberry, Homer
00554	Tjoflat, Gerald
00555	Tuttle, Elbert
00556	Vance, Robert
00557	Walker, Richard
00558	Waller, Curtis
00562	Wiener, Jacques L., Jr.
00559	Williams, Jerre
00560	Wisdom, John

Sixth Circuit

00601	Allen, Florence
00602	Arant, Herschel
00647	Batchelder, Alice M.
00603	Boggs, Danny
00604	Brooks, Henry
00605	Brown, Bailey
00606	Cecil, Lester
00607	Celebrezze, Anthony
00650	Cole, R. Guy, Jr.
00608	Combs, Bert
00609	Contie, Leroy
00648	Daughtrey, Martha C.
00610	Denison, Arthur
00611	Donahue, Maurice
00612	Edwards, George
00613	Engel, Albert
00614	Guy, Ralph
00615	Hamilton, Elwood
00616	Hickenlooper, Smith
00617	Hicks, Xenophon
00618	Jones, Nathaniel
00619	Keith, Damen
00620	Kennedy, Cornelia
00621	Kent, Wallace
00622	Knappen, Loyal
00644	Krupansky, Robert B.
00623	Lively, Pierce
00624	Mack, Julian
00625	Martin, Boyce
00626	Martin, John
00627	McAllistor, Thomas
00628	McCree, Wade
00629	Merritt, Gilbert
00630	Milburn, Ted
00631	Miller, Shackelford
00632	Miller, William
00649	Moore, Karen N.
00633	Moorman, Charles
00634	Nelson, David
00635	Norris, Alan
00636	O'Sullivan, Clifford
00637	Peck, John
00638	Phillips, Harry
00639	Ryan, James
00646	Siler, Eugene E., Jr.
00640	Simons, Charles
00643	Stewart, Potter

00645	Suhrheinrich, Richard F.
00641	Weick, Paul
00642	Wellford, Harry

Seventh Circuit

00701	Alschuler, Samuel
00702	Anderson, Albert
00703	Bauer, William
00704	Castle, Latham
00705	Coffey, John
00706	Cudahy, Richard
00707	Cummings, Walter
00708	Duffy, Ryan
00709	Easterbrook, Frank
00710	Eschbach, Jesse
00711	Evans, Evan
00742	Evans, Terence T.
00712	Fairchild, Thomas
00713	Finnegan, Philip
00714	Fitzhenry, Louis
00715	Flaum, Joel
00716	Hastings, John
00717	Kanne, Michael
00718	Kerner, Otto
00719	Kiley, Roger
00720	Knoch, Win
00721	Lindley, Walter
00722	Mack, Julian
00723	Major, Earl
00724	Manion, Daniel
00725	Minton, Sherman
00726	Page, George
00727	Parkinson, Lynn
00728	Pell, Wilbur
00729	Posner, Richard
00739	Ripple, Kenneth
00740	Rovner, Ilana D.
00730	Schnackenberg, Elmer
00731	Sparks, William
00732	Sprecher, Robert
00733	Stevens, John
00734	Swaim, Nathan
00735	Swygert, Luther
00736	Tone, Philip
00737	Treanor, Walter
00741	Wood, Diane P.
00738	Wood, Harlington

Eight Circuit

00841	Arnold, Morris S.
00801	Arnold, Richard
00802	Beam, Clarence
00803	Blackmun, Harry
00804	Booth, Wilbur
00805	Bowman, Pasco
00806	Bright, Myron
00807	Collet, John
00808	Cotteral, John
00809	Fagg, George
00810	Faris, Charles
00811	Gardner, Archibald
00812	Gibson, Floyd
00813	Gibson, John
00840	Hansen, David E.
00815	Heaney, Gerald
00816	Henley, J. Smith
00814	Johnson, Harvey
00817	Kenyon, W.M.
00818	Lay, Donald
00819	Lewis, Robert
00839	Loken, James B.
00820	McMillan, Theodore
00821	Magill, Frank
00822	Matthes, Marion
00823	Mehaffey, Pat
00842	Murphy, Diane E.
00824	Riddick, Walter
00825	Ridge, Albert
00826	Ross, Donald
00827	Sanborn, J.B.
00828	Sanborn, Walter
00829	Stephenson, Roy
00830	Stone, Kimbrough
00831	Thomas, Seth
00832	Van Oosterhout, Martin
00833	Van Valkenburg, Arba
00834	Vogel, Charles
00835	Webster, William
00836	Whittaker, Charles
00837	Wollman, Roger
00838	Woodbrough, Joseph

Ninth Circuit

00901	Alarcon, Arthur
00902	Anderson, J. Blaine
00903	Barnes, Stanley
00904	Beezer, Robert
00905	Bone, Homer
00906	Boochever, Robert
00907	Browning, James
00908	Brunetti, Melvin
00909	Canby, William
00910	Carter, James
00911	Chambers, Richard
00912	Choy, Herbert
00913	Denman, William
00914	Dietrich, Frank
00915	Duniway, Ben
00916	Ely, Walter
00917	Farris, Jerome
00918	Fee, James
00919	Ferguson, Warren
00968	Fernandez, Ferdinand
00920	Fletcher, Betty
00921	Garrecht, Francis
00922	Gilbert, William
00923	Goodwin, Alfred
00924	Hall, Cynthia
00925	Hamley, Frederick
00926	Hamlin, Oliver
00927	Haney, Emery
00972	Hawkins, Michael D.
00928	Healy, William
00929	Hufstedler, Shirley
00930	Hug, Procter
00931	Hunt, William
00932	Jertberg, Gilbert
00933	Kennedy, Anthony
00934	Kilkenny, John
00971	Kleinfeld, Andrew J.
00935	Koelsch, Oliver
00936	Kozinski, Alex
00937	Leavy, Edward
00938	Lemmon, Dal
00939	McCamant, Wallace
00940	Mathews, Clifton
00941	Merrill, Charles
00942	Morrow, William
00971	Murray, Frank J.
00943	Nelson, Dorothy

00970	Nelson, Thomas G.
00944	Noonan, John
00945	Norcross, Frank
00946	Norris, William
00947	Orr, William
00948	O'Scannlain, Diarmuid
00949	Poole, Cecil
00950	Pope, Walter
00951	Pregerson, Harry
00952	Reinhardt, Stephen
00953	Ross, Erskine
00954	Rudkin, Frank
00969	Rymer, Pamela Ann
00955	Sawtelle, William
00956	Schroeder, Mary
00957	Skopil, Otto
00958	Sneed, Joseph
00959	Stephens, Albert
00960	Tang, Thomas
00974	Tashima, A. Wallace
00975	Thomas, Sidney R.
00961	Thompson, David
00962	Trask, Ozell
00963	Trott, Stephen
00964	Wallace, Clifford
00965	Wiggins, Charles
00966	Wilbur, Curtis
00967	Wright, Eugene

Tenth Circuit

001001 Anderson, Stephen
001002 Baldock, Bobby
001003 Barrett, James
001004 Bratton, Sam
001005 Breitenstein, Jean
001031 Briscoe, Mary B.
001006 Brorby, Wade
001007 Cotteral, John
001008 Doyle, William
001009 Ebel, David
001030 Henry, Robert H.
001010 Hickey, John
001011 Hill, Delmas
001012 Holloway, William
001013 Huxman, Walter
001029 Kelly, Paul J., Jr.
001014 Lewis, David
001015 Lewis, Robert
001016 Logan, James
001032 Lucero, Carlos F.
001017 McDermott, George
001018 McKay, Monroe
001019 McWilliams, Robert
001020 Moore, John
001033 Murphy, Michael R.
001021 Murrah, Alfred
001022 Phillips, Orrie
001023 Pickett, John
001024 Seth, Oliver
001025 Seymour, Stephanie
001026 Symes, J.F.
001027 Tacha, Deanell
001028 Williams, R.L.

Eleventh Circuit

000502 Anderson, R. Lanier
001123 Barkett, Rosemary
001119 Birch, Stanley F., Jr.
001121 Black, Susan H.
001122 Carnes, Edward E.
000510 Clark, Thomas
001103 Cox, Emmett
001120 Dubina, Joel F.
000514 Dyer, David
001105 Edmondson, James
000515 Fay, Peter
000521 Godbold, John
000523 Hatchett, Joseph
000524 Henderson, Albert
001110 Hill, James
000530 Johnson, Frank
000534 Jones, Warren
000537 Kravitch, Phyllis
000542 Morgan, Lewis
000545 Roney, Paul
000554 Tjoflat, Gerald
000555 Tuttle, Elbert
000556 Vance, Robert

DC Circuit

001201 Arnold, Thurman
001202 Barber, Orion
001203 Bastian, Walter
001204 Bazelon, David
001205 Bland, Oscar
001206 Bork, Robert
001207 Buckley, James
001208 Burger, Warren
001209 Clark, Bennett
001210 Danaher, John
001211 Edgerton, Henry
001212 Edwards, Harry
001213 Fahy, Charles
001214 Garrett, Finis
001215 Ginsburg, Douglas
001216 Ginsburg, Ruth
001217 Graham, William
001218 Groner, Lawrence
001219 Hatfield, Charles
001249 Henderson, Karen L.
001220 Hitz, William
001221 Leventhal, Harold
001222 McGowan, Carl
001223 MacKinnon, George
001224 Martin, George
001225 Mikva, Abner
001226 Miller, Justin
001227 Miller, Wilbur
001228 Prettyman, Barrett
001229 Procter, James
001250 Randolph, A. Raymond
001230 Robb, Charles
001231 Robb, Roger
001232 Robinson, Spottswood
001251 Rogers, Judith W.
001233 Rutledge, Wiley
001234 Scalia, Antonin
001235 Sentelle, David
001236 Silberman, Laurence
001237 Smith, James
001238 Starr, Kenneth
001239 Stephens, Harold
001240 Tamm, Edward
001252 Tatel, David S.
001248 Thomas, Clarence
001241 Van Orsdel, Josiah
001242 Vinson, Fred

001243 Wald, Patricia
001244 Washington, George
001245 Wilkey, Malcolm
001246 Williams, Stephen
001247 Wright, J. Skelly

Appendix 4

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE Codes and Names

First Circuit-District Judges

10101	Acosta, Raymond
10102	Aldrich, Bailey
10167	Anderson, George Weston
10195	Barbadoro, Paul J.
10162	Boldt, George H.
10103	Bownes, Hugh H.
10104	Boyle, Francis J.
10105	Brewster, Elisha H.
10186	Brody, Morton A.
10170	Brown, Arthus L.
10106	Caffrey, Andrew
10107	Campbell, Levin H.
10108	Cancio, Hiram R.
10109	Carter, Gene
10197	Casellas, Salvador E.
10110	Cerezo, Carmen
10111	Chevez, David Jr.
10112	Clifford, John D., Jr.
10113	Connor, Aloyuis J.
10114	Cooper, Robert A.
10115	Cyr, Conrad K.
10116	Day, Edward William
10117	Devine, Shane
10194	Di Clerico, Joseph A., Jr.
10198	Dominguez, Daniel R.
10118	Eubanks, Luther B.
10119	Fernandaz-badillo, Juan B.
10120	Ford, Francis J. W.
10121	Freedman, Frank H.
10122	Fuste, Jose A.
10123	Garritty, W. Arthur, Jr.
10191	Gertner, Nancy
10124	Gignoux, Edward T.
10125	Glerbolini-ortiz, Gil
10187	Gorton, Nathaniel M.
10181	Hale, Clarence
10184	Harrington, Edward F.
10126	Hartigan, John P.
10127	Healy, Auther D.
10185	Hornby, D. Brock
10128	Julian, Anthony

10129 Keeton, Robert E.
 20102 Kelleher, Robert H.
 10130 Lafitte, Hector M.
 10131 Lageux, Ronald R.
 10132 Leahy, Edward L.
 10133 Letts, Ira Lloyd
 10190 Lindsay, Reginald G.
 10199 Lisi, Mary M.
 10163 Lord, John W.
 10134 Loughlin, Martin F.
 10135 Lowell, James a
 10196 Mcauliffe, Stevem J.
 10136 Mccarthy, William T.
 10137 Mcllellan, Hugh D.
 10138 Mcnaught, John J.
 10179 Mack, Julian
 10139 Mahoney, John D.
 10161 Mazzone, A. David
 10140 Morris, George F.
 10166 Morton, James M.
 10141 Murray, Frank J.
 10142 Nelson, David S.
 10143 O'conner, Earl E.
 10169 Odlin, Arthur Fuller
 10193 O'toole, George A.
 10144 Perez-gimenez, Juan M.
 10145 Pesquera, Herman G.
 10146 Peters, John A.
 10147 Pettine, Raymond J.
 10148 Peras, Jamie, Jr.
 10192 Ponsor, Michael A.
 10149 Roberts, Thomas H.
 10150 Ruiz-nazario, Clemente
 10188 Saris, Patti B.
 10151 Selya, Bruce M.
 10152 Skinner, Walter J.
 10176 Snyder, Cecil A.
 20101 Stahl, Norman
 10189 Stearns, Richard G.
 10153 Sweeney, George C.
 10154 Tauro, Joseph L.
 10180 Todd, Roberto Henry, jr.
 10155 Toledo, Jose V.
 20100 Torres, Ernest C.
 10156 Torruella Del Valle, Juan R.
 10168 Wells, Ira Kent
 10157 Wolf, Mark L.
 10158 Woodlock, Douglas P.
 10159 Wyzanski, Charles E., Jr.

10160 Young, William G.
10162 Zobel, Rya W.

Second Circuit-District Judges

10201 Abruzzo, Simon L.
10202 Alder, Simon L.
10203 Altimari, Frank X.
20268 Amon, Carol B.
10204 Anderson, Robert P.
20265 Arterton, Janet B.
20289 Baer, Harold, Jr.
10205 Bartles, John R.
20287 Batts, Deborah A.
10206 Bauman, Arnold
10257 Bibson, Ernest W.
10207 Bicks, Alexander
10208 Billings, Franklin S.
20273 Block, Frederic
10209 Blumenfeld, M. Joseph
10210 Bondy, William
10211 Bonsal, Dudley B.
10212 Bramwell, Henry
10213 Brennan, Stephen W.
10214 Brieant, Charles L.
10215 Bright, John
10216 Broderick, Vincent
10217 Bruchhausen, Walter
10218 Bryan, Fredrick Vanpelt
10219 Bryant, Fredrick H.
10220 Burke, Harold P.
10221 Burns, Ellen B.
10222 Byers, Mortimer
10223 Cabranes, Jose A.
10224 Caffey, Francis G.
10225 Campbell, Marcus B.
10226 Cannella, John M.
10227 Carter, Robert L.
10228 Cashin, John M.
10229 Cedarbaum, Miriam G.
20262 Chatigny, Robert N.
10230 Cholakakis, Con G.
10231 Clancy, John W.
10232 Clairie, T. Emmet
10233 Coffrin, Albert
10234 Coleman, Frank J.
20260 Conboy, Kenneth
10235 Conger, Edward A.
10236 Conner, William
10237 Constantino, Mark
10238 Cooper, Frank
10239 Cooper, Irving Ben

20288 Cote, Denise
 20261 Covello, Alfred V.
 10240 Coxe, Alfred C.
 10241 Crooke, Thomas F.
 10242 Curtin, John T.
 10243 Daly, T.f. Gilroy
 10244 Dawson, Archie O.
 10245 Dearie, Raymond J.
 20293 Dicarlo, Dominick L.
 10246 Dimock, Edward Jordon
 10247 Dooling, John F., Jr.
 10248 Dorsey, Peter C.
 10249 Duffy, Kevin Thomas
 10250 Delstein, David N.
 10251 Eginton, Warren W.
 10252 Elfvin, John T.
 10253 Finberg, Wilfred
 10254 Foley, James T.
 10255 Frankel, Marvin E.
 20290 Freeh, Louis J.
 10256 Galston, Clarence G.
 10258 Gagliardi, Lee P.
 20276 Gershon, Nina
 10259 Glasser, Isreal L.
 20274 Gleeson, John
 10260 Goddard, Henry W.
 10261 Goettel, Gerald L.
 10262 Griesa, Thomas P.
 10263 Gurfein, Murray I.
 10264 Haight, Charles S.
 10265 Henderson, John O.
 10266 Herlands, William B.
 10267 Hincks, Carroll C.
 10268 Holden, James S.
 10269 Howe, Harland
 10270 Hulbert, George M.
 20270 Hurley, Denis R.
 10271 Inch, Robert A.
 20269 Johnson, Sterling, Jr.
 10272 Judd, Orring
 20279 Kahn, Lawrence E.
 10273 Kampf, Edward S.
 10274 Kaufman, Irving R.
 10275 Kaufman, Samuel H.
 10276 Keenan, John F.
 10277 Kennedy, Harold Mauric
 10278 Knapp, Whitman
 10279 Knight, John
 10280 Know, John C.

10281 Korman, Edward R.
 10282 Kram, Shirley, W.
 10283 Lasker, Morris E.
 10284 Leamy, James P.
 20255 Laddy, Bernard J.
 10285 Leddy, James P.
 10286 Leibell, Vincent
 10287 Leisure, Peter K.
 10288 Leval, Pierre N.
 10289 Levet, Richard H.
 10290 Lowe, Mary Johnson
 10291 Mcavoy, Thomas J.
 10292 Mccurn, Neal P.
 10293 Mcgohey, John F.x.
 20283 Mckenna, Lawrence M.
 10294 Mclaughlin, Joseph M.
 10295 Mclean, Edward C.
 10296 Macmahon, Lloyd F.
 10297 Mandelbaum, Samuel
 10298 Mansfield, Walter
 20282 Martin, John S.
 10299 Medina, Harold
 20292 Merhige, Robert R.
 20200 Metzner, Charles
 20201 Miner, Roger J.
 20202 Mishler, Jacob
 20204 Moscowitz, Grover
 20205 Motley, Constance B.
 20280 Mukasy, Michael B.
 20206 Munson, Howard G.
 20207 Murphy, Thomas F.
 20208 Neaher, Edward R.
 20259 Newman, Bernard
 20209 Nevas, Alan H.
 20210 Newman, Jon O.
 20211 Nickerson, Eugene H.
 20212 Noonan, Gregory F.
 20213 Oakes, James L.
 20203 Organ, Justin C.
 20214 Owen, Richard
 20215 Palmieri, Edmund
 20291 Parker, Fred J.
 20216 Patterson, Robert P.
 20217 Pierce, Lawerence
 20218 Platt, Thomas C., Jr.
 20219 Pollack, Milton
 20278 Pooler, Rosemary S.
 20220 Port, Edmund
 20221 Pratt, George C.

20284 Preska, Loretta A.
20266 Raggi, Reena
20222 Rayfiel, Leo F.
20258 Re, Edward
20223 Rifknid, Simon H.
20224 Rippey, Harlan
20254 Ritter, Willis W.
20225 Rosling, George
20275 Ross, Allyne
20226 Ryan, Sylvester J.
20227 Sand, Leonard B.
20286 Schwartz, Allen G.
20277 Scullin, Frederick J.
20271 Seybert, Joanna
20252 Sifton, Charles P.
20228 Smith, J. Joseph
20253 Sofaer, Abraham D.
20285 Sotomayor, Sonia
20267 Spatt, Arthur D.
20229 Sprizzo, John E.
20263 Squatrito, Dominic J.
20230 Stanton, Louis L.
20231 Stewart, Charles E., Jr.
20232 Sugarman, Sidney
20233 Sweet, Robert W.
20234 Telesca, Michael A.
20235 Tenney, Charles
20236 Thomas, Edwin S.
20264 Thompson, Alvin W.
20237 Timbers, William H.
20272 Trager, David G.
20238 Travia, Anthony
20239 Tyler, Harlod R., Jr.
20240 Walker, John M.
20241 Walsh, Lawrence E.
20242 Ward, Robert J.
20251 Watson, Jamie
20243 Weinfeld, Edwar
20244 Weinstein, Jack B.
20245 Werker, Henry F.
20246 Wexler, Leonard D.
20281 Wood, Kimba
20247 Woosley, John Munro
20248 Wyatt, Inzer B.
20249 Zampano, Robert C.
20250 Zavatt, Joseph C.

Third Circuit-District Judges

10301 Ackerman, Harold
20397 Ambrose, Donnetta W.
10302 Augelli, Anthony T.
10303 Avis, John Boyd
10304 Bard, Guy K.
10305 Barlow, George H.
10306 Barry, Maryanne
20385 Bartle, Harvey, Iii
20371 Bassler, William G.
10307 Bechtle, Louis C.
10308 Becker, Edward R.
10309 Bissell, John W.
10310 Biunno, Vincent P.
10311 Bloch, Alan N.
20342 Bodine, Joseph L.
10312 Body, Ralph C.
10313 Broderick, Raymond J.
20390 Brody, Anita B.
10314 Brotman, Stanley S.
20340 Brown, Garrett
20383 Buckwalter, Ronald L.
10315 Burns, Owen Mcintosh
10316 Cahn, Edward N.
10317 Caldwell, William
10318 Christian, Almeric
30300 Cindrich, Robert J.
10319 Clark, William
10321 Clary, Thomas J.
10322 Cohen, Mitchell
10323 Cohill, Maurice B.
20359 Commissa, Vincent J.
10324 Conaboy, Richard P.
10325 Coolahan, James A.
10326 Cowen, Robert E.
20386 Dalzell, Stewart
10327 Davis, John M.
20349 Davis, J. Warren
10328 Debevoise, Dickinson R.
10329 Diamond, Gustave
10330 Dickerson, Oliver B.
10331 Ditter, J. William, Jr.
20381 Dubois, Jan E.
10332 Dumbald, Edward
10333 Egan, Thomas C.
10334 Fake, Guy L.
10335 Farnan, Joseph J.
20361 Fee, James Alger

30302 Finch, Raymond L.
 10336 Fisher, Clarkson S.
 10337 Fogel, Herbert H.
 20358 Foley, Roger T.
 10338 Follmer, Fredrick
 10339 Forman, Phillip
 10340 Freedman, Abraham L.
 10341 Fullum, John P.
 10342 Ganey, J. Cullen
 10343 Garth, Leonard
 20365 Gawthrop, Robert S., Iii
 10344 Gerry, John F.
 10345 Gibson, Robert
 10346 Giles, James
 20356 Goodrich, Herbert F.
 10347 Gorbey, James
 10348 Gordon, Walter
 10349 Gourley, Wallace
 10350 Green, Clifford Scott
 20377 Greenaway, Joseph A.
 10351 Grim, Allan K.
 10352 Hannum, John B.
 10353 Hartshorne, Richard
 10354 Herman, R. Dixon
 10355 Higginbothan, A. Leon, Jr.
 20382 Hutton, Herbert J.
 10356 Huyett, Daniel H., Iii
 20373 Irenas, Joseph E.
 10357 Johnson, Albert
 20388 Joyner, J. Curtis
 10358 Kalodner, Harry E.
 10359 Katz, Marvin
 10360 Kelly, James Mcgirr
 20378 Kelly, Robert F.
 20362 Kirkpatrick, Andrew
 10361 Kirkpatrick, William H.
 10362 Kitchen, John J.
 10363 Knox, William W.
 10364 Kosik, Edwin M.
 10365 Kraft, C. William, Jr.
 10366 Lacey, Frederick B.
 20398 Lancaster, Gary L.
 10367 Lane, Arthur
 10368 Latchum, James L.
 10369 Layton, Caleb B., Iii
 10370 Leahy, Paul C.
 10371 Lechner, Alfred J.
 20396 Lee, Donald J.
 20370 Lifland, John C.

10372 Longobardi, Joseph L.
 10373 Lord, John W.
 10374 Lord, Joseph S., Iii
 10375 Ludwig, Edmund V.
 10376 Luongo, Alfred L.
 20392 McClure, James F., Jr.
 10377 Mccune, Barron
 10378 Mcglynn, Joseph L., Jr.
 10379 Mcgranery, James P.
 10380 Mciivaine, John W.
 20368 Mckelvie, Roderick R.
 20399 Mclaughlin, Sean J.
 10381 Mcvicar, Nelson
 10382 Madden, Thomas M.
 10383 Maris, Albert Brandon
 10384 Marsh, Rabe Ferguson, Jr.
 10385 Masterson, Thomas A.
 10386 Meaney, Thomas F.
 10387 Meanor, H. Curtis
 10388 Mencer, Glenn E.
 10389 Miller, John L.
 10390 Modarelli, Alfred
 10391 Moore, Herman E.
 30301 Moore, Thomas K.
 10392 Morrill, Mende
 20345 Morris, Hugh H.
 10393 Muir, Malcolm
 10394 Murphy, John W.
 10395 Nealson, William J., Jr.
 10396 Newcomer, Clarence C.
 10397 Nields, John P.
 20363 Nygaard, Richard Lowell
 10398 O'brien, David V.
 10399 O'neill, Thomas N.
 20376 Orlofsky, Stephen M.
 20387 Padova, John R.
 20372 Parell, Mary L.
 20366 Politan, Nicholas H.
 20300 Pollack, Louis H.
 20301 Rambo, Sylvia
 20380 Reed, Lowell A., Jr.
 20344 Rellstab, John
 20391 Rendell, Majorie O.
 20367 Robinson, Sue L.
 20389 Robreno, Eduardo C.
 20302 Rodney, Richard Seymour
 20303 Rodriguez, Joseph H.
 20304 Rosenberg, Louis
 20305 Roth, Jane R.

20346 Runyon, William N.
 20306 Sarokin, H. Lee
 20307 Scalera, Ralph F.
 20308 Schoonmaker, Frederic
 20309 Schwartz, Murray M.
 20310 Shapiro, Norma L.
 20311 Shaw, Robert
 20312 Sheridan, Michael
 20313 Sifton, Charles P.
 20374 Simandle, Jerome B.
 20314 Simmons, Paul A.
 20395 Smith, D. Brooks
 20315 Smith, William F.
 20316 Snyder, Daniel J.
 20317 Sorg, Herbert
 20394 Standish, William L.
 20318 Stapleton, Walter K.
 20319 Steel, Edwin D., Jr.
 20320 Stern, Herbert J.
 20321 Stewart, William A.
 20322 Teitelbaum, Hubert I.
 20341 Thompson, Anne
 20247 Thompson, Joseph Whitaker
 20323 Thomson, W.h. Seward
 20324 Troutman, E. Mac
 20325 Van Artsdalen, Donald W.
 20379 Van Antwerpen, Franklin S.
 20326 Van Dusen, Francis L.
 20393 Vanaskie, Thomas I.
 20364 Waldman, Jay C.
 20327 Walker, Thomas Glynn
 20375 Walls, William H.
 20328 Watson, Albert L.
 20360 Watson, James
 20329 Weber, Gerald J.
 20330 Weiner, Charles R.
 20331 Weis, Joseph F., Jr.
 20332 Welsh, George A.
 20333 Whipple, Lawrence A.
 20334 Willson, Joseph P.
 20343 Witmer, Charles B.
 20369 Wolin, Alfred M.
 20335 Wood, Harold K.
 20336 Wortendyke, Reynier, Jr.
 20337 Wright, Caleb M.
 20384 Yohn, William H., Jr.
 20338 Young, Warren H.
 20339 Ziegler, Donald E.

Fourth Circuit-District Judges

10401 Anderson, Joseph F.
10402 Anderson, George R.
10403 Baker, William E.
10404 Barksdale, Alfred D.
20443 Beaty, James A., Jr.
10405 Black, Walter E., Jr.
10406 Blair, C. Stanley
20438 Blake, Catherine C.
10407 Blatt, Solomon, Jr.
10408 Boreman, Hebert S.
10409 Boyd, James E.
20414 Boyle, Terrence
10410 Boyle, Francis J.
20455 Brinkema, Leonie M.
10411 Britt, W. Earl
20461 Broadwater, Craig
10412 Bryan, Albert V.
10413 Bryan, Albert V., Jr.
10414 Bullock, Frank W.
10415 Butler, Algernon
10416 Butzner, John D., Jr.
10417 Cacharis, James C.
10418 Chapman, Robert F.
20436 Chasanow, Deborah K.
10419 Chesnut, W. Calvin
10420 Christie, Sidney L.
10421 Clarke, J. Clavitt
10422 Cochran, Ernest F.
10423 Coleman, William C.
20417 Conner, Henry Groves
10424 Copenhaver, John T.
10425 Craven, James Braxton, Jr.
20451 Currie, Cameron M.
10426 Dalton, Ted
20439 Davis, Andre M.
10427 Dobie, Armistead M.
10428 Doumar, Robert G.
20452 Duffy, Patrick M.
10429 Dupree, Franklin T. Jr.
20416 Ellis, Thomas Shelby, Iii
10430 Erwin, Richard C.
20462 Faber, David A.
10431 Field, John A., Jr.
10432 Fox, James C.
20432 Garbis, Marvin J.
10433 Gilliam, Don W.
10434 Glenn, J, Lyles

20463 Goodwin, Joseph R.
 10435 Gordon, Eugene A.
 20425 Groner, D. Lawrence
 10436 Haden, Charles H., Iii
 10437 Hall, Kenneth K.
 10438 Hallanan, Elizabeth V.
 10439 Hilton, Clyde H.
 10440 Hargrove, John R.
 10441 Harvey, Alexander, Ii
 10442 Hawkins, Falcon B.
 20449 Herlong, Henry M., Jr.
 10443 Hayes, Johnson J.
 10444 Hemphill, Robert W.
 10445 Henderson, David E.
 10446 Henderson, Karen L.
 10447 Hilton, Claude M.
 10448 Hoffman, Walter E.
 10449 Houck, C. Weston
 10450 Howard, Joseph C.
 20440 Howard, Malcolm J.
 20464 Horward, Malcolm J.
 10451 Hutchesen, Sterling
 20456 Jackson, Raymond A.
 20458 Jones, James P.
 20415 Jones, Shirley
 10452 Jones, Woodrow Wilson
 10453 Kaufman, Frank A.
 20460 Keeley, Irene M.
 10454 Kellam, Richard
 10455 Kidd, William M.
 10456 Kiser, Jackson L.
 10457 Knapp, Dennis R.
 10458 Larkins, John D., Jr.
 20434 Legg, Benson E.
 10459 Lewis, Oren R.
 10460 Lumpkin, Alva M.
 10461 Mackenzie, John A.
 10462 Martin, J. Robert
 10463 Maxwell, Robert Earl
 10464 Mcclinton, John A.
 20419 Mcclintic, George Warwick
 10465 Mcdowell, Henry Clay
 10466 Mcmillian, James B.
 10467 Meekins. Issac M.
 10468 Merhige, Robert R., Jr.
 20435 Messitte, Peter J.
 10469 Michael, James H., Jr.
 10470 Michie, Thomas J.
 10471 Miller, James R. Jr.

10472 Moore, Ben
20453 Morgan, Henry C., Jr.
20430 Motz, J. Frederick
20445 Mullen, Graham C.
10473 Murray, Herber F.
10474 Myers, Frank K.
20433 Nickerson, William M.
20428 Northcott, Elliott
10475 Northrop, Edward
20447 Norton, David C.
20442 Osteen, William L., Sr.
10476 Paul, Charles
20427 Paul, John
10477 Paul, John Jr.
20454 Payne, Robert E.
10478 Perry, Matthew J., Jr.
10479 Poff, William B.
10480 Pollard, Robert N.
10481 Potter, Robert D.
10482 Preyer, L. Richardson
10483 Ramsey, Norman P.
10484 Roberts, Floyd H.
10485 Russell, Donald
10486 Sentelle, David B.
20448 Shedd, Dennis W.
10487 Simons, Charles E., Jr.
10488 Smalkin, Frederic N.
20431 Smith, Rebbecca Beach
20420 Soper, Morris Ames
10489 Spencer, James R.
10490 Staker, Robert J.
20459 Stamp, Frederick P., Jr.
10491 Stanley, Edwin M.
10492 Tauro, Joseph L.
10493 Thompson, Roby C.
10494 Thomsen, Roszel C.
20446 Thornberg, Lacy H.
20441 Tilley, N. Carlton, Jr.
10495 Timmerman, George Bell
20450 Traxler, William B., Jr.
10496 Turk, James C.
20444 Voorhees, Richard L.
10497 Ward, Hiram, H.
10499 Waring, J. Watles
20426 Warlick, Wilson
20400 Warriner, D. Dortch
20401 Watkins, Harry E.
20402 Watkins, Henry H.
20403 Watkins, R. Dorsey

20404 Way, Luther B.
20405 Webb, Edwin Y.
20406 Widener, H. Emory Jr.
20407 Wilkins, William W.
20437 Williams, Alexander, Jr.
20408 Williams, Ashten
20409 Williams, Glen M.
20410 Williams, Richard L.
20457 Wilson, Samuel J.
10498 Wilson, Warlick
20411 Winter, Harrison
20412 Wyche, Charles C.
20413 Young, Joseph H.
20429 Young, Robert

Fifth Circuit-District Judges

10501 Ainsworth, Robert A., Jr.
10502 Akerman, Alexander
10503 Alaimo, Anthony A.
30510 Allgood, Clarence
10504 Allgood, Harlan Hobart
10505 Allred, James V.
10506 Andrews, M. Niel
10507 Arceneaux, George
10508 Arnow, Winston E.
10509 Arenovitz, Sidney M.
10510 Atkins, C. Clyde
30573 Atlas, Nancy F.
10511 Atwell, William H.
10512 Barbour, William H.
10513 Barker, William J.
10514 Barret, William H.
30519 Beattie, Charlton Reid
30579 Beer, Peter J.
10515 Belew, David O.
30540 Bell, Robert Holmes
30542 Berrigan, Helen G.
30575 Biery, Fred
10516 Biggers, Neal B.
10517 Black, Norman W.
30509 Boe, Donald W., Jr.
10518 Bootle, William A.
10519 Borah, Wayne G.
10520 Boyle, Edward J., Sr.
10521 Boynton, Charles A.
30553 Bramlette, David
10522 Brewster, Leo
30578 Briones, David
30532 Brister, Bill H.
30580 Brown, Paul N.
10523 Bryant, Randolph
10524 Buchmeyer, Jerry
10525 Bue, Carl O.
10526 Buntin, Jucius D.
30521 Burns, Lewis Henry
10527 Cabot, Ted
10528 Caillouet, Adrian J.
10529 Carr, Patrick E.
10530 Carswell, George Harold
10531 Cassibry, Fred J.
10532 Cecil, Lamar
10533 Choate, Emmett
10534 Christenberry, Herbert W.

10535 Clayon, Claude F.
30541 Clement, Edith B.
10536 Cobb, Howell
10537 Collins, Robert F.
10538 Comiskey, James A.
10539 Conger, Abraham, B.
10540 Connally, Ben C.
10541 Cox, Allen
10542 Cox, Owen D.
10543 Cox, William Harold
10544 Cowan, Finis E.
10545 Crowe, Guthrie F.
30559 Cummings, Samuel R.
10546 Davidson, Glan H.
10547 Davidson, T. Whitfield
10548 Davis, David J.
30513 Davis, Thomas Hoyt
10549 David, Eugene
10550 Dawkins, Benjamin C., Sr.
10551 Dawkins, Benjamin C., Jr.
10552 Deanda, James
10553 Deaver, Bascom S.
10554 Devane, Dozier
30550 Doherty, Rebecca F.
10555 Dooley, Joe B.
30539 Duggan, Patrick J.
10556 Duhe, John M.
10557 Duplantier, Adrian G.
30543 Duvall, Stanwood R., Jr.
10558 Dyer, David W.
10559 Eaton, Joe
10560 Edenfield, Newell
10561 Elliot, J. Robert
10562 Ellis, Frank
10563 Ervin, Robert T.
10564 Estes, Joe
30546 Fallon, Eldon E.
10565 Fay, Peter T.
10566 Feldman, Martin L. C.
10567 Fish, A. Joe
10568 Fisher, Joe J.
10569 Fitzwater, Sidney A.
30556 Folsom, David
30533 Fonseca, Ronald A.
30516 Foster, Rufus Edward
10570 Freeman, Richard C.
10571 Fulton, Charles B.
30576 Furguson, W. Royal
10572 Garcia, Hipolito F.

30577 Garcia, Orlando L.
10573 Gardner, Buck
30581 Garza, Emilio
10574 Garza, Reynaldo
10575 Gex, Walter J., Iii
10576 Gibson, Hugh
30572 Gilmore, Vanessa D.
30536 Gonzalez, Jose A., Jr.
10577 Gordon, Jack
30535 Gray, Frank Jr.
10578 Grooms, Harlan Hobart
10579 Grubb, William I.
10580 Guin, J. Foy, Jr.
10581 Guinn, Ernest
30548 Haik, Richard T.
10582 Hall, Sam B.
10583 Hancock, James Huger
10584 Hancock, Joseph
10585 Hand, William
30555 Hannah, John H.
10586 Hannay, Allan B.
30566 Harmon, Malinda
10587 Head, Hayden W.
30557 Heartfield, Thad
10588 Heebe, Fredrick J.
10589 Henderson, Albert J., Jr.
10590 Higginbotham, Patrick E.
10591 Hill, James C.
10592 Hill, Robert M.
10593 Hinojosa, Richardo H.
10594 Hittner, David
10595 Hodges, William Terrell
10596 Hoeveler, William M.
10597 Holland, John W.
10598 Holmes, Edwin R.
10599 Hopper, Frank A.
30564 Hoyt, Kenneth M.
20500 Hudspeth, Harry L.
20501 Hughes, Lynn N.
20503 Hughes, Sarah T.
30514 Hunter, Edwin Ford, Jr.
30517 Hutcheson, Charles Sterling
30923 Hutcheson, Joseph Chapell, Jr.
20504 Ingraham, Joe M.
30571 Jack, Janis G.
20505 Johnson, Frank M.
30520 Jones, Lake
20506 Justice, William Wayne
20507 Kazen, George P.

20508 Keady, William C.
20509 Keeling, Walter A.
30563 Kendall, Joe
20510 Kennamer, Charles B.
20511 Kennerly, Thomas M.
30568 Kent, Samuel B.
20512 King, James L.
20513 Krentzman, Ben
30565 Lake, Sim
20514 Lawrence, Alezander
20515 Lee, Toms
30538 Lemelle, Ivan L.
30547 Lemmon, Mary Ann Vial
30537 Lenthau, James J.
20516 Lieb, Joseph
20517 Little, F.a.
20518 Livaudis, J. Marcel
20519 Long, Augustus
20520 Lovett, Archibald R.
20521 Lynne, Seybourn H.
30560 Mcbryde, John H.
30531 Mcall, Rhydon M.
20522 Mcdonald, Gabrielle K.
20523 Mcduffie, John
20524 Mcfadden, Frank H.
20525 Mcmillan, Robert J.
20526 Mcnamara, A.j.
20527 Mcrae, William A., Jr.
20528 Mahon, Elson
30558 Maloney, Robert B.
30562 Means, Terry R.
20529 Meek, Edward
20530 Mehrtens, William
30551 Melancon, Tucker L.
20531 Melton, Howell W.
20532 Mentz, Henry A.
20533 Middlebrooks, David L., Jr.
20534 Mitchell, Lansing L.
20535 Mize, Sidney C.
20536 Morgan, Lewis R.
20537 Moye, Charles A., Jr.
20538 Mullins, Clarence
20539 Murphee, Thomas A.
20540 Nixon, Walter L., Jr.
20541 Noel, James L.
20542 Nowlin, James R.
20543 O'conor, Robert
20544 O'kelly, William C.
20545 Owens, Wilbur D.

20546 Parker, John V.
20547 Parker, Robert M.
30552 Pickering, Charles W., Sr.
20548 Pittman, Virgil
20549 Pointer, Sam C., Jr.
20550 Polezola, Frank J.
30545 Porteous, G. Thomas, Jr.
20551 Porter, Robert W.
20552 Porterie, Gaston Louis
20553 Prado, Edward C.
20554 Putman, Richard J.
30567 Rainey, John D.
20555 Reed, John A.
30534 Reeves, Albert, Jr.
20556 Rice, Ben H.
20557 Ritter, Halsted L.
20558 Roberts, Jack
20559 Robinson, Mary Lou
20560 Roettger, Norman C., Jr
30570 Rosenthal, Lee H.
20561 Rubin, Alvin B.
20562 Russell, Dan M., Jr.
20563 Russell, Robert C.
20564 Sanders, Barefoot
20565 Scarlett, Frank M.
30554 Schell, Richard A.
20566 Schwartz, Charles
20567 Scott, Charles R.
20568 Scott, Nauman, S.
20569 Seals, Woodrow B.
20570 Sear, Morey L.
20571 Senter, L. T., Jr.
20572 Sessions, William S.
30511 Shannon, Fred
20573 Shaw, John M.
20574 Sheehy, Joe W.
20575 Sheppard, William B.
30518 Sibly, Samuel Hale
20576 Simpson, Bryan
20577 Singleton, John V., Jr.
20578 Sloan, William Boyd
20579 Smith, Orma R.
20580 Smith, Sidney O., Jr.
20581 Smith, Walter S., Jr.
30561 Solis, Jorge A.
30574 Sparks, Sam
20582 Spears, Adrian
20583 Stafford, William H.
20584 Stagg, Tom

20585 Steger, William M.
20586 Sterling, Ross N.
20587 Strum, Louie W.
20588 Suttle, Dorwin
20589 Taylor, William , Jr.
20590 Thomason, R.e.
20591 Thomas, Daniel H.
20592 Thornberry, Homer
30524 Tilson, Wielian J.
20593 Tjoflat, Gerald B.
30549 Trimble, James T.
20594 Underwood, E. Marvin
30544 Vance, Sarah S.
20595 Varner, Robert E.
20596 Vela, Fileman B.
20597 Vernon, Earl E.
20598 Waller, Curtis, L.
20599 Walter, Donald E.
30569 Weirlein, Ewing, Jr.
30522 West, D W Al
30500 West, E. Gordon
30501 West, R. Blake
30502 Wicker, Veronica D.
30503 Whitehurst, George W.
30504 Wilson, James Clifton
30512 Wingate, Henry B.
30505 Wood, John H., Jr.
30506 Woodward, Halvert Owen
30507 Wright, J. Skelly
30508 Young, George

Sixth Circuit-District Judges

10601 Aldrich, Ann
10602 Allen, Charles
10603 Anderson, Harry
10604 Allintine, Thomas A.
10605 Batchelder, Alice M.
10606 Battisti, Frank
10607 Beamer, George
20677 Beckwith, Sandra S.
20664 Bell, Robert H.
10608 Bell, Sam H.
10609 Bertelsman, William
20662 Borman, Paul D.
20639 Boyle, Patricia
10610 Boyd, Marion
10611 Bratcher, Rhodes
10612 Brooks, Henry
10613 Brown, Bailey
20683 Campbell, Todd J.
20669 Carr, James G.
10614 Cecil, Lester
10615 Churchill, James
20659 Cleland, Robert H.
10616 Cochran, Andrew
20651 Coffman, Jennifer B.
10617 Cohn, Avern
20681 Collier, Curtis L.
10618 Connell, James
10619 Cook, Julian A., Jr.
10620 Contie, Leroy J.
10621 Darr, Leslie
10622 Davies, Elmer
10623 Dawson, Charles I.
10624 Demascio, Robert
20678 Dlott, Susan J.
20685 Donald, Bernice B.
10625 Dowd, David D., Jr.
10626 Druffel, John
20655 Duggan, Patrick J.
10627 Duncan, Robert M.
20682 Echols, Robert L.
20673 Economous, Peter C.
10628 Edgar, R. Allen
20660 Edmunds, Nancy G.
10629 Engel, Albert
10630 Ensels, Richard A.
10631 Eschbach, Jesse
10632 Feikens, John

10633 Ford, Hiram Church
20649 Forester, Karl S.
10634 Fox, Noel P.
10635 Freed, Emerich
10636 Freeman, Ralph
20656 Freidman, Bernard A.
20657 Gadola, Paul V.
20675 Gaughan, Patricia A.
10637 Gibbons, Julia S.
10638 Gibson, Benjamin F.
10639 Gilmore, Horace W.
10640 Gordon, James
10641 Gore, John
10642 Graham, James L.
10643 Gray, Frank
10644 Green, Ben
10645 Gubow, Lawrence
10646 Guy, Ralph B., Jr.
10647 Hackett, Barbara K.
10648 Hahn, George
10649 Hamilton, Elwood
10650 Harvey, James
10651 Hermansdorfer, Howard
20652 Heyburn, John G. II
20643 Hicks, Xenophon
20641 Hickenlooper, Smith
10652 Higgins, Thomas A.
10653 Hillman, Douglas W.
10654 Hogan, Timothy
10655 Holshuh, John D.
20661 Hood, Denise P.
20650 Hood, Joseph M.
10656 Horton, Odell
10657 Hough, Benson
10658 Hull, Thomas
10659 Jarvis, James H.
10660 Johnstone, Edward H.
10661 Joiner, Charles
10662 Jones, Paul
20680 Jordan, Robert L.
10663 Kaess, Fredrick
10664 Kalbfleisch, Girard
20671 Katz, David A.
10665 Keith, Damon
10666 Kennedy, Cornelia
10667 Kent, W. Wallace
20646 Killits, John Milton
10668 Kinneary, Joseph
10669 Kloeb, Frank

10670 Koscinski, Arthur
10671 Krenzler, Alvin I.
10672 Krupansky, Robert
10673 Lambros, Thomas
10674 Laplata, George
10675 Lederle, Arthur
10676 Levin, Theodore
10677 Machrowicz, Thaddeus
20684 Mccalla, Jon P.
10678 Mccree, Wade H.
20665 Mckeague, David W.
20654 Mckinley, Joseph H.
10679 Mcnamee, Charles J.
10680 Mcquade, Richard B.
10681 Mcrae, Robert
10682 Manos, John M.
10683 Martin, John D.
20667 Matia, Paul R.
20640 Meredith, Ronald E.
10684 Miles, Wendell A.
10685 Miller, Shackelford E.
10686 Miller, William E.
10687 Moinet, Edward E.
10688 Morton, L. Clure
10689 Moynahan, Bernard T.
10690 Neese, C. G.
10691 Nevin, Robert
10692 Newblatt, Stewart A.
10693 Nixon, John T.
20674 Nugent, Donald C.
10694 O'brien, Ernest
20672 O'malley, Kathleen M.
20663 O'meara, John C.
10695 O'sullivan, Clifford
20670 Oliver, Samuel, Jr.
10696 Peck, John
10697 Picard, Frank A.
20666 Quist, Gordon J.
10698 Porter, David S.
10699 Potter, John W.
20600 Pratt, Phillip
20601 Raymond, Fred M.
20602 Reed, Scott E.
20603 Revell, Richard A.
20604 Rice, Walter H.
20658 Rosen, Gerald E.
20642 Ross, John William
20605 Roth, Stephen
20606 Rubin, Carl B.

20653 Russell, Thomas B.
20579 Sargus, Edmund A., Jr.
20647 Sater, John E.
20607 Shelbourne, Roy M.
20608 Siler, Eugene E.
20645 Simons, Charles C.
20609 Simpson, Charles R.
20676 Smith, George C.
20610 Smith, Talbot
20611 Spiegel, S. Arthur
20612 Starr, Raymond W.
20613 Suhrheinrich, Richard F.
20614 Swinford, Mac
20615 Taylor, Anna Diggs
20616 Taylor, George C.
20617 Taylor, Robert L.
20618 Thomas, William K.
20619 Thompson, Anne E.
20620 Thornton, Thomas D.
20621 Todd, James D.
20686 Turner, Jerome
20622 Tuttle, Arthur J.
20623 Underwood, Mel G.
20624 Unthank, G. Wix
20625 Walinski, Nicholas
20648 Watson, James L.
20626 Weber, Herman J.
20627 Weick, Paul C.
20628 Weinman, Carl A.
20629 Wellford, Harry
20668 Wells, Lesley B.
20630 West, Samuel
20644 Westenhauer, D.c.
20631 White, George W.
20632 Wihoit, Henry R.
20633 Wilkin, Robert N.
20634 Wilson, Frank W.
20635 Wiseman, Thomas A.
20636 Woods, George E.
20637 Young, Don J.
20638 Zatkoff, Lawrence P.

Seventh Circuit-District Judges

10701 Ackerman, J. Waldo
10702 Adair, J. Leroy
20719 Alesia, James H.
20723 Andersen, Wayne R.
10703 Aspen, Marvin
10704 Austin, Richard B.
10705 Baker, Harold A.
10706 Baltzell, Robert C.
10707 Barker, Sarah Evans
10708 Barnes, John P.
10709 Bauer, William J.
10710 Beamer, George N.
10711 Beatty, William L.
10712 Briggles, Charles G.
10713 Brooks, Gene E.
10714 Bua, Nicholas, J.
20729 Bucklo, Elaine E.
10715 Campbell, William J.
10716 Carpenter, George A.
20725 Castillo, Ruben
20711 Clegg, Cecil Hunter
20739 Clevert, Charles N., Jr.
20708 Cliffe, Adam C.
20727 Coar, David H.
20720 Conlon, Susan B.
10717 Crabb, Barbara
10718 Crowley, John P.
10719 Curran, Thomas J.
20715 Davis, Oscar H.
10720 Decker, Bernard M.
10721 Dillin, S. Hugh
10722 Doyle, James E.
10723 Duff, Brian B.
10724 Duffy, F. Ryan
10725 Eschbach, Jesse E.
10726 Evans, Terence T.
10727 Fitzhenry, Louis
10728 Flaum, Joel M.
10729 Foreman, James L.
10730 Geiger, Ferdinand A.
20728 Gettleman, Robert W.
10731 Getzandanner, Susan C.
20731 Gilbert, J. Phil
10732 Gordon, Myron
20730 Gottschall, Joan B.
10733 Grady, John F.
10734 Grant, Robert

10735 Grubb, Kenneth
20736 Hamilton, David F.
20712 Harding, Justin W.
10736 Hart, William T.
10737 Hoffman, Julius J.
10738 Holder, Cale J.
10739 Holderman, James F., Jr.
10740 Holly, William H.
10741 Igoe, Michael
10742 Johnson, George E.q.
10743 Juergens, William G.
10744 Kanne, Michael S.
10745 Kirkland, Alfred Y.
10746 Knoch, Win G.
10747 Kocoras, Charles P.
10748 Labuy, Walter
20705 Landis, Fredrick
10749 Larson, Earl
10750 Lee, William C.
10751 Leighton, George N.
20707 Leinenweber, Harry D.
20722 Linberg, George W.
10752 Lindley, Walter C.
20733 Lozano, Rudy
20717 Luse, Claude Z.
10753 Lynch, William J.
20718 Mcdade, Joe B.
10754 McGarr, Frank J.
20734 McKinney, Larry J.
10755 McLaren, Richard W.
10756 Mcmillen, Thomas R.
10757 McNagny, Phil M.
10758 Major, J. Earl
20726 Manning, Blanche M.
20721 Marovich, George M.
10759 Marovitz, Abraham
10760 Marshall, Prentice
10761 Mercer, Fredrick
20710 Meyers, Kenneth
10762 Mihm, Michael M.
10763 Miller, Robert L.
10764 Mills, Richard H.
10765 Miner, Julius
10766 Miidy, James T.
20740 Moody, James T.
10767 Moran, James B.
10768 Morgan, Robert
20704 Mueller, J.p. Stadt
10769 Napoli, Alexander

10770 Noland, James E.
10771 Nordberg, John A.
20716 Nordbye, Gunnar H.
10772 Norhle, Charles R.
10773 Parkinson, W. Lynn
10774 Parsons, James B.
10775 Perry, Joseph Samuel
10776 Platt, Casper
10777 Plunkett, Paul E.
10778 Poos, Omer
10779 Rabinovitz, David
20738 Randa, Rudolph T.
20724 Reinhard, Philip G.
10780 Reynolds, John W.
20732 Riley, Paul E.
10781 Robson, Edwin A.
10782 Roszkawski, Stanley
10783 Rovner, Illana D.
10784 Shabaz, John C.
10785 Shadaur, Milton I.
10786 Sharp, Allen
10787 Shaw, Elwyn R.
20713 Singleton, John V.
10788 Slick, Thomas
20737 Stadtmueller, J.p.
10789 Steckler, William
10790 Stiehl, William D.
10791 Stone, Patrick T.
10792 Sullivan, Phillip L.
10793 Swygert, Luther M.
10794 Tehan, Robert E.
20735 Tinder, John D.
10795 Tone, Phillip
10796 Warren, Robert W.
10797 Wham, Fred
10798 Wilkerson, James
10799 Will, Hubert
20700 Williams, Ann C.
20701 Wise, Henry S.
20714 Wong, Dick Yin
20702 Wood, Harlington, Jr.
20703 Woodward, Charles E.
20706 Zagel, James B.

Eighth Circuit-District Judges

10801 Alsop, Donald R.
10802 Arnold, Morris
10803 Barlett, D. Brook
20837 Barnes, Harry F.
10804 Battey, Richard
10805 Beam, Clarence A.
10806 Beck, Alex
10807 Becker, William
10808 Bell, Robert C.
20839 Bennet, Mark W.
10809 Benson, Paul
10810 Bogue, Andrew W.
10811 Cahill, Clyde S., Jr.
10812 Collinson, William R.
20857 Cambridge, William G.
10813 Cant, William A.
10814 Clark, Russell G.
10815 Collet, John C.
10816 Conmy, Patrick A.
20819 Cotterall, John Hazelton
10817 Davies, Ronald M.
10818 Davis, Charles B.
20843 Davis, Michael J.
10819 Delehandt, John W.
10820 Denney, Robert
10821 Devitt, Edward J.
10822 Dewey, Chalres
10823 Dier, Richard A.
10824 Donohoe, James A.
10825 Donovan, Dennis E.
20841 Doty, David S.
10826 Duncan, Richard
10827 Eisele, Garnett
10828 Elliot, James D.
10829 Farris, Charles B.
20855 Fenner, Gary A.
10830 Filippine, Edward L.
20853 Gaitan, Fernando J., Jr.
10831 Gibson, Floyd
10832 Graven, Henry
10833 Gunn, George F., Jr.
20846 Hamilton, Jean C.
10834 Hansen, David R.
10835 Hanson, William C.
10836 Harper, Roy W.
10837 Harris, Oren
20829 Heaney, Gerald W.

20836 Hendren, Jim L.
10838 Henley, J. Smith

10839 Hicklin, Edwin
20828 Hodges, James
10840 Howard, George Jr.
10841 Hulen, Rubey
10842 Hungate, William L.
10843 Hunter, Elmo
20848 Jackson, Carol E.
20818 Johnson, Tillman Davis
10844 Jones, John B.
10845 Joyce, Matthew
20817 Kennamer, Franklin E.
20858 Kopf, Richard G.
20862 Kornmann, Charles B.
20842 Kyle, Richard H.
10846 Larson, Earl
20856 Laughrey, Nanette K.
10847 Lemley, Harry
10848 Limbaugh, Stephen N.
20840 Longstaff, Ronald E.
10849 Lord, Miles
20812 Mcgee, John Franklin
10850 Mcmanus, Edward J.
10851 Maclaughlin, Harry W.
10852 Magnuson, Paul A.
10853 Martineau, John E.
20838 Melloy, Michael J.
10854 Meredith, James
10855 Mickelson, George T.
10856 Miller, Andrew
10857 Miller, John E.
10858 Molyneaux, Joseph
20835 Moddy, James M.
20845 Montgomery, Ann D.
10859 Moore, George
10860 Munger, Thomas C.
10861 Murphy, Diana F.
10862 Nangle, John F.
20823 Neblet, Colin
10863 Neville, Phillip
10864 Nichol, Fred J.
10865 Nordbye, Gunnar H.
10866 O'brien, Donald E.
10867 Oliver, John
10868 Otis, Merrill
10869 Overton, William R.
20850 Perry, Catherine D.
20831 Phillips, Orie L.
20861 Piersol, Lawrence L.
20816 Pollock, John C.

10870 Porter, Donald J.
10871 Ragon, Heartsill
20825 Ralston, Richard H.
20832 Reasoner, Stephen M.
10872 Reeves, Albert
10873 Regan, John
10874 Register, George
10875 Renner, Robert G.
10876 Ridge, Albert A.
10877 Riley, William
10878 Roberts, Ross T.
10879 Robinson, Richard E.
10880 Rosenbaum, James M.
10881 Roy, Elsyane
10882 Sachs, Howard F.
20826 Sanborne, John B.
10883 Schatz, Albert G.
10884 Scott, George C.
20859 Shanaha, Thomas M.
20849 Shaw, Charles A.
10885 Shell, Terry L.
10886 Smith, J. Jasper
20854 Smith, Ortrie D.
10887 Stephenson, Roy
10888 Stevens, Joseph E., Jr.
20847 Stohr, Donald J.
10889 Stone, Kimbrough
20809 Strom, Lyle E.
10890 Stuart, William C.
10891 Sullivan, George
10892 Switzer, Carroll
20827 Symes, John Foster
20815 Trieber, John
10893 Trimble, Thomas C.
20844 Tunheim, John R.
10894 Urbom, Warren K.
10895 Van Sickle, Bruce
20814 Van Valkenburge, Arba Seymour
20811 Van Pelt, Robert
10896 Vietar, Harold D.
10897 Vogel, Charles
10898 Wangelin, H. Kenneth
10899 Waters, H. Franklin
20860 Webb, Rodney S.
20851 Webber, E. Richard
20800 Weber, Randolph
20801 Webster, William
20852 Whipple, Dean
20802 Whittaker, Charles

20803 Williams, Paul
20824 Williams, Robert L.
20834 Wilson, William R., Jr.
20810 Wolle, Charles R.
20804 Woodrough, Joseph W.
20805 Woods, Henry
20806 Wright, Scott O.
20833 Wright, Susan W.
20807 Wyman, A. Lee
20813 Youmans, Frank A.
20808 Young, Gordon E.

Ninth Circuit-District Judges

10901 Aguilar, Robert P.
10902 Alexander, George
10903 Anderson, J. Blaine
30967 Armstrong, Sandra B.
30952 Baird, Lourdes G.
10904 Baldwin, James H.
10905 Battin, James F.
30926 Bean, R.s.
10906 Beaumont, Campbell
10907 Beeks, William
10908 Belloni, Robert
30931 Biggs, John Jr.
10909 Bilby, Richard M.
10910 Black, Lloyd
10911 Boldt, George
10912 Bourquin, George
10913 Bowen, John C.
10914 Brewster, Rudi M.
10915 Broomfield, Robert
10916 Brown, R.
10917 Browning, William D.
10918 Bryan, Robert J.
30996 Burgess, Franklin D.
10919 Burke, Lloyd
10920 Burns, James
30963 Burrell, Garland E., Jr.
10921 Byrne, William M.
10922 Byrne, Wm. Mattew, Jr.
10923 Callister, Marion J.
10924 Carr, Charles
10925 Carroll, Earl H.
10926 Carter, James M.
10927 Carter, Oliver J.
10928 Cavanah, Charles
30970 Chesney, Maxine M.
10929 Clairborne, Harry
10930 Clark, Chase
10931 Clarke, Thurmond
30954 Collins, Audrey B.
10932 Conti, Samuel
10933 Cooper, Joseph
10934 Copple, William
10935 Cordova, Valdemar
10936 Cosgrave, George
10937 Coughenour, John
10938 Coyle, Robert E.
10939 Craig, Walter

10940 Crary, F. Avery
10941 Crocker, M.d.

10942 Curtis, Jesse
10943 Cushman, Edward E.
10944 Davies, John G.
10945 Davis, Arthur
30925 Dietrich, Frank Sigel
10946 Dimmick, Carolyn R.
10947 Dimond, Anthony
10948 Driver, Samuel
10949 Duenas, Cristobal
30994 Dwyer, William L.
10950 East, William G.
10951 Enright, William B.
10952 Erskine, Herbert
30978 Ezra, David A.
30929 Farrington, Edward
10953 Fee, James Alger
10954 Ferguson, Warren J.
10955 Fernandez, Ferdinand F.
30939 Firth, Robert
10956 Fitzgerald, James M.
10957 Foley, Roger
10958 Foley, Robert
10959 Folta, George
10960 Fong, Harold M.
10961 Forbies, Vernon
10962 Frey, William C.
10963 Friedman, Monroe
10964 Frye, Helen J.
10965 Gadbois, Richard A.
10966 Garcia, Edward J.
10967 George, Lloyd D.
30915 Gilliam, Earl 8.
10968 Gilmartin, Eugene
30979 Gillmor, Helen
30973 Gonzalez, Irma E.
10969 Goodman, Louis
10970 Goodwin, Alfred
10971 Goodwin, William
10972 Gray, William P.
30985 Hagen, David W.
30990 Haggerty, Ancer L.
10973 Halbert, Sherrill
10974 Hall, Peirson
10975 Hamlin, Oliver D.
10976 Hardy, Charles L.
10977 Harris, George
10978 Harrison, Benjamin
10979 Hatfield, Paul G.
10980 Hatter, Terry J., Jr.

10981 Hauk, A. Andrew
30936 Healy, William H.
10982 Henderson, Thelton E.
30942 Hill, Edward Coke
10983 Hill, Irving
10984 Hodge, Walter
30987 Hogan, Michael R.
10985 Holland, H,. Russel
10986 Hollzer, Harry
30972 Huff, Marilyn L.
10987 Hupp, Harry L.
10988 Ideman, James M.
30971 Illston, Susan Y.
10989 Ingram, Willaim A.
10990 Irving, J. Lawrence
10991 Jacobs, F.c.
10992 James, William
10993 Jamesdon, William
10994 Jenney, Ralph E.
10995 Jensen, D. Lowell
10996 Jertberg, Gilbert H.
30974 Jones, Napoleon A.
30989 Jones, Robert E.
10997 Karlton, Lawrence K.
30977 Kay, Alan Cooke
10998 Keep, Judith N.
30916 Keller, William Duffy
10999 Kehoe, Joseph
20900 Kelleher, Robert J.
20901 Kelly, Raymond
20902 Kenyon, David V.
20903 Kerrigan, Frank
30920 Kilkenny, John F.
30957 King, George H.
20904 King, Samuel P.
20905 Kleinfeld, Andrew J.
20906 Kunzel, Fred
20907 Laureta, Alfred
30941 Layton, Caleb R., Iii
20908 Leavy, Charles
20909 Leavy, Edward
30917 Legge, Chalres A.
20910 Lemmon, Dal M.
20911 Lettis, J. Spencer
30961 Levi, David F.
20912 Levin, Gerald
30950 Lew, Ronald S.w.
20913 Lindberg, William J.
20914 Ling, David

30980 Lodge, Edward J.
30932 Lomen, Gudbrand J.
20915 Louderback, Harold
20916 Lovell, Charles C.
20917 Lucas, Malcolm M.
20918 Lydick, Lawrence
20919 Lynch, Eugene F.
20920 Macbride, Thomas
20921 Mccarrey, James
20922 Mccolloch. Claude
20923 McCormick, Paul
20924 Mcdonald, Alan A.
20925 Mcgovern, Walter
30918 Mckibben, Howard D.
20926 Mclaughlin, J. Frank
30953 Mclaughlin, Linda H.
30946 Mcnamee, Stephen M.
20927 McNary, John
20928 McNichols, Ray
20929 McNichols, Robert J.
20930 Marquez, Alfredo C.
30988 Marsh, Malcolm F.
20931 Marshall, Consuelo B.
20932 Mathes, William C.
20933 Metzger, Delbert
30983 Molloy, Donald W.
20934 Muecke, Charles A.
30986 Munson, Alex
20935 Murphy, Edward P.
20936 Murray, William
30975 Muskowitz, Barry Ted
20937 Neterer, Jeremiah
30935 Neill, Marshall A.
20938 Nielsen, Leland
30991 Nielsen, W. Fremming
20939 Norcross, Frank
20940 O'connor, J.f.t.
20941 Orrick, William H., Jr.
30997 Owen, Richard
30955 Paez, Richard A.
20942 Panner, Owen M.
30922 Partridge, John S.
20943 Patel, Marilyn H.
20944 Peckham, Robert F.
20945 Pence, Martin
20946 Pfaelzer, Mariana R.
20947 Plummer, Raymons
30919 Poole, Cecil F.
20948 Powell, Charles L.

20949 Pratt, Harry
20950 Pray, Charles N.
30959 Pregerson, Dean D.
20951 Pregerson, Harry
20952 Price, Edward D.
30984 Pro, Phillip M.
20953 Quackenbush, Justin L.
20954 Rafeedie, Edward
20955 Ramirez, Raul A.
20956 Rea, William J.
20957 Real, Manueal
20958 Redden, James A.
20959 Reed, Edward C., Jr.
30927 Reed, Thomas Milburne
30937 Regan, John K.
20960 Renfrew, Charles
20961 Rhoades, John S., Sr.
30921 Richey, Mary Anne
30928 Richie, Elmer E.
20962 Roche, Michael
30947 Roll, John M.
20963 Rosenblatt, Paul G.
20964 Ross, John
20965 Rothstein, Barbara J.
30924 Rudkin, frank K.
20966 Ryan, Harold L.
20967 Rymer, Pamela A.
20968 Sames, Albert M.
30930 Sawtelle, William Henry
20969 Schnacke, Robert
20970 Schwartz, Edward
20971 Schwartz, Milton L.
20972 Schwarzer, William W.
20973 Schellenbach, Lewis
30945 Sedwick, John W.
30982 Shanstrom, Jack G.
20974 Sharp, Morell
20975 Shriver, Paul D.
30960 Shubb, William B.
30948 Silver, Roslyn O.
30944 Singleton, James K., Jr.
20976 Skopil, Otto R.
30964 Smith, Fern M.
20977 Smith, Russel
20978 Solomon, Gus J.
20979 Speakman, Howard C.
20980 Stephens, Albert Lee
20981 Stephens, Albert Lee, Jr.
20982 St. Sure, Adophus

20983 Stolter, Alicemaris
20984 Strand, Roger G.
20985 Sweigert, William
20986 Takasugi, Robert M.
20987 Tanner, Jack E.
20988 Tashima. A. Wallace
20989 Tavares, C. Nils
20990 Taylor, Fred
30951 Taylor, Gary L.
30934 Tevrizian, Dickran, M.
20991 Thompson, Bruce
20992 Thompson, Gordon Jr.
30956 Timlin, Robert J.
20993 Talin, Ernest
20994 Turrentine, Howard
30976 Unpingco, John S.
30992 Van Sickel, Fred L.
30943 Vaught, Edgar Sullins
20995 von Der Heydt, James A.
20996 Voorhees, Donald S.
20997 Vukasin, John P., Jr.
30965 Walker, Vaughn R.
20998 Wallace, J. Clifford
20999 Walsh, James
30962 Wanger, Oliver W.
30958 Wardlaw, Kim McLane
30966 Ware, James
30900 Waters, Laughlin E.
30901 Webster, J. Stanley
30902 Weigel, Stanley
30903 Weinberger, Jacob
30904 Welsh, Martin
30905 Westover, Harry C.
30993 Whaley, Robert H.
30906 Whelan, Francis
30968 Whyte, Ronald M.
30907 Wiig, Jon
30969 Wilken, Claudia
30908 Wilkins, Philip
30909 Williams, David W.
30910 Williams, Spencer M.
30911 Wilson, Stephen V.
30981 Winmill, B. Lynn
30912 Wollenberg, Albert C.
30913 Yankwich, Leon
30949 Zapata, Frank R.
30995 Zilly, Thomas S.
30914 Zirpoli, Alfonso

Tenth Circuit-District Judges

11001 Alley, Wayne
11002 Anderson, Alson J.
11003 Arraj, Alfred A.
11084 Babcock, Lewis T.
11004 Baldock, Bobby Ray
11005 Barrow, Allen E.
11091 Belot, Monti L.
21003 Benson, Dee
11096 Black, Bruce D.
11006 Bohanon, Luthur
11007 Bowen, John C.
11008 Bratton, Howard C.
11009 Breitenstein, Jean S.
11010 Brett, Thomas R.
11011 Brimmer, Clarence A.
11012 Broaddus, Bower
11013 Brown, Wesley E.
11014 Burciaga, Juan G.
11097 Burrage, Michael
21004 Campbell, Tina
11015 Campos, Santiago
11016 Carrigan, Jim R.
21000 Cauthron, Robin J.
11017 Chandler, Stephen
11018 Chilson, Olin
11019 Christensen, A. Sherman
11020 Conway, John
11021 Cook, H. Dale
11022 Crow, Sam A.
11087 Daniel, Wiley
11023 Daugherty, Fredrick
21005 Downes, William F.
11024 Doyle, William
11081 Durfee, James R.
11025 Ellison, James O.
11026 Eubanks, Luther B.
11027 Finesilver, Sherman G.
11075 Greene, J. Thomas
11094 Hansen, C. Leroy
11028 Hatch, Carl A.
11029 Helvering, Guy T.
11030 Hill, Delmas C.
11099 Holmes, Sven Erik
11031 Hopkins, Richard J.
11078 Huxman, Walter A.
11032 Jenkins, Bruce S.
11033 Johnson, Alan B.

11034 Johnson, Tillman
11035 Kane, John L., Jr.

11036 Kelly, Patrick P.
11037 Kennamer, Franklin E.
11038 Kennedy, T. Blake
11098 Kern, Terry C.
11039 Kerr, Ewing T.
11040 Knous, William Lee
11041 Langley, Edwin
21001 Leonard, Tim
11090 Lungstrum, John W.
11074 Mare, John
11093 Maten, John T.
11042 Matsch, Richard P.
11043 Mechem, Edwin L.
11044 Mellott, Arthur J.
21002 Miles-lagrange, Vicki
11088 Miller, Walker D.
11077 Moore, John P.
11045 Morris, Joseph W.
11046 Murrah, Alfred
11047 O'connor, Earl
11048 Neblett, Colin
11085 Nottingham, Edward W.
11076 Parker, James A.
11049 Payne, H. Vearle
11080 Phillips, Layn R.
11079 Phillips, Orie L.
11050 Pollock, John C.
11051 Rice, Eugene
11052 Richey, Mary Anne
11053 Ritter, Willis W.
11054 Rizley, Ross
11055 Rogers, Richard Dean
11056 Rogers, Waldo
11057 Russell, David L.
11058 Saffels, Dale E.
11059 Sam, David
11060 Savage, Royce
11061 Seay, Frank H.
11086 Spar, Daniel B.
11062 Stanly, Arthur
11063 Symes, John
11064 Templar, George
11065 Theis, Frank G.
11066 Thompson, Ralph G.
11089 Van Bebbber, G. Thomas
11067 Vaught, Edgar
11095 Vazquez, Martha
11092 Vratil, Kathryn H.
11068 Wallace, William

11069 Weinshienk, Zita L.
11070 West, Lee R.
11083 Wham, Fred C.
11071 Williams, Robert
11072 Winder, David K.
11073 Winner, Fred

Circuit-District Judges

11101 Acker, William M., Jr.
11186 Adams, Henry Lee, Jr.
11102 Alaimo, Anthony A.
11176 Albritton, W. Harold Iii
11173 Allgood, Clarence W.
11168 Arnow, Winston
11103 Aronovitz, Sidney M.
11104 Atkins, Clyde C.
11105 Black, Susan H.
11178 Blackburn, Sharon L.
11106 Bowen, Dudley H., Jr.
11107 Brevard Hand, William
11187 Bucklew, Susan C.
11180 Butler, Charles R., Jr.
11108 Camp, Jack T.
21100 Carnes, Julie E.
11109 Carr, George C.
11110 Castagna, William J.
11111 Clemon, U.w.
11188 Collier, Lacey A.
11184 Conway, Ann C.
21101 Cooper, Clarence
11112 Cox, Emmett Ripley
11113 Davis, B. Edward
11177 Dement, Ira
11114 Dubina, Joel F.
11115 Eaton, Joe
11116 Edenfield, B. Avant
11117 Elliot, Robert J.
11118 Evans, Orinda D.
11119 Fawsett, Patricia C.
11195 Ferguson, Wilkie D., Jr.
11120 Fitzpatrick, Duross
11121 Forrester, J. Owen
11123 Freeman, Richard C.
11124 Gonzalez, Jose A., Jr.
11191 Graham, Donald L.
11122 Guin, Foy J., Jr.
11125 Hall, Robert H.
11126 Haltom, E.b.
11127 Hancock, Hughes James
11170 Hand, William B.
11128 Hastings, Alcee L.
11129 Higby, Lynn C.
11192 Highsmith, Shelby
11189 Hinkle, Robert L.
11130 Hobbs, M. Truman

11131 Hodges, Terrell Wm.
 11132 Hoeveler, Wm. M.
 11133 Howard, Alex T., Jr.
 21102 Hull, Frank M.
 21103 Hunt, Willis B., Jr.
 11196 Hurley, Daniel T.k.
 11171 Jacobs, Carol
 11134 James, C.p.
 11135 Kehoe, W. James
 11136 King, James Lawrence
 11137 Kovachevich, Elizabeth A.
 11138 Krentzman, Ben
 11199 Lawson, Hugh
 11197 Lenard, Joan A.
 11139 Marcus, Staney
 11174 Markey, Howard
 11140 Maurice, Mitchell Paul
 11141 Mcfadden, Frank H.
 11142 Melton, Howell W.
 11185 Merryday, Stephen D.
 11143 Moore, John H., Iii
 11193 Moore, K. Michael
 21104 Moore, William T., Jr.
 11190 Moreno, Frederico A.
 11144 Moye, Charles A., Jr.
 11145 Murphy, Harold L.
 11146 Nelson, Edwin L.
 11147 Nesbitt, Lenore Carrero
 11183 Nimmons, Ralph W., Jr.
 11148 O'kelly, William C.
 11149 Owens, Wilbur D.
 11169 Paine, James
 11175 Paul, Maurice Mitchell
 11150 Pointer, Sam C., Jr.
 11151 Propst, B. Robert
 11152 Reed, John A., Jr.
 11153 Roettger, Norman C.
 11154 Ryskamp, Kenneth L.
 11198 Sands, W. Lewis
 11182 Schlesinger, Harvey E.
 11155 Scott, Thomas E.
 11172 Seybourne, H. Lynne
 11156 Sharp, George Kendall
 11157 Shoob, Marvin H.
 11179 Smith, C. Lynwood
 11158 Spellman, Eugene P.
 11159 Stafford, William C.j.
 11160 Thompson, Myron H.
 11161 Tidwell, Ernest G.

11194 Ungaro-benages, Ursula
11162 Varner, E. Robert
11163 Vining, Robert L., Jr.
11164 Vinson, Roger C.
11181 Vollmer, Richard W., Jr.
11165 Ward, Horace T.
11166 Young, George C.
11167 Zloch, William J.

D.C. Circuit-District Judges

11201 Adkins, Jeese
11202 Bailey, Jennings
11203 Bastian, Walter
11204 Bryant, Wiilliam
11258 Burton, Harold H.
11261 Christenson, A. Sherman
11205 Corcoron, Howard
11254 Corman, Milton D.
11206 Cox, Joseph
11207 Curran, Edward M.
11208 Eicher, Edward
11209 Flannery, Thomas
11266 Friedman, Paul L.
11210 Gasch, Oliver
11211 Gessell, Gerhard
11212 Green, Joyce Hens
11213 Green, June
11214 Greene, Harold H.
11215 Goldsborough, T. Alan
11216 Gordon, Peyton
11217 Harris, Stanley S.
11218 Hart, George L.
11219 Hogan, Thomas F.
11220 Holtzoff, Alexander
11257 Jackson, Joseph R.
11221 Jackson, Thomas P.
11222 Johnson, Norma H.
11223 Jones, Wiilliam
11224 Keech, Richmaond
11267 Kessler, Gladys
11225 Kirkland, James R.
11265 Lambreth, Royce C.
11226 Laws, Bolitha
11227 Letts, F. Dickinson
11228 Luhring, Oscar
11229 Mcgarrahy, Joseph
11230 McGuire, Mathew
11231 Mclaughlin, Charles
11232 Mattews, Burnite
11264 Miller, Wilbur K.
11233 Mooris, James W.
11234 Oberdorfer, Louis F.
11235 O'donoghur, Daniel
11236 Parker, Barrington
11237 Penn, John G.
11238 Pine, David
11239 Pratt, John H.

11240 Proctor, James
11256 Real, Manuel L., Jr.
11259 Reed, Stanley
11241 Revercomb, George H.
11242 Richey, Charles
11262 Rizley, Ross
11270 Robertson, James
11243 Robinson, Aubrey
11244 Ribinson, Spottswood Iii
11245 Schweinhault, Henry
11246 Sirica, John
11247 Smith, John
11271 Sporkin, Stanley
11269 Sullivan, Emmet G.
11248 Tamm, Edward
11268 Urbina, Ricardo M.
11249 Waddy, Joseph
11250 Walsh, Leonard
11263 Washington, George Thomas
11251 Wheat, Alfred
11252 Youngdahl, Luther W.
11253 Zloch, William J.

Appendix 5

Number of Cases in Each Circuit/Year in Appeals Court Data Base

C	Y	#
I	E	C
R	A	A
C	R	S
U		E
I		S
T		

01	25	95
02	25	329
03	25	116
04	25	99
05	25	175
06	25	222
07	25	81
08	25	330
09	25	289
00	25	196
01	26	95
02	26	339
03	26	118
04	26	131
05	26	170
06	26	227
07	26	102
08	26	377
09	26	210
00	26	219
00	27	187
01	27	86
02	27	307
03	27	107
04	27	99
05	27	205
06	27	188
07	27	94
08	27	374
09	27	188
01	28	104
02	28	312
03	28	137
04	28	109
05	28	232

06	28	190
07	28	95
08	28	331
09	28	213
00	28	177
01	29	90
02	29	317
03	29	154
04	29	122
05	29	195
06	29	184
07	29	82
08	29	360
09	29	277
00	29	128
01	30	69
02	30	362
03	30	159
04	30	148
05	30	238
06	30	242
07	30	119
08	30	259
09	30	304
10	30	178
00	30	121
01	31	76
02	31	392
03	31	176
04	31	140
05	31	266
06	31	260
07	31	139
08	31	272
09	31	281
10	31	200
00	31	173
01	32	94
02	32	315
03	32	185
04	32	146
05	32	280
06	32	252
07	32	155
08	32	253
09	32	283
10	32	158
00	32	176
01	33	91

02 33 433
03 33 174
04 33 149
05 33 296
06 33 242
07 33 167
08 33 221
09 33 281
10 33 220
00 33 198
01 34 86
02 34 427
03 34 178
04 34 169
05 34 326
06 34 159
07 34 216
08 34 280
09 34 278
10 34 203
00 34 213
01 35 72
02 35 434
03 35 178
04 35 196
05 35 280
06 35 105
07 35 253
08 35 267
09 35 324
10 35 158
00 35 149
01 36 84
02 36 406
03 36 154
04 36 138
05 36 259
06 36 262
07 36 277
08 36 230
09 36 284
10 36 157
00 36 167
01 37 82
02 37 397
03 37 189
04 37 112
05 37 285
06 37 263

07	37	276
08	37	225
09	37	326
10	37	122
00	37	154
01	38	60
02	38	355
03	38	184
04	38	161
05	38	292
06	38	232
07	38	240
08	38	251
09	38	352
10	38	134
00	38	147
01	39	59
02	39	336
03	39	230
04	39	137
05	39	248
06	39	282
07	39	214
08	39	297
09	39	284
10	39	166
00	39	146
01	40	81
02	40	346
03	40	188
04	40	130
05	40	300
06	40	252
07	40	238
08	40	257
09	40	325
10	40	198
00	40	166
01	41	72
02	41	316
03	41	195
04	41	106
05	41	283
06	41	252
07	41	243
08	41	251
09	41	273
10	41	171
00	41	189

01 42 132
02 42 323
03 42 195
04 42 103
05 42 315
06 42 250
07 42 232
08 42 303
09 42 259
10 42 184
00 42 183
01 43 53
02 43 297
03 43 177
04 43 93
05 43 263
06 43 211
07 43 242
08 43 265
09 43 110
10 43 171
00 43 147
01 44 62
02 44 324
03 44 144
04 44 98
05 44 244
06 44 147
07 44 146
08 44 212
09 44 277
10 44 136
00 44 158
01 45 56
02 45 336
03 45 168
04 45 76
05 45 239
06 45 155
07 45 148
08 45 232
09 45 271
10 45 141
00 45 164
01 46 71
02 46 255
03 46 142
04 46 74
05 46 255

06 46 141
07 46 155
08 46 175
09 46 238
10 46 151
00 46 168
01 47 58
02 47 274
03 47 151
04 47 110
05 47 261
06 47 137
07 47 154
08 47 152
09 47 222
10 47 157
00 47 139
01 48 64
02 48 241
03 48 174
04 48 107
05 48 267
06 48 171
07 48 148
08 48 179
09 48 157
10 48 55
00 48 158
01 49 56
02 49 298
03 49 189
04 49 137
05 49 313
06 49 187
07 49 176
08 49 178
09 49 232
10 49 186
00 49 203
01 50 53
02 50 196
03 50 202
04 50 154
05 50 303
06 50 197
07 50 195
08 50 226
09 50 262
10 50 157

00	50	228
01	51	52
02	51	268
03	51	150
04	51	125
05	51	327
06	51	158
07	51	165
08	51	205
09	51	269
10	51	161
00	51	207
01	52	59
02	52	253
03	52	192
04	52	142
05	52	403
06	52	170
07	52	164
08	52	84
09	52	238
10	52	174
00	52	245
01	53	64
02	53	261
03	53	209
04	53	139
05	53	379
06	53	204
07	53	162
08	53	211
09	53	249
10	53	156
00	53	192
01	54	68
02	54	188
03	54	129
04	54	114
05	54	383
06	54	185
07	54	135
08	54	188
09	54	279
10	54	123
00	54	167
01	55	55
02	55	311
03	55	177
04	55	172

05	55	448
06	55	207
07	55	211
08	55	218
09	55	434
10	55	192
00	55	303
01	56	78
02	56	320
03	56	189
04	56	156
05	56	439
06	56	288
07	56	212
08	56	193
09	56	375
10	56	110
00	56	318
01	57	79
02	57	348
03	57	189
04	57	184
05	57	419
06	57	226
07	57	220
08	57	189
09	57	342
10	57	200
00	57	353
01	58	73
02	58	337
03	58	246
04	58	167
05	58	500
06	58	251
07	58	203
08	58	219
09	58	359
10	58	184
00	58	354
01	59	55
02	59	359
03	59	218
04	59	170
05	59	448
06	59	220
07	59	225
08	59	204
09	59	330

10	59	224
00	59	334
01	60	93
02	60	368
03	60	204
04	60	175
05	60	441
06	60	260
07	60	221
08	60	234
09	60	334
10	60	55
00	60	319
01	61	91
02	61	365
03	61	197
04	61	186
05	61	477
06	61	242
07	61	222
08	61	222
09	61	348
10	61	218
00	61	299
01	62	112
02	62	415
03	62	202
04	62	231
05	62	555
06	62	250
07	62	244
08	62	253
09	62	373
10	62	235
00	62	306
01	63	83
02	63	413
03	63	253
04	63	227
05	63	609
06	63	252
07	63	263
08	63	275
09	63	412
10	63	242
00	63	339
01	64	112
02	64	410
03	64	260

04	64	280
05	64	659
06	64	312
07	64	247
08	64	222
09	64	403
10	64	268
00	64	235
01	65	95
02	65	406
03	65	246
04	65	238
05	65	634
06	65	274
07	65	298
08	65	245
09	65	409
10	65	272
00	65	294
01	66	119
02	66	110
03	66	297
04	66	298
05	66	784
06	66	257
07	66	307
08	66	232
09	66	492
10	66	298
00	66	263
01	67	110
02	67	393
03	67	338
04	67	364
05	67	926
06	67	325
07	67	284
08	67	221
09	67	491
10	67	338
00	67	266
01	68	105
02	68	110
03	68	306
04	68	312
05	68	1054
06	68	340
07	68	298
08	68	224

09	68	539
10	68	280
00	68	269
01	69	121
02	69	434
03	69	328
04	69	324
05	69	1228
06	69	430
07	69	348
08	69	286
09	69	746
10	69	282
00	69	325
01	70	155
02	70	523
03	70	350
04	70	385
05	70	1464
06	70	451
07	70	344
08	70	340
09	70	950
10	70	353
00	70	315
01	71	146
02	71	565
03	71	403
04	71	289
05	71	1818
06	71	379
07	71	382
08	71	411
09	71	1159
10	71	364
00	71	276
01	72	152
02	72	459
03	72	537
04	72	269
05	72	1462
06	72	417
07	72	381
08	72	427
09	72	1012
10	72	418
00	72	325
01	73	138
02	73	428

03 73 293
04 73 246
05 73 1307
06 73 380
07 73 287
08 73 399
09 73 626
10 73 287
00 73 279
01 74 164
02 74 490
03 74 206
04 74 234
05 74 1129
06 74 395
07 74 360
08 74 417
09 74 582
10 74 240
00 74 293
01 75 161
02 75 537
03 75 110
04 75 278
05 75 1021
06 75 401
07 75 405
08 75 494
09 75 655
10 75 227
00 75 275
01 76 189
02 76 466
03 76 254
04 76 295
05 76 1044
06 76 318
07 76 328
08 76 549
09 76 641
10 76 228
00 76 252
01 77 205
02 77 464
03 77 259
04 77 299
05 77 1185
06 77 273
07 77 320

08 77 585
09 77 596
10 77 241
00 77 273
01 78 246
02 78 377
03 78 291
04 78 277
05 78 1288
06 78 321
07 78 344
08 78 518
09 78 654
10 78 287
00 78 236
01 79 230
02 79 376
03 79 279
04 79 286
05 79 1205
06 79 289
07 79 331
08 79 523
09 79 752
10 79 309
00 79 227
01 80 245
02 80 411
03 80 328
04 80 306
05 80 1496
06 80 437
07 80 377
08 80 550
09 80 860
10 80 361
00 80 411
01 81 269
02 81 366
03 81 302
04 81 334
05 81 1630
06 81 399
07 81 357
08 81 650
09 81 770
10 81 336
00 81 325
01 82 266

02 82 417
03 82 353
04 82 340
05 82 998
06 82 424
07 82 509
08 82 626
09 82 890
10 82 55
11 82 654
00 82 302
01 83 281
02 83 479
03 83 342
04 83 339
05 83 989
06 83 496
07 83 578
08 83 688
09 83 914
10 83 359
11 83 726
00 83 341
01 84 309
02 84 505
03 84 326
04 84 340
05 84 790
06 84 501
07 84 546
08 84 784
09 84 799
10 84 357
11 84 761
00 84 331
01 85 287
02 85 543
03 85 358
04 85 380
05 85 844
06 85 475
07 85 691
08 85 673
09 85 941
10 85 342
11 85 748
00 85 295
01 86 320
02 86 488

03 86 346
04 86 405
05 86 963
06 86 470
07 86 672
08 86 694
09 86 1069
10 86 334
11 86 816
00 86 314
01 87 371
02 87 428
03 87 350
04 87 355
05 87 838
06 87 261
07 87 699
08 87 221
09 87 1025
10 87 348
11 87 663
00 87 394
01 88 358
02 88 508
03 88 377
04 88 321
05 88 810
06 88 486
07 88 676
08 88 605
09 88 820
10 88 336
11 88 616
00 88 388
01 89 195
02 89 246
03 89 192
04 89 173
05 89 432
06 89 269
07 89 324
08 89 379
09 89 482
10 89 186
11 89 296
00 89 166
01 90 189
02 90 269
03 90 150

04	90	172
05	90	447
06	90	243
07	90	378
08	90	419
09	90	494
10	90	262
11	90	291
00	90	149