

Annual Report

1972



**THE
JUVENILE COURT DIVISION
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS**

**CUYAHOGA COUNTY
CLEVELAND, OHIO**

Hon. John G. Jones

Hon. Walter G. Whittlatch

Hon. Angelo J. Gagliardo

Hon. John F. Corrigan

The Honorable Hugh A. Corrigan, Frank R. Pokorny, Seth C. Taft
Commissioners of Cuyahoga County

The Honorable Charles W. Bates
Director, Ohio Department of Public Welfare

The Honorable Kenneth D. Gaver, M.D.
Director, Ohio Department of Mental Health

The Honorable Bennett J. Cooper
Director, Ohio Department of Correction

The Honorable William J. Ensign
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 1972, 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,

John J. Toner, Judge

Common Pleas Court
Juvenile Court Division

Cleveland, Ohio
May 31, 1973



HON. JOHN J. TONER



HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH



HON. ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO



HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN

ANNUAL REPORT, 1972

1972, YEAR OF SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS

In 1972, the Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County marked its seventieth year of service to the greater Cleveland community.

On the occasion of this important anniversary, the year 1972 further proved to be particularly significant, presenting the Court with some formidable challenges, demands and changes in meeting its responsibilities to the community in general and to the children and families referred to it in particular. The events of the year, therefore, compel introspection and planning for the future more than they require comparison to the past. To the extraordinary demands made upon it by the community in terms of sheer volume of cases which in the past ten years have risen by fifty per cent, were added compliance with certain legislative requirements concerning juvenile court procedures. While these procedural requirements are necessary to the safeguarding of legal rights within the judicial process, their implementation nonetheless created additional stresses and strains upon the mechanics of court operation and procedures.

NEW JUVENILE COURT RULES CAUSE STRAIN AS COURT BECOMES DIVISION OF COMMON PLEAS COURT

Among these events, in addition to recent Supreme Court rulings governing juvenile proceedings, were the enactment of the new Juvenile Court rules for the State of Ohio and the establishment of the Juvenile Court as a division of the Common Pleas

Court of Cuyahoga County which were effective as of the last half of the year. The new rules of court proved particularly taxing in implementation in terms of existing facilities, procedural requirements, staff and volume of cases. Nevertheless, the court did manage to comply with such requirements as detention hearings, and setting court hearings for children detained in Detention Home within ten days of the filing of the complaint, while routinely docketing other cases for hearing within four weeks of the date of filing. Also, while the court has always adhered to the requirements of legal representation, their more clear definition in recent Supreme Court decisions and legislative enactment has resulted in greater exercise of such rights. Consequently, expanded use of counsel and the need for County prosecutors are factors which have considerably influenced case processing and scheduling. As a result, a great deal of staff time, not provided for structurally, has been consumed in meeting these requirements which involve the issuance of additional notices of hearing, hearing schedule changes, and staff involvement with attorneys. In those cases where a denial of the allegation is made, the court is required to have the presence of a county prosecutor at the hearing to represent the State. Currently, three assistant prosecutors are assigned to the court by the County

Prosecutor's office. The court needs four additional prosecutors for a total compliment of seven in order to more adequately fulfill this requirement. Likewise, the procedures involved in furnishing counsel to indigent clients has evolved into a more time-consuming task than heretofore. Arrangements for legal representation in behalf of indigent clients are made with the Legal Aid Society for which the Society was reimbursed \$40,000 last year.

Despite such strains on the court's facilities caused by these various demands, there isn't a significant backlog of cases at the present time. But, to keep pace with the reasonable demands and requirements to ensure and to protect individual rights and at the same time to provide for quality of service, attention needs to be given to internal restructuring of management operations and procedures in order to achieve a balance in fulfilling obligatory requirements and efficiency in staff function.

**VOLUME OF HEARINGS
TAXING CURRENT
COURT FACILITIES**

To this end, the court must examine the past year in terms of how it can better serve the community and how to accomplish its mission as outlined by the Juvenile Code. As such it is charged with both adjudicative and rehabilitative responsibilities concerning the individual offender, and, perhaps has, because of its focus on the individual, consistently understated its volume of work in terms of hearings within the total context of the judicial process. However, as the work of the court is evaluated, the hearings involved in processing the twenty-some thousand cases filed during the year in addition to the re-hearing of old cases zoom into many thousand more hearings, requiring much effort on the part of the staff to undertake. When the volume of total court transactions in terms of hearings is viewed in relation to the constrictions and limitations of current capabilities, facilities, resources and organizational structure, the need to re-examine our performance and to develop programs for growth and change in administering our services becomes even more apparent.

**COURT MANAGEMENT
PROJECT AND ADVISORY
BOARD ASSISTING COURT
IN SOLVING OPERATIONAL
PROBLEMS**

Toward the latter part of 1972, the court, therefore, welcomed the assistance of the Court Management Project of the Cleveland Bar Association whose function, among others, is to aid in the development of a county-wide criminal justice information system and to assist the county courts in developing more modern and efficient techniques, including computerized systems to facilitate their work and speed up the process within the total criminal justice system. For the past several years, the court has sought assistance in the

form of computerized operations from the County Data Processing Center. Toward the end of 1972, the first phase of computerized operation was initiated in the cashier's office and is about to become operational.

At this writing, a preliminary report by the Project has been submitted containing proposals for organizational and procedural changes, as well as proposals for computerized programs for operational, data collection and evaluation purposes. At the same time, the court has been considering its own re-alignment plans and anticipates a meshing of the two in terms of optimum administrative development. Further, the Court Management Project has obtained and made available to the court funds to conduct a wage and salary study. Last year, as in the past years, while not the only reason, salary matters played a significant role in the chronic problem of staff turnover and instability, especially in the probation department, which in 1972 experienced a fifty per cent turnover in staff. Recommendations will also be forthcoming from four committees of the Court's Citizen's Advisory Board regarding vital areas of concern which include: probation services, personnel needs and practices, research and building renovation.

The physical limitations of the Court buildings, which are more than forty years-old, have made suitable accommodations for our increased staff and services difficult to achieve. In attempting to adapt current needs to facilities which were originally designed for other purposes a rather makeshift arrangement has evolved, with services being located on the basis of available space rather than in accordance with functional relationships. Also, current office layouts preclude the availability of much needed private interviewing and dictating rooms, among other needs, for the Probation Department. In addition to these special needs, the buildings are in need of extensive repairs made necessary by time and usage. Modernization of courtroom facilities and other court features, including Detention Home food and laundry services, are also needed. It is anticipated that the Citizen's Advisory Board's committee studying this aspect of the court's needs will be able to aid in achieving the desired renovations to make the building more serviceable and functional in the near future and for many years to come.

MORE EFFICIENT PROCESS- Our over-all expectations, therefore, are
ING TECHNIQUES NEEDED for a more efficient manner of processing
TO GIVE BETTER SERVICE cases thereby providing more immediate
and effective service both in the adjudicative and rehabilitative phases of court operation as the end results of such efforts. These results must be achieved throughout the total court process which is now executed in a complex and completely manual system of paper work flow which causes quite a creak in our ad-

ministrative machinery. Concomitant to the many labor-saving and speedier devices and techniques that may facilitate the flow of work toward the goal of actual service is the freeing of personnel time to better render this service. And these goals can be especially realized in such areas as the indexing of more than 100,000 family records, the issuance of summonses, the docketing and assignment of cases as well as caseload management, probation indexes, management information, statistical reports and evaluations, among other areas of operation.

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS BEGIN AT INTAKE

The information accessibility of such an over-all program would be invaluable to the court in not only facilitating the hearing process but in implementing its rehabilitative programs. For example, this process may start at the very point of intake, where last year more than 1,200 cases were referred elsewhere for service, with 130 cases referred to the Court Diversion Program which is federally funded and which draws upon a number of private community agencies, providing counseling and vocational services rather than processing the child through the judicial system.

ACCESSIBILITY AND RETRIEVAL OF CASE DATA REQUIRED TO DEVELOP SUITABLE REHABILITATIVE PROGRAMS

Once in the court system, the accessibility of record information, past experience and availability of current information can be of immeasurable benefit in diagnostic and investigative reports. During the year, more than 4,000 new investigations were done by the probation staff. And approximately 450 clinical examinations were conducted with evaluations and recommendations made to the court. In addition, 427 boys and girls were administered the High School Personality Questionnaire, designed to provide insight into behavior patterns as an aid in probation supervision. Assignments to probation supervision during the year totaled 4,741 boys and girls with extensive record keeping and follow-up data transcribed into each individual record. The quality of total court service would be considerably enhanced with improved record keeping devices and the ability to have immediate access to pertinent data supporting the development and maintenance of workable probation programs according to specific individual needs.

Likewise, the ability to plan for other suitable rehabilitative programs including diversion programs, referral to private residential treatment centers, private agency counseling services and correctional institutions, among others, would, under a more efficient processing system, be greatly facilitated and more clearly defined with more secure implementation. In essence, the significance of the voluminous data gathered and maintained regarding each individual child and family,

as well as the more global experience of the court is diminished in importance if its preparation, accessibility and retrieval are so cumbersome as to delay, encumber and impede the end result of service for which they exist. Evaluations of individual successes, as well as program worth are virtually unattainable under present circumstances.

The problem of management information is further compounded as the court decentralizes its operation in the form of branch offices. While branch operations have brought immediate service to the areas they serve directly, and have somewhat relieved the use of the court's over-taxed main buildings, they also present problems because of their physical separation in the areas of communications and record keeping procedures, court processing and supportive services. In 1972, nearly 13% (1,127 cases) of the total delinquency and unruly complaints were filed in the court's two branch offices; 854 in the Cleveland Heights Office, serving most of the County's eastern suburbs, and 273 in the Euclid Office, serving the City of Euclid. We can anticipate that the problem of record keeping and other communications problems in a decentralized operation will become more critical in the future since, at this writing, the Court's federally funded Neighborhood Counseling Centers Project is currently underway with the establishment of four branch offices in the Central, Hough-Norwood, Glenville and East Cleveland areas providing in-neighborhood probation services.

**OPERATIONAL IMPROVE-
MENT IS GOAL FOR THE
FUTURE**

The year 1972, viewed in retrospect was, then, a most significant year; perhaps the most critical year in the court's seventy year's existence. In many ways it represents a time of change and the beginning of new growth and development. While the principle and simple mandate of providing for the welfare of the children and families referred to it remains its task as handed down by its founders, its implementation, as we note, has been made more complex by the mere mechanics of processing, selection of services, technical requirements, work-flow and internal structuring of services related to the volume of work the court finds before it. It is the court's plan, therefore, to build upon the experience and events of 1972 so that the techniques of rendering better service through updated methods may achieve the goals of service in a more expeditious and efficient manner for both the community and the children it refers to the court.

The accomplishments and experiences of the court during 1972 as outlined on the following pages are especially remarkable considering the limitations in staff, facilities, and resources currently available to us. The improvement and refinement of these accomplishments will be the goal of the court for the immediate year ahead.

STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS

CORRECTIONAL SCHOOL COMMITMENTS SHOW SIGNIFICANT DECLINE In providing its services during 1972, as discussed on the preceding pages, the Juvenile Court dealt with a total of 20,117 new cases of all kinds under its jurisdiction. Included in this total were 8,999 delinquency and unruly cases requiring expeditious processing, detailed investigative work and rehabilitative planning. The extent of the court's efforts in devising and implementing social service programs to effect rehabilitation is reflected in the significant decline in correctional school commitments, especially to the Ohio Youth Commission. While commitments three years ago represented nearly 20% of the court's official dispositions, in 1972, they accounted for 16% and reflected a drop of 300 boys and girls committed, or almost a quarter less than in 1969. The gradual decline in such commitments, carried on in 1972, demonstrates the court's concentrated use of community based rehabilitative programs whenever possible, and its reliance on its probation department for follow-up supervision.

PROBATION SERVICES INTENSIFIED Probation services were provided to 4,741 boys and girls throughout the year, with 2,209 carried over from 1971, and 2,532 placed on probation in 1972. A total of 2,469 cases were closed from probation, with 2,272 carried over to 1973. The average monthly caseload per probation officer was approximately 53 cases. Despite the high incidence of staff turnover, the department managed to increase the volume of its probation contacts and follow-up supervision, especially with children in their own communities rather than in the court buildings. Such field contacts on the part of the male staff rose from 35% of total probation contacts in 1971 to 64% of total contacts in 1972; for female staff, community contacts with probationers rose from 16% of total contacts to 46% of the total in 1972. The benefits of such increased intensity of probation supervision in the child's own surroundings resulted in an increased proportion of successful discharges from probation -- about one-third more than in 1971.

PROBATION OFFICER TRAINING EXPANDED The quality of probation supervision was further enhanced by the expansion of the court's in-service training program for probation staff. The program, begun several years ago in cooperation with Cleveland State University with federal funding, continued in 1972, providing more in-depth studies in the behavioral sciences, focussing on the techniques of casework related to the adolescent. Through the active participation of court casework supervisors, the

principles and theories of these studies were further developed and explored as to their practical application by the staff in relation to their actual court experience.

**DIVERSION PROJECTS
EFFECTIVE**

Other social service programs utilized by the court in the rehabilitation process, in addition to casework referrals for supportive service to the Center for Human Services, included several federally funded programs, either operated by the court itself or by other agencies. The Court's Diversion Project which was funded for only nine months in 1972, referred 166 boys and girls for service to a number of participating agencies which included the Center for Human Service, the Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services, Catholic Counseling Center, and several neighborhood centers of the Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association. Upon successful participation in the rehabilitative services afforded by these agencies, the charges against the children referred were dismissed by the court. Likewise, 60 boys were referred, under suspended commitment to the Ohio Youth Commission, to the Cleveland Offender Rehabilitation Program in which the court began to participate some time after the beginning of 1972. Successful adjustment and gainful employment in this program, also resulted in dismissal of charges. Similarly, referrals to Friendship Inc., a volunteer program of interdenominational sponsorship providing "big sister" supportive services to girls on probation, numbered 70 girls in 1972. Also, 50 boys on probation were given supportive services from the Big Brothers Association, which, with an LEAA grant, offers much needed assistance and friendship to boys without fathers in their homes.

NEIGHBORHOOD PROBATION OFFICES DEVELOPED IN 1972 BECAME OPERATIONAL EARLY IN 1973

As noted earlier in this report, at this writing, the court has established, through LEAA funding, its Neighborhood Counseling Centers Project to provide in-community probation services with more intensive follow-up supervision. The four branch probation offices, unlike the other two branch court offices, will offer no intake services but will focus exclusively on probation services. The offices are located in the Central-Central East social planning area, the Hough-Norwood social planning area, the Glenville social planning area, and the City of East Cleveland. In addition to the probation officers assigned to each office, supportive services will be given by a staff of youth workers assisting the probation officers. Also, at this writing, the court has implemented the referral of first offenders living in the South East side of the City of Cleveland to the Catholic Counseling Center which received a federal grant for a demonstration project to give

guidance and counseling service to boys and girls in that area who otherwise would, for the most part, be placed under the supervision of the court probation staff.

During the year, a total of 201 boys and girls were placed by the court's placement department in various residential treatment centers, used for children in need of long-term placement. In addition to effecting and supervising such placements, the department also works with parents in preparation for the child's return home as well as gives probation follow-up service to the child upon release from the institution.

DETENTION ADMISSIONS CONTINUE TO DECLINE Detention Home admissions declined in 1972 to 3,258 from 3,439 in 1971. The average daily population remained at 68 children and the average length of stay increased slightly, from 7 to 7.5 days. The 1972 admissions to Detention Home represent a 27% decline from those of 1967 when the Court's Detention Home population control program was fully operational. Since that time, through the offices of a Detention Home Intake Referee, admissions have been thoroughly screened to ensure that only those children who need to be detained are so confined, and at the same time, releases have been more expeditiously effected. The 1972 average daily population of 68 children represents a decline of 60% over the 1966 average daily population of 172 children.

DELINQUENCY - UNRULY COMPLAINTS LEVEL OFF FROM 1969 HIGH In terms of volume, the year 1972 continued a slight downward trend in delinquency and unruly complaints from the all-time high of 9,678 cases experienced in 1969. Since then, the number of cases referred declined to 9,363 cases in 1970 and 9,098 cases in 1971, with 1972 resulting in 8,999 cases, representing a decline of only one per cent in 1972 compared with 1971. The number of complaints filed in 1972 represents a delinquency-unruly rate of 38 per 1,000 children, ages 12 through 17, resident in Cuyahoga County.

Cases of unruliness in 1972 represented, as in 1971, slightly less than one quarter of the total complaints against boys and girls; involving, for the most part, charges of incorrigibility, running away, truancy, certain liquor violations and curfew violations. There were 2,150 total unruly cases in 1971 compared with 2,099 unruly cases in 1972. Delinquency charges, on the other hand, represented 77% of the total charges against boys and girls, about the same as in 1971. Of the boys charged during the year, 84% were charged with delinquency and 16% were charged with unruliness. On the other hand, of the girls

charged, 51% were referred for delinquency, with 49% being referred for unruliness.

SHOPLIFTING CHARGES INCREASE

Significant increases in delinquency cases were recorded in several categories. Shoplifting charges rose from 761 cases in 1971 to 940 cases in 1972. There were 500 boys so charged, and 440 girls referred for shoplifting. For girls, shoplifting represented the most frequent reason for delinquency charges, and is the only offense in which girls significantly out-proportioned their one to three ratio to boys in over-all filings.

DRUG, NARCOTIC AND GLUE CHARGES INCREASE

Charges of inhaling glue and other toxic vapors, and charges of drug and narcotic violations also showed significant increases in 1972. While the offense of inhaling glue had been evidencing a continued decline in the past several years, 1972 reversed that trend, going from a low of 67 cases in 1971 to 161 cases in 1972. This offense more than doubled, for an increase of 140%. Of the total glue inhaling charges, the majority concerned boys and girls living in the City of Cleveland (73%). For the most part, girls charged with glue violations (17) had no prior court experience. On the other hand, of the 144 boys so charged, nearly two-thirds had prior delinquency records.

While inhaling glue and other toxic vapors was primarily a phenomenon concerning boys and girls living in the lower economic sections of the City of Cleveland, drug and narcotic violations, on the other hand, came mostly from the suburban areas of the county, with children in the suburbs accounting for 73% of all such cases. Of the total boys and girls so charged (292), the majority of girls, as in the case of inhaling glue, were first offenders, while boys charged with drug violations also were usually first offenders, almost in direct inverse proportion to the boy glue offender, the majority of whom were repeaters. A survey of drug and narcotic violations revealed that the vast majority of charges involved the possession of marijuana.

AUTO THEFT AND AUTO TRESPASSING CHARGES CONTINUE TO DECLINE

Notable declines were recorded in several other categories of offenses. Auto theft and auto trespassing cases declined from 1,269 cases in 1971 to 1,081 cases in 1972. Such charges have declined by 47%, or nearly one-half, since 1969 when they amounted to 2,068 cases. Other significant decreases occurred in the offenses of stealing and theft, including theft from person, which declined from 1,135 cases to 934 cases, for a decrease of 18%. Charges of possession of weapons

were reduced by nearly one-half, going from 63 cases in 1971 to 39 cases in 1972. Truancy cases showed a 13% decline, going from 407 cases in 1971 to 356 cases in 1972. Incurrigibility complaints for the year remained at about the same level as in 1971. As in the past, the greatest single offense on the part of boys was that of unlawful entry and stealing, 1,006 cases. For girls, the greatest single reason for referral was for incurrigibility, 685 cases. See Table 2 for a listing of all offenses.

**POLICE FILING
INCREASED, OTHER
SOURCES OF COMPLAINTS
DECREASED**

The Cleveland Police Department filed nearly 5% more new complaints in 1972 than it did in 1971 - 2,903 compared with 2,680 in 1971. Suburban police referrals rose by nearly 8% over those filed in 1971, going from 2,261 to 2,437 in 1972. Referrals from the Cleveland Board of Education declined by 27%, going from 379 cases in 1971 to 277 cases in 1972. Other sources of referral, including parents and citizens, were about 9% lower than in 1971. Complaints filed by parents regarding their own children accounted for 13% of the intake (1,154 cases), while those filed by private citizens accounted for 10% of the intake (911 cases). See Table B for all sources of referral.

**DELINQUENCY - UNRULY
CASES FROM SUBURBS
CONTINUE TO RISE**

Complaints regarding children living in the City of Cleveland declined by 7%, from 6,136 cases in 1971 to 5,677 cases in 1972. Cases regarding suburban boys and girls increased by nearly 9%, from 2,839 cases to 3,090 cases in 1972. The increase in referrals regarding children from suburban areas of the County continues the trend noted in the past five years, during which time such referrals have risen from 25% to 35% of the court's intake.

**HIGH CITY DELINQUENCY
AREAS CONTINUE DECLINE
FOR THIRD CONSECUTIVE
YEAR**

Three high delinquency areas in the City of Cleveland, for the third consecutive year, showed significant decreases in court intake. They were the Glenville area, declining by 24%, from 858 cases to 655 cases; the Hough area, declining by 15%, from 653 to 553 cases, and the Central areas, declining by nearly 8%, from 637 to 588 cases. Glenville, however, remained the highest delinquency area of the city, with its 655 cases, while the Near West Side social planning area ranked second, with 625 cases, down only slightly from the 642 cases recorded in 1971. The four areas combined accounted for 43% of the delinquency and unruly cases recorded from the City of Cleveland.

Two-thirds of all referrals from county areas, other than the City of Cleveland, came from the following municipalities by rank of cases: East Cleveland, 310 cases; Lakewood, 277 cases; Cleveland Heights, 240 cases; Euclid, 219 cases; Parma, 209 cases; Brook Park, 134 cases; North Olmsted, 129 cases; Maple Heights, 116 cases; Garfield Heights, 98 cases; South Euclid, 93 cases; Bedford, 84 cases; Berea, 78 cases; and Westlake, 75 cases. See Table A for area of residence regarding delinquent and unruly complaints.

While children living in the City of Cleveland comprise approximately 42% of the 12 through 17 age group population in the County, they accounted for 65% of the total Court intake. Children living in suburban areas comprise 58% of the County's population in this age group, and accounted for 35% of the total intake. As in the past years, the age group fourteen through seventeen accounted for the majority of referrals, comprising 83% of the children referred. Children from the ages of eight and under through eleven years of age accounted for about 5% of the intake, or 344 cases. See Table C for ages of individual delinquent and unruly children.

**UNOFFICIAL CASES
ADJUSTED BY
REFEREES**

Of the total delinquency and unruly cases filed in 1972, 62% or 5,587 were processed on an official basis, while the remaining 3,412 or 38% were handled unofficially.

In the unofficial category, the greatest disposition was that of an adjustment of the situation with the issue being resolved before a Court referee. Such dispositions amounted to 2,330 or 68% of the unofficial dispositions. In addition, 235 boys and girls were placed on unofficial probation, an increase of 26% over the 186 placed on unofficial probation in 1971.

**SUSPENSION OF DRIVER'S
LICENSE MOST FREQUENT
DISPOSITION IN TRAFFIC
CASES**

Other children's cases included those of juvenile traffic offenders which declined from 9,303 cases in 1971 to 8,936 cases in 1972. In keeping with court policy, the most frequent disposition, in helping the young driver to develop good driving habits, was the suspension of the driver's license for an appropriate period of time. Court costs assessed in traffic cases amounted to \$83,829.98 in 1972.

**NEGLECTED AND DEPEND-
ENT CHILDREN'S CASES**

In other areas of the court's jurisdiction, 98 neglected and 172 dependent children were placed by the court in the custody of the Social Services Division of the County Welfare Department. In

addition, 172 other children were given to the permanent care and custody of the Welfare Department by the approval of applications for permanent surrender for adoption purposes. And a total of 147 applications for consent to marry for minors were granted by the court.

**MORE THAN THREE
MILLION DOLLARS
COLLECTED BY THE
COURT FOR CHILD
SUPPORT**

In its non-support jurisdiction, the court, through its Department of Child Support, collected more than three million dollars for the support of minor children and disbursed it for payment through its Cashier's Office. Of the total amount collected,

more than \$80,000 was paid directly to the County Welfare Department as part of its payments to welfare recipients for whom such money was ordered by the court to be paid.

**ADULT CASES DECLINE
FROM 1971**

New filings of non-support against adults amounted to 541 cases compared with 610 cases in 1971. The Child Support

Department currently has a caseload of about 5,000 cases covering various support orders. In addition, there were 48 charges of neglect by parents in 1972 compared with 76 in 1971. Adults charged with contributing to delinquency increased from 26 in 1971 to 34 in 1972, while adults charged with contributing to unruliness increased from 44 to 62 in 1972. Paternity cases declined from 765 cases in 1971 to 605 cases in 1972. Total adult cases filed in the court declined from 1,632 cases in 1971 to 1,387 cases in 1972, or by 15%.



WILLIAM A. NESI, COURT ADMINISTRATOR, RETIRES

William A. Nesi retired as Court Administrator, a post he had held since 1967 when he was appointed by the late Judge Albert A. Woldman. At his retirement, Mr. Nesi completed more than thirty-five years of public service, an early part of which was spent at the Juvenile Court as a probation officer (1940-1942) and as Referee for boys' cases (1942-1944). In his long public service career he also served as administrative assistant with the Child Welfare Board of Cuyahoga County, Superintendent of the Children's Receiving Home and as executive secretary of the County Welfare Department's Division of Child Welfare. While with the Child Welfare Board, the County's Children's Receiving Home was founded and established under his direction. Mr. Nesi left the position of executive secretary of the Lorain County Child Welfare Board to accept the post of administrator.

He was the first to hold the position of administrator. By 1967, the requirements of maintaining and developing the court with an ever-increasing staff, and the vast scope of function and operational planning became of such proportion as to call for the establishment of such an administrative position.

His service to the court was characterized by a great deal of staff growth and development, with the probation staff reaching the largest number in the court's history. Also, during his years of service the court became involved in a variety of innovative programs, mostly federally funded, requiring a great deal of administrative direction. The improvement of working conditions and staff relationships also received special attention from Mr. Nesi.

The Court has benefited greatly from his administrative skills in developing his position into one providing a basis for sound management, making the court an effective and efficient instrument within our judicial system. We wish him and his wife, Hilda, the very best in a happy retirement.

ERVIN J. WIERZBINSKI NAMED COURT ADMINISTRATOR

Ervin J. Wierzbinski, ACSW, was appointed Court Administrator by Judge John J. Toner to succeed Mr. William Nesi. Mr. Wierzbinski left the post of Assistant Director of Court Services of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Chicago, Illinois, to accept his current position. He had been with the Chicago Court for six years, having served as Deputy Chief Probation Officer prior to his appointment as Assistant Director. Prior to joining the Cook County Juvenile Court, Mr. Wierzbinski served for more than nine years with the Lucas County Juvenile Court, Toledo, Ohio. While with that court, his positions included: probation counselor, marriage counselor, custody investigator, referee and training supervisor.

Mr. Wierzbinski is a native of South Bend, Indiana, and now resides in North Olmsted, Ohio, with his wife and twin son and daughter. He was graduated with a B.A. in Sociology from the University of Notre Dame from which he also holds a M.A. in Correctional Administration, and received his M.S.W. in Social Work from the University of Michigan.

He has served as a member of the Professional Advisory Committee of the Illinois Youth Commission, the Professional Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and the Illinois Academy of Criminology. He is also a member of the Ohio Correctional and Court Services Association and the American Congress of Correction.

PERSONNEL NOTES

Sam Berman, Referee, and veteran Court employee retired in 1972 with twenty-eight years of service to the Juvenile Court. Prior to serving as Referee for paternity complaints and as jury assignment officer, Mr. Berman had been with the court's Child Support Department as a caseworker. In addition to his other duties, Mr. Berman processed all of the Court's applications for consent to marry. The Court takes this opportunity to wish him well in his retirement.

Patrick F. Gallagher resigned his post as Legal Consultant to the Court upon his election in 1972 to the Domestic Relations Division of the Common Pleas Court of Cuyahoga County. Judge Gallagher joined the Juvenile Court in 1956 and served as an intake officer until 1960 when he was named Assistant Legal Consultant. He was named Legal Consultant in 1969. The Court wishes Judge Gallagher well as he continues his career of public service in his judicial capacity.

Oscar B. Markey, M.D. resigned in 1972 as Director of the Court's Clinic, a post he had held since 1946. Dr. Markey, as head of the Clinic, lead the Court's Psychiatric Panel in submitting recommendations to the Court on children and adults referred for psychiatric diagnoses. The Court wishes Dr. Markey continued success as he continues the pursuit of his private practice.

JUDGES CONTINUE COMMUNITY SERVICE

As in the past, the judges of the Juvenile Court continued, in 1972, to participate in a variety of community activities involving the welfare of families and children. In addition to memberships in community organizations, the judges were frequent speakers at hundreds of civic and agency meetings throughout the year.

JUDGE JOHN J. TONER, in 1972, served as president of the Ohio Juvenile Court Judges Association, and as chairman of the Youth Services Advisory Board. He is also a member of the Criminal Justice Co-ordinating Council, the Family Law Committee of the Ohio State Bar Association, the Cuyahoga County Welfare Department's Advisory Board, the Junior League of Cleveland Community Advisory Committee, the Executive Committee of the Ohio Judicial Conference and the Catholic Counselling Center Board. He also serves as a trustee of the following organizations: The Federation for Community Planning, Ohio Boys Town, and the Catholic Lawyers Guild. In 1972, he was named man of the year by the Diocesan Union of the Holy Name Society.

Judge Toner was elected Administrative Judge of the Court by his colleagues in July, 1972, under the new rules of Superintendency. Prior to the new rules, the senior judge served as administrative judge.



JUDGE WALTER G. WHITLATCH served, in 1972, as Vice-President of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. He also served as a board member of the following organizations: Hillcrest Y.M.C.A., De Paul Maternity and Infant Home, Ohio Boys Town, the Pennsylvania George Junior Republic, the Federation for Community Planning, Sagamore Hills Children's Hospital, and the Big Brothers of Greater Cleveland. He also served as a member of the Family Law Committee of the Ohio State Bar Association. He was the author of "Toward An Understanding of the Juvenile Court Process" which was published in Juvenile Justice, the Journal of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges.



JUDGE ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO served as Chairman of the Supreme Court of Ohio's Advisory Committee on Juvenile Rules. Included among his many agency board memberships are: Catholic Family and Children's Services, the Nationalities Services Center, the Alta House Social Settlement and St. Mary's Seminary. He also served as a lecturer at the Law-Medicine Center of Case Western Reserve University and the North Star Council of Governments. He was awarded, in 1972, a plaque for Superior Judicial Service by the Ohio Supreme Court. Judge Gagliardo was also awarded the rank of "Commendatore" of the Star of Solidarity by the Republic of Italy.



JUDGE JOHN F. CORRIGAN was a guest lecturer for the 1972 Juvenile Law Session Program of the Cleveland Marshall Law School, Cleveland State University. He also served as a lecturer for the North Star Council of Governments Conference and was the principle speaker for the 1972 Ohio Youth Commission's Workshop Program. He was also principle speaker for the Law Day Program at Collinwood High School, in addition to fulfilling numerous speaking engagements to a variety of civic organizations. Among his board memberships, are: St. Anthony's Boys Home, Marycrest School for Girls and St. Luke's School Board.

TABLE A

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly
1972 and 1971

AREA OF RESIDENCE

City of Cleveland By Social Planning Areas	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>
Central	149	123	36	45	185	168
Central - East	158	186	56	47	214	233
Central - West	134	188	55	48	189	236
Clark - Fulton	129	111	35	46	164	157
Corlett	373	307	103	85	476	392
Denison	99	106	27	39	126	145
Downtown	6	3	2	4	8	7
Edgewater	17	15	10	13	27	28
Glenville	476	627	179	231	655	858
Goodrich	57	56	16	21	73	77
Hough	459	514	94	139	553	653
Jefferson	80	73	20	24	100	97
Kinsman	88	108	31	45	119	153
Lee - Miles	196	219	52	58	248	277
Mt. Pleasant	191	235	74	61	265	296
Near West Side	492	513	133	129	625	642
North Broadway	60	87	27	29	87	116
North Collinwood	56	66	16	9	72	75
Norwood	121	144	39	48	160	192
Puritas - Bellaire	107	99	22	29	129	128
Riverside	89	53	20	27	109	80
South Broadway	87	96	21	28	108	124
South Brooklyn	91	108	35	22	126	130
South Collinwood	141	178	31	54	172	232
Tremont	171	169	43	55	214	224
University	22	42	11	7	33	49
West Side	137	128	46	37	183	165
Woodland Hills	190	158	67	44	257	202
TOTAL, City of Cleveland	<hr/> 4,376	<hr/> 4,712	<hr/> 1,301	<hr/> 1,424	<hr/> 5,677	<hr/> 6,136

TABLE A, Continued

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly
1972 and 1971

AREA OF RESIDENCE

Municipalities, Villages & Townships	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>
Bay Village	34	63	17	13	51	76
Beachwood	27	31	7	8	34	39
Bedford	75	38	9	19	84	57
Bedford Heights	36	36	12	14	48	50
Berea	57	80	21	10	78	90
Brecksville	14	14	-	2	14	16
Broadview Heights	19	17	1	5	20	22
Brooklyn	23	20	6	7	29	27
Brook Park	115	94	19	19	134	113
Cleveland Heights	165	190	75	72	240	262
East Cleveland	236	224	74	73	310	297
Euclid	175	138	44	25	219	163
Fairview Park	38	31	10	10	48	41
Garfield Heights	81	73	17	15	98	88
Independence	15	16	4	2	19	18
Lakewood	209	217	68	89	277	306
Lyndhurst	52	24	9	7	61	31
Maple Heights	93	68	23	12	116	80
Mayfield Heights	33	44	7	5	40	49
Middleburg Heights	23	18	6	3	29	21
North Olmsted	100	120	29	24	129	144
North Royalton	26	23	6	6	32	29
Parma	165	116	44	52	209	168
Parma Heights	38	29	9	15	47	44
Richmond Heights	10	15	1	1	11	16
Rocky River	45	50	13	19	58	69
Seven Hills	29	22	3	2	32	24
Shaker Heights	43	67	20	21	63	88
Solon	18	9	8	3	26	12
South Euclid	81	42	12	12	93	54
Strongsville	55	45	14	3	69	48
University Heights	36	36	15	12	51	48
Warrensville Heights	40	23	23	14	63	37
Westlake	66	46	9	14	75	60

TABLE A, Continued

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly

1972 and 1971

AREA OF RESIDENCE

Municipalities, Villages & Townships, continued	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1971</u>
Bentleyville	1	-	-	-	1	-
Bratenahl	-	-	1	1	1	1
Brooklyn Heights	4	1	-	-	4	1
Chagrin Falls	31	13	12	5	43	18
Cuyahoga Heights	2	-	-	-	2	-
Gates Mills	5	3	2	1	7	4
Glenwillow	3	1	-	1	3	2
Highland Heights	13	14	2	4	15	18
Hunting Valley	1	-	-	-	1	-
Linndale	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mayfield	6	8	1	1	7	9
Moreland Hills	4	4	3	2	7	6
Newburgh Heights	4	3	1	3	5	6
North Randall	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oakwood	15	19	3	4	18	23
Olmsted Falls	7	7	-	4	7	11
Orange Village	4	-	4	-	8	-
Pepper Pike	10	4	1	3	11	7
Valley View	3	5	-	-	3	5
Walton Hills	7	3	1	1	8	4
Westview	6	7	2	4	8	11
Woodmere	3	1	-	-	3	1
Chagrin Falls Township	-	-	-	-	-	-
Olmsted Township	16	18	1	3	17	21
Riveredge Township	1	1	1	-	2	1
Warrensville Township	2	2	-	1	2	3
TOTAL SUBURBS	<u>2,420</u>	<u>2,193</u>	<u>670</u>	<u>646</u>	<u>3,090</u>	<u>2,839</u>
Agency Residents	27	22	8	16	35	38
Out-of-County Residents	84	49	31	31	115	80
Area Designation Unknown	59	3	23	2	82	5
GRAND TOTAL	<u>6,966</u>	<u>6,979</u>	<u>2,033</u>	<u>2,119</u>	<u>8,999</u>	<u>9,098</u>

TABLE B

Source of Referral - Delinquency and Unruly Cases, 1972

<u>SOURCE OF REFERRAL</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Cleveland Police Department	2,591	212	2,803
Other County Police Departments	2,130	307	2,437
Other Police (State, Private, etc.)	69	6	75
Railroad Security Officers	70	5	75
Fire Departments	30	—	30
Store Security	396	350	746
Other Courts	64	6	70
Department of Liquor Control	32	1	33
Cleveland Board of Education	206	71	277
Other County School Boards	145	64	209
Public Social Agencies	50	37	87
Private Social Agencies	1	2	3
Parents, Relatives	424	730	1,154
Citizens	696	215	911
Other Sources	62	27	89
TOTAL	<u>6,966</u>	<u>2,033</u>	<u>8,999</u>

TABLE C

Ages of Individual Delinquent and Unruly Children, 1972

<u>AGE</u>	<u>BOYS</u>	<u>GIRLS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Eight and under	24	3	27
Nine	52	7	59
Ten	69	11	80
Eleven	154	24	178
Twelve	305	77	382
Thirteen	572	221	793
Fourteen	945	426	1,371
Fifteen	1,257	461	1,718
Sixteen	1,331	406	1,737
Seventeen	1,200	269	1,469
Eighteen	37	2	39
Unknown	86	31	117
Total Individuals	<u>6,032</u>	<u>1,938</u>	<u>7,970</u>
Number Receiving More than one New Filing during the Year	934	95	1,029
TOTAL CASES	<u>6,966</u>	<u>2,033</u>	<u>8,999</u>

TABLE 1
TOTAL COMPLAINTS, 1972 COMPARED WITH 1971

CHILDREN'S CASES	1972	1971
Delinquency: Boys	5,864	5,900
Girls	1,036	1,048
TOTAL DELINQUENCY	6,900	6,948
Unruliness: Boys	1,102	1,079
Girls	997	1,071
TOTAL UNRULINESS	2,099	2,150
TOTAL DELINQUENCY and UNRULINESS	8,999	9,098
Juvenile Traffic Offenders	8,936	9,303
Neglected Children's Cases	148	161
Dependent Children's Cases	266	257
Application to Determine Custody	172	227
Application for Approval of Permanent Surrender	43	68
Application for Consent to Marry	147	131
Writ of Habeas Corpus	19	—
TOTAL CHILDREN'S CASES	18,730	19,245
<hr/>		
<u>ADULT CASES</u>		
Non-Support of Minor Children	541	610
Neglect of Minor Children	48	76
Contributing to Delinquency	34	26
Contributing to Unruliness	62	44
Paternity Complaints	605	765
Certifications and Motions	62	70
Contempt of Court	24	—
Other Adult Cases	11	41
TOTAL ADULT CASES	1,387	1,632
<hr/>		
GRAND TOTAL, Children's and Adult Cases	20,117	20,877

TABLE 2

DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY COMPLAINTS, 1972 COMPARED WITH 1971

COMPLAINT	Boys		Girls		Total	
	1972	1971	1972	1971	1972	1971
Auto Theft	117	106	9	7	126	113
Auto Trespassing	893	1,072	62	84	955	1,156
Unlawful Entry and Stealing . .	1,006	941	45	42	1,051	983
Other Theft	489	581	51	102	540	683
Shoplifting	500	396	440	365	940	761
Theft from Person	371	423	23	29	394	452
Other Property Offense	124	91	15	18	139	109
Act Resulting in Death	19	19	3	1	22	20
Injury to Person	677	714	204	209	881	923
Destruction of Property	455	430	24	33	479	463
Disorderly Conduct	238	256	34	35	272	291
Possession of Weapons	126	127	3	6	129	133
Fire Setting	39	56	—	7	39	63
Trespassing on Property	164	172	9	12	173	184
Glue Sniffing	144	61	17	6	161	67 ✓
Drug and Narcotic Violations .	256	149	36	35	292 ✓	184 ✓
Liquor Offense	213	190	31	36	244	226
Sex Offense	49	47	37	41	86	88
Incorrigibility	486	544	685	697	1,171	1,241
Truancy	233	247	123	160	356	407
Running Away	49	43	95	113	144	156
Curfew Violation	201	148	39	42	240	190
Other Complaints	117	166	48	39	165	205
TOTAL	6,966	6,979	2,033	2,119	8,999	9,098

TABLE 3

DISPOSITIONS MADE IN DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY CASES, 1972

OFFICIAL CASES	Boys	Girls	Total
Placed on Probation	1,560	536	2,096
Placed in Private Treatment Centers	141	60	201
Committed or Returned to Public Institutions:			
Ohio Youth Commission	523	116	639
Mansfield Youth Center	56	—	56
Cleveland Boys' School - Blossom Hill	164	91	255
Total Committed or Returned to Institutions	743	207	950
Transferred to Common Pleas Court	25	2	27
Continued Under Supervision of Parole Officer	41	1	42
Continued Under Supervision, County Welfare Department	30	10	40
Committed to Parents or Relatives	305	43	348
Order Made in Other Case	506	42	548
Other Disposition	102	13	115
Dismissed by the Court	481	89	570
Withdrawn by Complainant	207	182	389
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1973	502	151	653
TOTAL OFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS	4,643	1,336	5,979
UNOFFICIAL CASES	Boys	Girls	Total
Adjusted by Referee	1,770	560	2,330
Court Diversion Project	104	62	166
Probation Officer to Supervise	180	55	235
Referred to Agency	48	33	81
Made Official	57	27	84
Other Disposition	96	46	142
Dismissed by Referee	155	46	201
Withdrawn by Complainant	46	27	73
Continued, Held Open	83	17	100
TOTAL UNOFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS	2,539	873	3,412

* Discrepancy between the amount of official dispositions and the number of filings results from multiple dispositions made regarding children returned to Court during the year.

TABLE 4
 CASES UNDER SUPERVISION OF THE PROBATION
 AND PLACEMENT DEPARTMENTS, 1972

MOVEMENT OF CASES	Boys	Girls	Total
Brought Forward January, 1972	1,638	571	2,209
Received for Supervision, 1972	1,881	651	2,532
Total Under Supervision	3,519	1,222	4,741
Removed from Supervision	1,926	543	2,469
Carried Forward to 1973	1,593	679	2,272

TABLE 5
 CHILDREN UNDER CARE IN DETENTION HOME - 1972

	Boys	Girls	Total
Under Care, January 1, 1972	28	12	40
Admitted During the Year	2,345	913	3,258
Total Under Care During Year	2,373	925	3,298
Released During the Year	2,330	911	3,241
Under Care December 31, 1972	43	14	57
Total Days of Care Furnished	18,363	6,470	24,833
Average Daily Population	50	18	68
Average Length of Stay in Days	8	7	7.5

TABLE 6
DISPOSITION OF CHILDREN IN OFFICIAL
NEGLECT AND DEPENDENCY CASES - 1972

DISPOSITION	Neglect	Dependency	Total
Committed to Parents or Relatives	4	2	6
Committed to the County Welfare Department:			
Temporary Care and Custody	98	172	270
Permanent Care and Custody	10	32	42
Committed to other Agencies	—	2	2
Dismissed or Withdrawn	13	13	26
Other Order	1	—	1
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1973	22	44	66
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN	148	265	413

TABLE 7
DISPOSITION OF ADULTS IN OFFICIAL NEGLECT,
NON-SUPPORT, DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY CASES, 1972

DISPOSITION	Neglect Non-Support	Delinquency and Unruly	Total
Committed to:			
Cleveland House of Correction	4	5	9
County Jail	-	-	-
Court Order to Support Minor Children	135	-	135
Sentence Suspended:			
On Condition of Proper Behavior	11	25	36
Pay Fine and/or Cost	-	1	1
Other Order	26	3	29
Dismissed or Withdrawn	33	12	45
Continued or Set for Hearing in 1973	138	31	169
TOTAL ADULTS CHARGED	347	77	424

TABLE 8

COLLECTION OF MONEY BY THE COURT AND DISTRIBUTION
OF MONEY FOR THE SUPPORT OF MINOR CHILDREN

TYPE OF COLLECTION	Amount
For Support of Children	\$3,179,541.83
Damages or Restitution	25,427.66
Poundage	32,227.61
Fines	11,677.35
Costs	108,484.99
Appearance Bonds	22,085.00
Maternity Hospital Collections	9,392.55
State of Ohio - Educational Subsidy	204,872.00
Miscellaneous General Collections	53,834.95
TOTAL AMOUNT COLLECTED	\$3,647,543.94
Money for Support of Children Disbursed to:	
Parents and Relatives	\$2,997,195.57
Public Agencies:	
Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, Social Services	80,960.81
Other Tax-Supported Agencies and Institutions	6,697.37
TOTAL PUBLIC AGENCIES	87,658.18
Private Agencies:	
Out-of-Town Placements	68,617.38
Local Agencies and Institutions	26,070.70
TOTAL PRIVATE AGENCIES	94,688.08
GRAND TOTAL OF SUPPORT MONEY DISBURSED	\$3,179,541.83

TABLE 9

REPORT OF THE INTAKE - AFFIDAVIT DEPARTMENT

ACTION TAKEN AT INTAKE	Number of Complaints Received
New Cases Accepted for Court Action	20,117
Disposed of Without Court Action:	
Referred to Social Agencies	364
Referred to Boards of Education	39
Referred to Police Departments	158
Referred to Other Courts	83
Referred to Court Diversion Services	130
Referred to Other Services	147
Handeled by Correspondence	332
TOTAL DISPOSED OF WITHOUT COURT ACTION	1,253

TABLE 10
 DIAGNOSES OF PATIENTS EXAMINED
 BY THE COURT PSYCHIATRISTS - 1972

DIAGNOSIS	Boys	Girls	Adults	Total
Psychoses:				
Schizophrenia, various types	4	-	-	4
Neuroses:				
Depressive Reaction	5	4	-	9
Anxiety Reaction	1	-	-	1
Personality Disorders:				
Passive-Aggressive Personality	60	18	1	79
Inadequate Personality	5	4	1	10
Anti-Social Personality	9	1	-	10
Hysterical Personality	-	8	-	8
Schizoid Personality	3	1	-	4
Paranoid Personality	1	-	-	1
Other Personality Disorders	24	4	2	30
Transient Situational Disturbances:				
Adjustment Reaction of Childhood	2	-	-	2
Adjustment Reaction of Adolescence	137	68	-	205
Behavior Disorders:				
Runaway Reaction	4	-	-	4
Withdrawing Reaction	7	-	-	7
Overanxious Reaction	1	-	-	1
Unsocialized Aggressive Reaction	9	1	-	10
Group Delinquent Reaction	6	2	-	8
Other Behavior Disorders	8	-	-	8
Other Disorders:				
Mental Retardation	13	1	-	14
Drug Dependence	7	3	-	10
Other Diagnosis	1	-	3	4
Diagnosis Deferred	7	-	-	7
No Diagnosis Made	13	1	5	19
TOTAL EXAMINATIONS	327	116	12	455

DIRECTORY OF PERSONNEL

COMMON PLEAS COURT

JUVENILE COURT DIVISION

2163 East 22nd Street

Telephone: 771-84

HON. JOHN J. TONER, Administrative Judge

HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH, Judge

HON. ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO, Judge

HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN, Judge

ERVIN J. WIERZBINSKI, Administrator

BAILIFFS and JUDGES' CLERKS

Donald Gagliardo, Bailiff

Andrew Ladika, Bailiff

Michael O'Grady, Bailiff

Fred O'Malley, Bailiff

Sue Fisher, Cler

Ruth Gorman, Cler

Andrew Pierce, Cler

Janice Szalkowski, Cler

DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL SERVICES

JOHN J. SWEENEY, Chief Clerk

REFEREES

Louise Amico

Ralph T. DeFranco

Blanche Drenfeld

Sam Durante

William Fraunfelder

George McCready

Jeanne Winkler

INTAKE OFFICERS

Rosa Benton

Sharon Berman

Donna Catliota

Jack DiCillo

Sandra Malevan

Margaret Simpson

CLERK'S OFFICE

ELIZABETH HOPKINS, Chief Deputy Clerk

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

JOHN J. ALDEN, Director

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

ANDREW J. DeSANTI, Chief Probation Officer

CASE SUPERVISORS

Rudiene Brabson

Joseph Cabot

Josephus Hicks

Francis Hogan

Lucille Jackson

Millard Jones, Jr.

Donald Peak

Charlotte Perry

Gladys Rubin

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES Continued

PROBATION OFFICERS

Lawrence Alesnik	Christina Hamlin	John Rath
Harris Allen	Richard Hoose	Orin Richburg
Peter Baumgartner	Cynthia Jarzembak	Debra Ross
Duane Belcher	Mary Ann Konrad	Catherine Samano
Nanee Bennett	Lynda Kurtz	Donald Schwallie
Carol Boyd	John Lepo	Tyler Somersshield
Myrtle Brown	Daniel Lyon	William Stephen
John Carlin	Earl Matthews	Wayne Strunk
Jack Cervelli	John Miller	Cynthia Ward
Judith Colby	Mark Minnello	Jacqueline Warren
Timothy Deegan	Regis McGann	Kenneth Watson
Ralph DeFranco	Lorenzo Norris	Joseph Whalen
Richard Donelan	David Novak	Gwenyth Williams
Martin Farraher	Marci Novak	Catherine Witt
Peter French	Patrick O'Donnell	Mary Ellen Wobbecke
David Gay	Barbara Payne	James Zaas
Kathryn George	Thomas Pearson	Robert Zak
Gregory Graham	Carolyn Penn	Kevin Zehe
Ellen Greene	Russell Perkins	Joseph Ziemnek
Benjamin Haberman	Joseph Pertz	

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNSELING CENTERS PROJECT

ROBERT TWOHEY, Director and Supervisor

Edith Anderson, Supervisor

Edgar MacConnell, Supervisor

PROBATION OFFICERS

Sylvia Baugham	Steven Ramsey
Ann Chambers	Kathy Schaeffer
Helen Curry	James Streetz
Gladwin Goins	Bernard Thomas
Robert Jennings	George Tsagaris
William McCollough	Richard Walker

PLACEMENT UNIT

VICTOR MACHA, JR., Supervisor

PROBATION OFFICERS

Roland Born	Patricia Mannix
Robert Hanna	James Manuel
Bruce Hinsdale	Donald Switzer
Edward McCabe	

STATISTICS DEPARTMENT

RICHARD A. GALLITTO, Statistician

BUDGET AND PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

BRICE W. MANNING, Director

COURT DIVERSION PROJECT

THOMAS EDWARDS, Director

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

DAVID ADAMS, Supervisor

Child Support Department
Cashier's Office
Bail Bond - Police Liaison
Detention Intake and Release

MYRON T. MOSES, Chief
ARTHUR DUDLEY, Chief Cashier
STUART WOLDMAN, Chief
ROBERT HORLEY, Referee

COURT CLINIC

Psychiatrists

Psychologists

Dr. Irving Berger
Dr. John A. Hadden, Jr.
Dr. Florence Matthews
Dr. Samuel Nigro

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

JUVENILE COURT BRANCH OFFICES

CLEVELAND HEIGHTS OFFICE

2969 Mayfield Road

Telephone: 321-7380

Brian Sexton, Referee
Mathias Novak, Probation Officer

Alice Carter, Clerk

CITY OF EUCLID OFFICE

545 East 222nd Street

Telephone: 731-9555

Daniel O'Neil, Referee

STENOGRAPHIC SERVICE AND RECORD ROOM

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

CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

2209 Central Avenue

Telephone Numbers: Days - 771-8400,
Nights, Sundays, Holidays - 771-8421

Martin Kelley, Superintendent
Janet Estadt, Assistant Superintendent-Eugenia Dziedzicki, Office Manager

MEDICAL SERVICE

Regis F. Golubski, M.D., Director Katherine M. Alden, R.N., Head Nurse

JUVENILE COURT STAFF MEMBERS

Katherine Adams	Bruce Greenberger	Victoria Podolak
David Aggers	Daniel Halligan	Dorothy Pudgush
Valorie Allen	Beverly Hamilton	Delores Reid
Stephanie Anderson	Frank Haskovec	Linda Resler
John Avon	Janice Horton	Margaret Rhoades
Agnes Baldwin	Christine Heestand	Marjorie Rhoades
Diane Barry	Thomas Hurley	Susan Ronges
Thelma Barry	Linda Hustak	Lydia Sauer
Peggy Bishop	Barbara Jeske	Joan Saxon
Maryanne Boesken	Sheila Johnson	Bonnie Seiber
John Bokoch	Walter Juba, Jr.	Cresta Short
Edna Branning	Mary Keating	Shirley Smik
Paul Bunker	Margaret Keller	Constance Somersfield
Gussy Burlin	Madaline Kelly	Jack Sonneborn
Debra Bush	Jeannette Kennedy	Michael Speranza
Frances Chambers	Fannie Kinderman	Donald Spooner
Melvin Chavinson	Eleanor Kirby	John Stanberry
David Chelminski	Mary Kretai	Susan Stakolich
David Clarke	Mary Kremzar	Mary Frances Steirer
Delores Coleman	Patricia Kus	Catherine Stewart
Sharon Coleman	Debbie Kuzel	Shirley Storey
Patricia Connors	Lois Lakatos	Peter Streetz
Irene Conzaman	Linda Lanigan	Joyce Stucko
Carrie Cook	Robert Larson	Barbara Sullivan
Mary Courtot	Linda Lehman	Alfred Sylvester
Glynn Crawford	Josephine Lotarski	Ola Taylor
Debera Decker	Sandra McCraw	Milton Terheggen
Eda Deggin	Danielle McGuirk	Carlotta Thatch
Joseph DelBalso	Denise Magalotti	Earle Thompson II
Stanley Devaughn	Phyllis Matthews	Diane Thornsberry
Michael Diemert	Peggy Mangan	Emma Torok
Anna Dudash	Linda Mezera	Gayl Tuckosh
Debra Dukes	Marsha Miles	Kathy Tumolo
Ella Eckhoff	David Miller	Donna Vojticek
Wendy Ehle	Jeanne Minnello	Jeanne Walsh
Melvyn Ellis	Loretta Montemarano	Irene Walzak
Marlene Ende	Willa Morgan	Sandra Weaver
Dorothy Englehart	Mildred Mulgrew	Darlene Wenz
Frank Finan	Grace Myers	Jean Wetzel
Ruth Folan	Jane Nebesar	Veda Wheat
Lizaweta Foltzer	Margaret Nelson	Jean White
Thomas Foster	Mary Newport	Mary White
Connie Fuerst	Quentin Nolan	Ellen Wier
Larry Gaines	Joanne Nowicki	Harry Wilson
Kathryn Gillespie	Roberta Oleksiak	Stephen Wilson
Rita Golembiewski	Lee Oliver	Sharon Woodring
William Gorman	Rosanne Orzechowski	Natalie Zagor
Helen Gorsch	James Papp	Diane Zirneskie
		Sandra Zummo

DETENTION HOME STAFF MEMBERS

Jacquelyn Abbott	Mary Gilbert	Geddes Mitchell
Christine Akins	Julia Graca	Evelyn Montgomery
Thomas Alexander	Eddie Greene	Willie Moore
Virginia Alexander	Charles Hall	Garrett Morgan, Jr.
Nellie Allen	Kenneth Hamilton	Alberta Morrison
Rowena Beauford	Robert Hampton	Pierre Nappier
Rita Bednarski	Hillman Hanley, Jr.	Robert Neill, Jr.
Edna Bloser	Hillman Hanley, III	Lena Nicolli
Gladys Blue	Victor Hardcastle	Francis Ogene
Samuel Bogan	James Harris, Jr.	Isaac Oliver
William Bowen	Lowell Harris	Lillian Orosz
Mary Braeunig	Ruby Harris	Jessie Mae Parker
Eugene Branham	Barbara Head	Henry Payne
Eleanore Bridge	Sherman Helm	Kyril Popoff
Curtis Broughton	Mae Hensell	Catherine Prevo
John Brown	Marie Hickman	Fannie Price
Ella Burt	Joel Hicks	Jerome Quarterman
James Burt	Mary Hillman	Lillie Rice
William Burton	Jeanie Hogue	Jean Richard
David Butcher	Leon Holmes, Jr.	Lawrence Richards
Dewey Carducci	Kenneth Hughes	James Robinson
Helen Cermely	Otha Jackson	John Robinson
Regis Clark	Elmore Jenkins	Lois Rosasco
Kenneth Cloud	Barbara Jeskey	Lucile Ruff
Mallory Coats	Mittie Johnson	Carl Schmitz
Lucille Cobb	Nellie Johnson	Devon Settles
Arthur Cornelius	Fred Jones, Jr.	Floyd Simmons
Fannie Costanzo	James Jones	Clinton Simpson
Rose Cotos	Perry Joyner	Luvenia Spivey
Helena Danczak	Johnny Kelly	Thomas Stewart
Mary Davis	Janie Kemp	Eugene Stover
Nettie Davis	Jeanne Kurtz	Anna Taraba
Charles Day	Albert Laster	Robert Taylor
Luther Demery	Mary Leggon	Jessie Ann Thompson
Oliver Demery	Roosevelt Lockley, Jr.	Zelma Tucker
Elverna Dillingham	Mildred Lowery	Regina Tycast
Ruth Easley	George McJunkins	Bertha Untisz
Claudia Felder	Mary McJunkins	Callie Wade
Genevieve Ferguson	Charlie Mae Malone	Eugene Wheeler
Lawrence Fields	Sallie Malone	Vera White
Thelma Fitch	Anthony Manning	Georgia Whittmore
Samuel Franks	Dougal Mays	Charles Williams
Gerald Frazier	Catherine Midgett	Leonard Williamson
Harrison Fulton	Charles Mines	Edward Wooten, Jr.
James A. Gay, Jr.	Arnold Mitchell	Allison Wrenn
James A. Gay, Sr.		Charlie Young

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.

ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

MR. RONALD BROWN, Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Allen

Mr. Leslie W. Jacobs

Mrs. John Bernet

Mrs. H. Andrew Johnson

Mr. Crede Calhoun

Mr. Frank E. Joseph

Mr. Frank Catliota

Mr. Frank L. Kelker

Msgr. Casimir Ciolek

Mr. Richard Kelley

Mr. Richard Cole

Mr. Robert Larson

Mr. A. F. Connors

Mr. Frank Leonetti

Mrs. Francis A. Coy

Mrs. Ann A. McManamon

Mrs. Garry B. Curtiss

Mr. John Petten

Mr. Donald Freeman

Mrs. Frank H. Porter

Mr. John Garson

Mr. Albert Ringler

Mrs. Scott B. Hayes

Mrs. Paul A. Unger

Mrs. Gilbert Humphrey