

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED
COUNSEL SYSTEM (MAACS)**

2013 ANNUAL REPORT

The 2013 Annual Report of the Michigan Appellate Assigned Counsel System (MAACS) is submitted to the Appellate Defender Commission, the Michigan Supreme Court and the One Court of Justice, the Michigan Legislature, the Hon. Rick Snyder, Governor and the People of the State of Michigan.

2013 APPELLATE DEFENDER COMMISSION

John Nussbaumer, Chair
State Bar Designee

Thomas W. Cranmer, Vice-Chair
Supreme Court Designee

Thomas J. Adams
Governor's Designee

Honorable William J. Caprathe
Michigan Judges Association Designee (from September 18, 2013)

Judith Gracey
State Bar Designee

Honorable John T. Hammond
Michigan Judges Association Designee (through March 22, 2013)

Thomas G. McNeill
Supreme Court Designee

Douglas Messing
Court of Appeals Designee

2013 MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM

Thomas M. Harp
Administrator

Lyle N. Marshall
Deputy Administrator

Table of Contents

MAACS Mission Statement	1
Executive Summary	1
I. MAACS History and Profile	2
II. Operational Merger.....	3
A. Physical Merger.....	3
B. IT Consolidation.....	3
C. Training Consolidation.....	4
III. Roster Expansion, Marketing and Recruitment.....	5
IV. Caseload Limits Management	5
V. Roster Performance Oversight.....	5
VI. Select Roster Attorney Case Highlights	7
VII. Other Activities	10
MAACS 2013 Appendices	

MAACS Mission Statement

MAACS's mission is to compile and maintain a statewide roster of attorneys eligible and willing to accept criminal appellate defense assignments, enhance the capacity of the private bar to render effective assistance of appellate counsel to indigent defendants, and improve the administration of justice through comprehensive roster attorney oversight, caseload management, roster right-sizing, and attorney training while at the same time providing a cost-effective service that results in a favorable return on Michigan taxpayer investments.

2013 Executive Summary

Consolidation of Operations between MAACS and SADO

In December of 2012 the Appellate Defender Commission approved a two-year plan to create and implement a physical and operational merger of MAACS and the State Appellate Defender Office (SADO). The Commission directed that the operational merger begin with IT and attorney training. The plan also includes the gradual expansion of the MAACS roster to qualified applicants, the creation of a marketing and recruitment plan to facilitate roster expansion, limitations on annual MAACS roster attorney case assignments in conformance with the federal Criminal Justice Act model and the physical merger of MAACS and SADO Lansing office space. Both MAACS and SADO were charged with creating a time line to measure their progress toward the plan's goals and to provide reports to the Commission on that progress at each Commission meeting. In 2013 the Appellate Defender Commission approved a two-year timeline submitted by MAACS and SADO and expanded the plan to include the enhancement of the depth and frequency of review of MAACS roster attorney performance. MAACS and SADO took significant steps toward the implementation of this plan.

MAACS and SADO began the process of identifying a location suitable for the physical merger of their Lansing office locations upon the expiration of their current leases in 2014. MAACS and SADO developed and began to implement an IT plan which will integrate their systems. SADO submitted the first grant request in coordination with MAACS for funding to provide training to appellate assigned counsel and the funding request was granted. MAACS conducted annual CLE Fall Training for roster members and orientation training for applicants for admission to the roster. SADO attorneys and IT staff were involved as presenters at these trainings. Appellate assignments slightly increased in 2013. MAACS engaged in attorney recruitment efforts and expanded the roster. MAACS presented caseload limits management plans to the Appellate Defender Commission. MAACS instituted a variety of additional procedures to enhance roster attorney performance oversight. MAACS investigated and resolved matters concerning roster attorney performance. MAACS promoted the payment of reasonable fees to roster members and alternative methods for the adequate funding of indigent appellate defense to the circuit courts and the Legislature. MAACS engaged in other activities in support of high-quality, effective and efficient indigent appellate representation.

I. MAACS History and Profile

The system for providing indigent appellate felony defense is governed by the seven-member Appellate Defender Commission, pursuant to the Appellate Defender Act, MCL 780.711 *et seq.* The Michigan Supreme Court approved the MAACS Regulations and the Minimum Standards for Indigent Criminal Appellate Defense Services in Administrative Order 1981-7. The Regulations govern the duties of the MAACS administration, the operation of the state-wide appellate case-assignment system and define regulatory obligations that roster attorneys must meet. The Standards set the representational benchmark for all roster attorneys. MAACS began the administration of the system in 1985.

Indigent appeals are assigned to members of the MAACS roster of attorneys. These attorneys are private assigned counsel. They are paid through County appropriations to the Circuit Courts and pursuant to fee schedules set by the Circuit Courts. Appeals are also assigned to SADO, the state-funded appellate public defender office established in 1969.

MAACS's regulatory structure has four primary components:

1. It maintains the statewide roster of attorneys eligible and willing to receive assignments.
2. It manages the circuit court case assignment process. It ensures that cases are appropriately matched to qualified attorneys and are correctly distributed between roster attorneys and SADO.
3. It engages in roster oversight regarding the quality of representation provided by roster attorneys.
4. It acts to enhance the capacity of the private bar to render effective assistance of appellate counsel to indigent defendants.

As of December 31, 2013 there were 139 roster members: 82 Level I attorneys, 32 Level II attorneys and 25 Level III attorneys. Attorney Levels are set by the Regulations. They are based on a combination of the seriousness of the offense of conviction and the type of proceeding that resulted in the conviction(s).

In 2013 appellate counsel was assigned in 3,331 cases. This figure represented an increase of 146 cases from the number of cases (3,185) assigned in 2012; an increase of 4.4%. MAACS roster attorneys were assigned in 2,690 cases: 80.8 % of the total appellate assignments.

The Appellate Defender Commission awarded the 2013 Barbara R. Levine Award for Excellence in Appellate Advocacy to roster attorney Lawrence W. Katz.

Included with this report are “MAACS Appendices.” The Appendices contain a series of Metrical Reports for 2013, prepared by MAACS, which describe the following:

- A. Total Appellate Assignments.
- B. Assigned Appeals, by Case Type and Level, by Circuit
- C. Changes in Appellate Assignments 2010-2012, by Circuit.
- D. Appeals by Jurisdictional Type, by Circuit.
- E. MAACS Assigned Appeals, by Case Type and Level.
- F. SADO Assigned Appeals, by Case Type and Level.
- G. Appeals of Resentencings, by Circuit.

In 2013 MAACS staff consisted of the following people:

Thomas M. Harp, Administrator
Lyle N. Marshall, Deputy Administrator
MariaRosa J. Palmer, Administrative Office, Financial and Systems Manager
Mary Lou Emelander, Roster Manager/Administrative and Legal Secretary
Jane Doyle, Assignment Coordinator/Receptionist

II. Operational Merger

A. Physical Merger of MAACS and Lansing SADO Offices

During 2013 SADO and MAACS began the process of identifying a location suitable for combining their Lansing office locations upon the expiration of their current leases in 2014. The plan contemplates sharing space with the new statewide indigent defense agency once its Commission has been appointed and its Director selected. MAACS and SADO are being assisted by a real estate agent who has specific expertise in the Lansing office market.

B. IT Consolidation

MAACS and SADO developed and began to implement an IT plan for the Appellate Defense system. The plan consolidates the MAACS case assignment system used by the agency and the Circuit Courts within SADO’s IT department, integrates MAACS’s caseload management system with SADO’s, expands MAACS’s capacity to capture data regarding case outcomes and roster attorney performance and will create a MAACS website to facilitate that effort and to expand MAACS’s availability to its constituents.

MAACS earmarked some FY 2013-2014 funding to a “bridge” contract with an IT professional to program adjustments in the case assignment system (MCAP) that will allow customization of MAACS roster caseloads in conformance with the consolidation.

MAACS replaced its phone system and upgraded some of its computer hardware in conformance with this plan and based on technical recommendations from SADO's IT Department.

MAACS staff regularly worked with Judicial Information Services (J.I.S.) to realize improvements in its case assignment and internal correspondence systems.

MAACS conducts daily monitoring of the assignment system's operation. It collaborates with SADO to ensure it is assigned the proper percentage, number and types of cases as set by the Appellate Defender Commission. The MAACS assignment coordinator remained readily available for consultation with and assistance to the circuit courts concerning the case assignment system. This availability will continue after the IT consolidation occurs.

In December, MAACS and SADO met with Supreme Court and J.I.S. Administrative staff to discuss the consolidation plan and scheduled a meeting early in 2014 with all J.I.S. staff who work with the MAACS IT systems. A timeline was created for transferring the MAACS assignment and correspondence systems from J.I.S. hosting to the consolidated SADO IT system in 2014.

C. Training Consolidation

SADO submitted the first grant request in coordination with MAACS to the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards for funding to provide training to appellate assigned counsel. Funding was approved to conduct both MAACS's annual roster attorney training program in the fall of 2014 and training for SADO attorneys.

MAACS held its 2013 Fall Training program on three dates in October at Cooley Law School locations in Grand Rapids, Lansing and Auburn Hills. The program included four SADO attorneys as presenters along with the MAACS administrators and one former roster attorney. Seventy-eight roster attorneys attended. An additional thirty non-roster attorneys who had applied to join the roster also attended the training.

MAACS also conducted a two-day roster attorney orientation training on December 3-4 at Cooley Law School, Lansing. The orientation included presentations by the MAACS administrators, four MAACS attorneys, six SADO attorneys and its Criminal Defense Resource Center site administrator and trainer and one former roster attorney. SADO provided all attorneys admitted to the roster after the orientation training with a complimentary one-year membership in the Criminal Defense Resource Center.

III. Roster Expansion, Marketing and Recruitment

In 2013 MAACS continued its efforts to expand and improve the MAACS roster using the marketing and recruiting plan developed in 2012 for attracting attorneys to the MAACS roster and encouraging roster members to request reclassification. MAACS attempted to recruit, through advertising and direct contact, qualified applicants for Levels I, II, and III roster membership. MAACS accepted applications for Level I roster membership and invited seventy-six qualified applicants to attend the two-day orientation training held on December 3, 2013 and December 4, 2013. By the end of 2013, thirty-eight of fifty-nine orientation attendees had so far been added to the roster as Level I attorneys. Two applicants who had acquired “comparable experience” were added to the roster as Level II attorneys pursuant to MAACS Regulation Section 4(3). Two former roster attorneys rejoined the roster at Level III. MAACS approved the request of one roster attorney to be reclassified from a Level I attorney to a Level II attorney.

IV. Caseload Limits Management

At the direction of the Appellate Defender Commission MAACS formulated a plan for the management of caseloads to address the over-assignment of roster attorneys, with an eye toward the caseload limits in operation pursuant to the federal Criminal Justice Act system and while taking into account its responsibility to ensure that all indigent appellants would be assigned counsel on appeal through the appellate assignment system. MAACS compiled statistics regarding the numbers of trial and plea assignments received in 2011, 2012 and as averaged in 2011-2012 for each roster attorney. MAACS consulted with SADO regarding its case-weighting system and obtained and analyzed the raw and weighted caseload statistics for their attorneys for 2011-2012. MAACS sent surveys to roster members in order to obtain information about the hours per week and percentages of time devoted to both their MAACS and non-MAACS practices and a description of other criminal or civil law the attorney practiced. It obtained information from the Judicial Warehouse concerning the non-MAACS practice of certain roster attorneys. MAACS proposed a caseload limits management plan which employs SADO’s case-weighted assignment system model and sets caseload limits based on all of this information.

V. Enhanced Roster Attorney Performance Review

MAACS instituted a variety of additional procedures to enhance the depth and frequency of its roster attorney review.

MAACS receives quarterly reports from the Court of Appeals which track the timeliness of brief filings and the requests for oral argument for all MAACS roster attorneys. These continue to be provided by the Court. The administrator and Chief Clerk have also continued efforts to improve the utility of this report. The MAACS Administrators also review for timeliness and requests for oral argument all criminal appeals upon their release in email notifications it receives of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals opinions and orders.

MAACS continued its efforts with the Third Circuit Court to receive copies of the MAACS Statement of Service and Order for Payment filed by roster attorneys in all other Circuit Courts. The Third Circuit Court now provides copies of this form to all assigned roster attorneys and has begun to provide MAACS with copies of the completed Statement of Services.

Regulation Section 4(6)(f) requires each roster attorney to annually complete seven hours of CLE in subjects relevant to criminal appellate advocacy. MAACS also receives two copies of DVDs of the Fall Training program as part of its grant. These are available to attorneys who wish to demonstrate CLE by certifying they have viewed the training program on DVD. Three roster attorneys have not yet completed their 2013 CLE requirements but will view the DVD. Once they have certified that viewing, all MAACS attorneys will have demonstrated CLE compliance.

Investigation of Standards Compliance

MAACS continued its oversight of roster attorney compliance with the Minimum Standards. In 2013 MAACS administrative staff investigated and resolved 128 matters which involved complaints, or information from other sources, including the Courts, regarding roster attorney performance. After investigation, MAACS administrative staff resolved the matters concerning roster representation as follows:

41% of the matters investigated were determined to not implicate a violation of the Standards.

27% of the matters involved complaints from clients concerning the nature and sufficiency of attorney-client communication. All of these matters were resolved by roster attorney action.

30% of the matters resulted in a determination that a violation or violations of the Minimum Standards occurred.

2013 Standards Compliance Investigation

Total Attorney Performance Complaints Investigated	125
Number of Attorneys Investigated	22
Complaint Determinations Finding a Standard Violation	40
Number of Standard Violations Found	47

Violations Found by Standard

Minimum Standard 1	0	Minimum Standard 4	0	Minimum Standard 7	5
Minimum Standard 2	5	Minimum Standard 5	17	Minimum Standard 8	1
Minimum Standard 3	2	Minimum Standard 6	17	Minimum Standard 9	0

VI. Select Roster Attorney Case Highlights

Michigan Supreme Court

People v Smith-Anthony, MSC No. 145371; COA No. 300480, July 30, 2013

Affirmed the Court of Appeals opinion reversing Defendant's conviction of larceny from a person where there was no evidence that Defendant took property that was in the physical possession of, or immediate proximity to, the Macy's loss-prevention officer and there was no evidence that she used force or threats to distance the loss-prevention officer from the property at the time of the taking.

People v Hershey, MSC No. 146125; COA No. 309183, March 4, 2013

In lieu of granting leave to appeal, the Court remanded to the Court of Appeals for consideration, as on leave granted, of whether OV 16 and OV 19 were correctly scored and whether the defendant, by failing to object to the rescoring of these offense variables at sentencing, forfeited or waived any scoring errors.

People v Ryan Christopher Smith, MSC No. 147187; COA No. 312242, September 18, 2013

Leave to appeal granted and the parties ordered to address: (1) whether a trial court loses jurisdiction, for purposes of sentencing or otherwise, by the failure to sentence a defendant within one year after delaying sentence under M.C.L. 771.1; (2) whether a defendant waives a claim of error related to a delay in sentencing where he requests a delayed sentence under the statute; and (3) what remedy should apply to a failure to sentence a defendant within a year of conviction.

People v De La Rosa, MSC No. 147084; COA No. 314596, October 23, 2013

In lieu of granting leave to appeal, the Court remanded to the circuit court for it to correct the judgment of sentence by striking the language prohibiting Defendant's deportation until he serves 17.5 years. Defendant is not currently eligible for early parole and deportation, but the language of the statute is mandatory, and the circuit court may not prevent application of the statute if a defendant eventually becomes eligible.

Michigan Court of Appeals

People v Gietek, COA No. 306087, January 14, 2013

Reversed and remanded for a new trial. The trial court failed to substantially comply with case law and MCR 6.005(D) when it found that the defendant

waived his right to counsel. The error was structural and automatic reversal was required.

People v Mathis, COA No. 305687, March 14, 2013

Reversed Defendant's convictions of assault with intent to do great bodily harm less than murder, felony firearm, and felon in possession. Remanded for a new trial.

People v Gardner, COA No. 303997, April 16, 2013

Reversed Defendant's convictions of second-degree murder, felon in possession of a firearm, and felony firearm and remanded for a new trial where Defendant satisfied the test for ineffective assistance of counsel.

People v Bynum, COA No. 307028, April 18, 2013

Reversed Defendant's convictions of first-degree premeditated murder, two counts of assault with intent to murder, carrying a concealed weapon, and felony firearm and remanded for a new trial. Defendant was deprived of a fair trial when the prosecution's expert witness testified to improper propensity evidence.

People v Snyder, COA No. 310208, May 21, 2013

Reversed Defendant's conviction of larceny in a building where the erroneous admission of Defendant's prior conviction undermined the reliability of the verdict.

People v Love, COA No. 308868, April 25, 2013

Vacated Defendant's mandatory sentence of life without the possibility of parole and remanded for sentencing consistent with the directives of *Miller* and *Eliason*.

People v Taylor, COA No. 303208, March 21, 2013

Vacated Defendant's mandatory life sentence for first degree felony murder and remanded for resentencing. Defendant was a juvenile when the offense was committed.

People v Mitchell Skinner, COA No. 306903, February 21, 2013

Remanded for resentencing on the first degree murder conviction, but affirmed convictions for attempted murder and conspiracy to commit murder. The trial court erred when it failed to make the necessary determination under *Miller*

before sentencing Defendant to life without parole for the first degree murder conviction.

People v Morikawa, COA No. 308016, August 27, 2013

The Court of Appeals reversed and remanded for a new trial where Defendant sufficiently established a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel and demonstrated a fundamental unreliability with respect to his trial.

People v McCloud, COA No. 296256, May 30, 2013

Affirmed Defendant's convictions for two counts of felony murder, but vacated his mandatory life sentences and remanded for resentencing consistent with *Miller* and *Carp*. Defendant was a juvenile at the time of the offenses, but was charged and convicted as an adult.

People v Carruthers, COA No. 309987, July 11, 2013, For Publication

Remanded to allow Defendant to file a motion to dismiss the charges against him and for an evidentiary hearing to determine whether Defendant can present a defense pursuant to Section 8 of the MMMA. In this case of first impression, the Court held that an edible containing THC extract from marijuana resin is not usable marijuana under the MMMA.

People v Dykes, COA No. 318038, November 20, 2013

In lieu of granting the delayed application for leave to appeal, the Court vacated the judgment of sentences and remanded the case to allow Defendant the opportunity to withdraw his plea. The trial court failed to inform Defendant of the rights he was waiving, and otherwise failed to comply with the requirements of MCR 6.302(B) – (E).

Circuit Court

People v Short, Saginaw Circuit Court No. 12-37238-FH

Trial court resentenced Defendant to reflect specific performance of plea agreement. Original sentence of 10 years for unlawful imprisonment reduced to 4 years and 2 months.

People v McKenzie, Calhoun Circuit Court No. 11-2293-FH

Trial court resentenced Defendant and removed the habitual, making Defendant boot-camp eligible, and reduced the maximum term from 8 years to 4 years.

People v Hansen, Cheboygan Circuit Court No. 12-004606-FC, July 31, 2013

The Circuit Court reduced Defendant's sentence by 30 months.

People v Perken, Calhoun Circuit Court No. 12-000463-FC

The Court of Appeals remanded because PRV 5 was misscored. The circuit court reduced Defendant's minimum sentence from 57 months to 38 months.

People v Dixon, St. Clair Circuit Court No. 12-002405-FH, September 3, 2013

The circuit court reduced Defendant's sentence by 12 months after the prosecutor stipulated that OV 15 should have been scored at 5 points instead of 10 points, changing the guidelines from 14 to 58 months to 12 to 48 months.

People v Ball, COA No. 303727, Jackson Circuit Court No. 10-005752-FC, February 13, 2013

Court of Appeals remanded for resentencing and the circuit court reduced Defendant's sentence by 14 months.

People v Thomas, Kent Circuit Court No. 10-303727-FH, July 9, 2013

The Circuit Court ordered the Michigan State Police to remove Defendant's name from the SORA list.

VII. Other Activities

MAACS compiles information about appellate assigned counsel fees. MAACS met with circuit judges from SCAO Regions 3 and 4 and discussed the goals and operation of the system, roster performance oversight and assistance the agency can provide toward working to increase the fees paid to appellate assigned counsel. MAACS later assisted in the efforts of one circuit court to increase its appellate assigned attorney fee schedule.

MAACS responds to numerous inquiries per year from defendants and their families involving issues outside the regulatory purview of MAACS.

MAACS responds to questions and concerns raised by the courts, other governmental entities and the general public involving indigent appellate defense, Department of Corrections policies and other matters.

MAACS provides form pleading packets to defendants who wish to appeal a court's denial of a request for the appointment of appellate counsel or who wish to seek available post-conviction relief, after appeal.

MAACS Appendices

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
APPELLATE ASSIGNMENTS
JANUARY 1, 2013 - DECEMBER 31, 2013**

	Total No. ---	MAACS No.	SADO No. ---	SADO Percent of Total Case Type
	<u>Percent of Grand Total</u>	<u>Percent of MAACS Total</u>	<u>Percent of SADO Total</u>	
<u>Level I</u>				
Plea/PV/Resentencing	1034 31.0%	819 30.4%	215 33.5%	20.8%
Waiver Trial/INT/6.5/PPO Evidentiary Hearing	50 1.5%	37 1.4%	13 2.0%	26.0%
Jury Trial	74 2.2%	44 1.6%	30 4.7%	40.5%
Level I Total	1158 34.8%	900 33.5%	258 40.2%	22.3%
<u>Level II</u>				
Plea/PV/Resentencing	1387 41.6%	1198 44.5%	189 29.5%	13.6%
Waiver Trial/INT/6.5/PPO Evidentiary Hearing	67 2.0%	51 1.9%	16 2.5%	23.9%
Jury Trial	121 3.6%	84 3.1%	37 5.8%	30.6%
Level II Total	1575 47.3%	1333 49.6%	242 37.8%	15.4%
<u>Level III</u>				
Jury Trial	549 16.5%	415 15.4%	134 20.9%	24.4%
PV/Resentencing	30 0.9%	26 1.0%	4 0.6%	13.3%
INT/6.5	19 0.6%	16 0.6%	3 0.5%	15.8%
Level III Total	598 18.0%	457 17.0%	141 22.0%	23.6%
Prosecution Appeals of Dismissals				0.0%
Miscellaneous				0.0%
Motion for Relief				
GRAND TOTAL	3331	2690 80.8%	641 19.2%	

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
1st Hillsdale				13	6		19				0			3	3	22
2nd Berrien				47	28		75	1			1		1	9	10	86
3rd Wayne		20		156	311	11	478	37	45		82	34	39	203	276	856
4th Jackson				34	22	1	57	1			1	1	1	13	15	73
5th Barry				6	10		16					1			1	17
6th Oakland		5		61	155	4	220	3	1		4	2	11	51	64	293
7th Genesee				27	72	1	100				0	1	2	26	29	129
8th Ionia/Montcalm		1		13	6		19				0		5	3	8	28
9th Kalamazoo		2		35	41		76				0		2	14	16	94
10th Saginaw				40	54	3	97				0	5	2	20	27	124
11th Alger/Luce Schoolcraft				5	6		11				0	1	1	1	3	14
12th Baraga/Houghton/ Keweenaw				2			2				0	1		1	2	4
13th Antrim/Grand Traverse/Leelanau				18	6		24				0	1	3	7	11	35

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level			Total	Level			Total	Level				Total
				1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		
14th Muskegon				12	35		47	2	1		3		2	8	10	60
15th Branch				8	3		11				0	1		2	3	14
16th Macomb				73	91	1	165				0	4	11	26	41	206
17th Kent				92	89	2	183		2		2	1	7	23	31	216
18th Bay				25	11		36				0		3	6	9	45
19th Benzie/Manistee				6	3		9				0				0	9
20th Ottawa				7	7		14				0	2		4	6	20
21st Isabella				28	9		37				0	1		2	3	40
22nd Washtenaw				47	37		84				0	1	2	7	10	94
23rd Iosco/Oscoda				4	4		8				0				0	8
24th Sanilac				2	1		3				0			1	1	4
25th Marquette				11	3		14	1			1		1	4	5	20
26th Alcona/Alpena/ Montmorency/ Presque Isle				1	8		9				0			2	2	11

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
27th Newaygo/Oceana				5	4		9				0			2	2	11
28th Missaukee/Wexford				7	4		11				0		1	3	4	15
29th Clinton/Gratiot				13	10		23				0	2	1	3	6	29
30th Ingham				20	33		53		1		1	6	5	20	31	85
31st St. Clair				6	25	1	32				0		3	9	12	44
32nd Gogebic/Ontonagon				2	4	1	7				0			1	1	8
33rd Charlevoix				1	1		2				0				0	2
34th Arenac/Ogemaw Roscommon				8	8		16				0		1		1	17
35th Shiawassee				2	6		8				0	1		2	3	11
36th Van Buren		1		9	10	1	20				0			4	4	25
37th Calhoun				33	30	1	64		1		1	3	2	13	18	83
38th Monroe				4	17		21				0		1	3	4	25
39th Lenawee				18	16		34				0			3	3	37

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
40th Lapeer				4	1		5				0			1	1	6
41st Dickinson/Iron Menominee				4	6		10				0		1		1	11
42nd Midland		1		5	6		11				0			2	2	14
43rd Cass				9	11		20				0			8	8	28
44th Livingston				18	27		45		1		1		1	3	4	50
45th St. Joseph		3		3	15		18				0			4	4	25
46th Crawford/Kalkaska Otsego				8	12		20				0		3	1	4	24
47th Delta				2	1		3				0			2	2	5
48th Allegan				7	21	2	30				0	2	1	1	4	34
49th Mecosta/Osceola				14	9		23				0	1		1	2	25
50th Chippewa/Mackinaw				13	16		29		3		3			6	6	38
51st Lake/Mason				6	4		10				0		1		1	11
52nd Huron		1		5	3		8				0		2	3	5	14

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level			Total	Level			Total	Level				Total
				1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		
53rd Cheboygan				3	3		6				0	1		2	3	9
54th Tuscola				9	18		27				0		1	1	2	29
55th Clare/Gladwin				2	13		15				0	1		5	6	21
56th Eaton				12	33	1	46				0	1	1	6	8	54
57th Emmet				9	2		11	1	1		2	1	1	4	6	19
ALL CIRCUITS TOTALS	0	34	0	1034	1387	30	2451	46	56	0	102	76	119	549	744	3331
Level 1							1156									
Level 2							1562									
Level 3							579									
Total							3297									

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
APPELLATE ASSIGNMENT CHANGES BY CIRCUIT 2011-2013**

	2011 TOTAL	2012 TOTAL	11-12% CHANGE #/%	2013 TOTAL	12-13% CHANGE #/%	11-13% CHANGE #/%
1st Hillsdale	22	28	6 27.3%	22	-6 -21.4%	0 0.0%
2nd Berrien	122	85	-37 -30.3%	86	1 1.2%	-36 -29.5%
3rd Wayne	722	737	15 2.1%	856	119 16.1%	134 18.6%
4th Jackson	91	86	-5 -5.5%	73	-13 -15.1%	-18 -19.8%
5th Barry	10	14	4 40.0%	17	3 21.4%	7 70.0%
6th Oakland	365	283	-82 -22.5%	293	10 3.5%	-72 -19.7%
7th Genesee	112	110	-2 -1.8%	129	19 17.3%	17 15.2%
8th Ionia/Montcalm	26	19	-7 -26.9%	28	9 47.4%	2 7.7%
9th Kalamazoo	96	90	-6 -6.3%	94	4 4.4%	-2 -2.1%
10th Saginaw	172	189	17 9.9%	124	-65 -34.4%	-48 -27.9%
11th Alger/Luce Schoolcraft	8	7	-1 -12.5%	14	7 100.0%	6 75.0%
12th Baraga/Houghton/ Keweenaw	0	4	4 0	4	0 0.0%	4 0
13th Antrim/Grand Traverse/Leelanau	38	48	10 26.3%	35	-13 -27.1%	-3 -7.9%
14th Muskegon	81	65	-16 -19.8%	60	-5 -7.7%	-21 -25.9%

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
APPELLATE ASSIGNMENT CHANGES BY CIRCUIT 2011-2013**

	2011 TOTAL	2012 TOTAL	11-12% CHANGE #/%	2013 TOTAL	12-13% CHANGE #/%	11-13% CHANGE #/%
15th Branch	9	9	0 0.0%	14	5 55.6%	5 55.6%
16th Macomb	203	208	5 2.5%	206	-2 -1.0%	3 1.5%
17th Kent	210	235	25 11.9%	216	-19 -8.1%	6 2.9%
18th Bay	69	48	-21 -30.4%	45	-3 -6.3%	-24 -34.8%
19th Benzie/Manistee	5	7	2 40.0%	9	2 28.6%	4 80.0%
20th Ottawa	19	22	3 15.8%	20	-2 -9.1%	1 5.3%
21st Isabella	37	40	3 8.1%	40	0 0.0%	3 8.1%
22nd Washtenaw	84	84	0 0.0%	94	10 11.9%	10 11.9%
23rd Iosco/Oscoda	15	10	-5 -33.3%	8	-2 -20.0%	-7 -46.7%
24th Sanilac	9	9	0 0.0%	4	-5 -55.6%	-5 -55.6%
25th Marquette	13	13	0 0.0%	20	7 53.8%	7 53.8%
26th Alcona/Alpena/ Montmorency/ Presque Isle	13	8	-5 -38.5%	11	3 37.5%	-2 -15.4%
27th Newaygo/Oceana	16	10	-6 -37.5%	11	1 10.0%	-5 -31.3%
28th Missaukee/Wexford	19	21	2 10.5%	15	-6 -28.6%	-4 -21.1%
29th Clinton/Gratiot	28	26	-2 -7.1%	29	3 11.5%	1 3.6%

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
APPELLATE ASSIGNMENT CHANGES BY CIRCUIT 2011-2013**

	2011 TOTAL	2012 TOTAL	11-12% CHANGE #/%	2013 TOTAL	12-13% CHANGE #/%	11-13% CHANGE #/%
30th Ingham	65	53	-12 -18.5%	85	32 60.4%	20 30.8%
31st St. Clair	42	39	-3 -7.1%	44	5 12.8%	2 4.8%
32nd Gogebic/Ontonagon	1	5	4 400.0%	8	3 60.0%	7 700.0%
33rd Charlevoix	4	8	4 100.0%	2	-6 -75.0%	-2 -50.0%
34th Arenac/Ogemaw Roscommon	13	10	-3 -23.1%	17	7 70.0%	4 30.8%
35th Shiawassee	17	13	-4 -23.5%	11	-2 -15.4%	-6 -35.3%
36th Van Buren	15	22	7 46.7%	25	3 13.6%	10 66.7%
37th Calhoun	72	91	19 26.4%	83	-8 -8.8%	11 15.3%
38th Monroe	37	29	-8 -21.6%	25	-4 -13.8%	-12 -32.4%
39th Lenawee	44	35	-9 -20.5%	37	2 5.7%	-7 -15.9%
40th Lapeer	5	8	3 60.0%	6	-2 -25.0%	1 20.0%
41st Dickinson/Iron Menominee	7	10	3 42.9%	11	1 10.0%	4 57.1%
42nd Midland	12	18	6 50.0%	14	-4 -22.2%	2 16.7%
43rd Cass	27	18	-9 -33.3%	28	10 55.6%	1 3.7%
44th Livington	31	40	9 29.0%	50	10 25.0%	19 61.3%

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
APPELLATE ASSIGNMENT CHANGES BY CIRCUIT 2011-2013**

	2011 TOTAL	2012 TOTAL	11-12% CHANGE #/%	2013 TOTAL	12-13% CHANGE #/%	11-13% CHANGE #/%
45th St. Joseph	28	27	-1 -3.6%	25	-2 -7.4%	-3 -10.7%
46th Crawford/Kalkaska Otsego	23	22	-1 -4.3%	24	2 9.1%	1 4.3%
47th Delta	6	7	1 16.7%	5	-2 -28.6%	-1 -16.7%
48th Allegan	25	32	7 28.0%	34	2 6.3%	9 36.0%
49th Mecosta/Osceola	25	21	-4 -16.0%	25	4 19.0%	0 0.0%
50th Chippewa/Mackinaw	22	29	7 31.8%	38	9 31.0%	16 72.7%
51st Lake/Mason	9	13	4 44.4%	11	-2 -15.4%	2 22.2%
52nd Huron	6	4	-2 -33.3%	14	10 250.0%	8 133.3%
53rd Cheboygan	23	13	-10 -43.5%	9	-4 -30.8%	-14 -60.9%
54th Tuscola	14	24	10 71.4%	29	5 20.8%	15 107.1%
55th Clare/Gladwin	18	26	8 44.4%	21	-5 -19.2%	3 16.7%
56th Eaton	37	22	-15 -40.5%	54	32 145.5%	17 45.9%
57th Emmet	25	31	6 24.0%	19	-12 -38.7%	-6 -24.0%
All Circuit Totals	3,267	3,185	-82 -2.5%	3,331	146 4.6%	64 2.0%

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 ASSIGNED APPEALS BY JURISDICTIONAL TYPE
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	CLAIM				APPLICATION				RESPONSE				Grand Total
	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	
1st Hillsdale	3	2		5		17		17					22
2nd Berrien	11	1	1	13		70	3	73					86
3rd Wayne	323		16	339	35	425	57	517					856
4th Jackson	14	2	1	17	1	54	1	56					73
5th Barry	1			1		16		16					17
6th Oakland	61	2	4	67	6	213	7	226					293
7th Genesee	26		1	27	3	87	12	102					129
8th Ionia/Montcalm	8			8		19	1	20					28
9th Kalamazoo	15		1	16	1	69	8	78					94
10th Saginaw	26		4	30	1	89	4	94					124
11th Alger/Luce Schoolcraft	3			3		11		11					14
12th Baraga/Houghton/Keweenaw	2			2		2		2					4
13th Antrim/Grand Traverse/Leelanau	11		1	12		23		23					35

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 ASSIGNED APPEALS BY JURISDICTIONAL TYPE
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	CLAIM				APPLICATION				RESPONSE				Grand Total
	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	
14th Muskegon	11			11	2	47		49					60
15th Branch	3			3		11		11					14
16th Macomb	39	1	1	41	2	162	1	165					206
17th Kent	33		2	35		171	10	181					216
18th Bay	9			9		27	9	36					45
19th Benzie/Manistee				0		9		9					9
20th Ottawa	6			6		14		14					20
21st Isabella	3			3		37		37					40
22nd Washtenaw	10			10		84		84					94
23rd Iosco/Oscoda						8		8					8
24th Sanilac	1			1		3		3					4
25th Marquette	5			5	1	14		15					20
26th Alcona/Alpena/ Montmorency/ Presque Isle	2			2		8	1	9					11

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 ASSIGNED APPEALS BY JURISDICTIONAL TYPE
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	CLAIM				APPLICATION				RESPONSE				Grand Total
	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	
27th Newaygo/Oceana	2			2		9		9					11
28th Missaukee/Wexford	4			4		11		11					15
29th Clinton/Gratiot	6			6		21	2	23					29
30th Ingham	31			31	1	53		54					85
31st St. Clair	10		2	12	2	29	1	32					44
32nd Gogebic/Ontonagon	1		1	2		6		6					8
33rd Charlevoix						2		2					2
34th Arenac/Ogemaw Roscommon					1	15	1	17					17
35th Shiawassee	3			3		7	1	8					11
36th Van Buren	4		1	5		19	1	20					25
37th Calhoun	18	2	2	22	1	60		61					83
38th Monroe	3			3	1	21		22					25
39th Lenawee	3	1		4		33		33					37
40th Lapeer	1			1		5		5					6

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 ASSIGNED APPEALS BY JURISDICTIONAL TYPE
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	CLAIM				APPLICATION				RESPONSE				Grand Total
	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	
41st Dickinson/Iron Menominee	1			1		10		10					11
42nd Midland	2			2		11	1	12					14
43rd Cass	8			8		20		20					28
44th Livingston	5		1	6		44		44					50
45th St. Joseph	4			4		18	3	21					25
46th Crawford/Kalkaska Otsego	4	1		5		19		19					24
47th Delta	2			2		3		3					5
48th Allegan	4		2	6		28		28					34
49th Mecosta/Osceola	2			2		23		23					25
50th Chippewa/Mackinaw	9			9		29		29					38
51st Lake/Mason	1	1		2		9		9					11
52nd Huron	4			4	1	8	1	10					14
53rd Cheboygan	3			3		6		6					9

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 ASSIGNED APPEALS BY JURISDICTIONAL TYPE
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	CLAIM				APPLICATION				RESPONSE				Grand Total
	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	Trials	Pleas	Other	Total	
54th Tuscola	2			2		27		27					29
55th Clare/Gladwin	6			6		14	1	15					21
56th Eaton	8	2		10		44		44					54
57th Emmet	7	1		8		10	1	11					19
ALL CIRCUITS TOTALS	784	16	41	841	59	2304	127	2490	0	0	0	0	3331

E:\ANNUAL REPORTS\ANNUAL REPORT 2010\ByJuris.qpw

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
MAACS ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
1st Hillsdale				12	5		17				0			1	1	18
2nd Berrien				37	23		60	1			1		1	8	9	70
3rd Wayne		17		132	276	9	417	27	36		63	22	25	157	204	701
4th Jackson				25	20	1	46	1			1		1	12	13	60
5th Barry				4	9		13					1			1	14
6th Oakland		4		52	135	3	190	2			2	1	8	39	48	244
7th Genesee				23	61	1	85				0	1	2	20	23	108
8th Ionia/Montcalm		1		10	4		14				0		3	3	6	21
9th Kalamazoo		1		20	35		55				0		2	8	10	66
10th Saginaw				31	37	2	70				0	2	1	17	20	90
11th Alger/Luce Schoolcraft				5	5		10				0	1	1		2	12
12th Baraga/Houghton/ Keweenaw				1			1				0	1		1	2	3
13th Antrim/Grand Traverse/Leelanau				13	6		19				0		2	7	9	28

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 MAACS ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
14th Muskegon				9	33		42	2			2		1	6	7	51
15th Branch				6	3		9				0				0	9
16th Macomb				60	76	1	137				0		10	21	31	168
17th Kent				81	85	2	168		2		2		7	22	29	199
18th Bay				20	11		31				0		1	4	5	36
19th Benzie/Manistee				6	3		9				0				0	9
20th Ottawa				5	6		11				0	1		3	4	15
21st Isabella				22	8		30				0	1		2	3	33
22nd Washtenaw				38	34		72				0	1	2	5	8	80
23rd Iosco/Oscoda				2	3		5				0				0	5
24th Sanilac				2	1		3				0				0	3
25th Marquette				9	2		11	1			1		1	2	3	15
26th Alcona/Alpena/ Montmorency/ Presque Isle					7		7				0			1	1	8

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
MAACS ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
27th Newaygo/Oceana				3	3		6				0			2	2	8
28th Missaukee/Wexford				6	4		10				0		1	1	2	12
29th Clinton/Gratiot				12	10		22				0	1		3	4	26
30th Ingham				11	29		40		1		1	3	3	15	21	62
31st St. Clair				3	20	1	24				0		2	8	10	34
32nd Gogebic/Ontonagon					4	1	5				0				0	5
33rd Charlevoix				1	1		2				0				0	2
34th Arenac/Ogemaw Roscommon				6	6		12				0		1		1	13
35th Shiawassee				1	4		5				0	1		2	3	8
36th Van Buren		1		6	8	1	15				0			3	3	19
37th Calhoun				27	27	1	55		1		1	2	1	7	10	66
38th Monroe				4	16		20				0		1	2	3	23
39th Lenawee				13	15		28				0			1	1	29

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
MAACS ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
40th Lapeer				1			1					0			0	1
41st Dickinson/Iron Menominee				2	4		6					0			0	6
42nd Midland		1		4	6		10					0		2	2	13
43rd Cass				6	8		14					0		4	4	18
44th Livingston				13	23		36		1		1		1	2	3	40
45th St. Joseph		2		3	9		12					0		2	2	16
46th Crawford/Kalkaska Otsego				3	7		10					0	2		2	12
47th Delta				2	1		3					0		2	2	5
48th Allegan				5	14	2	21					0	1	1	2	23
49th Mecosta/Osceola				13	8		21					0	1	1	2	23
50th Chippewa/Mackinaw				13	13		26		2		2			5	5	33
51st Lake/Mason				6	4		10					0		1	1	11
52nd Huron				4	3		7					0		1	1	9

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 MAACS ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level			Total	Level			Total	Level				Total
				1	2	3		1	2	3		1	2	3		
53rd Cheboygan				2	2		4				0	1		1	2	6
54th Tuscola				8	16		24				0			1	1	25
55th Clare/Gladwin				1	12		13				0	1		1	2	15
56th Eaton				7	31	1	39				0	1		5	6	45
57th Emmet				9	2		11				0	1	1	3	5	16
ALL CIRCUITS TOTALS	0	27	0	820	1198	26	2044	34	43	0	77	45	84	413	542	2690
Level 1							899									
Level 2							1325									
Level 3							439									
Total							2663									

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
SADO ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
1st Hillsdale				1	1		2				0			2	2	4
2nd Berrien				10	5		15				0			1	1	16
3rd Wayne		3		24	35	2	61	10	9		19	12	14	46	72	155
4th Jackson				9	2		11				0	1		1	2	13
5th Barry				2	1		3				0				0	3
6th Oakland		1		9	20	1	30	1	1		2	1	3	12	16	49
7th Genesee				4	11		15				0			6	6	21
8th Ionia/Montcalm				3	2		5				0		2		2	7
9th Kalamazoo		1		15	6		21				0			6	6	28
10th Saginaw				9	17	1	27				0	3	1	3	7	34
11th Alger/Luce Schoolcraft					1		1				0			1	1	2
12th Baraga/Houghton/ Keweenaw				1			1				0					1
13th Antrim/Grand Traverse/Leelanau				5			5				0	1	1		2	7

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 SADO ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total		
				Level				Level				Level					
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total	
14th Muskegon				3	2		5		1			1		1	2	3	9
15th Branch				2			2					0	1		2	3	5
16th Macomb				13	15		28					0	4	1	5	10	38
17th Kent				11	4		15					0	1		1	2	17
18th Bay				5			5					0		2	2	4	9
19th Benzie/Manistee							0					0					0
20th Ottawa				2	1		3					0	1		1	2	5
21st Isabella				6	1		7					0				0	7
22nd Washtenaw				9	3		12					0			2	2	14
23rd Iosco/Oscoda				2	1		3					0				0	3
24th Sanilac							0					0			1	1	1
25th Marquette				2	1		3					0			2	2	5
26th Alcona/Alpena/ Montmorency/ Presque Isle				1	1		2					0			1	1	3

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
SADO ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
27th Newaygo/Oceana				2	1		3				0				0	3
28th Missaukee/Wexford				1			1				0			2	2	3
29th Clinton/Gratiot				1			1				0	1	1		2	3
30th Ingham				9	4		13				0	3	2	5	10	23
31st St. Clair				3	5		8				0		1	1	2	10
32nd Gogebic/Ontonagon				2			2				0			1	1	3
33rd Charlevoix							0				0				0	0
34th Arenac/Ogemaw Roscommon				2	2		4				0				0	4
35th Shiawassee				1	2		3				0				0	3
36th Van Buren				3	2		5				0			1	1	6
37th Calhoun				6	3		9				0	1	1	6	8	17
38th Monroe					1		1				0			1	1	2
39th Lenawee				5	1		6				0			2	2	8
40th Lapeer				3	1		4				0			1	1	5

**MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
SADO ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013**

Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
41st Dickinson/Iron Menominee				2	2		4				0		1		1	5
42nd Midland				1			1				0				0	1
43rd Cass				3	3		6				0			4	4	10
44th Livingston				5	4		9				0			1	1	10
45th St. Joseph		1			6		6				0			2	2	9
46th Crawford/Kalkaska Otsego				5	5		10				0		1	1	2	12
47th Delta							0				0				0	0
48th Allegan				2	7		9				0	1		1	2	11
49th Mecosta/Osceola				1	1		2				0				0	2
50th Chippewa/Mackinaw					3		3		1		1			1	1	5
51st Lake/Mason							0				0				0	0
52nd Huron		1		1			1				0		1	2	3	5
53rd Cheboygan				1	1		2				0			1	1	3

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 SADO ASSIGNED APPEALS BY CASE TYPE AND LEVEL
 JANUARY 1, 2013 TO DECEMBER 31, 2013


Circuit	MISC.	MOTION/ RELIEF	PROSEC. APPEALS	PLEA/PV/ RESENTENCING				WT/EVIDENTIARY HEARING/INT/PPO				JURY			Grand Total	
				Level				Level				Level				
				1	2	3	Total	1	2	3	Total	1	2	3		Total
54th Tuscola				1	2		3				0		1		1	4
55th Clare/Gladwin				1	1		2				0			4	4	6
56th Eaton				5	2		7				0		1	1	2	9
57th Emmet							0	1	1		2			1	1	3
ALL CIRCUITS TOTALS	0	7	0	214	189	4	407	12	13	0	25	31	35	136	202	641
Level 1				257												
Level 2				237												
Level 3				140												
Total				634												

E:\ANNUAL REPORTS\ANNUAL REPORT 2010\SADO_AN_LEV_TYP_RPT.QPW

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 RESENTENCINGS
 JANUARY 1, 2013 to DECEMBER 31, 2013

CIRCUIT	TOTAL CASES	LEVEL I					LEVEL II					LEVEL III
		PL	PVP	PVH	JT	WT	PL	PVP	PVH	JT	WT	JT
1	3	3										
2	4	1				2			1			
3	53	21		2		7	2	4	3	3		11
4	1					1						
6	5				1							4
7	13	1	2	4		2	2	1				1
9	7		3			2	1	1				
10	8	1				2			2			3
16	2					1						1
17	12	1	1			2	6					2
18	9		7			1		1				
26	1					1						
29	2	1				1						
31	3					1		1				1
32	1											1
34	1	1										
35	1					1						
36	1											1
37	2							1				1
44	1								1			
48	2											2
55	1	1										

MICHIGAN APPELLATE ASSIGNED COUNSEL SYSTEM
 RESENTENCINGS
 JANUARY 1, 2013 to DECEMBER 31, 2013



	TOTAL	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III
PLEAS	55	31	24	
PVP	24	13	11	
PVH	15	6	9	
JT	36	1	7	28
WT	3	0	3	