

*Statistical Dept.*



*Annual Report*

*1969*

**The**

**JUVENILE COURT**

**of**

**CUYAHOGA COUNTY**

**CLEVELAND, OHIO**

**HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH**

**HON. JOHN J. TONER**

**HON. ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO**

**HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN**

The Honorable Hugh A. Corrigan, Frank M. Gorman, Frank R. Pokorny  
Commissioners of Cuyahoga County

The Honorable Denver L. White,  
Director, Ohio Department of Public Welfare

The Honorable Martin A. Janis,  
Director, Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction

The Honorable Daniel W. Johnson,  
Chairman, Ohio Youth Commission

Sirs:

In compliance with Section 2151.18 of the Revised Code we submit herewith the Annual Report of the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court for the calendar year 1969, showing the number and kind of cases that have come before it, the disposition thereof ordered by the Court, and other data pertaining to the work of the Court of interest to you and to the general public.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter G. Whitlatch, Senior Judge  
The Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County

Cleveland, Ohio  
May 29, 1970

## 1969 - A YEAR OF UNPARALLELED DEMANDS AND PROGRESS

The year 1969 surpassed previous years in the number of total complaints filed in the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court. There were 21,099 new complaints of all types brought before the Court, compared with 19,301 in 1968. While it has not been unusual to experience annual increases in total caseloads of five or ten percent, the unprecedented 1969 caseload saw an extraordinary increase of 20% in juvenile delinquency cases alone.

### **COURT PREPARED TO MEET INCREASED DEMANDS EARLY IN YEAR**

Fortunately, plans for significant improvements in Court services had been launched early in the year, and the Court was able to successfully meet the heavy demands made upon its services by the increased caseload.

### **PROBATION STAFF INCREASE TO 70 MEMBERS**

Most notable among the improvements made in 1969 was the appreciable increase in probation staff. Twenty additional probation officers were hired bringing the probation officer staff to 70 members, making it the largest probation staff in the Court's history. The development of the probation staff was not intended merely to keep pace with the numerical increase in caseloads but was calculated to upgrade the quality of services rendered by our probation officers, particularly in permitting the staff to give more individual attention to probationers.

### **"SPLIT-STAFF" SYSTEM PUT INTO EFFECT**

Along with the 1969 probation staff expansion, the Court put into effect a system of work assignment commonly known as the "split-staff" system which provides for the separation of the responsibilities of investigation and court presentation from probation supervision. Heretofore, investigation, court presentation, and probation supervision had been traditionally accepted as component parts of the probation officer's function.

As a result of the reorganization of the probation department, half of the probation officers was assigned to investigations and court hearing work, exclusively, and the other half was assigned the sole responsibility of providing probation supervision counselling for those youths placed on probation.

**WORK LOADS  
LIMITED AND  
SPECIALIZED**

Under the "split-staff" system a specialization and concentration of services has been achieved. Along with this, the workloads in each area has been limited in order to maintain a high level of performance in each specialty. No more than twenty cases per month are assigned to each investigative worker, and supervision caseloads are maintained at between sixty and seventy cases. Specialization has resulted in the improved quality of social studies made by the investigating officers, and the quality of supervision of probationers has likewise noticeably improved.

**FIVE TRAINED  
SUPERVISORS ADD-  
ED TO STAFF**

To provide for the proper direction of the enlarged probation staff, five additional casework supervisors with master's degrees in social work were added to the Social Service Department, bringing the current supervisory staff to thirteen members, each being responsible for the supervision of about six probation officers.

**IN-SERVICE TRAIN-  
ING AND STAFF  
DEVELOPMENT PRO-  
GRAM EXPANDED**

Along with the significant increase in probation staff and the inauguration of the "split-staff" system, the Court in 1969 greatly expanded its In-Service Training and Staff Development Program. To provide an on-going program, Professor Serapio Zalba, Chairman of the Social Service Department, Cleveland State University, was employed to serve as discussion leader and lecturer. By-weekly sessions are conducted by Professor Zalba concerning the fundamentals and techniques of casework. Visiting psychiatrists, clinical psychologists and other experts, as well as Court supervisory personnel, serve as quest speakers in the program. Among some of the areas covered in the sessions were such subjects as: "Problems in the Use of Authority," "The Rational Approach to Casework," and "Helping the Client Negotiate the Systems."

**FURTHER EXPANSION  
OF TRAINING  
PROGRAM SOUGHT**

Through Professor Zalba's efforts, a federal grant of \$30,000 is to be made available for further expansion and continuation of the In-Service Training Program. This will provide augmented training aids and help create closer Cleveland State University ties. Under the augmented program, it is planned that staff members will be educated as co-trainers in the program through individual programs, including courses at Cleveland State University, institutes on special areas of concern, and special training experiences. It is expected that a training guide will be developed from this program. Hopefully, it might serve as a model for other agencies in establishing in-service training programs.



**CLINICAL SERVICES  
BOLSTERED**

Clinical services were bolstered during the year with the appointment of another psychiatrist to the Psychiatric Panel. With a total of seven psychiatrists serving the Court on a part-time bases, psychiatric diagnoses were made for 863 cases referred by the Court to its Clinic.

Psychological testing was provided by the Court through its Panel of four part-time psychologists who, in 1969, made approximately 700 psychological evaluations. These and the psychiatric recommendations aided the Court in formulating the most appropriate disposition for each case referred for diagnosis and evaluation.

**GROUP THERAPY  
PROGRAM CONTINUES**

The Court's on-going therapy program for selected boys on probation, continued in 1969 and was augmented by a similar program for girls. Sessions are held weekly for the small groups, with about eight youths usually being in each group. Supportive probation counselling is provided by special assignment to two selected probation officers.

**JOB PLACEMENT  
SERVICE STARTED**

A Job Placement Officer was appointed to the staff to administer a job placement program for out-of-school youths on probation. From March, 1969, when the service was initiated, until the end of the year, a total of 201 boys and girls were referred for employment.

**COUNTY WELFARE  
LIAISON OFFICER  
NAMED TO COURT**

Another significant development during the year was the assignment of a social worker from the County Welfare Department's Family and Children's Services to act as a liaison officer between the Court and the Family and Children's Services in matters concerning neglected and dependent children. Many neglect and dependency cases are brought to the attention of the Court which can be serviced by the County Welfare Department without Court intervention. Such cases are immediately referred to the liaison worker who properly channels them to the Welfare Department. The liaison worker also renders effective service by aiding in the processing of cases that need court action.

Since the program's inception in August, 1969, a total of 175 cases of neglect and dependency, involving 474 children, have been handled in this manner with Family and Children's Services providing follow-up action within forty-eight hours. This program has resulted in faster service to the public, elimination of duplication of efforts, and a lessening of the burden on the Court's Intake Department and Social Service Department. Indicative of the efficacy of this liaison service

is the fact that of the 175 cases referred by the worker, only eight cases were referred back to the Court for further action.

**FAMILY SERVICE  
ASSOCIATION LIAISON  
EXPEDITES  
REFERRALS**

Another development in the expediting of services to families and children was the expansion of the liaison services of a Family Service Association's social worker to include three half-days at the Court to review Court referrals to that agency. The accessibility of the agency's representative has resulted in a speedier intake process which saw 59 cases referred to the Family Service Association in the first few months of this program.

**LIAISON WITH CLEVELAND BOARD OF EDUCATION CONTINUES TO BE EFFECTIVE**

The long-established liaison between the Court and the Cleveland Board of Education continued to be effective in maintaining the good working relationship that has always existed between the two agencies. Through the services of the three Board of Education representatives stationed at the Court, all filings of complaints in behalf of the School System receive prompt attention and are processed with the greatest facility. With their assistance, the Court is also able to obtain complete school records, arrange transfers and other services in the discharging of mutual responsibilities, thereby removing many of the conflicts which too often characterize court-school relationships.

**GREATLY INCREASED  
PLACEMENTS AT  
MARYCREST SCHOOL**

Another significant joint effort during the year was the development of a closer working relationship with Marycrest School for Girls. Several meetings were held by the Court with members of the Marycrest Board of Trustees, the Catholic Family and Children's Services and the Sisters who operate the School. Through the joint planning of the agencies, the Court was able to increase the number of placements at this local treatment facility thus obviating the placement of many girls in schools outside of Cleveland. Marycrest School was thus able to increase its enrollment to its full capacity of 70 girls. A particularly gratifying aspect of these developments was that more girls from the inner city have been afforded the advantage of care and treatment at Marycrest School.

**SUBURBAN BRANCH  
COURT OPERATION  
EXPANDED**

The Branch Court established in January, 1969, in Cleveland Heights, originally planned to serve that community as well as University Heights, was expanded at mid-year to serve some 20 other eastern suburbs. The year's experience has well demonstrated the worth of this innovative improvement in Court services. The estab-

lishment of the Branch has served the dual purpose of making our services more accessible to the police officials, school authorities and the general public of the outlying suburbs, as well as relieving our over-crowded main facilities. Not suprisingly, there has been a substantial increase in the number of referrals to the Court from the areas involved. The Branch Office, financed through a grant from the Cleveland Foundation for a two-year period, has shown that proximity, as well as intensified inter-communication between Branch officials and the local communities, can enhance the work of the Court and allow more effective coordination of efforts on the part of all concerned. The project, which has the enthusiastic approval of the suburbs it serves, is to be continued through 1970. The Court currently has under consideration several requests for the establishment of branch courts in other suburban areas.

**FAMILY LIFE  
PROGRAM AIDS  
COURT WORK**

As part of the Cleveland Heights-University Heights Branch operation, the Court was instrumental in the creation of a Family Life Program carried out for area youths and families referred

by the Branch Office. The program, funded by the two municipalities and their combined school district, is conducted by the Jewish Family Service Association and involves 20 families in two separate ten week sessions. Separate discussions for youths and parents were held on such family problems as parent-child communications, controls on behavior, and the need to set limits within family groups.

**INTAKE DEPARTMENT  
RE-ORGANIZED TO PROVIDE  
PROMPT DOCKETING OF CASES**

By way of further improvement of Court services, the Court reorganized the Intake Department, and streamlined the process of docketing cases for hearing at the point of intake. The prompt scheduling of cases attainable under

the new system permits advance arrangements for the efficient ordering of Court business in a more expeditious manner. The services of a docket review officer, a post created in 1969, also aids in making maximum use of docket time by assessing the probable hearing-time and other ramifications of cases to determine the optimum number of cases to be heard daily.

**DETENTION HOME  
POPULATION CONTROL PROVIDES  
NEEDED SERVICE  
WITH REDUCED  
COST**

Continued close attention to, and refinement of a program initiated in 1966, has resulted in the substantial decline of Detention Home population. Since that time the average daily population of 172 children has fallen to an average 109 in 1969. Total days of care furnished, likewise, fell by nearly 40% in that period, dropping from 62,732 to 39,508.

With the careful control of the Detention Home population, managed by a Detention Intake Referee, the Court has been able to substantially reduce the operating cost of the home.

Under the law, children may be detained only when it is necessary to protect the person and property of others or those of the child or when the child may abscond or be removed from the jurisdiction of the Court. By employing these statutory criteria, we have been able to control the Detention Home population so that there is never a time when we cannot admit and hold a child who needs to be detained. No longer does a crowded Detention Home determine whether or not a child will be admitted or released.

With the reduced population, we have been able to provide a better educational program in our school, and have substantially enriched other Detention Home programs. We have also been able to utilize vacant Detention Home areas for much needed Court offices, thus relieving over-crowded Court facilities.

**COURT'S FOLLOW-UP  
ON SUPPORT MAT-  
TERS BRINGS IN  
RECORD MONEY  
COLLECTION**

A vigorous follow-up program on all support cases, where Court-ordered support money is not being paid for the maintenance of minor children, was launched last year. One day each week of the year is devoted to cases involving violations of orders for support. As a result of this action, approximately 1,560 such cases were heard by the Court. A record-breaking \$3,174,-938.82 was collected for the Support of minor children as a result of the Court's concentration on support matters. Of this amount, \$1,245,880.83 was paid directly to the County Welfare Department for the support of children whose families were receiving public assistance. The bulk of the funds collected were disbursed directly to the mother, with the balance going to several child-caring agencies and institutions.

The Court's effectiveness in collecting support money was greatly enhanced by the use of the statutes which permit the Court to order employers to deduct support payments from the father's earnings to be sent to the Court and by having the father assign his wages to provide for the payment ordered by the Court. We now have approximately 2,000 support cases wherein the employer is deducting the required payments from the father's earnings for transmission to the Court.

**UNDERGRADUATE  
TRAINING PRO-  
GRAM ADDED TO  
GRADUATE PLACE-  
MENT SERVICES**

The Court has long served as an accredited field placement facility for graduate students in social work from the School of Applied Social Sciences of Case-Western Reserve University. However, the Court has now extended itself as

a training experience to undergraduate social work students from several Cleveland area universities and colleges. The Court welcomes the opportunity to serve as a training institution for these students and anticipates that the program will become a source for the development of qualified future staff. Colleges and universities participating in this program are: Case-Western Reserve, Notre Dame, Baldwin Wallace, Oberlin, Ohio University, and Bowling Green.

**OTHER STUDENT  
AND UNIVERSITY  
PROGRAMS**

Other student placements included those made through the Cleveland International Program, with the Court acting as host to two social workers from Hong Kong and Scotland. The Court provided them with work experience as supervising probation officers. Also placed at the Court during the summer months were several college students participating in the Welfare Federation's Careers in Social Work Program. Upon graduation, two of these students became members of the staff. The Child Support Department was aided in its work by the placement of four Cleveland Marshall Law School students who were assigned to do follow-up work with cases concerning support of children. This program which provides these law students with courtroom experience, is partially funded by the Federal government with the Court participating financially.

The school-work-cooperative plan with Cleveland State University continued in 1969 to provide opportunities for students to earn salaries while providing ediphone services for the Court. In addition to the work experience, the students were afforded orientation to, and observation of court procedures with the requirement of writing a report as part of their assignment. For this they received one hour of credit.

**COURT DOCKET  
KEPT CURRENT**

In spite of the unprecedented volume of Court business, we have been able to keep our docket current and dispose of the great majority of children's cases within three or four weeks after filing. Our jury docket which consumes 18 weeks of judicial time each year in the trial of bastardy and criminal matters is also current. Keeping abreast of a voluminous court docket requires systematic planning and hard work but the efficiency of operation that results from being free from an overwhelming back log is well worth the time and effort involved.

**MARKED IMPROVE-  
MENT IN QUALITY  
& QUANTITY OF  
NON-COURT SER-  
VICES NEEDED  
TO REDUCE  
DELINQUENCY**

The extraordinary increase in the volume of work for the year unquestionably deterred some of the expected improvements in the quality of service which would have resulted from the increased staff, and improved procedures. Perhaps, this shows all too plainly, our inability

to substantially produce desired results without a corresponding increase in community services.

For example, almost 500 Ohio Youth Commission parolees were placed in our Detention Home during the year. These 500 parolees were probably responsible for the commission of over 1,000 individual crimes. It obviously follows, that had adequate facilities existed at the Ohio Youth Commission to provide proper lengths of stay for committed youth -- an average length of stay of at least a year -- rather than the 6 months stay typical of the Fairfield School, the incidence of crime in our County would have been diminished accordingly.

The State of Ohio needs to increase the capacities of its residential facilities for delinquents to accomodate at least 1,000 additional youths so as to provide a proper length of stay for their wards. Cuyahoga County has a desperate need for placement facilities-- group homes, foster homes, and residential schools -- for at least 500 dependent and neglected children who presently are not receiving proper care. Without such facilities, these children will inevitably be referred to the Court as delinquents.

The schools and social agencies in the community must develop and provide the special services which will divert problem-ridden children coming to their attention from the criminal justice system.

We will continue our efforts to improve both the quality and quantity of our service. However, without concerted public support of those agencies which can divert children from our Court, we will not be able to stem the unrelenting increase in the incidence of delinquency which in 1969 reached what ought to be an intolerable peak.

## 1969 - STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS AND SIGNIFICANT TRENDS

The record-breaking 21,099 new complaints filed in the Juvenile Court in 1969 do not reflect completely the Court's heavy work load for the year. In addition to the new filings, there were approximately 2,000 cases which came before the Court on motions for change of custody, motions to show cause, and for violations of probation conditions and support orders. However, for comparative purposes, only new filings are used in measuring the changes which occur from year to year, because they more validly reflect the incidence of the various offenses within the Court's jurisdiction. The increase in total new cases filed in 1969, therefore, represents a 9% increase over the 1968 volume of 19,301 cases.

### **DELINQUENCY INCREASE OF 20% IS LARGEST EVER**

New delinquency complaints, however, rose by a staggering 20%, going from 8,091 cases in 1968 to 9,678 in 1969. This unprecedented delinquency increase unquestionably reflects the turmoil which now characterizes the United States, particularly in the great urban centers and parallels the general increase in crime in America. In no time in the Court's history have we experienced a comparable increase. In recent years the rate of delinquency increase has been from 5 to 10%. The number of boys' and girls' cases filed in 1968 was 6,405 and 1,686 respectively. In 1969, there was an increase of 21% in boys' cases and 16% in girls' cases.

### **BOYS OUTNUMBERED GIRLS FOUR TO ONE**

Continuing a long-established pattern, the boys appearing in Court outnumbered the girls by a ratio of four to one. There were 7,728 delinquency complaints filed against boys compared with 1,950 against girls. Likewise, the different patterns of delinquency between boys and girls were evident again in 1969, with boys being referred most often for aggressive acts against the community. Meanwhile girls were largely referred for behavior problems of a personal nature, involving sexual misconduct, running away, truancy, and general incorrigibility.

### **AUTOMOBILE OFFENSES ACCOUNT FOR 50% OF INCREASE IN BOYS' CASES**

Accounting for nearly 50% of the total increase in boys' delinquency cases were offenses involving automobiles, namely auto theft and auto trespassing. While these are different offenses under the law, the Court considers the combined total as indicative of the wide spread unlawful use and damage of automobiles in the community. Since charges of auto theft are more difficult to substantiate, the police most often file the unlawful use of automobiles under charges of auto trespassing and tampering. Boys



referred for these offenses in 1969 amounted to 1,968 compared with 1,339 in 1968, an increase of 47%. In addition, 100 girls were referred for the same offenses in 1969 compared with 76 in 1968.

These offenses frequently involve extensive damage to automobiles adding greatly to the ever increasing cost of insurance. Further, these violations endanger the safety of the general public, the police, who often need to pursue such violators, and the youths themselves. The Court can only view these offenses as very serious law violations and treat them accordingly. During 1969, about 400 youths were committed to institutions for automobile offenses, and in many cases substantial restitution of damages was required.

**PUBLIC COOPERATION NEEDED TO REDUCE AUTO THEFTS**

While the Court deals effectively with automobile violations, it must be realized, as recent U.S. Justice Department surveys and educational programs point out, that the greatest burden in reducing these offenses lies with the general public. Car owners should take the precaution of removing the ignition key and securely locking their car doors. Automobile manufacturers should be encouraged to install tamper-proof locks and ignition systems, as part of the effort to make cars less vulnerable to theft.

**OTHER FORMS OF THEFT ALSO ARE FREQUENT CHARGES AGAINST BOYS**

As in past years, other forms of stealing remained a primary reason for referring boys to Court. Among these were: unlawful entry and stealing, 1,088 cases; other stealing, including shoplifting, 982 cases; theft from person, 346 cases; and other property offenses, 118 cases.

**ACTS RESULTING IN DEATH, AND WEAPONS CHARGES INDICATIVE OF VIOLENT BEHAVIOR**

While most other charges against boys remained virtually the same as in 1968, some noticeable exceptions were recorded in overtly hostile and aggressive acts against persons and property. Most significant was the 15 cases of acts resulting in death brought against boys in 1969 compared with five in 1968. Including two girls referred for this offense in 1969, a total of 17 acts resulting in death were filed, compared with six in 1968. Charges involving weapons increased from 60 to 97 for boys alone. Including 11 girls so charged, weapons offenses totaled 108 for the year, compared with 64 in 1968.

The aforementioned charges are indicative of the violent pattern of activities prevalent in our society today. The fact that adults are evidently making guns available to children is an especially alarming development.

**DESTRUCTION OF  
PROPERTY  
CHARGES IN-  
CREASED BY 40%**

The Court shares with society in general, and particularly with public agencies, great dismay at the increase in malicious destruction of property cases which rose from 307 in 1968 to 435 this year, an increase of 40%. The Court urges public authorities to promptly refer acts of vandalism and arson to the Court for appropriate action. Whether these cases arise from malicious mischief or emotional disturbances, the Court views them as serious deviant behavior and stands ready to take aggressive action to curtail this senseless destruction of property. The Court frequently requires restitution of the damages incurred by the victims of such acts. A total of \$32,000 in damages was collected by the Court in the past year.

The 40% increase in destruction of property cases strongly suggests that the recently enacted statutes making parents civilly liable for damages caused by the malicious acts of their children has not provided the expected deterrent effect on such acts.

**BIND-OVERS TO  
COMMON PLEAS  
COURT MORE THAN  
DOUBLED IN 1969**

Reflected in the rise in violent acts was the substantial increase in the number of minors bound-over to the Common Pleas Court to stand trial as adults for their criminal acts. More than twice as many boys in 1969 over 1968 (27 compared with 11) were so transferred to the Common Pleas Court.

**DRUG & NARCOTIC  
VIOLATIONS IN-  
CREASED; GLUE  
SNIFFING  
DECLINES**

Since 1967, drug and narcotic violations have risen from 27 cases recorded in that year, to 70 in 1968, and to 119 cases (108 boys and 11 girls) in 1969. On the other hand, glue sniffing charges declined from 239 in 1967 to 166 in 1968, and to 97 in 1969. The Court is encouraged by the sharp decline in glue sniffing offenses and hopes that the same trend will occur in drug violations. We view the unlawful use of drugs and narcotics as being symptomatic of the emotional disturbance that has, in the past, and will continue in the future to bring children before the Court.

However, the use of drugs, marijuana and medicines by our age group is both a dangerous and destructive manifestation of deviant behavior that requires special attention and vigilance. The Court recognizes that in order to effectively treat such violators, the root causes of their problems must be uncovered. In order to obtain the necessary direction in the treatment of the drug offender, our staff has attended several seminars devoted to this subject.

**GIRLS ARE MOST  
OFTEN REFERRED  
FOR OFFENSES  
AGAINST SELF**

The pattern of girls' delinquency mentioned earlier in this report, contrasts sharply with that of boys in that the proportion of hostile and aggressive acts against the community on their part is almost negligible. More than two-thirds of the girls' cases, as in the past, were filed for what is statistically termed "incurability". This catch-all term may encompass several manifestations of wayward conduct, including sexual misbehavior, running away, habitual disobedience to parents, and truancy from home and school. Any one of these acts is sufficient reason for referral to the Court. There were 741 incurability charges filed against girls in 1969. The next most frequent offense by girls was that of stealing (mostly shoplifting) which increased by nearly 40%, moving from 311 to 435 cases in the last year. The third most frequent offense, yet representing only 7% of all girls' cases, was injury to person charges which amounted to 145 cases.

Delinquency on the part of girls is generally of an emotional origin, and it is more difficult to control. Counseling for girls requires frequent reappearances in Court, and more intensive efforts by the probation staff.

*Please see Table 2 for delinquency offenses reported in 1969 and 1968.*

**FIVE THOUSAND  
YOUTHS ON PROBATION  
SUPERVISED  
DURING THE YEAR**

The Court's Probation Department supervised 5,065 cases during the year, including 2,550 boys and girls who were newly put on probation during the year, the balance having been carried over from the previous year. Boys under supervision totaled 3,877, while girls numbered 1,138. In addition, 69 dependent and neglected children also were supervised by the Department. The number of these children under supervision is gradually being phased out by transfer to the Family and Children's Services of the County Welfare Department.

Discharges from probation supervision after a satisfactory period of adjustment accounted for two-thirds of all probation closings. A total of 567 boys and girls, or 21% of all probationers closed, was committed to correctional institutions for further treatment as a result of subsequent reappearances in Court while on active probation. The remaining 13%, or 378 cases, were removed for other reasons including loss of jurisdiction, disappearance of the probationer, and the use of alternative arrangements in lieu of probation.

**COMMITMENTS TO  
INSTITUTIONS  
INCREASE**

Commitments to correctional institutions and private placements increased by 15% in 1969 over 1968, involving 1,373 boys and girls in 1969 compared with 1,196 youths the previous year. The Court committed 765 boys and 175 girls to the Ohio Youth Commission; 151 boys were committed to the Cleveland Boys' School, and 100 girls to the Blossom Hill School. Another 168 children -- 101 boys and 67 girls -- were placed by the Court in residential treatment centers, located for the most part out of the State of Ohio. These centers offer group living arrangements and treatment services for the emotionally disturbed child. Such residential placements are made after clinical evaluations indicate that the youths involved can best profit from the treatment offered by these facilities.

Commitments to the Ohio State Reformatory declined from 39 to 14 boys in 1969. This decline occurred because upper court decisions had put in doubt the constitutionality of such commitments. The revision of the Juvenile Court Act and the establishment of the Mansfield Youth Center at Mansfield, Ohio, resolved this problem and gave the Court a facility to which boys over 16 years of age, adjudged delinquent for felonious acts, may be committed.

The over-all increase in the number of commitments was almost directly proportional to the increased number of delinquent children appearing before the Court. It is the policy of all the judges as well as being the law of the State of Ohio to provide for the supervision, care and rehabilitation of the child in the family environment, separating the child from its parents only when necessary for his welfare or in the interest of public safety. It is only natural for the parents, the children and their counsel to resist the Court's placement plans; there are many situations, however, where, after long and exhausting efforts to control the child's behavior in the home, all concerned agree that placement is the only solution. Understandable as the resistance to placement may be, the Court, in the interest of preventing the child from doing great harm to himself or to others frequently must place the child notwithstanding the strong opposition of parents and child. The availability of more and better placement facilities would help greatly in overcoming the all too prevalent and erroneous notion that any commitment of a child is tantamount to a jail sentence.

**GEOGRAPHICAL  
DISTRIBUTION OF  
DELINQUENCY  
CASES**

The geographical distribution of delinquency cases displayed virtually the same pattern as has been evident for the past several years, with three-fourth's of delinquency cases coming from the City of Cleveland and the remaining quarter from suburban

areas. It is significant that this pattern continues despite the continuing decline in Cleveland's population and the continuing rise in suburban population. It is estimated that of the total number of families living in Cuyahoga County, 46.2% are residing in the City of Cleveland, with 53.8% residing in the suburbs. Total population, it is further estimated, declined in the City of Cleveland from 809,022 in 1968 to 796,430 in 1969, while the suburban population rose from 944,426 to 959,545 in the same period.

**DELINQUENCY IN  
THE CITY OF  
CLEVELAND**

Delinquency cases from the City of Cleveland increased by 16% over 1968, rising from 6,011 cases to 6,996 cases. While most City of Cleveland social planning areas were relatively stable in the 1969 proportion of delinquency increase, the Glenville area, the highest area of delinquency in the City, showed an increase of 300 cases. The number of cases from Glenville went from 1,036 in 1968 to 1,336 in 1969, for an increase of nearly 30%. The following other city social planning areas showed even more noticeable increases over the past year: Central-East, from 269 to 382 cases (up 42%); Central-West, from 276 to 424 cases (up 54%). Other areas of substantial increases included: Corlett, from 298 to 393 cases (up 32%); Lee-Miles, from 189 to 288 cases (up 52%) and the Near West Side, from 430 to 512 cases (up 19%). It is significant that the Hough Social planning area, the second highest delinquency area in the City, increased by only 6.5% in case volume, going from 993 to 1,058 cases in 1969. This situation is believed attributable in part to the decline in the Hough area population and resultant shift in population to the Glenville area and eastward.

**TWO-THIRDS OF CITY  
DELINQUENCY CAME  
FROM 7 AREAS**

Nearly two-thirds of all the City of Cleveland's delinquency cases came from seven of the City's twenty-eight social planning areas, namely: Central-East, Central-West, Corlett, Glenville, Hough, Mt. Pleasant and the Near West Side.

**SUBURBAN DELIN-  
QUENCY STATISTICS  
AFFECTED BY  
BRANCH COURT  
OPERATION**

Delinquency complaints from suburban areas amounted to 2,483 in 1969 compared with 1,913 in 1968, for an increase of nearly 30% in volume. While there were noticeable increases in individual suburbs, statistics on suburban cases in general are somewhat distorted by the experience of the Court's Branch Office located in Cleveland Heights. As explained earlier in this report, the Branch Court served most of the County's eastern suburbs. Unquestionably, the proximity of the Branch Court to the suburbs served, and an increased awareness of the availability of our

services resulted in many complaints being filed which otherwise would not have come to our attention.

This factor is most strikingly illustrated in Cleveland Heights and University Heights where there were respectively 200 cases and 44 cases filed in 1969 compared with 73 and 19 in 1968, an increase of 174% in Cleveland Heights, and 132% in University Heights. There was a total of 554 cases filed in the Branch Court with the other suburbs served likewise exhibiting marked increases in the number of complaints filed. Therefore, any comparison of the prior incidence of delinquency in the suburbs served by the Branch Court to that of 1969 should take into account the abnormality produced by the establishment of the Branch Court.

*Please see Table B for delinquency complaints by individual suburbs as well as City of Cleveland social planning areas.*

**POLICE OFFICIALS  
FILE TWO-THIRDS  
OF ALL DELIN-  
QUENCY CASES**

Police officials in Cuyahoga County, including private police and store security officers, filed approximately two-thirds of all the delinquency complaints brought to the Court, with police from the City of Cleveland accounting for nearly one-third of all the delinquency filings. Parents were responsible for 14% of all delinquency filings, and the Cleveland Board of Education accounted for 4% of the filings. Individuals, other than parents of the children involved, filed 13% of all delinquency complaints. Many of these individuals were referred to the Court by policemen who had investigated the cases. In a number of such cases, the police and judicial process would be more effectively served if the police had filed. Through regular meeting with Cleveland and suburban police officials during the past year, we have worked out expeditious filings procedures which give better service to the citizenry and conserve the time of both police and Court officials. Particularly effective in this respect, has been having the police mail to the Court complaints which can be processed informally. *Please see Table C for source of referral.*

**OTHER CHILDREN'S  
CASES**

Other children's cases processed by the Court in 1969 included 94 applications for the approval of permanent surrender of children. These actions sought court approval of agreements made for adoption purposes between parents, usually unwed mothers, and the Family and Children's Services of the County Welfare Department. In addition, 216 applications to determine custody of children were filed. Many of the custody cases were incidental to non-support cases where the custody of children was awarded to the mother with no contest by the father. However, a

considerable number of these custody cases are strongly contested between husband and wife, consuming a great amount of trial time.

In addition, there were 144 applications to gain consent to marry heard by the Court. These included youth who were old enough to marry with parental approval, but who had to have the Court consent because they had no parent or guardian. Also included among these applicants were children under the statutory age to marry with parental consent (16 years for girls and 18 years for boys) who sought the Court's consent to marry because of pregnancy or the birth of an illegitimate child.

There were 133 neglected and 194 dependent children's cases filed in 1969 compared with 145 and 227 respectively in 1968. The decrease in the number of filings in these categories is attributable to the improved liaison between the Court and the Family and Children's Services which has resulted in a considerable number of cases being directly referred to the Family and Children's Services by the Intake Department liaison worker without further Court intervention.

**JUVENILE TRAFFIC  
OFFENDERS UP  
ONLY 5%**

Juvenile Traffic offenders totaled 8,436 in 1969 compared with 8,014 in 1968, for an increase of only 5%. This is a negligible increase considering the ever-increasing number of 16 and

17 year olds licensed to drive each year. Boys' cases increased by 3% from 7,241 to 7,484, while girls' cases increased by 23%, from 773 to 952. In almost every case the suspension of the drivers' license for an appropriate period of time and the payment of the costs of Court continued to be effective methods of dealing with the youthful traffic offender.

**ADULT CASES**

Actions brought against adults, other than the non-support and neglect cases previously mentioned, included 945 paternity filings compared with 877 in 1968; 114 cases of Adults Contributing to Delinquency compared with 110 in 1968; and 18 Adults Tending to Cause Delinquency compared with 61 in 1968. *See Table 1 for the breakdown of children's and adult complaints filed in 1969 compared with 1968.*

**PUBLIC SEEKS  
COURT AID**

In addition to the foregoing, other complaints were reviewed by the Intake Department and were referred elsewhere for service. Included in these instances were 554 referrals to local public and private social agencies. Many of these complainants who came to the Court did so



in desperation because of the difficulty of obtaining social services in the community. In those cases not accepted for Court service, it was determined that other community services would be more appropriate for their needs.

**JUDGES CONTINUE  
COMMUNITY  
ACTIVITIES**

Judges Whitlatch, Toner, Gagliardo and Corrigan continued throughout 1969 to participate in a variety of community activities in behalf of child welfare, juvenile delinquency treatment, and prevention. Memberships on boards of trustees of a number of social service organizations were included in their activities as well as innumerable talks, panel discussions and other programs on delinquency. These appearances included radio and television interviews. Supervisors and probation officers as well as other court personnel continued in 1969 to fulfill many speaking engagements in behalf of the Court and its work. In addition to his other contributions, Senior Judge Walter G. Whitlatch served as chairman of the Juvenile Code Revision Committee of the Ohio Association of Juvenile Court Judges. This Committee drafted the revised Juvenile Court Act, which became effective in Ohio on November 19, 1969.

**VOLUNTEER  
SERVICES AID  
THE COURT**

We along with other juvenile courts are attracted to the advantages and use of volunteers in a court setting. The Court has had valuable results from its volunteer program and currently plans are under way to expand its program. We gratefully acknowledge the dedicated services of the following volunteers who serve in the Court's Intake Department: Mrs. John Bernet, Mrs. Seward Covert, Mrs. Ralph Gibbon, Mrs. Robert Gilkeson, Mrs. Scott Hayes, Mrs. Martha Hickox, Mrs. Clyde Nash, Jr., Mrs. Frederick Reuter and Mrs. Bently Thomas.

Another valuable adjunct to the Court is Project Friendship, Incorporated. Sponsored by the Women's Presbytery of Cleveland, it provides numerous volunteers who counsel girls on probation and contribute other services. We, at the Court, thank all of the devoted ladies who participated in this program.

**LEO G. CHIMO  
ENTERS PRIVATE  
PRACTICE**

Leo G. Chimo, Esq. resigned from the Court as Director of Legal Services with thirty-six years of service to the Court and entered the private practice of law. Mr. Chimo first joined the Court in 1933 as a supervisor in the Detention Home. In 1942, he was appointed as a counselor in the Child Support Department where he served until 1954, when he was named Assistant Director of Legal Services. Mr. Chimo was named Director of Legal Services in 1960, a post he held until his resignation. In his work at the Court, Mr. Chimo

✓

1969

was always known for his patience and exactness in dealing with both the staff and public in interpreting and expediting legal matters and procedures. The Court wishes him well in the practice of his profession after his long years of meritorius service.

Patrick F. Gallagher, Assistant Director of Legal Services since 1960, was named to succeed Mr. Chimo as Director of the Department.

**ARTHUR DUDLEY  
RECEIVES BAR  
AWARD**

Arthur W. Dudley, Chief Cashier of the Court since 1948, was a recipient of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association's Public Service Award in recognition of his many years of service to

the Court and the public. Mr. Dudley observed thirty-one years with the Court in 1969, having joined the staff in 1938 as an assistant in the Cashier's Office. The Court is proud that Mr. Dudley was selected as a recipient for the Bar Award and extends its best wishes to him.

**CITIZEN'S  
ADVISORY BOARD  
AIDS COURT**

The Citizen's Advisory Board to the Court continued in 1969 to give advice, assistance and support in the implementation of our plans to improve services. The Court is grateful for the

dedicated service of the following men and women who are members of the Board: Dr. Arthur Blum, Mr. Paul Briggs, Mr. Ronald Brown, Mr. Crede Calhoun, Mr. Neil Carothers, Msgr. Casimir S. Ciolek, Mr. Charles F. Clarke, Mr. A.F. Connors, Mr. Victor E. De Marco, Mr. Clarence Gaines, Mr. Fred Hauserman, Mrs. Gilbert Humphrey, Mr. Frank E. Joseph, Mr. Bruce B. Krost, Mr. Richard M. Kelley, Mr. Frank L. Kelker, Mr. James H. Miller, Mr. John Petten, Mr. George Pillersdorf, Mrs. Frank H. Porter, Mr. Louis B. Seltzer, Rev. Roger S. Shoup, Mr. Curtis Lee Smith, Mrs. Paul A. Unger, Mrs. Robert P. Wright, and Mr. Ben D. Zevin.

Mr. Ronald Brown, a member of the Board since its inception in 1966 and one of its most devoted and active members, is now Chairman of the Board.

The Court lost a great friend and supporter in the death of Morris Berick, Esq. Mr. Berick, one of Cleveland's most distinguished lawyers and a former president of the Cleveland Bar Association, was Chairman of the Advisory Board from its establishment in 1966 until the end of 1969. Mr. Berick's recognized position as an outstanding Cleveland citizen gave strength and prestige to the Board's activities. His ready grasp and understanding of the Court's many problems, his astuteness and friendliness in effecting practical solutions will make his contribution to this Court affectionately and long remembered.

TABLE A  
Ages of Delinquents

<u>AGE</u>	<u>BOYS</u>	<u>GIRLS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Eight and Under	26	6	32
Nine	43	7	50
Ten	105	9	114
Eleven	198	26	224
Twelve	382	82	464
Thirteen	716	239	955
Fourteen	1,254	369	1,623
Fifteen	1,678	503	2,181
Sixteen	1,648	408	2,056
Seventeen	1,599	293	1,892
Eighteen	61	6	67
Unknown	18	2	20
TOTAL	7,728	1,950	9,678

TABLE B

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents  
1968 and 1969

AREA OF RESIDENCE

City of Cleveland By Social Planning Areas	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Central	137	140	47	40	184	180
Central - East	198	288	71	94	269	382
Central - West	190	345	86	79	276	424
Clark - Fulton	101	84	15	18	116	102
Corlett	233	309	65	84	298	393
Denison	74	87	30	23	104	110
Downtown	13	8	1	1	14	9
Edgewater	33	28	2	4	35	32
Glenville	800	1,019	236	317	1,036	1,336
Goodrich	77	49	9	12	86	61
Hough	797	858	196	200	993	1,058
Jefferson	75	78	24	17	99	95
Kinsman	155	166	71	63	226	229
Lee - Miles	150	251	39	37	189	288
Mt. Pleasant	291	269	74	87	365	356
Near West Side	349	426	81	86	430	512
North Broadway	68	77	13	17	81	94
North Collinwood	44	60	13	8	57	68
Norwood	141	150	21	29	162	179
Purtis - Bellaire	73	103	26	9	99	112
Riverside	93	66	13	17	106	83
South Broadway	103	72	18	22	121	94
South Brooklyn	70	84	13	9	83	93
South Collinwood	93	122	16	31	109	153
Tremont	154	199	31	39	185	238
University	37	53	11	12	48	65
West Side	76	88	29	18	105	106
Woodland Hills	109	116	26	28	135	144
TOTAL, City of Cleveland	4,734	5,595	1,277	1,401	6,011	6,996

TABLE B, Continued  
 Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents  
 1968 and 1969

AREA OF RESIDENCE

Municipalities, Villages & Townships	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Bay Village	70	61	13	11	83	72
Beachwood	23	25	1	11	24	36
Bedford	23	44	8	4	31	48
Bedford Heights	18	34	5	7	23	41
Berea	54	41	8	9	62	50
Brecksville	6	16	6	1	12	17
Broadview Heights	8	22	1	3	9	25
Brooklyn	29	19	11	10	40	29
Brook Park	54	95	17	14	71	109
Cleveland Heights	61	158	12	42	73	200
East Cleveland	174	203	35	55	209	258
Euclid	83	73	18	15	101	88
Fairview Park	33	37	8	8	41	45
Garfield Heights	57	34	4	6	61	40
Independence	10	11	-	8	10	19
Lakewood	170	222	56	68	226	290
Lyndhurst	33	53	3	4	36	57
Maple Heights	61	77	6	18	67	95
Mayfield Heights	11	22	1	3	12	25
Middleburg Heights	7	10	1	6	8	16
North Olmsted	44	63	6	15	50	78
North Royalton	14	23	4	4	18	27
Parma	126	142	39	33	165	175
Parma Heights	39	29	14	14	53	43
Richmond Heights	14	7	2	4	16	11
Rocky River	36	62	7	15	43	77
Seven Hills	22	14	10	6	32	20
Shaker Heights	40	48	19	19	59	67
Solon	4	21	2	-	6	21
South Euclid	35	46	3	8	38	54
Strongsville	21	9	4	5	25	14
University Heights	8	31	11	13	19	44
Warrensville Heights	20	52	10	19	30	71
Westlake	56	46	5	6	61	52

TABLE B, Continued

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents  
1968 and 1969

AREA OF RESIDENCE

Municipalities, Villages & Townships con't.	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969
Bentleyville	2	-	-	-	2	-
Bratenahl	1	-	-	1	1	1
Brooklyn Heights	4	1	-	-	4	1
Chagrin Falls	15	32	2	5	17	37
Cuyahoga Heights	1	6	-	-	1	6
Gates Mills	-	-	-	-	-	-
Glenwillow	-	-	-	-	-	-
Highland Heights	3	5	1	3	4	8
Hunting Valley	1	1	-	-	1	1
Linndale	-	-	1	-	1	-
Mayfield	3	9	-	2	3	11
Moreland Hills	3	5	1	1	4	6
Newburgh Heights	8	14	4	5	12	19
North Randall	1	2	-	-	1	2
Oakwood	8	17	6	5	14	22
Olmsted Falls	1	7	-	-	1	7
Orange Village	5	1	-	1	5	2
Pepper Pike	3	6	2	3	5	9
Valley View	5	7	-	-	5	7
Walton Hills	3	6	-	1	3	7
Westview	2	5	1	3	3	8
Woodmere	-	1	-	-	-	1
Chagrin Falls Township	-	-	-	-	-	-
Olmsted Township	11	12	-	1	11	13
Riveredge Township	-	-	-	-	-	-
Warrensville Township	1	1	-	-	1	1
TOTAL, Suburbs	1,545	1,988	368	495	1,913	2,483
Agency Residents	42	52	33	33	75	85
Out-of-County Residents	83	89	8	19	91	108
Area Designation Unknown	1	4	-	2	1	6
GRAND TOTAL DELINQUENCY CASES	6,405	7,728	1,686	1,950	8,091	9,678

TABLE C

## Delinquency Cases, Official and Unofficial by Source of Referral

<u>SOURCE OF REFERRAL</u>	Boys		Girls		Total
	<u>Official</u>	<u>Unofficial</u>	<u>Official</u>	<u>Unofficial</u>	
Cleveland Police Department	2,222	525	165	73	2,985
Other County Police Departments	1,102	819	83	92	2,096
Other Police (State, Park, etc.)	100	47	7	20	174
Railroad Security Officers	5	36	5	-	46
Cleveland Fire Department	9	30	4	2	45
Store Security	157	352	65	260	834
Other Courts	37	-	6	1	44
Department of Liquor Control	7	37	1	2	47
Cleveland Board of Education	174	137	34	30	375
Other County School Boards	62	55	34	23	174
Public Social Agencies	35	9	40	7	91
Private Social Agencies	7	-	9	-	16
Parents, Guardians and Relatives	397	210	623	165	1,395
Citizen	543	552	47	143	1,285
Other Source	<u>32</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>71</u>
TOTAL	4,889	2,839	1,130	820	9,678



TABLE 1  
Total Complaints By Years, 1969 and 1968

Type of Complaint	1969	1968
<b>CHILDREN'S CASES</b>		
Delinquency: Boys . . . . .	7,728	6,405
Girls . . . . .	1,950	1,686
<b>TOTAL DELINQUENCY . . . . .</b>	<b>9,678</b>	<b>8,091</b>
Juvenile Traffic Offenders: Boys . . . . .	7,484	7,241
Girls . . . . .	952	773
<b>TOTAL TRAFFIC OFFENDERS . . . . .</b>	<b>8,436</b>	<b>8,014</b>
Neglected Children's Cases . . . . .	133	146
Dependent Children's Cases . . . . .	194	227
Application to Determine Custody . . . . .	216	227
Application for Approval of Permanent Surrender . .	94	120
Application for Consent to Marry . . . . .	144	151
<b>TOTAL CHILDREN'S CASES . . . . .</b>	<b>18,895</b>	<b>16,976</b>
<b>ADULT CASES</b>		
Non-Support of Minor Children . . . . .	872 *	943 *
Neglect of Minor Children . . . . .	118	181
Contributing to Delinquency . . . . .	124	110
Tending to Cause Delinquency . . . . .	18	61
Paternity Complaints . . . . .	945	877
Certifications and Motions . . . . .	72	121
Other Adult Cases . . . . .	55	32
<b>TOTAL ADULT CASES . . . . .</b>	<b>2,204</b>	<b>2,325</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL, CHILDREN'S and ADULT CASES . . . . .</b>	<b>21,099</b>	<b>19,301</b>

\* In addition, approximately 1,560 non-support matters were re-activated for court action obviating the need to fill a new complaint.

TABLE 2  
 Official and Unofficial Delinquency Complaints, 1969  
 Compared with 1968

Complaint	Boys		Girls		Total	
	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968
Auto Theft . . . . .	544	528	5	13	549	541
Auto Trespassing & Tampering . . . . .	1,424	811	95	63	1,519	874
Unlawful Entry & Stealing	1,088	906	17	23	1,105	929
Other Theft . . . . .	982	847	435	311	1,417	1,158
Theft from Person . . . . .	346	313	22	23	368	336
Other Property Offenses .	118	105	17	11	135	116
Act Resulting in Death .	15	5	2	1	17	6
Injury to Person . . . . .	553	538	145	143	698	681
Incorrigibility . . . . . ✓	680	637	741	657	1,421	1,294
Truancy . . . . . ✓	207	173	76	89	283	262
Running Away . . . . . ✓	61	46	107	90	168	136
Sex Offense . . . . .	131	110	84	109	215	219
Destruction of Property .	435	307	26	24	461	331
Disorderly Conduct . . . .	150	173	39	25	189	198
Liquor Violation . . . . . ✓	259	270	34	41	293	311
Possession of Weapons . .	97	60	11	4	108	64
Fire Setting . . . . .	20	39	4	1	24	40
Trespassing on Property .	91	109	5	7	96	116
Curfew Violation . . . . . ✓	218	119	38	8	256	127
Inhaling Glue Fumes . . . .	91	154	6	12	97	166
Drug and Narcotic Violation	108	55	11	15	119	70
Other Complaints . . . . .	110	100	30	16	140	116
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,728</b>	<b>6,405</b>	<b>1,950</b>	<b>1,686</b>	<b>9,678</b>	<b>8,091</b>

TABLE 3  
 Disposition of Juveniles In Delinquency Cases  
 Official and Unofficial By Sex, 1969

Official Cases	Boys	Girls	Total
Placed Under Supervision of			
Probation Officer . . . . .	1,935	615	2,550
Placed in Private Treatment Centers . . . . .	101	67	168
Committed or Returned to Public Institutions:			
Ohio Youth Commission . . . . .	765	175	940
Ohio State Reformatory . . . . .	14	-	14
Cuyahoga County Training Schools . . . . .	151	100	251
TOTAL Committed or Returned to Institutions .	930	275	1,205
Transferred to Common Pleas Court . . . . .	27	-	27
Continued Under Supervision of Parole Officer	56	2	58
Continued Under Supervision of Family and			
Children Services . . . . .	27	7	34
Committed to Parents or Relatives . . . . .	242	48	290
Order Made in Other Case . . . . .	601	50	651
Other Disposition . . . . .	106	21	127
Dismissed by the Court . . . . .	389	94	483
Withdrawn by Complainant . . . . .	209	117	326
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1970 . . . . .	415	125	540
<b>TOTAL OFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>5,038</b>	<b>1,421</b>	<b>6,459</b>

TABLE 3 (continued)

Unofficial Cases	Boys	Girls	Total
Adjusted by Referee . . . . .	2,125	516	2,641
Restitution Ordered . . . . .	67	-	67
Probation Officer to Supervise . . . . .	171	67	238
Referred to Agency . . . . .	31	38	69
Made Official . . . . .	29	39	68
Other Disposition . . . . .	18	6	24
Dismissed by Referee . . . . .	141	56	197
Withdrawn by Complainant . . . . .	38	37	75
Continued, Held Open . . . . .	219	61	280
<b>TOTAL UNOFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>2,839</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>3,659</b>

\* Discrepancy between the amount of official dispositions and the number of filings results from multiple dispositions and inclusion of alias commitments to public institutions.

TABLE 4  
Complaints - Adult Cases 1969

Complaint	Official	Unofficial	Total
Non-Support of Minor Children . . . . .	378	494	872
Improper Subsistence and Care . . . . .	61	30	91
Abandonment of Minor Children . . . . .	2	3	5
Abuse of Minor Children . . . . .	11	8	19
Other Neglect . . . . .	-	3	3
Contributing to Delinquency . . . . .	114	10	124
Acting In a Way Tending To Cause Delinquency . . . . .	18	-	18
Paternity Complaints . . . . .	945	-	945
Certifications . . . . .	72	-	72
Other Adult Cases . . . . .	45	10	55
<b>TOTAL ADULT CASES . . . . .</b>	<b>1,646</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>2,204</b>

TABLE 5  
Disposition of Children in Official  
Neglect and Dependency Cases - 1969

Disposition	Neglect	Dependency	Total
Committed To:			
Parents, Relatives, Guardians . . . . .	25	23	48
Referred to Child Caring and Placing Agencies:			
County Welfare Department - Family and Children's Services:			
Temporary Care and Custody . . . . .	194	278	472
Permanent Care and Custody . . . . .	15	18	33
Other Child Caring & Placing Agencies . . . . .	-	5	5
TOTAL referred to Child Caring and Placing Agencies . . . . .	209	301	510
Dismissed or Withdrawn . . . . .	24	22	46
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1970 . . . . .	21	10	31
<hr/>			
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN . . . . .	279	356	635

TABLE 6  
Disposition of Adults Dealt With In Official  
Neglect, Non-Support and Delinquency Cases - 1969

Disposition	Neglect Non-Support	Contributing To Delinquency	Total
Committed To:			
* Cleveland House of Cor- rection . . . . .	90	13	103
County Jail . . . . .	1	-	1
Court Order to Support Minor Child- ren . . . . .	223	-	223
Sentence Suspended:			
On condition of proper behavior	15	5	20
Probation Officer to supervise	-	2	2
Pay fine and/or costs . . . . .	2	37	39
Other order . . . . .	2	2	4
Dismissed or Withdrawn . . . . .	78	29	107
Continued, or Set hearing in 1970 . . . . .	122	37	159
<hr/>			
Number of Adults Charges . . . . .	452	114	566

\* Includes Commitments made on alias hearings.

TABLE 7  
Cases Under Supervision of Probation  
and Placement Department - 1969

Movement of Cases	Delinquents		Dependent and Neglected Children		Total Children
	Boys	Girls			
Brought Forward, January 1, 1969 . . . . .	1,942	523	60		2,525
Received for Supervision During Year . . . . .	1,935	615	9		2,559
Total Under Supervision in 1969 . . . . .	3,877	1,138	69		5,084
Removed From Supervision During Year . . . . .	2,177	568	33		2,778
Carried Forward to 1970 . . . . .	1,700	570	36		2,306

TABLE 8  
Cases Supervised By Child Support Department - 1969

Movement of Cases	Non-Support	Contributing to Delinquency		Total
		Neglect	Paternity	
Brought forward, January 1, 1969. . . . .	.6,220	768	3,633	10,621
Received for supervision during the year . . . . .	712	200	649	1,561
Total under supervision in 1969 . . . . .	.6,932	968	4,282	12,182
Removed from supervision during the year . . . . .	886	224	352	1,462
Carried forward December 31, 1969 . . . . .	.6,046	744	3,930	10,720

TABLE 9  
Children Under Care In Detention Home, 1969

	Delinquent		Dependent		Total
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Under Care January 1, 1969 . . . . .	41	34	0	0	75
Admitted during the year . . . . .	3,016	1,325	0	1	4,342
Total under care in 1969 . . . . .	3,057	1,359	0	1	4,417
Released during the year . . . . .	3,003	1,343	0	1	4,347
Under Care December 31, 1969 . . . . .	54	16	0	0	70
Total days of care furnished in 1969 . . . . .	27,247	12,260	0	1	39,508
Average Daily Population . . . . .	75	34	0	0	109
Average length of stay in days . . . . .	9	9	0	0	9

TABLE 10

Collection of Money by the Court and Distribution  
of Money for the Support of Minor Children - 1969

Type of Collection	Amount
For Support of Children . . . . .	\$3,174,938.8
Damages or Restitution . . . . .	19,722.6
Poundage . . . . .	32,202.4
Fines . . . . .	9,769.8
Costs . . . . .	108,381.07
Appearance Bonds . . . . .	35,433.00
Maternity Hospital Collections . . . . .	12,157.61
Miscellaneous General Collections . . . . .	74,407.07
TOTAL AMOUNT COLLECTED . . . . .	\$3,467,012.50
Money for Support of Children Disbursed To:	
Parents and Relatives . . . . .	\$2,953,010.21
Public Agencies:	
Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, Family and Children's Services . . . . .	105,576.78
Other Tax-Supported Agencies & Institutions . . . . .	2,332.17
TOTAL PUBLIC AGENCIES . . . . .	107,908.95
Private Agencies:	
Out-of-Town Placements . . . . .	78,853.35
Catholic Agencies and Institutions . . . . .	27,843.95
Protestant Agencies and Institutions . . . . .	3,357.18
Other, Non-Sectarian Agencies and Institutions . . . . .	3,965.18
TOTAL PRIVATE AGENCIES . . . . .	114,019.66
GRAND TOTAL OF SUPPORT MONEY DISBURSED . . . . .	\$3,174,938.82

TABLE 11

## Report of The Intake - Affidavit Department

Action Taken at Intake	Number of Complaints Received
New Cases Accepted for Court Action:	
For Official Hearing . . . . .	8,446
For Unofficial Hearing . . . . .	4,217
Old Cases Set for Alias Hearing . . . . .	1,973
* Traffic Cases Set for Hearing . . . . .	8,436
TOTAL - Cases Set for Hearing . . . . .	23,072
Disposed of Without Court Action:	
Referred to Social Agencies . . . . .	554
Referred to Boards of Education . . . . .	74
Referred to Police Departments . . . . .	163
Referred to Other Courts . . . . .	107
Referred to Other Services . . . . .	216
TOTAL Disposed of Without Court Action . . . . .	1,114

\* Traffic cases are not processed through the Intake Department but are set for hearing upon receipt of the arresting officer's notice of violation. Official and Unofficial cases also include those processed by the Branch Office.

TABLE 12  
Diagnoses of Patients Examined  
By the Court Psychiatrists - 1969

Diagnosis	Boys	Girls	Adults	Total
<b>Psychoses</b>				
Schizophrenia, various types . . . . .	4	2	1	7
Acute Paranoid Reaction . . . . .	1	-	-	1
<b>Neuroses</b>				
Phobic Reaction . . . . .	2	-	-	2
Depressive Reaction . . . . .	6	4	-	10
Hysterical Reaction . . . . .	-	3	-	3
Anxiety Reaction . . . . .	5	-	-	5
Other Neurosis . . . . .	1	1	-	2
<b>Personality Disorders</b>				
Passive-Aggressive Personality . . . . .	61	29	3	93
Inadequate Personality . . . . .	14	7	3	24
Antisocial Personality . . . . .	19	1	-	20
Hysterical Personality . . . . .	-	4	1	5
Schizoid Personality . . . . .	3	-	-	3
Paranoid Personality . . . . .	1	-	1	2
Other Personality Disorders . . . . .	23	4	3	30
<b>Transient Situational Disturbances</b>				
Adjustment Reaction of Childhood . . . . .	5	1	-	6
Adjustment Reaction of Adolescence . . . . .	186	108	1	295
Adjustment Reaction of Adult Life . . . . .	-	-	2	2
<b>Behavior Disorders</b>				
Runaway Reaction . . . . .	25	45	-	70
Unsocialized Aggressive Reaction . . . . .	91	17	-	108
Group Delinquent Reaction . . . . .	27	2	-	29
Withdrawing Reaction . . . . .	13	1	-	14
Other Behavior Disorders . . . . .	34	16	-	50
<b>Other Disorders</b>				
Other Disorders . . . . .	8	2	3	13
Mental Retardation . . . . .	21	2	-	23
<b>Conditions without Manifest</b>				
Psychiatric Disorders . . . . .	12	2	-	14
No Mental Disorder . . . . .	3	3	-	6
Diagnosis Deferred . . . . .	14	7	5	26
<b>TOTAL EXAMINATIONS</b> . . . . .	<b>579</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>863</b>



# DIRECTORY OF PERSONNEL

## CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

2163 East 22nd Street

Telephone: 771-8400

*HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH, Senior Judge*

*HON JOHN J. TONER, Judge*

*HON. ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO, Judge*

*HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN, Judge*

*WILLIAM A. NESI, Administrator*

### BAILIFFS

Donald Gagliardo  
Andrew Ladika

Michael O'Grady  
Fred O'Malley

Bail Bonds-Police Liaison - Stewart Woldman

### DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES

*PATRICK F. GALLAGHER, Legal Advisor*

### REFEREES

Louise Amico  
S. J. Berman

Elaine J. Chimo  
Blanche B. Direnfeld  
Jeanne A. Winkler

George McCready  
Pierce J. O'Connor

### INTAKE - AFFIDAVIT DEPARTMENT

*JOHN J. SWEENEY, Chief*

Rosa Clark, Intake Officer  
Sam Durante, Intake Officer  
Saundra Malevan, Intake Officer

William Fraunfelder, Docket Review Officer  
Margaret Mazza, Intake Officer  
Sam Rubin, Senior Clerk

### CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT

*MYRON T. MOSES, Chief*

John Bokoch, Chief Assistant  
John Harkins, Referee  
James H. Hansen

Bernard Easton, Counsellor  
James Papp, Counsellor  
Jeffrey Zucco, Counsellor

Jeanne Walsh, Senior Clerk

### CLERK'S OFFICE

*ELIZABETH HOPKINS, Chief Deputy Clerk*

*Judges' Clerks:*

Andrew Pierce  
Sue Fisher

Katherine Neudembach  
Janice Szalkowski

### CASHIER'S OFFICE

*ARTHUR W. DUDLEY, Chief Cashier*

DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICES

JOHN J. ALDEN, *Director*  
ANDREW J. DeSANTI, *Assistant Director*

CASE SUPERVISORS

Rudiene Brabson  
Joseph Cabot  
Milton F. Hay  
Josephus F. Hicks  
Lucille M. Jackson  
Millard F. Jones, Jr.

Dolores M. Mlacha  
Victor Macha, Jr  
Donald Peal  
Charlotte Perry  
Robert Twohey  
Judith Winters

PROBATION OFFICERS

Carl Adlon  
Luther Alston  
Phyllis Anderson  
Timothy Armstrong  
Howard Baskin  
Sylvia Baugham  
Nanee Bennett  
Kenneth Bossin  
Robert Bostick  
Andrew Bunch  
Jeannette Cephas  
Jack Cervelli  
James Cummins  
Timothy Deegan  
Ralph DeFranco  
Jack DiCillo  
Jill Dworkin  
Martin Farraher  
Wade Fraser  
Peter French  
John Gelski

Blaise Giusto  
Ellen Greene  
JoAnna Hairston  
Christina Hamlin  
Bruce Hinsdale  
Robert Horley  
Marwan Jadeed  
Russell Jankowski  
Andrew Jones  
Garlandine Jones  
John Klott  
Roman Kokodyniak  
Holly Krailo  
Jeffrey Largent  
Peter Leon  
Carl Lo Presti  
Catherine Lore  
William Lyons  
Earl Matthews  
Jeffrey Meldon

Michelle Mitchum  
Michael Noble  
Patrick O'Donnell  
Daniel O'Neil  
George Palda  
Doretta Pompiley  
Frank Puthoff  
David Quigley  
John Rath  
Jearline Rogers  
Val Schaffer  
Joyce Smith  
William Stephen  
Tyler Somersfield  
Donald Switzer  
August Supan  
Anthony Tuschner  
Fred Wittenbrook  
Robert Wong  
James Zaas  
Robert Zak

Eugene Strelec, Job Placement Officer

BUDGET AND PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

BRICE W. MANNING, *Chief*

STATISTICS DEPARTMENT

Richard A. Gallitto, Statistician

Donna Fell, Clerk  
Thelma Barry, Clerk

PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

DAVID C. ADAMS, *Director*

Ronald Born  
Thomas Edwards  
Robert Hanna  
Patricia Mannix

James Manuel  
James Mullen  
David Novak

## COURT CLINIC

*OSCAR B. MARKEY, M.D., Director*

### *Psychiatric Panel:*

Dr. Irving Berger  
Dr. John Hadden, Jr.  
Dr. Florence Matthews

Dr. Ake Mattsson  
Dr. Samuel Nigro  
Dr. Irwin Perr  
Dr. Lawrence Schrieber

### *Psychologists:*

Charles Ford  
James Irwin  
Isidore Helfand, Ph.D.  
Charles Winslow, Ph.D.

## MEDICAL SERVICE

*REGIS F. GOLUBSKI, M.D., Director*

Katherine M. Alden, R.N., Head Nurse

## STENOGRAPHIC SERVICE AND RECORD ROOM

Stella Papchak, Chief, Central Stenographic Service  
Rosamond B. Keaton, Chief, Family Case Records

## INFORMATION CLERKS

Frances Chambers  
Dorothy Davies

Eda Deggin  
Matilda Ingeborg

## JUVENILE COURT BRANCH OFFICE

2969 Mayfield Road

Telephone: 321-7380

*BRIAN SEXTON, Referee*

Blaise Giusto, Probation Officer

Alice Carter, Clerk

## CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

2209 Central Avenue

Telephone Numbers: DAYS - 771-8400

NIGHTS, SUNDAYS, HOLIDAYS - 771-8421

Don B. Adamson, Superintendent  
Martin C. Kelley, Asst. Superintendent

Janet Estadt, Asst. Superintendent  
Eugenia Dziedzicki, Office Manager

Paul E. Baxter, Referee of Admissions and Releases

## BAIL BOND ARRANGEMENTS

During office hours, 8:15 A.M. to 4:30 P.M., bail bonds may be arranged at the Clerk's Office in the Court Building. Between 4:00 P.M. and midnight, bail may be arranged in the Detention Home.

**NUMBER OF COPIES ORDERED PRINTED: 2,000**  
**APPROXIMATE COST PER COPY: 20 CENTS**

## FURTHER INFORMATION AVAILABLE

This report has been prepared and is issued under the direction of the Honorable Walter G. Whitlatch, Senior Judge of the Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County. The Department of Research and Statistics, Richard A. Gallitto, Statistician, compiled the report. Citizens, students, and others who wish more particular information are invited to call at Room 310 where every effort will be made to give them courteous attention and service. It is hoped that this report may stimulate interest of the public in the services that the Juvenile Court provides the dependent, neglected, delinquent, and otherwise unfortunate children of the County; and that it will enlist their informed support and cooperation in extending and improving these services wherever needed.

Richard A. Gallitto, Statistician