Supreme Court of Maryland

Robert C. Murphy Courts of Appeal Building
361 Rowe Boulevard
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Matthew J. Fader
Chief Justice

(410) 260-3725

December 17, 2024

The Honorable William C. Ferguson IV
President
Maryland State Senate
H-107 State House
100 State Circle
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

The Honorable Adrienne A. Jones
Speaker
Maryland House of Delegates
H-101 State House
100 State Circle
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

Re: 2024_p5_JUD Judgeship Needs for Fiscal Year 2026 (MSAR #12876)

Dear President Ferguson and Speaker Jones:

In accordance with the procedure established by the Judiciary to certify judgeships to the General Assembly, the Judiciary submits its annual certification of need for judgeships. While certifying the need for four additional judgeships for Fiscal Year 2026 based on our needs analysis, the Judiciary also identified a need for one trial court judgeship in St. Mary's County upon completion of a qualitative review of resources in circuit courts throughout Maryland.

Additional need has been certified in the Circuit Court for Kent County and three District Court locations: Dorchester, Washington, and Wicomico. However, mindful of budgetary considerations, existing space within those courthouses, and other factors, we are declining to request judgeships in those jurisdictions at this time. The study also shows that judicial resources in some courts exceed the need anticipated in Fiscal Year 2026. We do not think the analysis is necessarily reflective of long-term needs in those jurisdictions and, therefore, are not currently proposing any reduction in the number of judicial resources in those jurisdictions. Attached, for your convenience, is the report detailing the workload analysis conducted as the basis for this certification.

The underlying model for establishing judicial officer need was most recently updated by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in November 2022, *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers*. As recommended by the NCSC, this model relies predominately on new case filings mostly unaffected by the COVID-19 pandemic; Fiscal Year 2019, Fiscal Year 2023, and Fiscal Year 2024. While the model relies on case weights, the NCSC recognizes that other qualitative factors can be considered as well, including local court practices and variations in policies among the State's

Attorneys. Circuit Court Administrative Judges were asked to conduct a thorough review of local conditions, current capacity, and workforce factors to supplement the quantitative analysis. The Judiciary reviewed the submitted findings and is working with the Circuit Court for St. Mary's County and St. Mary's County government to identify and plan courthouse space to accommodate an additional judgeship. To allow adequate preparation time and coordination with the St. Mary's County government, we request one (1) judgeship in the Circuit Court for St. Mary's County to begin January 1, 2026. The Judiciary requests your assistance with the introduction of this bill.

Despite the utility of the 2022 interim model update, the NCSC has recommended a full workload assessment study, with a full judicial officer time study to be conducted to ensure current practices are incorporated into the case weights that determine judicial workload. The Judiciary recognizes the limitations of the current model due to changing policies and practices and has initiated a new full-scale model update with results expected to be available for use in the Fiscal Year 2027 judicial need certification analysis.

Please contact our State Court Administrator, Judy Rupp, 410-260-1540, should you have any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matthew J. Fader

cc: Honorable Guy J. Guzzone, Chair, Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
Honorable William C. Smith, Jr., Chair, Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee
Honorable Sarah K. Elfreth, Chair, Public Safety, Transportation and Environment Subcommittee
Honorable Benjamin S. Barnes, Chair, House Appropriations Committee
Honorable Luke H. Clippinger, Chair, House Judiciary Committee
Honorable Jazz M. Lewis, Chair, Public Safety and Administration Subcommittee
Honorable E. Gregory Wells, Chief Judge, Appellate Court of Maryland
Honorable Audrey Carrión, Chair, Conference of Circuit Judges
Honorable John P. Morrissey, Chief Judge, District Court
Circuit, County, and District Administrative Judges
Judy K. Rupp, State Court Administrator
Nancy Faulkner, Deputy State Court Administrator
Honorable Kevin R. Tucker, Chair, Conference of Circuit Court Clerks
Stephanie A. Medina, Chair, Conference of Circuit Court Administrators
Kelley E. O'Connor, Assistant State Court Administrator, Government Relations and Public Affairs
Natasha M. Dartigue, Public Defender
Steven Kroll, Executive Director, Maryland State's Attorneys' Association

Sally McMillan Robb, Chief of Staff, Office of the Senate President
Matthew Jackson, Chief of Staff, Office of the House Speaker
Jacob Pollicove, Budget Analyst
Kenneth Weaver, Budget Analyst
Daneen M. Banks, Policy Analyst
Erika S. Schissler, Policy Analyst
Jeff Wulbrecht, Budget Analyst, Department of Budget and Management
Sarah Albert, Mandated Reports Specialist

Analysis of Need for Additional Judgeships in the Judicial Branch

FY 2026

Administrative Office of the Courts

December 2024

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the comprehensive evaluation of need for additional judgeships in Maryland for fiscal year 2026. The report details the history and current established process for determining need. Although Maryland has projected judicial need since 1979, this report benefits from its most current and comprehensive judgeship need evaluation using a national model in judgeship certifications.

Using national best practices developed by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), the Maryland Judiciary carefully evaluated predominant indicators of future judicial work and corresponding judgeship need. The determination of need for FY 2026 is based on the most recent recommendations established by the NCSC in November 2022, which seek to account for the extraordinary circumstances brought on by the outbreak of the novel coronavirus, COVID-19. This model relies primarily on the average number and type of cases originally filed in the three most recent years least affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, FY 2019, FY 2023, and FY 2024.

Through extensive research, the NCSC guided the Judiciary in determining the amount of judicial work generated on average per case filing within each distinct case type. A preliminary determination of need for each jurisdiction and within trial court level (District and circuit) was achieved by combining the projected number of filings with the average time a judge will spend on each case, from initiation through any post-judgment activity, to ensure proper administration of justice. After the projected need was established, each county and district administrative judge provided input on the most immediate need for additional judgeships in FY 2026.

Appendices A and B detail the projected filings and corresponding judicial work in the trial courts for FY 2026. Tables 1 and 2 identify the current judgeships, projected need, and requested additional positions for the circuit courts and the District Court, respectively.

Recommended Quantitative Need:

For FY 2026, there is a projected increased need for judicial resources in four courts, including one circuit court, and three jurisdictions in the District Court. These numbers reflect three courts where the prior projected need is no longer present and two jurisdictions with a projected need not identified in the FY 2025 report. Typically, differences from one year to another are a result of updated filings data and adjusted use of quasi-judicial resources to ensure judicial resources are fully utilized. The FY 2026 report benefits from the NCSC-recommended interim adjustments that were first put in place for the FY 2024 report.

Recommended Qualitative Need:

While certifying the need for four additional judgeships for Fiscal Year 2026 based on the current needs analysis, the Judiciary identified a need for one trial court judgeship in St. Mary's County upon completion of a qualitative review of resources in circuit courts throughout Maryland. The Judiciary is working with the Circuit Court for St. Mary's County to assess current and projected needs to help ensure the timely processing of cases and prevent case scheduling delays .

This report also identifies filing trends in the trial courts. Active monitoring of the judicial workload aids the Judiciary's continuous efforts to utilize existing judicial resources most efficiently. Continuing to monitor judgeship need will help ensure fair, effective, and efficient access to justice in all trial courts across the state.

Certifying Trial Court Judgeship Need

In 1979, the Maryland Judiciary began an annual process to certify to the General Assembly the need for additional judges in the trial courts. Over time, that process has been refined to ensure the Judiciary has the judicial resources to manage effectively and resolve court business without delay while delivering quality service to the public. From 2015 to 2017, the National Center for State Courts performed an intensive judicial needs assessment to equip Maryland with the most current and precise tools to calculate judicial need. The results of that comprehensive research and methodology for calculating judicial need are detailed in the *Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment Final Report, December 2017.*[1] Beginning in 2021, the NCSC performed an interim model assessment, with the goal of updating any deficiencies in the 2017 model. This interim update sought to account for any changes in legislation, court practices, filings trends, and other relevant factors for projecting need. In addition, the NCSC sought to determine to what extent COVID-19 has impacted filings and court practices and how the model should account for that impact. This interim update was completed in November 2022 and is summarized in the *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers, November 2022.*[2] Since the weighted caseload model relies on new case filings to calculate workload, it is not designed to account for surges in backlogs due to extended times with limited court activity, such as what occurred during the pandemic. Based on the recommendation of the NCSC, judicial need for FY 2024 was calculated based on the three-year filings average from FY 2018 to FY 2020 to avoid having undue influence from historically low filings during FY 2021 and FY 2022 that were expected to rebound. As expected, filings increased in FY 2023 in both the

[1] Kleiman, M., & Lee, C. (December 2017). *Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment Final Report.* National Center for State Courts.
[2] Tallarico, S., Boyce, E., Bell, B., & Slayton, D. (November 2022). *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers.* National Center for State Courts.

circuit courts and the District Court. For FY 2025 and beyond, the NCSC has recommended monitoring filings trends and case backlog to make the most accurate assessment of future workload. The FY 2025 report was based on the three-year average of FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2023. For FY 2026, filings are projected based on the three-year average of FY 2019, FY 2023, and FY 2024, consistent with the NCSC's recommendations.

The FY 2026 certification of need for additional judgeships is guided by three key factors: (1) analyzing court workload and current resources to quantify judicial officer need; (2) assessing the ability of local governments to provide support for judicial staff specifically in the circuit courts as well as considering magistrate resources as an alternative to judgeships; and (3) determining if available courthouse space will accommodate additional judges in both trial courts.

Trial Court Certification Process

The annual process employed by the Judiciary affords the opportunity to present the need for judgeships based on a review of comprehensive quantitative and qualitative factors relating to the capacity with which the judicial system can adjudicate cases in a timely manner. Three different steps are involved in the Chief Justice's certification process. The starting point, and the subject of this report, is an empirical analysis prepared by the Administrative Office of the Courts. In 2021, the Judiciary engaged the NCSC to develop an interim adjustment to the weighted caseload methodology, enhancing the last full model that was finalized in 2017, to determine judgeship needs. As with the previous model, this methodology objectively determines case weights based on judicial time by case type and provides a more informed and comprehensive reflection of a court's capacity to address its workload than do other models that rely on filings alone. Three key enhancements developed by the NCSC through the 2022 interim adjustment were: (1) qualitative review of case weights to determine where adjustments were needed to fully account for current

practices,[3] (2) accounting for the significant impact of COVID-19 on new case filings and overall case processing beginning in March 2020 and continuing into FY 2021 and FY 2022, and (3) temporarily adjusting the lower limit threshold of the model to ensure sufficient resources are available as courts continue to navigate changes to case processing brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The second phase of the certification process involves the individual trial courts. At this point, circuit court administrative judges and administrative judges in the District Court are asked to provide input on the need for additional judgeships. In preparation of this response, the administrative judge is advised to: (1) seek the views of judges from that jurisdiction; (2) solicit opinions from members of the local bar; and (3) in the case of the circuit courts, consult with the local government with respect to providing an administrative support staff member, as well as the availability of additional courthouse space, and to consider if using magistrates will address the resource need. Administrative judges are required to conduct a thorough review of local conditions, as well as other pertinent factors that may supplement the quantitative analysis, particularly if they could result in specific recommendations relating to the need for additional judicial resources.

- Circuit court administrative judges respond directly to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Maryland with copies to the Administrative Office of the Courts.
- District Court administrative judges respond directly to the Chief Judge of the District Court, who prepares a final recommendation to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Maryland.

[3] Based on a statewide sufficiency of time survey sent to all judges and magistrates, three focus groups, and final recommendations from the Judicial Needs Assessment Advisory Work Group, the NCSC recommended case weight adjustments in three District Court case types: Domestic Violence Protective Orders, Large Claims/Other Civil, and DUI/DWI. The NCSC recommended case weight adjustments in two case types in the circuit courts: Family Law and Domestic Violence Protective Orders. The details of the basis for those adjustments are outlined in the *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers (November 2022)*.

The final phase of the certification process occurs when the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Maryland reviews the analysis from the Administrative Office of the Courts, any responses from circuit court county administrative judges, and the recommendation of the Chief Judge of the District Court and approves the certification and budgetary request.

Methodology

In brief, the weighted caseload model weights case filings to account for the varying degrees of complexity associated with specific case types and the amount of judicial time required to process the workload. Case weights represent the average bench and non-bench time (in minutes) required to reach a disposition in each case type. Different types of cases create different amounts of judicial work: for example, a felony case typically requires more judge time than a routine traffic case. Unlike methods of judicial resource allocation that are based on population or raw, unweighted caseloads, the weighted caseload method explicitly incorporates the differences in judicial workload associated with different types of cases, producing a more accurate and nuanced profile of the need for judges in each court. The weighted caseload method calculates judicial need based on each court's total workload. The weighted caseload formula consists of three critical elements:

1. Case filings, or the number of new cases of each type projected to be opened each year.
2. Case weights, which represent the average amount of judicial officer time required to handle cases of each type over the life of the case.
3. The year value, or the amount of time each judicial officer has available for case-related work in one year.

Total annual workload is calculated by multiplying the projected filings for each case type by the corresponding case weight, then summing the workload across all case types. Per the NCSC, the weighted caseload methodology requires the periodic reassessment of the case weights to

validate their accuracy taking into consideration legislative actions and other case-related changes over which a court effectively has little or no control. Such changes may affect the time it takes a judge to properly adjudicate a matter. The work by the NCSC to develop preliminary case weights is detailed in the *Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment Final Report, December 2017.*[4] The current case weights were originally established in 2017 through an intensive time study with significant judicial officer participation rates. All case weights went through a thorough quality adjustment process, initially in 2017 and most recently in 2022. This interim update was completed in November 2022 and is summarized in the *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers, November 2022.*[5]

After a court's total workload is established, it is then divided by the judge year value to determine the total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) judges needed to handle the workload.[6] An additional level of analysis is required in the circuit courts where judicial work is performed by both judges and magistrates. Primary analysis is first conducted by subtracting the work handled by a circuit court's current complement of magistrates from the total workload, where each magistrate is assumed to work a full magistrate workload. The remaining workload is then divided by the current complement of judges to determine if the estimated per-judge workload falls within the acceptable range of 0.85 to 1.1 FTE.[7] Jurisdictions that currently fall within the 0.85 to 1.1

[4] Kleiman, M., & Lee, C. (December 2017). *Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment Final Report.* National Center for State Courts.

[5] Tallarico, S., Boyce, E., Bell, B., & Slayton, D. (November 2022). *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers.* National Center for State Courts.

[6] The judge year value is based on a rigorous analysis conducted in 2017 combining elements of the time study as well as an analysis of judge leave data. The year value was adjusted in 2022 based on the recognition of the Juneteenth National Independence Day as a Maryland state holiday.

[7] The 2017 model update established an acceptable range of 0.9 FTE to 1.1 FTE for judicial resources. In 2022, the NCSC recommended temporarily adjusting the lower limit of the threshold from 0.9 FTE to 0.8 FTE to account for the impact of the pandemic on both new case filings and existing case backlog. The NCSC recommended gradually increasing this lower threshold by 0.025 FTE each year until a return to 0.9 FTE is reached in FY 2028. Based on this recommendation, the proper lower threshold for FY 2026 is 0.85 FTE. The upper limit, 1.1 FTE, used to indicate a need for additional judgeships remains unchanged.

FTE per-judge workload range are considered properly resourced. Where per-judge workload is greater than 1.1 FTE, the primary analysis indicates the need for additional resources. Where per-judge workload is below 0.85 FTE, the primary analysis indicates a decreased need for resources.

As prescribed by the NCSC, where the primary analysis shows a decreased need for resources, a secondary analysis should be employed in the circuit courts. Although the primary analysis is useful to determine whether a court has the correct number of resources, a secondary analysis is required to identify which type of resource, either magistrate or judge, should be adjusted to ensure the court is properly resourced. In accordance with the NCSC's guidance that the secondary analysis should also take into consideration the fact that magistrates are not authorized to perform the full range of judicial functions, the secondary analysis is conducted by first assigning work to existing judges, with each judge working within the acceptable workload range developed by the NCSC. Next, the remaining work is assigned to magistrates to determine the resulting magistrate need rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE. See Table 1 and Appendix A for judgeship needs in each circuit court. See Table 2 and Appendix B for the District Court judgeship needs.

Total judgeship need in the circuit courts is projected to be 178 judges statewide. The overall statewide increase of two judgeships reflects:

1) the application of the most recently developed case weights, incorporation into the model of current availability and use of magistrate resources and applying nationally regarded best practices for determining need on an individual judge workload basis, and
2) the results of a qualitative review of local conditions, capacity, and workforce factors to supplement the quantitative analysis.

Total judgeship need in the District Court is projected to be 114 judges statewide. Judge need was determined using the most current weighted caseload methodology, applying nationally regarded best practices for determining need on an individual judge workload basis. From a jurisdiction-specific perspective, the model indicates a decreased need for judges in Baltimore City, Howard County, and Montgomery County and a need for additional judges across three different counties: Dorchester, Washington, and Wicomico.

Table 1. Judgeships Requested in the Circuit Courts

FY 2026 - Based on Weighted Caseload Methodology and Qualitative Factors

Jurisdiction	FY 2025 Judges	FY 2025 Magistrates	FY 2026 Projected Need[8]	Additional Judges Needed in FY 2026	FY 2026 Requested Judgeships	FY 2026 Requested Magistrates
Allegany	2	1.6	2	-	-	-
Anne Arundel	13	6	13	-	-	-
Baltimore City	35	14	35	-	-	-
Baltimore Co.	21	9	21	-	-	-
Calvert	3	1	3	-	-	-
Caroline	1	1	1	-	-	-
Carroll	4	2	4	-	-	-
Cecil	4	1	4	-	-	-
Charles	5	3	5	-	-	-
Dorchester	1	1	1	-	-	-
Frederick	6	2	6	-	-	-
Garrett	1	1	1	-	-	-
Harford	6	3	6	-	-	-
Howard	5	3	5	-	-	-
Kent[9]	1	0	2	1	0	0
Montgomery	24	6	24	-	-	-
Prince George's	25	8	25	-	-	-
Queen Anne's	1	1	1	-	-	-
St. Mary's[10]	3	1	4	1	1	-
Somerset	1	1	1	-	-	-
Talbot	1	1	1	-	-	-
Washington	6	1	6	-	-	-
Wicomico	4	1	4	-	-	-
Worcester	3	1	3	-	-	-
Statewide	**176**	**69.6**	**178**	**2**	**1**	**0**

[8] Per the recommendation of the National Center for State Courts, where primary analysis predicts a decreased need for judicial resources, a secondary analysis is performed to analyze both current judge and magistrate resources to determine where resource adjustments should be made. The secondary analysis used requires first assigning work to existing judges until an average per-judge workload within the acceptable range is reached and then assigning remaining work to magistrates, rounding magistrate need up to the nearest 0.25 FTE. Based on this secondary analysis, magistrate need decreases in Baltimore City by 9.25 magistrates, Calvert County by 0.5 magistrates, Carroll County by 1.25 magistrates, Charles County by 0.75 magistrates, Harford County by 0.25 magistrates, Washington County by 0.25 magistrates, and Worcester County by 1.0 magistrates.

[9] The FY 2026 per-judge workload in the Circuit Court for Kent County is estimated to be 1.12 FTE, slightly above the upper limit of 1.10 FTE. While the model certifies the need for an additional judgeship, this need could be satisfied by the addition of a part-time magistrate.

[10] For St. Mary's County, a qualitative review of local conditions, capacity, and workforce factors indicate a need for an additional judgeship. The Judiciary is working with the Circuit Court for St. Mary's County to assess current and projected needs in relation to available resources.

Table 2. Judgeships Requested in the District Court

FY 2026 - Based on Weighted Caseload Methodology

Jurisdiction	FY 2025 Judges	FY 2025 Projected Need	Additional Judges Needed in FY 2026[11]	FY 2026 Requested Judgeships
Allegany	2	2	-	-
Anne Arundel	10	10	-	-
Baltimore City	28	19	-	-
Baltimore County	15	15	-	-
Calvert	2	2	-	-
Caroline	1	1	-	-
Carroll	2	2	-	-
Cecil	2	2	-	-
Charles	3	3	-	-
Dorchester	1	2	1	-
Frederick	3	3	-	-
Garrett	1	1	-	-
Harford	4	4	-	-
Howard	5	3	-	-
Kent	1	1	-	-
Montgomery	13	12	-	-
Prince George's	19	19	-	-
Queen Anne's	1	1	-	-
St. Mary's	2	2	-	-
Somerset	1	1	-	-
Talbot	1	1	-	-
Washington	2	3	1	-
Wicomico	2	3	1	-
Worcester	2	2	-	-
Statewide	**123**	**114**	**3**	**0**

[11] Additional Judges Needed Statewide total shows sum of all counties where additional judges are needed. When including counties where the model suggests a decreased judge need, the statewide total need for FY 2026 is projected to be 114 judges.

General Trends in the Circuit Courts

After multiple years of decreasing original filings, new filings have increased each year since FY 2021. The approximately 135,000 new filings in FY 2024 represent a nearly 3% increase from FY 2023 and a 22% increase from FY 2021. However, new filings have not yet returned to pre-COVID-19 levels, with the FY 2024 filings representing a 13.5% decrease from FY 2019 (approximately 21,000 fewer filings). Table 3 presents the new case filings by case category from FY 2015 to FY 2024.[12]

Table 3. Circuit Court Statewide Original Filings FY 2015 to FY 2024

Fiscal Year	Criminal	Civil	Family	Juvenile	Total Filings	% Change From Previous Year
FY 2015	48,008	60,001	60,060	14,430	182,499	*N/A*
FY 2016	45,698	56,483	62,694	13,701	178,576	-2.1%
FY 2017	41,390	48,002	61,613	13,021	164,026	-8.1%
FY 2018	39,387	48,512	59,493	11,480	158,872	-3.1%
FY 2019	37,632	48,333	59,817	9,840	155,622	-2.0%
FY 2020	27,393	40,080	49,501	8,172	125,146	-19.6%
FY 2021	26,300	28,833	50,041	5,139	110,313	-11.9%
FY 2022	27,539	33,069	55,250	5,740	121,598	10.2%
FY 2023	29,186	39,442	55,974	6,282	130,884	7.6%
FY 2024	28,167	40,043	58,335	8,086	134,631	2.9%

The current analysis of the circuit courts reflects a comparison of case filings by case category from FY 2019 to FY 2024 with a focus on three single-year periods: FY 2019 (the most recent full year of data unaffected by COVID-19) and FY 2023 and FY 2024 (the two most recent complete years of data).

[12] Circuit court case types and categories as defined in the NCSC report are as follows: 1) The Criminal case category includes Criminal Indictments and Information, Jury Trial Prayer and Criminal Appeal, Adult Drug Court, and Other Problem-Solving Courts (2) the Civil case category includes Foreclosure, Contract, Tort, Other Civil, and Civil Appeal (3) the Juvenile case category includes CINA, CINS/Other Juvenile, Delinquency, TPR and Guardianships, Juvenile Drug Court, and Truancy Reduction Program (4) The Family case category includes Domestic Violence Protective Orders, Family Law, Civil Adoptions, Paternity and Non-Support, and Other Guardianships.

The overall trends observed in case filings are seen in each of the four case type categories except for Criminal filings. Civil, Family, and Juvenile case filings increased from FY 2023 to FY 2024 with the Family case category seeing the largest increase (2,361 more filings in FY 2024). Criminal filings in FY 2024 decreased from FY 2023 (approximately 1,000 fewer filings in FY 2024 compared to FY 2023). The Criminal case category also saw the largest decrease in filings from FY 2019 to FY 2024 (approximately 9,400 fewer filings). Family cases saw the smallest decrease in new filings from FY 2019 to FY 2024 (approximately 1,500 fewer filings). Trends specific to original filings in each case type are detailed more fully below.

Criminal. The approximately 28,000 Criminal case filings in FY 2024 represent a 3.5% decrease from FY 2023 and a 25.2% decrease from FY 2019 (approximately 9,500 fewer filings). The decrease in Criminal case filings from FY 2023 to FY 2024 was driven by an 8.4% decrease in the Criminal Indictments and Information case type (approximately 1,300 fewer filings). However, the Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals case type saw a 1.2% increase (approximately 150 filings). There was also an increase in Adult Drug Court case filings (327 in FY 2023 to 560 in FY 2024).

Civil. The total number of Civil case filings remained relatively stable from FY 2023 to FY 2024 (increasing 1.5%, approximately 600 more filings). There was an almost 12% decrease in Foreclosure case filings (approximately 1,400 fewer filings) that was offset by increases in the remaining Civil case types (Civil Appeals, Contract, and Other Civil). The largest increase was seen in Contract case filings with an 18.2% increase (approximately 800 more filings). There was an 8.3% increase in Civil Appeals (approximately 300 more filings), a 5.9% increase in Other Civil

(approximately 650 more filings), and a 2.8% increase in Torts (approximately 200 more filings) from FY 2023 to FY 2024.[13]

Despite recent increases, total Civil case filings in FY 2024 represent a 17.2% decrease from FY 2019 (approximately 8,300 fewer filings). Contract case filings are the only case category to increase with a 24.3% increase (approximately 1,000 additional filings) in FY 2024 compared to FY 2019.

Family. The 4.2% increase in Family case filings from FY 2023 to FY 2024 is primarily due to a 5.1% increase in Family Law cases (with FY 2024 recording approximately 2,000 more Family Law cases than in FY 2023). Civil Adoptions and Domestic Violence Protective Orders decreased from FY 2023 to FY 2024; however, these decreases represent a combined total of approximately 100 filings.

Despite recent increases, new Family case filings in FY 2024 represent a 2.5% decrease from FY 2019 (approximately 1,500 fewer filings) driven by a decrease in the Paternity and Non-Support Case Type (approximately 2,900 fewer filings in FY 2024 than in FY 2019). Domestic Violence Protective Orders, Family Law, and Other Guardianship case types each increased from FY 2019 to FY 2024 (186 additional filings, 974 additional filings, and 358 additional filings, respectively).

Juvenile. The 28.7% increase in Juvenile case filings from FY 2023 to FY 2024 is primarily due to an almost 50% increase in Delinquency cases (with FY 2024 recording approximately 1,700 more Delinquency cases than in FY 2023). CINA and TPR and

[13] As first detailed in the *FY 2021 Analysis of Need for Additional Judgeships in the Judicial Branch* report, using a weighted caseload model does not accurately depict judicial workload for asbestos cases based on filings. While the Circuit Court for Baltimore City continues to process the backlog of asbestos cases, the current model reserves two judges and 0.25 magistrate FTE in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City specifically to handle asbestos matters. Therefore, asbestos filings have been removed from the overall count of civil case filings during these periods. This is consistent with the *FY 2025 Analysis of Need for Additional Judgeships in the Judicial Branch* report.

Guardianships cases decreased from FY 2023 to FY 2024; however, these decreases represent a combined total of approximately 160 filings.

Despite recent increases, new Juvenile case filings in FY 2024 represent a nearly 18% decrease from FY2019 (approximately 1,700 fewer filings). The decrease is driven by decreases in the CINA and Delinquency case types (899 fewer filings and 832 fewer filings, respectively). The Juvenile Drug Court and Truancy Reduction Program case types increased by a combined 22 new filings.

General Trends in the District Court

In FY2024, original filings in the District Court decreased 2.4% (approximately 27,000 fewer filings) compared to FY 2023. The approximately 1.1 million new filings in FY 2024 marked a nearly 34% decrease from pre-COVID levels observed in FY 2019. Table 4 presents new case filings in the District Court by case category from FY 2015 to FY 2024.[14]

[14] District Court case types and categories as defined in the NCSC report are as follows: 1) The Criminal case category includes Other Criminal, Violations of Probation, Drug Court, and Mental Health Court (2) the Civil case category includes Civil Infractions/Regulations, Small Claims, and Large Claims/Other Civil (3) the Landlord-Tenant case category includes Failure to Pay Rent as well as Rent Escrow and Other Landlord-Tenant (4) The Traffic case category includes Serious Traffic, Routine Traffic, and DUI/DWI (5) The Domestic Violence Protective Orders (DVPO) category includes Domestic Violence Protective Orders and Peace Orders.

Table 4. District Court Statewide Original Filings FY 2015 to FY 2024

Fiscal Year	Civil	Landlord-Tenant	Traffic	Criminal	DVPO	Total Filings	% Change From Previous Year
FY 2015	255,214	623,464	530,422	194,911	44,821	1,648,832	*N/A*
FY 2016	280,442	647,714	502,879	191,652	47,444	1,670,131	1.3%
FY 2017	306,617	650,549	477,016	181,050	48,263	1,663,495	-0.4%
FY 2018	305,380	663,348	486,895	174,981	47,021	1,677,625	0.8%
FY 2019	297,547	674,162	479,629	158,589	47,135	1,657,062	-1.2%
FY 2020	314,608	514,856	399,958	132,548	47,621	1,409,591	-14.9%
FY 2021	197,528	327,995	313,674	110,667	51,428	1,001,292	-29.0%
FY 2022	228,074	320,646	295,541	110,996	41,355	996,612	-0.5%
FY 2023	240,130	412,153	306,235	115,295	50,921	1,124,734	12.9%
FY 2024	249,407	404,175	271,545	122,052	50,408	1,097,587	-2.4%

The current analysis of the District Court reflects a comparison of case filings by case category from FY 2019 to FY 2024 with a focus on three single-year periods: FY 2019 (the most recent full year of data unaffected by COVID-19) and FY 2023 and FY 2024 (the two most recent complete years of data).

The decrease in total case filings from FY 2023 to FY 2024 was driven by an 11.3% decrease in Traffic filings (approximately 34,700 fewer filings). Landlord-Tenant filings and DVPO filings also decreased during this time. Civil and Criminal filings increased from FY 2023 to FY 2024 but did not outpace the decreases observed in other case categories (3.9% increase, approximately 9,300 additional filings and 5.9%, approximately 6,700 additional filings, respectively).

The DVPO case category increased nearly 7% from FY 2019 to FY 2024 (approximately 3,300 more filings) while all other case categories decreased during the same timeframe. The Traffic case category saw the largest decrease in filings with a 43.4% decrease from FY 2019 to FY 2024 (approximately 208,000 fewer filings). The Landlord-Tenant case type saw the largest

numeric decrease from FY 2019 to FY 2024 (40% decrease, approximately 270,000 fewer filings). Trends specific to original filings in each case type are detailed more fully below.

Civil. Filings have increased each year since FY 2021. The approximately 249,400 Civil filings in FY 2024 represent a 3.9% increase from FY 2023. Despite recent increases, Civil case filings in FY 2024 represent a 16.2% decrease from FY 2019 (approximately 48,000 fewer filings).

From FY 2023 to FY 2024, there was a 33.2% decrease in the Civil Infractions/Regulations case type (approximately 31,000 fewer filings) that was offset by increases in the other Civil case types (Small Claims and Large Claims/Other Civil). The largest increase was seen in Small Claims case filings with an almost 37% increase (approximately 34,000 more filings). The Large Claims/Other Civil case type saw an almost 12% increase between FY 2023 and FY 2024 (approximately 6,500 more filings).

Landlord-Tenant. The approximately 404,000 Landlord-Tenant filings in FY 2024 represent a 1.9% decrease from FY 2023 (approximately 8,000 fewer filings) and 40% decrease from FY 2019 (approximately 270,000 fewer filings). Decreases were seen in both Landlord-Tenant case types, with Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay filings decreasing nearly 2% (approximately 6,700 fewer filings) and Other Landlord-Tenant filings decreasing 15% (approximately 1,300 fewer filings) between FY 2023 and FY 2024.

Traffic. The approximately 271,500 Traffic filings in FY 2024 represent an 11.3% decrease from FY 2023 (approximately 34,700 fewer filings) and 43.4% decrease from FY 2019 (approximately 208,000) fewer filings. Decreases were seen in the Routine Traffic and DUI/DWI case types in FY 2024 compared to FY 2023 (15.5% decrease, approximately 35,000 fewer filings and 9.8% decrease, approximately 1,400 fewer filings, respectively), while Serious Traffic filings increased 2.2% (approximately 1,500 more filings in FY 2024 compared to FY 2023).

Criminal. Filings have increased each year since FY 2021. The approximately 122,000 new filings in FY 2024 represent a 5.9% increase from FY 2023 (approximately 6,800 more filings) but have decreased 23% from FY 2019 (approximately 36,500 fewer filings). The increase in Criminal case filings from FY 2023 to FY 2024 was primarily a result of increases in the Other Criminal (5% increase, approximately 5,000 more filings) and Violations of Probation (7% increase, approximately 1,300 more filings) case types.

Domestic Violence Protective Orders. The approximately 50,400 DVPO case filings in FY 2024 represent a 1% decrease from FY 2023 (approximately 500 fewer filings) and a 6.9% increase from FY 2019 (approximately 3,300 more filings). Although there was a less than one percent increase in Peace Orders between FY 2023 and FY 2024, it was outpaced by a 2.1% decrease in Domestic Violence Protective Orders (670 fewer filings in FY 2024 compared to FY 2023).

DVPO was the only case category that saw an increase in FY 2024 compared to FY 2019 with both case types seeing increases. Peace Orders increased 15.3% (approximately 2,600 more filings in FY 2024) and Domestic Violence Protective Orders increased 2.2% (650 more filings in FY 2024).

Bail Review and Expungements

Judicial case processing work on criminal and some traffic matters may not be declining at a rate commensurate with the decline in criminal filings. The original case weights in the current model were based on data collected on judge case processing work in 2016, coupled with case filing averages from FY 2013 to 2015. As noted previously, that work established the case weights, or average judge time per case type. As the NCSC identified in the *2017 Maryland Judiciary*

Workload Assessment Final Report[15], interim adjustments to the workload formula that reflect changes in legislation and court practices should be implemented where appropriate. In February 2017, new laws were adopted to change the bail review process. This led to a notable increase in the amount of time judges and commissioners spend reviewing and properly documenting bail for each case. In October 2017 and 2018, Maryland's expungement laws changed, expanding the list of criminal offenses eligible for expungement and increasing the expungement caseloads for judges hearing criminal and criminal traffic cases. The number of expungements handled has increased each year since FY 2022 and the 45,127 expungements handled in FY 2024 represents a 17% increase from FY 2023 (approximately 6,600 more expungements). However, the three-year average including FY 2019, FY 2023, and FY2024 (52,733) is 46% greater than the FY 2013 to FY 2015 average (36,210), the time that the original case weights were based upon.

The number of bail review events in the District Court has increased each year since FY 2021. The 45,864 bail review events in FY 2024 were slightly greater than the 45,292 bail review events seen in FY 2019 (the last full fiscal year of data available prior to the COVID-impacted fiscal years). During the 2022 model interim update evaluation, several judges noted bail review had become more complex compared to the last time-study period. While no bail review or expungement-specific adjustments were made as part of the 2022 interim update, the NCSC advised the Judiciary to explicitly track bail review activity in the next weighted caseload study to determine whether, and by how much, these changes have impacted case processing times in criminal cases. The next full model update, expected to be completed by FY 2027, will seek to separately account for judge work associated with bail review and expungement activity.

[15] Kleiman, M., & Lee, C. (December 2017). *Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment Final Report.* National Center for State Courts.

Interim Update and Next Steps

For the FY 2024 budget year, the NCSC specifically recommended that the Judiciary use FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020 filings to determine judicial staffing needs, since these are the most recent three years of data least affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Starting with the FY 2025 budget year, the NCSC provided broader guidance, instructing the Judiciary to monitor filing trends and case backlog to make the most accurate assessment of future workload.

While the 2022 interim update resulted in case weight adjustments across a select few case types, judges did express concern about the increased complexity of additional case types such as criminal cases in the District Court and Jury Trial Prayer and Criminal Appeals in the circuit courts. The workgroup ultimately decided to wait until the next full model update to determine if those numbers need to be adjusted.

When determining judicial resource need levels, the NCSC recommends that the Judiciary temporarily decrease the lower limit that determines the threshold of appropriate resourcing levels. During the 2017 model update, a rounding convention for determining judge need was established in which the average workload per-judge in each court should not exceed 1.1 FTE and where possible should not fall below 0.90 FTE. While this rounding convention is a useful tool to monitor workload across courts, in the *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers,*[16] the NCSC recommended that the Judiciary temporarily reduce the lower end of the range from which to determine need from 0.90 FTE to 0.80 FTE for the FY 2024 budget year. The NCSC recommended that the Judiciary incrementally increase the lower range by 0.025 FTE for each subsequent projection year until a return to 0.90 FTE is

[16] Tallarico, S., Boyce, E., Bell, B., & Slayton, D. (November 2022). *State of Maryland Limited Scope Workload Adjustment for District and Circuit Court Judicial Officers.* National Center for State Courts.

achieved.[17] The Judiciary continues to follow this recommendation to ensure there are sufficient resources in each jurisdiction to serve people who come before the courts.

Despite the utility of the 2022 interim model update, the NCSC has recommended a full workload assessment study, with a full judicial officer time study to be conducted no later than 2027. Best practices indicate a workload assessment model be updated every seven to ten years, to ensure current practices are incorporated into the case weights that determine judicial workload. As the last model update featuring a statewide time study was completed in 2017, conducting a new full-scale model update no later than 2027 would meet the ten-year timeframe.

[17] The NCSC recommended the following incremental increases in applying the lower range of workload to judicial officer need: FY 2024 budget = 0.80 FTE lower limit; FY 2025 budget = 0.825 FTE lower limit; FY 2026 budget = 0.85 FTE lower limit; FY 2027 budget = 0.875 FTE lower limit; FY 2028 budget and beyond = 0.9 FTE lower limit.

APPENDIX A:

CIRCUIT COURTS – JUDGE NEED BY COUNTY/CITY

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

First Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Dorchester	Adult Drug Court	0	0
	CINA	10	4,526
	CINS/Other Juvenile	33	3,433
	Civil Adoptions	4	234
	Civil Appeals	27	1,080
	Contract	17	1,768
	Criminal Indictments and Information	137	25,011
	Delinquency	90	9,720
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	65	4,442
	Family Law	267	44,109
	Foreclosure	110	990
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	193	7,720
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	190	15,036
	Other Guardianships	18	917
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	117	4,550
	Torts	21	2,331
	TPR and Guardianships	8	1,840
	Truancy Reduction Program	51	13,413
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**1,358**	**159,615**

Current Judges
1.0

Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
159,615	80,640	78,975	1.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

First Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Somerset	Adult Drug Court	12	6,708
	CINA	7	3,122
	CINS/Other Juvenile	38	3,948
	Civil Adoptions	2	90
	Civil Appeals	49	1,960
	Contract	9	902
	Criminal Indictments and Information	78	14,334
	Delinquency	33	3,600
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	31	2,086
	Family Law	179	29,589
	Foreclosure	100	897
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	169	6,747
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	55	4,319
	Other Guardianships	11	566
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	136	5,291
	Torts	14	1,517
	TPR and Guardianships	5	1,226
	Truancy Reduction Program	23	6,049
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**951**	**111,446**

Current Judges
1.0
Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
111,446	80,640	30,806	1.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

First Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Wicomico	Adult Drug Court	26	13,964
	CINA	6	2,808
	CINS/Other Juvenile	55	5,699
	Civil Adoptions	12	630
	Civil Appeals	60	2,387
	Contract	36	3,778
	Criminal Indictments and Information	486	88,938
	Delinquency	145	15,660
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	124	8,454
	Family Law	844	139,206
	Foreclosure	219	1,971
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	182	7,293
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	104	8,190
	Other Guardianships	61	3,034
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	280	10,933
	Torts	86	9,546
	TPR and Guardianships	7	1,534
	Truancy Reduction Program	39	10,257
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**2,772**	**352,777**

Current Judges
4.0

Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
352,777	**80,640**	**272,137**	**4.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

First Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Worcester	Adult Drug Court	12	6,348
	CINA	26	12,014
	CINS/Other Juvenile	49	5,081
	Civil Adoptions	7	378
	Civil Appeals	35	1,413
	Contract	39	4,090
	Criminal Indictments and Information	215	39,285
	Delinquency	77	8,352
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	27	1,814
	Family Law	339	55,989
	Foreclosure	125	1,125
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	98	3,920
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	81	6,425
	Other Guardianships	23	1,167
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	1	326
	Paternity and Non-Support	87	3,393
	Torts	58	6,401
	TPR and Guardianships	10	2,224
	Truancy Reduction Program	33	8,679
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**1,342**	**186,919**

Current Judges
3.0
Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
186,919	**80,640**	**106,279**	**3.0**

* Magistrate Work is shown in minutes based on the proposed number of magistrates needed given the current number of judges working within the per judge workload range established by the National Center for State Courts. Rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE, current magistrate need can be satisfied with 0.0 magistrates.

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Caroline	Adult Drug Court	7	3,808
	CINA	4	1,718
	CINS/Other Juvenile	3	275
	Civil Adoptions	5	270
	Civil Appeals	19	747
	Contract	17	1,768
	Criminal Indictments and Information	99	18,117
	Delinquency	37	3,960
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	62	4,216
	Family Law	281	46,365
	Foreclosure	100	897
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	203	8,107
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	56	4,424
	Other Guardianships	18	916
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	76	2,951
	Torts	19	2,072
	TPR and Guardianships	7	1,686
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**1,013**	**120,792**

Current Judges
1.0
Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
120,792	**80,640**	**40,152**	**1.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Cecil	Adult Drug Court	46	25,204
	CINA	38	17,938
	CINS/Other Juvenile	3	309
	Civil Adoptions	21	1,152
	Civil Appeals	70	2,800
	Contract	56	5,824
	Criminal Indictments and Information	316	57,828
	Delinquency	82	8,856
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	140	9,520
	Family Law	734	121,164
	Foreclosure	264	2,376
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	922	36,880
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	120	9,454
	Other Guardianships	47	2,350
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	202	7,878
	Torts	116	12,876
	TPR and Guardianships	33	7,666
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**3,210**	**348,570**

Current Judges
4.0
Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
348,570	**80,640**	**267,930**	**4.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Kent	Adult Drug Court	0	0
	CINA	3	1,404
	CINS/Other Juvenile	41	4,189
	Civil Adoptions	1	36
	Civil Appeals	10	413
	Contract	12	1,214
	Criminal Indictments and Information	50	9,210
	Delinquency	15	1,620
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	30	2,018
	Family Law	118	19,415
	Foreclosure	65	582
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	151	6,040
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	107	8,479
	Other Guardianships	10	500
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	32	1,261
	Torts	9	1,036
	TPR and Guardianships	1	230
	Truancy Reduction Program	27	7,014
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**682**	**83,156**

Current Judges
1.0
Current Magistrates
0.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
83,156	**0**	**83,156**	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Queen Anne's	Adult Drug Court	4	2,176
	CINA	3	1,558
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	69
	Civil Adoptions	7	360
	Civil Appeals	18	733
	Contract	25	2,600
	Criminal Indictments and Information	93	16,959
	Delinquency	20	2,124
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	38	2,562
	Family Law	289	47,739
	Foreclosure	114	1,023
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	489	19,560
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	128	10,086
	Other Guardianships	15	734
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	47	1,820
	Torts	34	3,774
	TPR and Guardianships	3	690
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**1,328**	**133,062**

Current Judges
1.0

Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
133,062	**80,640**	**52,422**	**1.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Talbot	Adult Drug Court	5	2,720
	CINA	5	2,186
	CINS/Other Juvenile	0	34
	Civil Adoptions	2	126
	Civil Appeals	20	800
	Contract	20	2,046
	Criminal Indictments and Information	112	20,556
	Delinquency	37	3,960
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	22	1,474
	Family Law	222	36,576
	Foreclosure	56	501
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	124	4,973
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	46	3,660
	Other Guardianships	13	650
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	2	652
	Paternity and Non-Support	45	1,755
	Torts	36	3,959
	TPR and Guardianships	2	460
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**769**	**105,583**

Current Judges
1.0

Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
105,583	80,640	24,943	1.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Third Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Baltimore County	Adult Drug Court	11	5,984
	CINA	276	129,168
	CINS/Other Juvenile	7	721
	Civil Adoptions	123	6,624
	Civil Appeals	697	27,880
	Contract	549	57,096
	Criminal Indictments and Information	2,429	444,447
	Delinquency	943	101,808
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	536	36,470
	Family Law	5,390	889,350
	Foreclosure	1,588	14,289
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	3,089	123,560
	Juvenile Drug Court	6	1,514
	Other Civil	1,631	128,875
	Other Guardianships	502	25,100
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	14	4,672
	Paternity and Non-Support	1,147	44,746
	Torts	1,118	124,135
	TPR and Guardianships	93	21,390
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	36,990
	Total	**20,149**	**2,224,819**

Current Judges
21.0
Current Magistrates
9.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
2,224,819	725,760	1,499,059	21.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Third Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Harford	Adult Drug Court	15	8,340
	CINA	107	50,230
	CINS/Other Juvenile	30	3,090
	Civil Adoptions	45	2,448
	Civil Appeals	129	5,147
	Contract	118	12,272
	Criminal Indictments and Information	508	92,904
	Delinquency	160	17,244
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	313	21,306
	Family Law	1,533	252,999
	Foreclosure	437	3,933
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	849	33,973
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	264	20,882
	Other Guardianships	91	4,567
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	8	2,608
	Paternity and Non-Support	337	13,143
	Torts	216	23,976
	TPR and Guardianships	46	10,504
	Truancy Reduction Program	12	3,069
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**5,218**	**601,130**

Current Judges
6.0
Current Magistrates
3.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
601,130	241,920	359,210	6.0

* Magistrate Work is shown in minutes based on the proposed number of magistrates needed given the current number of judges working within the per judge workload range established by the National Center for State Courts. Rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE, current magistrate need can be satisfied with 2.75 magistrates.

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Fourth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Allegany	Adult Drug Court	27	14,688
	CINA	34	15,912
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	69
	Civil Adoptions	13	684
	Civil Appeals	155	6,200
	Contract	13	1,386
	Criminal Indictments and Information	340	62,280
	Delinquency	59	6,336
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	58	3,944
	Family Law	522	86,076
	Foreclosure	225	2,025
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	544	21,773
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	88	6,978
	Other Guardianships	36	1,784
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	294	11,466
	Torts	54	6,031
	TPR and Guardianships	25	5,750
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**2,488**	**271,877**

Current Judges
2.0

Current Magistrates
1.60

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
271,877	129,024	142,853	2.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Fourth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Garrett	Adult Drug Court	0	0
	CINA	23	10,918
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	69
	Civil Adoptions	4	234
	Civil Appeals	12	467
	Contract	18	1,872
	Criminal Indictments and Information	61	11,223
	Delinquency	18	1,908
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	8	522
	Family Law	180	29,646
	Foreclosure	56	501
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	65	2,600
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	49	3,897
	Other Guardianships	6	316
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	73	2,860
	Torts	18	1,998
	TPR and Guardianships	16	3,680
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**608**	**91,206**

Current Judges
1.0

Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
91,206	20,160	71,046	1.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Fourth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Washington	Adult Drug Court	7	3,628
	CINA	50	23,400
	CINS/Other Juvenile	4	446
	Civil Adoptions	21	1,134
	Civil Appeals	104	4,147
	Contract	58	5,998
	Criminal Indictments and Information	515	94,305
	Delinquency	170	18,396
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	171	11,628
	Family Law	1,223	201,741
	Foreclosure	260	2,340
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	272	10,880
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	124	9,822
	Other Guardianships	47	2,350
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	710	27,677
	Torts	103	11,396
	TPR and Guardianships	22	4,984
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**3,861**	**452,767**

Current Judges
6.0

Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
452,767	**80,640**	**372,127**	**6.0**

* Magistrate Work is shown in minutes based on the proposed number of magistrates needed given the current number of judges working within the per judge workload range established by the National Center for State Courts. Rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE, current magistrate need can be satisfied with 0.75 magistrates.

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Fifth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Anne Arundel	Adult Drug Court	59	31,916
	CINA	48	22,310
	CINS/Other Juvenile	3	309
	Civil Adoptions	84	4,536
	Civil Appeals	367	14,693
	Contract	356	37,024
	Criminal Indictments and Information	1,341	245,403
	Delinquency	497	53,676
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	366	24,866
	Family Law	3,769	621,830
	Foreclosure	975	8,778
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	1,015	40,600
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	1,043	82,371
	Other Guardianships	216	10,783
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	464	18,109
	Torts	609	67,636
	TPR and Guardianships	19	4,294
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	36,990
	Total	**11,231**	**1,326,124**

Current Judges
13.0

Current Magistrates
6.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
1,326,124	**483,840**	**842,284**	**13.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Fifth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Carroll	Adult Drug Court	22	12,147
	CINA	18	8,424
	CINS/Other Juvenile	2	240
	Civil Adoptions	22	1,188
	Civil Appeals	87	3,480
	Contract	77	7,974
	Criminal Indictments and Information	156	28,548
	Delinquency	48	5,148
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	181	12,286
	Family Law	940	155,100
	Foreclosure	220	1,983
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	677	27,067
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	124	9,822
	Other Guardianships	73	3,650
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	125	4,875
	Torts	113	12,543
	TPR and Guardianships	9	2,070
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**2,894**	**315,040**

Current Judges
4.0
Current Magistrates
2.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
315,040	161,280	153,760	4.0

* Magistrate Work is shown in minutes based on the proposed number of magistrates needed given the current number of judges working within the per judge workload range established by the National Center for State Courts. Rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE, current magistrate need can be satisfied with 0.75 magistrates.

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Fifth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Howard	Adult Drug Court	0	0
	CINA	42	19,810
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	137
	Civil Adoptions	25	1,350
	Civil Appeals	176	7,027
	Contract	208	21,632
	Criminal Indictments and Information	383	70,029
	Delinquency	181	19,548
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	244	16,592
	Family Law	1,839	303,489
	Foreclosure	277	2,496
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	342	13,680
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	583	46,031
	Other Guardianships	194	9,716
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	217	8,476
	Torts	268	29,785
	TPR and Guardianships	9	2,070
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**4,989**	**590,363**

Current Judges
5.0
Current Magistrates
3.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
590,363	**241,920**	**348,443**	**5.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Sixth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Frederick	Adult Drug Court	22	11,968
	CINA	29	13,572
	CINS/Other Juvenile	3	309
	Civil Adoptions	41	2,196
	Civil Appeals	120	4,787
	Contract	119	12,342
	Criminal Indictments and Information	451	82,473
	Delinquency	133	14,364
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	280	19,017
	Family Law	1,735	286,275
	Foreclosure	356	3,204
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	768	30,720
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	165	13,061
	Other Guardianships	87	4,366
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	360	14,053
	Torts	177	19,684
	TPR and Guardianships	33	7,514
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**4,879**	**558,400**

Current Judges
6.0
Current Magistrates
2.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
558,400	161,280	397,120	6.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Sixth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Montgomery	Adult Drug Court	30	16,320
	CINA	138	64,430
	CINS/Other Juvenile	92	9,476
	Civil Adoptions	113	6,120
	Civil Appeals	426	17,053
	Contract	1,764	183,422
	Criminal Indictments and Information	1,258	230,214
	Delinquency	515	55,584
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	476	32,390
	Family Law	6,536	1,078,385
	Foreclosure	961	8,652
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	371	14,853
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	2,999	236,895
	Other Guardianships	494	24,700
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	7	2,390
	Paternity and Non-Support	781	30,446
	Torts	1,016	112,813
	TPR and Guardianships	53	12,190
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	36,990
	Total	**18,030**	**2,173,323**

Current Judges
24.0

Current Magistrates
6.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
2,173,323	**483,840**	**1,689,483**	**24.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Calvert	Adult Drug Court	48	26,112
	CINA	16	7,488
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	69
	Civil Adoptions	15	828
	Civil Appeals	54	2,173
	Contract	46	4,750
	Criminal Indictments and Information	149	27,207
	Delinquency	50	5,436
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	79	5,349
	Family Law	551	90,860
	Foreclosure	222	2,001
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	95	3,813
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	225	17,775
	Other Guardianships	31	1,534
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0
	Paternity and Non-Support	116	4,511
	Torts	94	10,471
	TPR and Guardianships	8	1,840
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**1,800**	**230,712**

Current Judges
3.0
Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
230,712	**80,640**	**150,072**	**3.0**

* Magistrate Work is shown in minutes based on the proposed number of magistrates needed given the current number of judges working within the per judge workload range established by the National Center for State Courts. Rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE, current magistrate need can be satisfied with 0.5 magistrates.

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Charles	Adult Drug Court	11	6,164
	CINA	13	6,238
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	137
	Civil Adoptions	20	1,080
	Civil Appeals	118	4,707
	Contract	102	10,608
	Criminal Indictments and Information	567	103,761
	Delinquency	119	12,852
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	285	19,402
	Family Law	1,442	237,876
	Foreclosure	467	4,200
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	340	13,587
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	170	13,404
	Other Guardianships	127	6,333
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	9	2,934
	Paternity and Non-Support	226	8,827
	Torts	223	24,716
	TPR and Guardianships	8	1,764
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**4,248**	**497,085**

Current Judges
5.0
Current Magistrates
3.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
497,085	241,920	255,165	5.0

* Magistrate Work is shown in minutes based on the proposed number of magistrates needed given the current number of judges working within the per judge workload range established by the National Center for State Courts. Rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE, current magistrate need can be satisfied with 2.25 magistrates.

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Prince George's	Adult Drug Court	19	10,336
	CINA	178	83,458
	CINS/Other Juvenile	5	549
	Civil Adoptions	47	2,556
	Civil Appeals	580	23,187
	Contract	767	79,734
	Criminal Indictments and Information	2,306	421,998
	Delinquency	623	67,320
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	695	47,282
	Family Law	7,545	1,244,979
	Foreclosure	2,539	22,848
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	1,359	54,373
	Juvenile Drug Court	17	4,451
	Other Civil	1,026	81,080
	Other Guardianships	666	33,300
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	11	3,586
	Paternity and Non-Support	1,367	53,326
	Torts	1,828	202,908
	TPR and Guardianships	34	7,820
	Truancy Reduction Program	32	8,416
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	36,990
	Total	**21,644**	**2,490,497**

Current Judges
25.0

Current Magistrates
8.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
2,490,497	645,120	1,845,377	25.0

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
St. Mary's	Adult Drug Court	14	7,436
	CINA	21	9,674
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	69
	Civil Adoptions	17	918
	Civil Appeals	41	1,627
	Contract	34	3,536
	Criminal Indictments and Information	295	53,925
	Delinquency	57	6,192
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	125	8,477
	Family Law	705	116,270
	Foreclosure	201	1,809
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	135	5,387
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	358	28,256
	Other Guardianships	34	1,683
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	7	2,390
	Paternity and Non-Support	171	6,682
	Torts	107	11,840
	TPR and Guardianships	14	3,220
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	18,495
	Total	**2,337**	**287,886**

Current Judges
3.0
Current Magistrates
1.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
287,886	**80,640**	**207,246**	**3.0**

* Rounded Judge Need is calculated based on the quantitative analysis of resources and filing trends described in this report. For St. Mary's County, a qualitative review of local conditions and other pertinent factors indicates a need for one additional judgeship. The Judiciary is working with the Circuit Court for St. Mary's County to assess current and projected needs in relation to available resources,

FY 2026 Projected Judge Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Eighth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023 and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Baltimore City	Adult Drug Court	47	25,748
	CINA	552	258,336
	CINS/Other Juvenile	189	19,433
	Civil Adoptions	27	1,458
	Civil Appeals	716	28,640
	Contract	390	40,526
	Criminal Indictments and Information	3,495	639,645
	Delinquency	873	94,248
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	338	22,984
	Family Law	3,795	626,121
	Foreclosure	3,709	33,381
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	2,766	110,627
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0
	Other Civil	2,243	177,197
	Other Guardianships	464	23,200
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	100	32,492
	Paternity and Non-Support	999	38,961
	Torts	1,708	189,551
	TPR and Guardianships	175	40,250
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	36,990
	Total	**22,586**	**2,439,788**

Current Judges
35.0

Current Magistrates
14.00

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judge Need
2,439,788	**1,108,800**	**1,330,988**	**35.0**

* Magistrate Work is shown in minutes based on the proposed number of magistrates needed given the current number of judges working within the per judge workload range established by the National Center for State Courts. Rounded up to the nearest 0.25 FTE, current magistrate need can be satisfied with 4.75 magistrates.

** This analysis includes reserving two judges and 0.25 FTE for a specially assigned magistrate to handle asbestos matters. The workload of those resources is included within the Torts case type. New asbestos case filings have been excluded from the FY 2019, FY 2023, and FY 2024 filings count.

APPENDIX B:
DISTRICT COURT – JUDGE NEED BY COUNTY/CITY

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

First District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Baltimore City	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	33,315	66,630
	Drug Court	38	15,908
	DUI/DWI	737	13,260
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	4,906	186,415
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	10,130	202,607
	Mental Health Court	126	25,830
	Other Criminal	19,658	255,550
	Other Landlord Tenant	2,034	61,020
	Peace Orders	2,631	36,829
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	92,683	37,073
	Routine Traffic	11,493	9,194
	Serious Traffic	8,011	72,096
	Small Claims	18,033	90,163
	Violations of Probation	2,459	19,672
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	33,908
	Total	**206,254**	**1,126,155**

Current Judges
28.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
1,126,155	**19.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Second District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Dorchester	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	695	1,391
	Drug Court	37	15,217
	DUI/DWI	194	3,486
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	244	9,285
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	276	5,513
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	1,134	14,738
	Other Landlord Tenant	51	1,540
	Peace Orders	185	2,585
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	1,515	606
	Routine Traffic	2,815	2,252
	Serious Traffic	924	8,313
	Small Claims	890	4,448
	Violations of Probation	435	3,480
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	16,954
	Total	**9,395**	**89,808**

Current Judges
1.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
89,808	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Second District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Somerset	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	352	703
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	96	1,722
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	147	5,599
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	173	3,467
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	763	9,919
	Other Landlord Tenant	29	870
	Peace Orders	115	1,605
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	1,830	732
	Routine Traffic	5,349	4,279
	Serious Traffic	915	8,232
	Small Claims	728	3,642
	Violations of Probation	134	1,072
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**10,631**	**41,842**

Current Judges
1.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
41,842	**1.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Second District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Wicomico	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	604	1,208
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	513	9,234
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	622	23,623
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	914	18,287
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	2,690	34,974
	Other Landlord Tenant	86	2,590
	Peace Orders	391	5,479
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	7,894	3,157
	Routine Traffic	7,953	6,362
	Serious Traffic	2,201	19,809
	Small Claims	5,809	29,047
	Violations of Probation	1,034	8,272
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**30,711**	**162,042**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
162,042	**3.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Second District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Worcester	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	1,539	3,078
	Drug Court	12	4,842
	DUI/DWI	921	16,572
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	221	8,398
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	410	8,200
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	2,676	34,788
	Other Landlord Tenant	40	1,190
	Peace Orders	171	2,389
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	730	292
	Routine Traffic	12,190	9,752
	Serious Traffic	2,037	18,330
	Small Claims	1,511	7,553
	Violations of Probation	346	2,771
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**22,804**	**118,155**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
118,155	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Third District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Caroline	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	309	619
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	144	2,598
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	163	6,181
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	219	4,373
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	857	11,137
	Other Landlord Tenant	27	810
	Peace Orders	115	1,605
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	550	220
	Routine Traffic	2,587	2,070
	Serious Traffic	685	6,162
	Small Claims	691	3,453
	Violations of Probation	144	1,149
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**6,491**	**40,377**

Current Judges
1.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
40,377	**1.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Third District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Cecil	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	913	1,826
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	321	5,772
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	686	26,068
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	685	13,693
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	3,088	40,148
	Other Landlord Tenant	84	2,530
	Peace Orders	289	4,046
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	3,907	1,563
	Routine Traffic	10,048	8,038
	Serious Traffic	2,062	18,558
	Small Claims	1,860	9,302
	Violations of Probation	585	4,677
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**24,528**	**136,221**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
136,221	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Third District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Kent	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	152	305
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	54	972
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	63	2,394
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	99	1,973
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	386	5,022
	Other Landlord Tenant	18	530
	Peace Orders	53	737
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	226	90
	Routine Traffic	1,266	1,013
	Serious Traffic	370	3,330
	Small Claims	300	1,498
	Violations of Probation	76	605
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	16,954
	Total	**3,063**	**35,423**

Current Judges
1.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
35,423	**1.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Third District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Queen Anne's	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	730	1,459
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	125	2,250
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	175	6,637
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	242	4,847
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	728	9,464
	Other Landlord Tenant	29	870
	Peace Orders	119	1,661
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	271	109
	Routine Traffic	5,713	4,571
	Serious Traffic	929	8,361
	Small Claims	569	2,843
	Violations of Probation	270	2,163
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**9,900**	**45,235**

Current Judges
1.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
45,235	**1.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Third District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Talbot	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	640	1,280
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	203	3,648
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	146	5,548
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	242	4,840
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	843	10,959
	Other Landlord Tenant	28	840
	Peace Orders	77	1,073
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	381	153
	Routine Traffic	4,199	3,359
	Serious Traffic	881	7,932
	Small Claims	691	3,455
	Violations of Probation	215	1,717
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**8,546**	**44,804**

Current Judges
1.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
44,804	**1.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Fourth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Calvert	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	798	1,597
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	487	8,766
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	458	17,391
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	503	10,067
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	1,828	23,768
	Other Landlord Tenant	55	1,650
	Peace Orders	341	4,769
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	773	309
	Routine Traffic	5,812	4,649
	Serious Traffic	1,344	12,093
	Small Claims	1,431	7,153
	Violations of Probation	532	4,259
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**14,362**	**96,471**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
96,471	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Fourth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Charles	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	1,303	2,606
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	476	8,574
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	1,128	42,864
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	1,802	36,040
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	3,248	42,228
	Other Landlord Tenant	159	4,760
	Peace Orders	748	10,472
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	5,880	2,352
	Routine Traffic	10,169	8,135
	Serious Traffic	2,832	25,488
	Small Claims	4,151	20,755
	Violations of Probation	264	2,109
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**32,160**	**206,383**

Current Judges
3.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
206,383	**3.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Fourth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
St. Mary's	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	747	1,494
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	409	7,356
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	709	26,955
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	723	14,467
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	2,115	27,499
	Other Landlord Tenant	103	3,090
	Peace Orders	427	5,973
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	3,212	1,285
	Routine Traffic	7,937	6,350
	Serious Traffic	1,732	15,585
	Small Claims	1,638	8,192
	Violations of Probation	538	4,307
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	16,954
	Total	**20,290**	**139,507**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
139,507	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Fifth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Prince George's	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	18,044	36,089
	Drug Court	85	35,413
	DUI/DWI	1,883	33,888
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	6,663	253,194
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	13,087	261,733
	Mental Health Court	76	15,648
	Other Criminal	16,050	208,646
	Other Landlord Tenant	1,560	46,790
	Peace Orders	3,593	50,307
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	122,933	49,173
	Routine Traffic	35,894	28,715
	Serious Traffic	13,758	123,819
	Small Claims	20,874	104,372
	Violations of Probation	583	4,664
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	33,908
	Total	**255,083**	**1,286,359**

Current Judges
19.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
1,286,359	**19.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Sixth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Montgomery	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	14,097	28,195
	Drug Court	30	12,588
	DUI/DWI	2,263	40,728
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	3,207	121,879
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	6,740	134,800
	Mental Health Court	31	6,423
	Other Criminal	10,213	132,773
	Other Landlord Tenant	1,196	35,880
	Peace Orders	2,346	32,844
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	40,756	16,303
	Routine Traffic	24,146	19,317
	Serious Traffic	6,014	54,123
	Small Claims	10,562	52,812
	Violations of Probation	2,453	19,624
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	33,908
	Total	**124,054**	**742,197**

Current Judges
13.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
742,197	**12.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Seventh District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Anne Arundel	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	3,299	6,598
	Drug Court	93	38,457
	DUI/DWI	1,632	29,376
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	2,399	91,149
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	4,188	83,760
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	12,625	164,121
	Other Landlord Tenant	395	11,860
	Peace Orders	1,707	23,898
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	32,179	12,872
	Routine Traffic	21,961	17,569
	Serious Traffic	11,324	101,919
	Small Claims	8,532	42,662
	Violations of Probation	2,160	17,283
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	33,908
	Total	**102,494**	**675,432**

Current Judges
10.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
675,432	**10.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Eighth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Baltimore County	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	5,863	11,726
	Drug Court	5	2,075
	DUI/DWI	1,755	31,596
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	3,943	149,847
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	9,732	194,633
	Mental Health Court	3	683
	Other Criminal	11,936	155,164
	Other Landlord Tenant	946	28,370
	Peace Orders	2,509	35,126
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	127,737	51,095
	Routine Traffic	26,627	21,301
	Serious Traffic	10,854	97,686
	Small Claims	20,657	103,287
	Violations of Probation	2,686	21,485
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.50 FTE*	33,908
	Total	**225,253**	**937,982**

Current Judges
15.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
937,982	**15.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Ninth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Harford	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	1,097	2,194
	Drug Court	9	3,597
	DUI/DWI	680	12,240
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	987	37,506
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	1,963	39,267
	Mental Health Court	8	1,640
	Other Criminal	4,109	53,421
	Other Landlord Tenant	207	6,220
	Peace Orders	710	9,940
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	12,489	4,996
	Routine Traffic	13,079	10,463
	Serious Traffic	2,398	21,582
	Small Claims	4,386	21,932
	Violations of Probation	1,728	13,827
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	16,954
	Total	**43,850**	**255,779**

Current Judges
4.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
255,779	**4.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Tenth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Carroll	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	471	942
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	408	7,338
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	508	19,317
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	740	14,807
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	2,052	26,672
	Other Landlord Tenant	67	2,020
	Peace Orders	417	5,833
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	1,428	571
	Routine Traffic	8,608	6,887
	Serious Traffic	1,449	13,041
	Small Claims	1,772	8,858
	Violations of Probation	589	4,709
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**18,509**	**110,995**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
110,995	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Tenth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Howard	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	1,095	2,191
	Drug Court	25	10,375
	DUI/DWI	603	10,848
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	784	29,779
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	1,822	36,433
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	2,277	29,601
	Other Landlord Tenant	198	5,950
	Peace Orders	444	6,216
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	16,809	6,723
	Routine Traffic	14,912	11,930
	Serious Traffic	2,166	19,494
	Small Claims	3,520	17,600
	Violations of Probation	350	2,797
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	16,954
	Total	**45,005**	**206,891**

Current Judges
5.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
206,891	**3.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Eleventh District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Frederick	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	1,103	2,207
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	722	13,002
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	832	31,616
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	1,507	30,133
	Mental Health Court	2	342
	Other Criminal	3,892	50,596
	Other Landlord Tenant	147	4,400
	Peace Orders	630	8,815
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	6,196	2,478
	Routine Traffic	10,169	8,135
	Serious Traffic	2,569	23,121
	Small Claims	3,224	16,122
	Violations of Probation	1,245	9,957
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	16,954
	Total	**32,238**	**217,878**

Current Judges
3.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
217,878	**3.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Eleventh District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Washington	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	685	1,370
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	352	6,342
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	1,092	41,509
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	1,038	20,753
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	2,749	35,733
	Other Landlord Tenant	227	6,800
	Peace Orders	553	7,742
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	7,526	3,011
	Routine Traffic	6,501	5,201
	Serious Traffic	1,696	15,264
	Small Claims	2,846	14,228
	Violations of Probation	1,160	9,277
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**26,425**	**167,230**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
167,230	**3.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Twelfth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Allegany	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	448	896
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	232	4,182
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	398	15,124
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	314	6,273
	Mental Health Court	0	68
	Other Criminal	2,393	31,113
	Other Landlord Tenant	70	2,100
	Peace Orders	253	3,542
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	938	375
	Routine Traffic	5,456	4,365
	Serious Traffic	819	7,374
	Small Claims	966	4,828
	Violations of Probation	2,106	16,848
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.25 FTE*	16,954
	Total	**14,393**	**114,042**

Current Judges
2.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
114,042	**2.0**

FY 2026 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Twelfth District

County	Case Type	FY2019, FY2023, and FY2024 Average Filings	Minutes of Work
Garrett	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	464	928
	Drug Court	0	0
	DUI/DWI	108	1,938
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	133	5,041
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	114	2,280
	Mental Health Court	0	0
	Other Criminal	567	7,371
	Other Landlord Tenant	29	870
	Peace Orders	54	751
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	201	80
	Routine Traffic	4,032	3,226
	Serious Traffic	267	2,403
	Small Claims	293	1,465
	Violations of Probation	430	3,440
	Administrative Adjustment	*0.00 FTE*	0
	Total	**6,692**	**29,793**

Current Judges
1.0

Total Work	Rounded Judge Need
29,793	**1.0**