68th Legislature 2023

| SR           | 299. | 1 |
|--------------|------|---|
| $\mathbf{u}$ | 200. |   |

| 1  |                                    | SENATE BILL NO. 299   |  |
|----|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 2  |                                    | INTRODUCED BY B. USHEF  | र  |
| 3  |                                    |   |  |
| 4  | A BILL FOR A                       | N ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT REQUIRING AN AUDIT O                  | F THE JUDICIAL BRANCH DISTRICT                 |
| 5  | COURTS; AND                        | O PROVIDING AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE."                     |  |
| 6  |                                    |   |  |
| 7  | BE IT ENACTE                       | ED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MONT                    | ANA:   |
| 8  |                                    |   |  |
| 9  | NEW S                              | SECTION. Section 1. Audit of judicial branch distrie          | <b>ct courts.</b> (1) There must be a one-time |
| 10 | performance a                      | udit of the district courts. The performance audit must b     | e conducted by or at the direction of the      |
| 11 | legislative audi                   | tor and may include but is not limited to:                    |  |
| 12 | (a)                                | a comparison of the district court case-weight assignn        | nents and workload measurement system          |
| 13 | to similar court                   | s in at least three other similar states. The following poi   | nts of comparison are of particular            |
| 14 | interest:                          |   |  |
| 15 | (i)                                | the average length of time required for cases in each         | district court to reach completion,            |
| 16 | including how I                    | long it takes a judge to issue a ruling after the matter if f | ully briefed and how those times compare       |
| 17 | to the current of                  | case-weight assignments, speedy-trial considerations fo       | r criminal cases, and completion               |
| 18 | expectations. T                    | This work must consider any applicable controlling direc      | tives, such as the Montana rules of            |
| 19 | evidence and c                     | civil procedure, individual case type legal requirements,     | and individual district court operational      |
| 20 | rules, including                   | factors outside of judicial control.                          |  |
| 21 | (ii)                               | the average amount of time judges are working; and            |  |
| 22 | (iii)                              | if and how time spent by judges on noncase activities         | , including time at conferences, trainings,    |
| 23 | meetings, othe                     | r court-related events, or making speeches to communi         | ty or other organizations, is recorded;        |
| 24 | (b)                                | whether recent increases in numbers of district court j       | udges have resulted in quicker                 |
| 25 | resolutions of c                   | civil cases;  |  |
| 26 | (c)                                | the number of full-time equivalent employees in the di        | strict court program;                          |
| 27 | (d)                                | a review of the status of the district court case manage      | ement system and electronic filing             |
| 28 | system, includi                    | ng if any efficiencies have been realized with the impler     | mentation of the electronic filing system;     |
|    | Legislativ<br>Services<br>Division |   | Authorized Print Version – SB 299              |

SB 299.1

| 1  | and  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  | (e)  | an analysis of budgets, costs, and functions of the district courts over time.                     |  |
| 3  | (2)  | The legislative auditor shall scope and plan the audit based on risk, including a consideration of |  |
| 4  | the district court's financial, operational, and technological risks associated with meeting its intended purpose, |  |  |
| 5  | goals, objectives, and legal mandates. The legislative auditor shall consider both rural and urban district courts |  |  |
| 6  | as part of its scoping and selection process.  |  |  |
| 7  | (3)  | The objectives of this audit must be formulated, defined, and conducted in accordance with         |  |
| 8  | industry standards established for auditing as described in 5-13-308.  |  |  |
| 9  | (4)  | The cost of the audit in whole must be paid for by the judicial branch.                            |  |
| 10 | (5)  | The audit must be completed by and presented to the legislative audit committee no later than      |  |
| 11 | December 15, 2024. Following review by the legislative audit committee, the audit and any audit followup must      |  |  |
| 12 | be delivered to members of the law and justice interim committee and the section D interim budget                  |  |  |
| 13 | subcommittee who shall serve in the 69th legislature and be posted on the website of the legislative audit         |  |  |
| 14 | division.  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 | NEW  | SECTION. Section 2. Effective date. [This act] is effective on passage and approval.               |  |
| 17 |  | - END -  |  |



- 2 -