

SESSION OF 2004

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON HOUSE BILL NO. 2880

As Amended by Senate Committee on
Judiciary

Brief*

HB 2880 amends current law regarding the administration and operation of the courts in Kansas. Certain decisions and actions by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court will require advice and approval of the Justices of the Supreme Court including the appointment of the position of judicial administrator. In addition, on or before January 16 of each year the Judicial Administrator will publish the caseload of each judicial district, the judicial and nonjudicial personnel of each judicial district, and district court offices, including the clerk's and court services offices.

Also under the bill, the chief judges in each of not to exceed six judicial departments would assist the departmental justice in developing a budget, and in making a report and recommendations about that budget to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The Chief Justice would then be responsible for summarizing the budget and reports as well as all summaries and recommendations to be filed as public records in the office of the clerk of the Supreme Court, who would submit a written report at the beginning of each legislative session to the Governor and the judiciary committees of both houses of the Legislature.

The Senate Committee deleted the amendment which would have required the Judicial Administrator, on or before July 1, 2005, and every four years thereafter, to prepare and utilize a comprehensive and uniform non judicial personnel plan. The Senate Committee make other clarifying amendments.

Background

*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org>

Representative Mike O'Neal testified in support of the bill. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court spoke in opposition of the measure.

The fiscal note indicates that according to the Office of Judicial Administration, if the current reports and information already provided to both the legislative and executive branches are adequate to fulfill the requirements of the bill, passage of the bill would have no fiscal effect on the Judiciary. If more rigorous studies are required, an outside consultant would need to be retained. Based on recent statewide reviews provided by consultants, it is anticipated that \$250,000 from the State General Fund would be required.