

**SB0543 – MSBA Support Letter (2026.02.16 - Judgesh**

Uploaded by: Shaoli Sarkar

Position: FAV



**MSBA Mailing Address**  
520 West Fayette Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201

**Canton Office**  
3700 O'Donnell Street  
Baltimore, MD 21224

**Annapolis Office**  
200 Duke of Gloucester Street  
Annapolis, MD 21401

**Bill:** SB 543 - Judgeships - Circuit Court and District Court

**Committee:** Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee

**Position:** Favorable

**Date:** February 16, 2026

---

The Maryland State Bar Association (MSBA) **supports** Senate Bill 543 - Judgeships - Circuit Court and District Court, increasing by one the number of resident judges of the Circuit Court for St. Mary's County and increasing by one the number of associate judges in the District Court in District 11 with a judge appointed from Washington County. Through its advocacy committees and various practice-specific sections, MSBA monitors and takes positions on legislation that protects the legal profession, preserves the integrity of the judicial system, and ensures access to justice for Marylanders.

The request for additional judgeships follows a thorough analysis by the Maryland Judiciary, taking into account several variables including actual and projected filings, the number of pending cases per judge, the ratio of attorneys to judges, the time required from the filing of the case through its disposition (divided by criminal, civil and juvenile), and the population per judge for each jurisdiction.

SB 543 will help to address the needs of the local jurisdictions to increase services and allow judges to more effectively dispense justice.

For these reasons, MSBA respectfully urges a favorable report on Senate Bill 543.

*Contact: Shaoli Sarkar, Advocacy Director ([shaoli@msba.org](mailto:shaoli@msba.org), 410-387-5606)*

---

**Marisa A. Trasatti**  
President

**Natasha Dartigue**  
President-Elect

**Randolph S. Sergent**  
Secretary

**Natasha M. Nazareth**  
Treasurer

**Anna S. Sholl**  
Executive Director

**sb543 - judgeship certification.pdf**

Uploaded by: Will Vormelker

Position: FAV



# Supreme Court of Maryland

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

(410) 260-3725

Matthew J. Fader

Chief Justice

December 8, 2025

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 State Senate  
H-101 State House  
100 State Circle  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

**Re: Judgeship Need for Fiscal Year 2027**

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 five additional judgeships for Fiscal Year 2027 based on the current 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 Dorchester County, 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 four of those jurisdictions at this time. One additional judgeship is being requested for the District Court for Washington County.

The certification of the need for judgeships also shows that judicial resources in some courts exceed the need anticipated in Fiscal Year 2027. 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 Honorable William C. Ferguson, IV  
The Honorable Adrienne A. Jones  
December 8, 2025  
Page 2

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 projects new case filings based on the three-year average of Fiscal Year 2023, Fiscal Year 2024, and Fiscal Year 2025. 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. The Judiciary requests your assistance with the introduction of this bill.

The Judiciary recognizes the limitations of the current model due to changing policies and practices. Administrative judges in several jurisdictions have asserted persuasively that the current model does not accurately reflect the needs of their jurisdictions due to a variety of factors. With the exception of the Circuit Court for St. Mary's County, we are not seeking additional judgeships in those jurisdictions. To update our model and ensure it is an accurate, current reflection of need, we have contracted with the NCSC to complete a new full-scale model update. The new workload assessment study will include a full judicial officer time study to help ensure that the case weights used to determine judicial workload are reflective of current practices. Results are expected to be available for use in the Fiscal Year 2028 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  
Chief Justice

cc: Honorable Guy J. Guzzone, Chair, Senate Budget & Taxation Committee  
Honorable William C. Smith, Jr., Chair, Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee  
Honorable Benjamin S. Barnes, Chair, House Appropriations Committee  
Honorable Luke Clippinger, Chair, House Judiciary Committee  
Honorable Jazz M. Lewis, Chair, Public Safety and Administration Subcommittee  
Honorable E. Greg Wells, Chief Judge, Court of Appeals

The Honorable William C. Ferguson, IV

The Honorable Adrienne A. Jones

December 8, 2025

Page 3

Honorable Fred S. Hecker, 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 Heather S. DeWees, Chair, Conference of Circuit Court Clerks

Matthew Barrett, Chair, Conference of Circuit Court Administrators

Kelley O'Connor, Assistant State Court Administrator, Government Relations and Public  
Affairs

Natasha Dartigue, Public Defender

Kirsten Brown, 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

Daneen M. Banks, Policy Analyst

Kenneth Weaver, Policy Analyst

Scott Benson, Policy Analyst

Sandi Henderson, Budget Analyst, Department of Budget and Management

Sarah Albert, Mandated Reports Specialist



# **Analysis of Need for Additional Judgeships in the Judicial Branch**

**FY2027**



**Administrative Office of the Courts**

December 2025

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Certifying Trial Court Judgeship Need.....	3
Trial Court Certification Process .....	4
Methodology .....	6
Table 1. Judgeships Requested in the Circuit Courts .....	10
Table 2. Judgeships Requested in the District Court .....	11
General Trends in the Circuit Courts .....	12
Table 3. Circuit Court Statewide Original Filings FY2016 to FY2025.....	12
General Trends in the District Court.....	14
Table 4. District Court Statewide Original Filings FY2016 to FY2025.....	15
Bail Review and Expungements .....	17
Interim Update and Next Steps .....	18
APPENDIX A: Circuit Courts – Judge Need by County/City .....	20
APPENDIX B: District Court – Judge Need by County/City .....	44

## Executive Summary

This report summarizes the comprehensive evaluation of need for additional judgeships in Maryland for fiscal year 2027. 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 FY2027 is based on the most recent recommendations established by the NCSC in November 2022. This model relies on the average number and type of cases originally filed in the three most recent years, FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025.

Through extensive research, the NCSC guided the Maryland Judiciary (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 FY2027.

Appendices A and B detail the projected filings and corresponding judicial work in the trial courts for FY2027. 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 FY2027, there is a projected increased need for judicial resources in five courts, including two circuit courts and three jurisdictions in the District Court. These numbers reflect one jurisdiction with a projected need not identified in the FY2026 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 FY2027 report benefits from the NCSC-recommended interim adjustments that were first put in place for the FY2024 report.

*Recommended Qualitative Need:*

While certifying the need for five additional judgeships for Fiscal Year 2027 based on the current needs analysis, the Judiciary identified a continuing 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 (the 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 (NCSC) 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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 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*.<sup>2</sup> 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 FY2024 was calculated based on the three-year filings average from FY2018 to FY2020 to avoid having undue influence from historically low filings during FY2021 and FY2022 that were expected to rebound. As expected, filings increased

---

<sup>1</sup> Kleiman, M., & Lee, C. (December 2017). *Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment Final Report*. National Center for State Courts.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

in FY2023 in both the circuit courts and the District Court. For FY2025 and beyond, the NCSC recommended monitoring filings trends and case backlog to make the most accurate assessment of future workload. For FY2027, filings are projected based on the three-year average of FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025, consistent with the NCSC's recommendations.

The FY2027 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 financial 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 exists to 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,<sup>3</sup> (2) accounting for the significant impact of COVID-19 on new case filings and overall case processing beginning in March 2020 and continuing into FY2021 and FY2022, 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 for this response, the administrative judge is advised to seek the views of judges in that jurisdiction and solicit opinions from members of the local bar. In the case of the circuit courts, the administrative judge is also advised to consult with the local government with respect to providing an administrative support staff member, 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 when such factors could lead to specific recommendations regarding the need for additional judicial resources.

- Circuit Court: Administrative judges respond directly to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Maryland, with copies provided 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 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*.<sup>4</sup> 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*.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup> 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 0.875 to 1.1 FTE.<sup>7</sup> Jurisdictions that currently fall within the 0.875 to 1.1

---

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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 FY2028. Based on this recommendation, the proper lower threshold for FY2027 is 0.875 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 0.875 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 179 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 and other pertinent factors to supplement the quantitative analysis.

Total judgeship need in the District Court is projected to be 112 judges statewide. Judge need was determined by using the most current weighted caseload methodology and 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 in three different counties: Dorchester, Washington, and Wicomico.

Table 1. Judgeships Requested in the Circuit Courts

**FY2027 - Based on Weighted Caseload Methodology**

Jurisdiction	FY2026 Judges	FY2026 Magistrates	FY2027 Projected Need <sup>8</sup>	Additional Judges Needed in FY2027	FY2027 Requested Judgeships	FY2027 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 <sup>9</sup>	1	1	2	1	0	0
Frederick	6	2	6	-	-	-
Garrett	1	1	1	-	-	-
Harford	6	3	6	-	-	-
Howard	5	3	5	-	-	-
Kent <sup>9</sup>	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 <sup>10</sup>	3	1	4	1	1	0
Somerset	1	1	1	-	-	-
Talbot	1	1	1	-	-	-
Washington	6	1	6	-	-	-
Wicomico	4	1	4	-	-	-
Worcester	3	1	3	-	-	-
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>69.6</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>8</sup> Per the recommendation of the NCSC, 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 Anne Arundel by 0.5 magistrates, Baltimore City by 11.25 magistrates, Calvert County by 0.75 magistrates, Carroll County by 1.5 magistrates, Cecil County by 0.5 magistrates, Charles County by 1.0 magistrates, Harford County by 0.5 magistrates, Washington County by 0.25 magistrates, and Worcester County by 1.0 magistrates.

<sup>9</sup> The FY2027 per-judge workload is estimated to be 1.17 FTE in the Circuit Court for Dorchester County and 1.11 FTE in the Circuit Court for Kent County, both above the upper limit of 1.10 FTE. While the model certifies the need for an additional judgeship, the need in each circuit court could be satisfied by the addition of a part-time magistrate.

<sup>10</sup> 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

**FY2027 - Based on Weighted Caseload Methodology**

Jurisdiction	FY2026 Judges	FY2027 Projected Need	Additional Judges Needed in FY2027 <sup>11</sup>	FY2027 Requested Judgeships
Allegany	2	2	-	-
Anne Arundel	10	10	-	-
Baltimore City	28	18	-	-
Baltimore County	15	15	-	-
Calvert	2	2	-	-
Caroline	1	1	-	-
Carroll	2	2	-	-
Cecil	2	2	-	-
Charles	3	3	-	-
Dorchester	1	2	1	0
Frederick	3	3	-	-
Garrett	1	1	-	-
Harford	4	4	-	-
Howard	5	3	-	-
Kent	1	1	-	-
Montgomery	13	11	-	-
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	1
Wicomico	2	3	1	0
Worcester	2	2	-	-
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

<sup>11</sup> 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 FY2027 is projected to be 112 judges.

## General Trends in the Circuit Courts

After multiple years of decreasing original filings, new filings have increased each year since FY2021. The approximately 140,000 new filings in FY2025 represent a 4% increase from FY2024 and a 27% increase from FY2021. However, new filings have not yet returned to pre-COVID-19 levels, with the FY2025 filings representing a 10% decrease from FY2019 (approximately 15,600 fewer filings). Table 3 presents the new case filings by case category from FY2016 to FY2025.<sup>12</sup>

**Table 3. Circuit Court Statewide Original Filings FY2016 to FY2025**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Criminal</b>	<b>Civil</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Juvenile</b>	<b>Total Filings</b>	<b>% Change From Previous Year</b>
FY2016	45,698	56,483	62,694	13,701	178,576	<i>N/A</i>
FY2017	41,390	48,002	61,613	13,021	164,026	-8.1%
FY2018	39,387	48,512	59,493	11,480	158,872	-3.1%
FY2019	37,632	48,333	59,817	9,840	155,622	-2.0%
FY2020	27,393	40,080	49,501	8,172	125,146	-19.6%
FY2021	26,300	28,833	50,041	5,139	110,313	-11.9%
FY2022	27,539	33,069	55,250	5,740	121,598	10.2%
FY2023	29,186	39,442	55,974	6,282	130,884	7.6%
FY2024	28,167	40,043	58,335	8,086	134,631	2.9%
FY2025	28,306	44,900	58,558	8,227	139,991	4.0%

Total original case filings have increased each year since FY2023, and this overall trend is observed in three of the four case-type categories. Civil, family, and juvenile case filings increased each year from FY2023 to FY2025 with the civil case category seeing the largest increase (nearly 5,500 more filings in FY2025 than in FY2023). Criminal filings in FY2024 decreased by 3.5%

<sup>12</sup> 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 child in need of assistance (CINA), child in need of supervision (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 nonsupport, and other guardianships.

from FY2023 (approximately 1,000 fewer filings in FY2024 compared to FY2023) before slightly increasing in FY2025 (approximately 0.5% increase from FY2024 to FY2025, representing approximately 140 more cases). Trends specific to original filings in each case type are detailed more fully below.

**Criminal.** The approximately 28,300 filings in FY2025 represent a 3% decrease from FY2023 (880 fewer filings). The jury trial prayer/criminal appeals case type increased each year since FY2023 with FY2025 representing a 9.3% increase from FY2023 (approximately 1,200 more filings). The criminal indictments and information case type has decreased each year since FY2023 with FY2025 representing a 13% decrease compared to FY2023 (approximately 2,000 fewer filings).

**Civil.** The total number of civil case filings remained relatively stable from FY2023 to FY2024 before increasing 12% from FY2024 to FY2025. The 44,900 civil case filings in FY2025 represent a 13.8% increase from FY2023 (approximately 5,500 more case filings). There was a 37.5% increase in tort<sup>13</sup> case filings (approximately 3,000 more filings) and 31.6% increase in contract case filings (approximately 1,700 more filings) between FY2024 and FY2025.<sup>14</sup>

**Family.** The total number of family case filings increased 4.2% from FY2023 to FY2024 and remained stable from FY2024 to FY2025 (0.4% increase, or approximately 200 more filings). FY2025 represents a 4.6% increase from FY2023 (approximately 2,600 more filings in FY2025).

---

<sup>13</sup> The tort case type includes cases filed under the Maryland Child Victims Act of 2023 which was amended in April 2025 (with an effective date in June 2025). In FY2025, there were approximately 1,950 Child Victims Act case filings which comprised approximately 18% of total tort case filings.

<sup>14</sup> 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 prior *Analysis of Need for Additional Judgeships in the Judicial Branch* reports.

From FY2024 to FY2025, increases were observed in the other guardianships and domestic violence protective orders case types (10% increase or approximately 350 more filings and 5.5% or approximately 260 more filings, respectively). Paternity and nonsupport case filings decreased 6.2% (approximately 470 fewer filings in FY2025 than in FY2024).

**Juvenile.** The total number of juvenile case filings increased 28.7% from FY2023 to FY2024 and 1.7% from FY2024 to FY2025 (approximately 140 more case filings). FY2025 represents a 31% increase from FY2023 (approximately 1,900 more filings). From FY2024 to FY2025, increases were observed in the delinquency and CINA case types (9.3% or approximately 500 more filings and 11.8% or approximately 160 more filings, respectively). The CINS/other juvenile case type saw the largest decrease from FY2024 to FY2025 with FY2025 representing a 52.8% decrease (approximately 300 fewer cases in FY2025 compared to FY2024).

### General Trends in the District Court

In FY2025, original filings in the District Court increased 2.8% (approximately 30,500 more filings) compared to FY2024. The approximately 1.1 million new filings in FY2025 marked a nearly 32% decrease from pre-COVID levels observed in FY2019. Table 4 presents new case filings in the District Court by case category from FY2016 to FY2025.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> 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 FY2016 to FY2025

Fiscal Year	Civil	Landlord-Tenant	Traffic	Criminal	DVPO	Total Filings	% Change From Previous Year
FY2016	280,442	647,714	502,879	191,652	47,444	1,670,131	N/A
FY2017	306,617	650,549	477,016	181,050	48,263	1,663,495	-0.4%
FY2018	305,380	663,348	486,895	174,981	47,021	1,677,625	0.8%
FY2019	297,547	674,162	479,629	158,589	47,135	1,657,062	-1.2%
FY2020	314,608	514,856	399,958	132,548	47,621	1,409,591	-14.9%
FY2021	197,528	327,995	313,674	110,667	51,428	1,001,292	-29.0%
FY2022	228,074	320,646	295,541	110,996	41,355	996,612	-0.5%
FY2023	240,130	412,153	306,235	115,295	50,921	1,124,734	12.9%
FY2024	249,407	404,175	271,545	122,052	50,408	1,097,587	-2.4%
FY2025	283,296	376,947	293,329	125,362	49,098	1,128,032	2.8%

The increase in total case filings from FY2024 to FY2025 was driven by a 13.6% increase in civil filings (approximately 34,000 more filings) and an 8% increase in traffic filings (approximately 21,800 more filings). Civil and criminal filings have increased each year since FY2023 with FY2025 representing an 18% and 8.7% increase, respectively (approximately 43,000 more civil filings and approximately 10,000 more criminal filings from FY2023 to FY2025). Landlord-tenant filings and DVPO filings have decreased each year since FY2023 with FY2025 representing an 8.5% and 3.6% decrease, respectively (approximately 35,000 fewer landlord-tenant filing and 1,800 fewer DVPO filings from FY2023 to FY2025).

**Civil.** Civil case filings have increased each year since FY2021. The approximately 283,000 civil filings in FY2025 represent a 13.6% increase from FY2024. The increase in civil case filings was driven by a 21.2% increase in the large claims/other civil case type and 19.7% increase in the small claims case types (approximately 13,000 more filings and 25,000 more filings, respectively). During this same timeframe, the civil infractions/regulations case type observed a 6.1% decrease (approximately 4,000 fewer filings in FY2025 compared to FY2024).

**Landlord-Tenant.** The approximately 377,000 landlord-tenant filings in FY2025 represent a 6.7% decrease from FY2024 (approximately 27,000 fewer filings) and 8.5% decrease from FY2023 (approximately 35,000 fewer filings). From FY2024 to FY2025, decreases were seen in both landlord-tenant case types, with rent escrow and failure to pay filings decreasing 6.7% (approximately 26,500 fewer filings) and other landlord-tenant filings decreasing 10.3% (approximately 750 fewer filings).

**Traffic.** The approximately 293,000 traffic filings in FY2025 represent an 8% increase from FY2024 (approximately 22,000 more filings) and a 4.2% decrease from FY2023 (approximately 13,000 fewer filings). From FY2024 to FY2025, DUI/DWI case filings remained stable while increases were seen in the routine traffic and serious traffic case types (8.4% increase, approximately 16,000 more filings and 8.6% increase, approximately 6,000 more filings, respectively).

**Criminal.** Criminal case filings have increased each year since FY2021. The approximately 125,000 new filings in FY2025 represent a 2.7% increase from FY2024 (approximately 3,000 more filings). The increase in criminal case filings from FY2024 to FY2025 was driven by increases in the other criminal (2.1% increase, approximately 2,000 more filings) and violations of probation (6.5% increase, approximately 1,300 more filings) case types.

**Domestic Violence Protective Orders.** DVPO case filings have decreased each year since FY2023 with approximately 49,000 DVPO case filings in FY2025 representing a 2.6% decrease from FY2024 (approximately 1,300 fewer filings). The observed decrease in DVPO filings was driven by a 1.8% decrease in domestic violence protective orders and 3.9% decrease in peace orders (approximately 550 fewer DVPO filings and approximately 760 fewer peace orders filings in FY2025 compared to FY2024).

## 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 FY2013 to FY2015. 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*,<sup>16</sup> 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 FY2022 and the 46,890 expungements handled in FY2025 represent a 3.9% increase from FY2024 (approximately 1,800 more expungements). However, the three-year average including FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 (43,527) is 20% greater than the FY2013 to FY2015 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 FY2021. The 49,269 bail review events in FY2025 represent an increase of 7.4% from FY2024 (approximately 3,400 more bail review events). During the 2022 model interim update evaluation, several judges noted bail review had become more complex compared to the last time-study period.

---

<sup>16</sup> Kleiman, M., & Lee, C. (December 2017). *Maryland Judiciary Workload Assessment Final Report*. National Center for State Courts.

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.

### Interim Update and Next Steps

Starting with the FY2025 budget year, the NCSC provided broad 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*,<sup>17</sup> 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 FY2024 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

---

<sup>17</sup> 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.

FTE is achieved in FY2028 budget year.<sup>18</sup> The Judiciary continues to follow this recommendation to ensure there are sufficient resources in each jurisdiction to serve people who come before the courts.

Recognizing that the current workload assessment model is due for recalibration and that a full model update would not be available in time to support the current analysis, the Maryland Judiciary conducted a series of visits in July and August of 2025 to four circuit courts that have historically noted a need for additional judgeships when the model did not recommend additional resources. The objective of these visits was to identify qualitative factors influencing judicial workload that may not be captured in the quantitative model. The findings from this effort are expected to be incorporated into the second phase of the certification process, during which circuit court administrative judges have the opportunity to provide input regarding the need for additional judgeships.

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. 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. Accordingly, the Maryland Judiciary has contracted with the NCSC to perform an updated, weighted caseload study, which will inform the FY2028 evaluation of need for additional judgeships.

---

<sup>18</sup> The NCSC recommended the following incremental increases in applying the lower range of workload to judicial officer need: FY2024 budget = 0.80 FTE lower limit; FY2025 budget = 0.825 FTE lower limit; FY2026 budget = 0.85 FTE lower limit; FY2027 budget = 0.875 FTE lower limit; FY2028 budget and beyond = 0.9 FTE lower limit.

APPENDIX A:  
Circuit Courts – Judge Need by County/City

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

First Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Dorchester	Adult Drug Court	0	0	Current Judges 1.0
	CINA	13	6,238	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	41	4,223	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	3	144	
	Civil Appeals	28	1,120	
	Contract	22	2,254	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	141	25,743	
	Delinquency	74	8,028	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	67	4,534	
	Family Law	261	43,119	
	Foreclosure	82	735	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	200	8,013	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	263	20,803	
	Other Guardianships	17	867	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	100	3,887	
	Torts	25	2,775	
	TPR and Guardianships	8	1,916	
	Truancy Reduction Program	52	13,676	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,397</b>	<b>166,480</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
166,479		80,280	86,199	2.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

**First Circuit**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Somerset	Adult Drug Court	12	6,708	Current Judges 1.0
	CINA	7	3,122	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	44	4,532	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	3	144	
	Civil Appeals	44	1,747	
	Contract	7	728	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	71	12,993	
	Delinquency	12	1,332	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	30	2,062	
	Family Law	177	29,205	
	Foreclosure	85	762	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	203	8,133	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	49	3,897	
	Other Guardianships	13	634	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	122	4,758	
	Torts	15	1,665	
	TPR and Guardianships	5	1,074	
	Truancy Reduction Program	25	6,488	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>924</b>	<b>108,389</b>	

  

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judgeship Need
108,388	80,280	28,108	1.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court**

**MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS**

**First Circuit**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Wicomico	Adult Drug Court	26	14,324	<b>Current Judges</b> 4.0
	CINA	11	5,148	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	48	4,978	<b>Current Magistrates</b> 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	10	522	
	Civil Appeals	56	2,240	
	Contract	44	4,542	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	449	82,167	
	Delinquency	122	13,140	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	124	8,454	
	Family Law	857	141,459	
	Foreclosure	185	1,662	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	160	6,400	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	113	8,927	
	Other Guardianships	65	3,234	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	208	8,112	
	Torts	87	9,657	
	TPR and Guardianships	4	844	
	Truancy Reduction Program	32	8,503	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,601</b>	<b>342,718</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>342,718</b>	<b>80,280</b>	<b>262,438</b>	<b>4.0</b>

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

First Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Worcester	Adult Drug Court	11	5,804	Current Judges 3.0
	CINA	26	12,322	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	40	4,120	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	8	414	
	Civil Appeals	30	1,213	
	Contract	36	3,710	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	186	34,098	
	Delinquency	70	7,560	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	25	1,678	
	Family Law	336	55,494	
	Foreclosure	97	873	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	80	3,200	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	82	6,504	
	Other Guardianships	29	1,450	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	3	870	
	Paternity and Non-Support	59	2,314	
	Torts	65	7,252	
	TPR and Guardianships	8	1,916	
	Truancy Reduction Program	23	6,049	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,214</b>	<b>175,246</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
175,247		80,280	94,967	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 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Caroline	Adult Drug Court	8	4,352	Current Judges 1.0
	CINA	10	4,680	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	3	275	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	5	288	
	Civil Appeals	20	800	
	Contract	20	2,114	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	96	17,568	
	Delinquency	33	3,564	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	58	3,944	
	Family Law	271	44,769	
	Foreclosure	72	651	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	196	7,840	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	74	5,872	
	Other Guardianships	22	1,117	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	50	1,963	
	Torts	19	2,109	
	TPR and Guardianships	6	1,380	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>963</b>	<b>121,691</b>	

  

Total Work	Magistrate Work	Judge Work	Rounded Judgeship Need
121,691	80,280	41,411	1.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Cecil	Adult Drug Court	44	23,756	Current Judges 4.0
	CINA	32	14,822	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	3	309	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	15	828	
	Civil Appeals	73	2,933	
	Contract	68	7,072	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	225	41,235	
	Delinquency	82	8,820	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	152	10,336	
	Family Law	696	114,840	
	Foreclosure	225	2,025	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	691	27,640	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	200	15,800	
	Other Guardianships	48	2,400	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	108	4,199	
	Torts	124	13,801	
	TPR and Guardianships	25	5,750	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,811</b>	<b>314,971</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
314,972		80,280	234,692	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 0.5 magistrates.

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Kent	Adult Drug Court	0	0	Current Judges 1.0
	CINA	3	1,404	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	28	2,884	Current Magistrates 0.00
	Civil Adoptions	1	72	
	Civil Appeals	9	360	
	Contract	8	866	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	46	8,418	
	Delinquency	20	2,124	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	30	2,062	
	Family Law	107	17,709	
	Foreclosure	57	510	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	161	6,427	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	160	12,640	
	Other Guardianships	10	500	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	29	1,118	
	Torts	10	1,147	
	TPR and Guardianships	1	230	
	Truancy Reduction Program	19	5,084	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>699</b>	<b>81,960</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>81,961</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>81,961</b>	<b>2.0</b>

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Queen Anne's	Adult Drug Court	8	4,352	Current Judges 1.0
	CINA	3	1,558	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	103	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	8	450	
	Civil Appeals	18	720	
	Contract	30	3,086	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	84	15,372	
	Delinquency	20	2,124	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	41	2,766	
	Family Law	278	45,816	
	Foreclosure	84	753	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	507	20,267	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	93	7,347	
	Other Guardianships	16	817	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	47	1,820	
	Torts	34	3,811	
	TPR and Guardianships	3	614	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,275</b>	<b>130,181</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
130,180		80,280	49,900	1.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Second Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Talbot	Adult Drug Court	9	5,076	<b>Current Judges</b> 1.0
	CINA	7	3,430	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	0	34	<b>Current Magistrates</b> 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	3	180	
	Civil Appeals	18	733	
	Contract	23	2,426	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	106	19,398	
	Delinquency	40	4,284	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	22	1,496	
	Family Law	215	35,529	
	Foreclosure	44	396	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	113	4,533	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	60	4,766	
	Other Guardianships	16	817	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	36	1,404	
	Torts	37	4,144	
	TPR and Guardianships	2	460	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>751</b>	<b>107,511</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
107,512		80,280	27,232	1.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Third Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Baltimore County	Adult Drug Court	14	7,436	Current Judges 21.0
	CINA	237	111,070	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	5	481	Current Magistrates 9.00
	Civil Adoptions	115	6,210	
	Civil Appeals	659	26,360	
	Contract	599	62,296	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	2,091	382,653	
	Delinquency	911	98,388	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	619	42,070	
	Family Law	5,475	903,429	
	Foreclosure	1,151	10,356	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	3,226	129,040	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	1,752	138,434	
	Other Guardianships	584	29,184	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	11	3,586	
	Paternity and Non-Support	1,041	40,612	
	Torts	1,225	135,975	
	TPR and Guardianships	97	22,234	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	36,810		
<b>Total</b>		<b>19,812</b>	<b>2,186,624</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
2,186,625		722,520	1,464,105	21.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Third Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Harford	Adult Drug Court	22	11,968	Current Judges 6.0
	CINA	85	39,780	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	26	2,644	Current Magistrates 3.00
	Civil Adoptions	39	2,106	
	Civil Appeals	118	4,707	
	Contract	151	15,738	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	526	96,258	
	Delinquency	178	19,188	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	330	22,462	
	Family Law	1,498	247,224	
	Foreclosure	323	2,904	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	745	29,800	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	247	19,539	
	Other Guardianships	104	5,184	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	12	4,020	
	Paternity and Non-Support	255	9,958	
	Torts	234	25,974	
	TPR and Guardianships	46	10,504	
	Truancy Reduction Program	10	2,630	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>4,949</b>	<b>590,993</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
590,994		240,840	350,154	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 2.5 magistrates.

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

**Fourth Circuit**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Allegany	Adult Drug Court	21	11,244	Current Judges 2.0
	CINA	24	11,232	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	103	Current Magistrates 1.60
	Civil Adoptions	8	450	
	Civil Appeals	126	5,040	
	Contract	15	1,526	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	331	60,513	
	Delinquency	58	6,228	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	63	4,306	
	Family Law	502	82,830	
	Foreclosure	207	1,866	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	474	18,960	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	81	6,373	
	Other Guardianships	38	1,884	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	252	9,815	
	Torts	44	4,884	
	TPR and Guardianships	21	4,830	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,266</b>	<b>250,489</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
250,489		128,448	122,041	2.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

**Fourth Circuit**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Garrett	Adult Drug Court	0	0	Current Judges 1.0
	CINA	12	5,770	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	0	0	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	5	270	
	Civil Appeals	14	547	
	Contract	17	1,802	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	48	8,784	
	Delinquency	22	2,376	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	9	590	
	Family Law	167	27,609	
	Foreclosure	48	429	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	77	3,093	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	47	3,687	
	Other Guardianships	8	400	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	50	1,937	
	Torts	21	2,331	
	TPR and Guardianships	13	2,990	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>558</b>	<b>81,020</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
81,021		20,070	60,951	1.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court**

**MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS**

**Fourth Circuit**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>		
Washington	Adult Drug Court	6	3,444	<b>Current Judges</b> 6.0	
	CINA	76	35,568		
	CINS/Other Juvenile	6	584	<b>Current Magistrates</b> 1.00	
	Civil Adoptions	22	1,188		
	Civil Appeals	91	3,640		
	Contract	73	7,558		
	Criminal Indictments and Information	518	94,854		
	Delinquency	123	13,320		
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	180	12,262		
	Family Law	1,204	198,714		
	Foreclosure	202	1,821		
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	215	8,600		
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0		
	Other Civil	121	9,559		
	Other Guardianships	57	2,834		
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0		
	Paternity and Non-Support	613	23,907		
	Torts	108	12,025		
	TPR and Guardianships	24	5,596		
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0		
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405			
<b>Total</b>		<b>3,639</b>	<b>453,879</b>		
		<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
		<b>453,878</b>	<b>80,280</b>	<b>373,598</b>	<b>6.0</b>

\* 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 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court**

**MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS**

**Fifth Circuit**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>		
Anne Arundel	Adult Drug Court	47	25,388	<b>Current Judges</b> 13.0	
	CINA	56	26,208		
	CINS/Other Juvenile	4	378	<b>Current Magistrates</b> 6.00	
	Civil Adoptions	85	4,590		
	Civil Appeals	344	13,773		
	Contract	423	43,958		
	Criminal Indictments and Information	1,268	232,044		
	Delinquency	451	48,672		
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	365	24,842		
	Family Law	3,790	625,296		
	Foreclosure	765	6,882		
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	779	31,173		
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0		
	Other Civil	941	74,365		
	Other Guardianships	234	11,700		
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0		
	Paternity and Non-Support	439	17,121		
	Torts	628	69,671		
	TPR and Guardianships	19	4,446		
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0		
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	36,810			
<b>Total</b>		<b>10,638</b>	<b>1,297,317</b>		
		<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
		1,297,318	481,680	815,638	13.0

\* 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 5.5 magistrates.

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

**Fifth Circuit**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Carroll	Adult Drug Court	16	8,524	<b>Current Judges</b> 4.0
	CINA	16	7,642	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	2	172	<b>Current Magistrates</b> 2.00
	Civil Adoptions	21	1,134	
	Civil Appeals	84	3,347	
	Contract	83	8,666	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	153	27,939	
	Delinquency	51	5,472	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	171	11,606	
	Family Law	888	146,466	
	Foreclosure	170	1,533	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	691	27,640	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	133	10,481	
	Other Guardianships	77	3,867	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	103	4,004	
	Torts	119	13,209	
	TPR and Guardianships	5	1,074	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,783</b>	<b>301,181</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
301,181		160,560	140,621	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 0.5 magistrates.

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Fifth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Howard	Adult Drug Court	0	0	<b>Current Judges</b> 5.0
	CINA	39	18,406	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	2	172	<b>Current Magistrates</b> 3.00
	Civil Adoptions	24	1,314	
	Civil Appeals	161	6,453	
	Contract	225	23,400	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	371	67,833	
	Delinquency	170	18,324	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	291	19,810	
	Family Law	1,872	308,880	
	Foreclosure	208	1,869	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	285	11,400	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	755	59,671	
	Other Guardianships	199	9,967	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	201	7,839	
	Torts	288	31,968	
	TPR and Guardianships	12	2,760	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>5,103</b>	<b>608,471</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
608,471		240,840	367,631	5.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Sixth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Frederick	Adult Drug Court	21	11,244	Current Judges 6.0
	CINA	28	12,950	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	5	481	Current Magistrates 2.00
	Civil Adoptions	41	2,214	
	Civil Appeals	129	5,173	
	Contract	141	14,698	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	443	81,069	
	Delinquency	102	11,052	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	283	19,266	
	Family Law	1,844	304,260	
	Foreclosure	275	2,472	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	661	26,427	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	183	14,483	
	Other Guardianships	99	4,967	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	340	13,273	
	Torts	204	22,644	
	TPR and Guardianships	32	7,360	
	Truancy Reduction Program	1	263	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>4,832</b>	<b>572,701</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
572,701		160,560	412,141	6.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Sixth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Montgomery	Adult Drug Court	22	12,148	<b>Current Judges</b> 24.0
	CINA	102	47,736	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	46	4,704	<b>Current Magistrates</b> 6.00
	Civil Adoptions	127	6,876	
	Civil Appeals	480	19,213	
	Contract	2,139	222,456	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	1,144	209,292	
	Delinquency	481	51,948	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	516	35,110	
	Family Law	6,662	1,099,176	
	Foreclosure	750	6,747	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	323	12,933	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	2,042	161,344	
	Other Guardianships	534	26,717	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	10	3,368	
	Paternity and Non-Support	641	24,999	
	Torts	1,140	126,503	
	TPR and Guardianships	62	14,184	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	36,810		
<b>Total</b>		<b>17,221</b>	<b>2,122,264</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
2,122,263		481,680	1,640,583	24.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Calvert	Adult Drug Court	43	23,572	Current Judges 3.0
	CINA	12	5,616	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	69	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	16	864	
	Civil Appeals	52	2,093	
	Contract	59	6,136	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	135	24,765	
	Delinquency	34	3,672	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	84	5,712	
	Family Law	534	88,056	
	Foreclosure	188	1,689	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	89	3,560	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	271	21,409	
	Other Guardianships	34	1,700	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	0	0	
	Paternity and Non-Support	93	3,614	
	Torts	92	10,212	
	TPR and Guardianships	5	1,150	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,742</b>	<b>222,294</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
222,294		80,280	142,014	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 0.25 magistrates.

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Charles	Adult Drug Court	13	7,252	Current Judges 5.0
	CINA	11	5,302	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	103	Current Magistrates 3.00
	Civil Adoptions	22	1,170	
	Civil Appeals	115	4,587	
	Contract	120	12,514	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	578	105,714	
	Delinquency	103	11,160	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	270	18,360	
	Family Law	1,460	240,846	
	Foreclosure	396	3,561	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	234	9,373	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	177	14,009	
	Other Guardianships	113	5,634	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	6	1,848	
	Paternity and Non-Support	254	9,893	
	Torts	250	27,787	
	TPR and Guardianships	1	306	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>4,124</b>	<b>497,824</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>497,823</b>	<b>240,840</b>	<b>256,983</b>
<b>Magistrate Work</b>		<b>240,840</b>	<b>256,983</b>	<b>5.0</b>
<b>Judge Work</b>		<b>256,983</b>	<b>5.0</b>	
<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>				

\* 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 2.0 magistrates.

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Prince George's	Adult Drug Court	18	9,792	Current Judges 25.0
	CINA	131	61,154	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	3	275	Current Magistrates 8.00
	Civil Adoptions	43	2,340	
	Civil Appeals	607	24,267	
	Contract	986	102,578	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	2,489	455,427	
	Delinquency	684	73,836	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	650	44,200	
	Family Law	7,673	1,265,991	
	Foreclosure	2,055	18,498	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	598	23,907	
	Juvenile Drug Court	21	5,607	
	Other Civil	935	73,839	
	Other Guardianships	654	32,700	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	15	4,998	
	Paternity and Non-Support	1,291	50,362	
	Torts	2,000	222,037	
	TPR and Guardianships	27	6,210	
	Truancy Reduction Program	23	5,962	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	36,810		
<b>Total</b>		<b>20,903</b>	<b>2,520,790</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
2,520,788		642,240	1,878,548	25.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Seventh Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
St. Mary's	Adult Drug Court	17	9,068	Current Judges 3.0
	CINA	17	7,802	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	1	69	Current Magistrates 1.00
	Civil Adoptions	18	954	
	Civil Appeals	43	1,720	
	Contract	47	4,854	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	314	57,522	
	Delinquency	52	5,652	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	116	7,910	
	Family Law	685	113,079	
	Foreclosure	166	1,497	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	150	5,987	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	508	40,132	
	Other Guardianships	43	2,134	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	8	2,608	
	Paternity and Non-Support	144	5,616	
	Torts	88	9,805	
	TPR and Guardianships	10	2,376	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	18,405		
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,427</b>	<b>297,190</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
297,190		80,280	216,910	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 of St. Mary's County to assess current and projected needs in relation to available resources.

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by Court

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

Eighth Circuit

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024 and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Baltimore City	Adult Drug Court	43	23,212	Current Judges 35.0
	CINA	440	205,920	
	CINS/Other Juvenile	141	14,489	Current Magistrates 14.00
	Civil Adoptions	29	1,548	
	Civil Appeals	737	29,467	
	Contract	447	46,454	
	Criminal Indictments and Information	3,084	564,312	
	Delinquency	976	105,444	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	344	23,414	
	Family Law	3,846	634,536	
	Foreclosure	3,336	30,027	
	Jury Trial Prayer/Criminal Appeals	2,243	89,720	
	Juvenile Drug Court	0	0	
	Other Civil	2,206	174,300	
	Other Guardianships	506	25,284	
	Other Problem-Solving Courts	70	22,712	
	Paternity and Non-Support	815	31,785	
	Torts	2,098	232,915	
	TPR and Guardianships	175	40,174	
	Truancy Reduction Program	0	0	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	36,810	
<b>Total</b>		<b>21,536</b>	<b>2,332,523</b>	
<b>Total Work</b>		<b>Magistrate Work</b>	<b>Judge Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>2,332,522</b>		<b>1,083,780</b>	<b>1,248,742</b>	<b>35.0</b>

\* 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.

\*\* 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 FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 filings count.

APPENDIX B:  
District Court – Judge Need by County/City

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**First District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Baltimore City	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	32,095	64,189	<b>Current Judges</b>  28.0
	Drug Court	39	16,322	
	DUI/DWI	742	13,362	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	4,683	177,954	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	10,433	208,653	
	Mental Health Court	113	23,165	
	Other Criminal	18,370	238,810	
	Other Landlord Tenant	1,924	57,720	
	Peace Orders	2,755	38,565	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	75,803	30,321	
	Routine Traffic	11,263	9,010	
	Serious Traffic	7,474	67,266	
	Small Claims	18,853	94,265	
	Violations of Probation	2,676	21,411	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	33,743	
<b>Total</b>		<b>187,223</b>	<b>1,094,756</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>1,094,756</b>	<b>18.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Second District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Dorchester	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	466	932	<b>Current Judges</b>  1.0
	Drug Court	33	13,695	
	DUI/DWI	146	2,628	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	245	9,323	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	312	6,247	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	1,078	14,018	
	Other Landlord Tenant	59	1,780	
	Peace Orders	207	2,903	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	852	341	
	Routine Traffic	2,452	1,962	
	Serious Traffic	826	7,437	
	Small Claims	1,046	5,228	
	Violations of Probation	415	3,323	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	16,871	
<b>Total</b>		<b>8,137</b>	<b>86,688</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>86,688</b>	<b>2.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Second District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Somerset	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	257	515	<b>Current Judges</b> 1.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	69	1,248	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	140	5,307	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	197	3,947	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	785	10,205	
	Other Landlord Tenant	34	1,010	
	Peace Orders	128	1,792	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	1,057	423	
	Routine Traffic	5,129	4,103	
	Serious Traffic	883	7,944	
	Small Claims	870	4,350	
	Violations of Probation	114	909	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>9,663</b>	<b>41,753</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
41,753	1.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Second District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Wicomico	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	391	782	<b>Current Judges</b>  2.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	545	9,810	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	652	24,789	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	992	19,833	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	2,453	31,889	
	Other Landlord Tenant	80	2,410	
	Peace Orders	429	6,011	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	6,097	2,439	
	Routine Traffic	7,444	5,955	
	Serious Traffic	2,240	20,160	
	Small Claims	5,959	29,795	
	Violations of Probation	1,092	8,739	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>28,374</b>	<b>162,612</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>162,612</b>	<b>3.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Second District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Worcester	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	922	1,843	<b>Current Judges</b> 2.0
	Drug Court	11	4,428	
	DUI/DWI	886	15,954	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	248	9,424	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	486	9,720	
	Mental Health Court	2	342	
	Other Criminal	2,403	31,239	
	Other Landlord Tenant	39	1,170	
	Peace Orders	178	2,487	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	542	217	
	Routine Traffic	10,020	8,016	
	Serious Traffic	1,962	17,655	
	Small Claims	1,770	8,848	
	Violations of Probation	456	3,648	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>19,925</b>	<b>114,991</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>114,991</b>	<b>2.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Third District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Caroline	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	114	229	<b>Current Judges</b>  1.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	92	1,650	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	171	6,498	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	255	5,093	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	856	11,128	
	Other Landlord Tenant	28	830	
	Peace Orders	124	1,736	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	375	150	
	Routine Traffic	1,765	1,412	
	Serious Traffic	574	5,163	
	Small Claims	824	4,120	
	Violations of Probation	167	1,333	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>5,345</b>	<b>39,342</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
39,342	1.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Third District

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Cecil	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	705	1,411	<b>Current Judges</b>  2.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	249	4,476	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	720	27,360	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	771	15,420	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	2,624	34,108	
	Other Landlord Tenant	76	2,270	
	Peace Orders	337	4,723	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	3,305	1,322	
	Routine Traffic	6,551	5,241	
	Serious Traffic	1,637	14,736	
	Small Claims	2,092	10,458	
	Violations of Probation	677	5,419	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>19,744</b>	<b>126,944</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
126,944	2.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Third District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Kent	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	162	324	<b>Current Judges</b>  1.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	40	714	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	63	2,394	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	109	2,187	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	369	4,793	
	Other Landlord Tenant	11	340	
	Peace Orders	56	779	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	187	75	
	Routine Traffic	1,026	821	
	Serious Traffic	341	3,072	
	Small Claims	302	1,510	
	Violations of Probation	80	640	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	16,871		
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,746</b>	<b>34,520</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>34,520</b>	<b>1.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Third District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Queen Anne's	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	563	1,127	<b>Current Judges</b>  1.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	90	1,620	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	173	6,587	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	265	5,300	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	670	8,706	
	Other Landlord Tenant	22	650	
	Peace Orders	122	1,708	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	250	100	
	Routine Traffic	5,407	4,326	
	Serious Traffic	925	8,328	
	Small Claims	641	3,203	
	Violations of Probation	224	1,792	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>9,352</b>	<b>43,447</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
43,447	1.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Third District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Talbot	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	349	698	<b>Current Judges</b>  1.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	162	2,910	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	141	5,371	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	279	5,587	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	706	9,182	
	Other Landlord Tenant	29	870	
	Peace Orders	92	1,293	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	236	94	
	Routine Traffic	3,131	2,505	
	Serious Traffic	828	7,455	
	Small Claims	721	3,603	
	Violations of Probation	258	2,067	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>6,932</b>	<b>41,635</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
41,635	1.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Fourth District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Calvert	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	483	967	<b>Current Judges</b>  2.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	398	7,158	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	451	17,151	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	594	11,873	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	1,536	19,968	
	Other Landlord Tenant	41	1,230	
	Peace Orders	367	5,143	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	679	272	
	Routine Traffic	4,661	3,729	
	Serious Traffic	1,143	10,284	
	Small Claims	1,511	7,555	
	Violations of Probation	432	3,459	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>12,296</b>	<b>88,789</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>88,789</b>	<b>2.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Fourth District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Charles	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	1,083	2,165	<b>Current Judges</b>  3.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	394	7,086	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	1,157	43,966	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	2,137	42,733	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	2,744	35,672	
	Other Landlord Tenant	109	3,280	
	Peace Orders	798	11,172	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	4,407	1,763	
	Routine Traffic	7,439	5,951	
	Serious Traffic	2,170	19,530	
	Small Claims	4,648	23,238	
	Violations of Probation	266	2,128	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	16,871	
<b>Total</b>		<b>27,352</b>	<b>215,555</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
215,555	3.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Fourth District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
St. Mary's	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	600	1,201	<b>Current Judges</b>  2.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	331	5,952	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	683	25,941	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	813	16,253	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	2,014	26,178	
	Other Landlord Tenant	103	3,080	
	Peace Orders	448	6,272	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	2,483	993	
	Routine Traffic	6,248	4,999	
	Serious Traffic	1,504	13,536	
	Small Claims	1,656	8,280	
	Violations of Probation	594	4,749	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>17,477</b>	<b>117,434</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>117,434</b>	<b>2.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Fifth District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Prince George's	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	14,538	29,076	<b>Current Judges</b> 19.0
	Drug Court	91	37,765	
	DUI/DWI	1,769	31,842	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	6,518	247,684	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	14,259	285,180	
	Mental Health Court	72	14,828	
	Other Criminal	15,204	197,652	
	Other Landlord Tenant	1,459	43,780	
	Peace Orders	3,550	49,700	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	97,875	39,150	
	Routine Traffic	29,857	23,886	
	Serious Traffic	12,498	112,482	
	Small Claims	22,374	111,868	
	Violations of Probation	626	5,008	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	33,743		
<b>Total</b>		<b>220,690</b>	<b>1,263,644</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>1,263,644</b>	<b>19.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Sixth District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Montgomery	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	8,065	16,131	<b>Current Judges</b>  13.0
	Drug Court	36	15,077	
	DUI/DWI	1,870	33,654	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	3,248	123,437	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	7,539	150,773	
	Mental Health Court	22	4,578	
	Other Criminal	8,553	111,185	
	Other Landlord Tenant	1,376	41,270	
	Peace Orders	2,366	33,124	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	37,309	14,924	
	Routine Traffic	16,525	13,220	
	Serious Traffic	5,091	45,819	
	Small Claims	10,918	54,592	
	Violations of Probation	1,070	8,557	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	33,743	
<b>Total</b>		<b>103,988</b>	<b>700,084</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
700,084	11.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Seventh District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Anne Arundel	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	2,224	4,448	<b>Current Judges</b>  10.0
	Drug Court	84	34,860	
	DUI/DWI	1,360	24,480	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	2,389	90,769	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	4,733	94,667	
	Mental Health Court	8	1,708	
	Other Criminal	11,930	155,086	
	Other Landlord Tenant	348	10,430	
	Peace Orders	1,738	24,337	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	23,489	9,396	
	Routine Traffic	17,241	13,793	
	Serious Traffic	11,342	102,075	
	Small Claims	9,192	45,958	
	Violations of Probation	2,340	18,717	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	33,743	
<b>Total</b>		<b>88,418</b>	<b>664,467</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
664,467	10.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Eighth District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Baltimore County	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	4,328	8,657	<b>Current Judges</b>  15.0
	Drug Court	6	2,490	
	DUI/DWI	1,263	22,740	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	4,080	155,027	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	10,548	210,953	
	Mental Health Court	8	1,640	
	Other Criminal	11,005	143,069	
	Other Landlord Tenant	950	28,510	
	Peace Orders	2,623	36,722	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	99,462	39,785	
	Routine Traffic	19,943	15,955	
	Serious Traffic	8,629	77,658	
	Small Claims	20,727	103,637	
	Violations of Probation	1,361	10,891	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.50 FTE</i>	33,743	
<b>Total</b>		<b>184,933</b>	<b>891,477</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>891,477</b>	<b>15.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Ninth District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Harford	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	964	1,927	<b>Current Judges</b> 4.0
	Drug Court	17	6,918	
	DUI/DWI	647	11,640	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	1,030	39,127	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	2,234	44,687	
	Mental Health Court	14	2,802	
	Other Criminal	4,072	52,936	
	Other Landlord Tenant	167	5,020	
	Peace Orders	741	10,379	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	10,258	4,103	
	Routine Traffic	10,121	8,097	
	Serious Traffic	2,352	21,168	
	Small Claims	4,936	24,678	
	Violations of Probation	1,701	13,608	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	16,871	
<b>Total</b>		<b>39,254</b>	<b>263,961</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
263,961	4.0

FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County

DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS

Tenth District

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Carroll	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	412	825	Current Judges 2.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	316	5,682	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	518	19,697	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	863	17,267	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	1,907	24,787	
	Other Landlord Tenant	56	1,690	
	Peace Orders	410	5,745	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	997	399	
	Routine Traffic	7,756	6,205	
	Serious Traffic	1,493	13,440	
	Small Claims	1,700	8,500	
	Violations of Probation	383	3,067	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>16,811</b>	<b>107,304</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>107,304</b>	<b>2.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**  
**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Tenth District**

County	Case Type	FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings	Minutes of Work	
Howard	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	1,084	2,167	<b>Current Judges</b>  5.0
	Drug Court	22	9,130	
	DUI/DWI	456	8,202	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	807	30,666	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	2,035	40,693	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	1,970	25,610	
	Other Landlord Tenant	185	5,550	
	Peace Orders	463	6,477	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	12,910	5,164	
	Routine Traffic	11,043	8,834	
	Serious Traffic	1,778	15,999	
	Small Claims	3,675	18,373	
	Violations of Probation	334	2,675	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	16,871	
<b>Total</b>		<b>36,762</b>	<b>196,411</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>196,411</b>	<b>3.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Eleventh District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Frederick	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	662	1,324	<b>Current Judges</b>  3.0
	Drug Court	2	830	
	DUI/DWI	677	12,186	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	871	33,098	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	1,753	35,060	
	Mental Health Court	2	410	
	Other Criminal	3,362	43,710	
	Other Landlord Tenant	114	3,420	
	Peace Orders	638	8,937	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	4,930	1,972	
	Routine Traffic	8,369	6,695	
	Serious Traffic	2,512	22,608	
	Small Claims	3,539	17,695	
	Violations of Probation	1,201	9,608	
<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	16,871		
<b>Total</b>		<b>28,632</b>	<b>214,424</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
214,424	3.0

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Eleventh District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Washington	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	560	1,119	<b>Current Judges</b>  2.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	292	5,256	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	1,111	42,205	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	1,121	22,413	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	2,622	34,086	
	Other Landlord Tenant	192	5,760	
	Peace Orders	578	8,097	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	5,862	2,345	
	Routine Traffic	4,952	3,961	
	Serious Traffic	1,592	14,325	
	Small Claims	3,279	16,397	
	Violations of Probation	1,414	11,312	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>23,575</b>	<b>167,276</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>167,276</b>	<b>3.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Twelfth District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Allegany	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	371	741	<b>Current Judges</b>  2.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	206	3,714	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	422	16,049	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	343	6,860	
	Mental Health Court	3	547	
	Other Criminal	2,265	29,449	
	Other Landlord Tenant	64	1,920	
	Peace Orders	284	3,981	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	758	303	
	Routine Traffic	4,904	3,923	
	Serious Traffic	764	6,876	
	Small Claims	1,124	5,618	
	Violations of Probation	2,006	16,048	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.25 FTE</i>	16,871	
<b>Total</b>		<b>13,514</b>	<b>112,900</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
<b>112,900</b>	<b>2.0</b>

**FY 2027 Projected Judgeship Need by County**

**DISTRICT COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICTS**

**Twelfth District**

<b>County</b>	<b>Case Type</b>	<b>FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025 Average Filings</b>	<b>Minutes of Work</b>	
Garrett	Civil Infractions/ Regulations	365	731	<b>Current Judges</b>  1.0
	Drug Court	0	0	
	DUI/DWI	107	1,920	
	Domestic Violence Protective Orders	127	4,826	
	Large Claims/ Other Civil	118	2,353	
	Mental Health Court	0	0	
	Other Criminal	490	6,374	
	Other Landlord Tenant	22	660	
	Peace Orders	59	831	
	Rent Escrow and Failure to Pay	146	58	
	Routine Traffic	3,206	2,565	
	Serious Traffic	253	2,277	
	Small Claims	305	1,525	
	Violations of Probation	442	3,536	
	<i>Administrative Adjustment</i>	<i>0.00 FTE</i>	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>5,640</b>	<b>27,656</b>	

  

<b>Total Work</b>	<b>Rounded Judgeship Need</b>
27,656	1.0



# **SB 543 Judgeships.pdf**

Uploaded by: Stephanie Jarrell

Position: FWA



*Queen  
Anne's  
County*

**THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF  
QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY**

The Liberty Building  
107 North Liberty Street  
Centreville, MD 21617

e-mail: [QACCommissioners&Administrator@qac.org](mailto:QACCommissioners&Administrator@qac.org)

**County Commissioners:**

James J. Moran, At Large  
Jack N. Wilson, Jr., District 1  
J. Patrick McLaughlin, District 2  
Philip L. Dumenil, District 3  
Christopher M. Corchiarino, District 4

*County Administrator: Todd R. Mohn, PE  
Executive Assistant to County Commissioners: Stephanie L. Jarrell  
County Attorney: Patrick Thompson, Esquire*

February 12, 2026

The Honorable William Smith  
Chairman, Judicial Proceedings  
2 West Miller Senate Office Building  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

RE: SB 543 – Judgeships – Circuit Court and District Court favorable with Amendment

Dear Chair Smith and Members of the Judicial Proceedings Committee:

The Queen Anne's County Commissioners respectfully submit this letter in support of Senate Bill 543, with an amendment to increase the number of resident Circuit Court judges in Queen Anne's County from one to two.

Queen Anne's County continues to experience population growth and increased filings across criminal, civil, family, and juvenile matters. With only one resident Circuit Court judge, the court faces significant scheduling pressures and limited flexibility to manage its caseload. Increasing the number of resident judges from one to two would improve case processing times, reduce delays, enhance access to justice, and support public safety.

For these reasons, we request that SB 543 be amended to include Queen Anne's County and urge a favorable report with this amendment.

Respectfully,

QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Moran, President

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack N. Wilson, Jr.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher M. Corchiarino

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Patrick McLaughlin

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Philip L. Dumenil