


1. Which of the following best describes your current position?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Attorney, private practice		58.6%	690
Attorney, corporate		7.5%	88
Attorney, government		16.0%	188
Attorney, non-profit		4.3%	51
Administrative Law Judge		0.9%	11
Magistrate or part-time judge		2.0%	24
District court judge		4.2%	49
Appellate judge		0.7%	8
Retired or inactive		5.8%	68
		answered question	1,177
		skipped question	6

2. Which of the following best describes your experience in civil litigation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
My current practice involves civil litigation.		69.1%	813
My current practice does not involve civil litigation, but I have past experience in civil litigation.		21.7%	255
I do not have experience in civil litigation.		9.3%	109
answered question			1,177
skipped question			6

3. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of municipality in which your civil litigation experience primarily takes place. (E.g., 8A, Davis, 2600.)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Judicial District (#)		96.1%	748
County		97.0%	755
Municipality population (#)		85.6%	666
answered question			778
skipped question			405

4. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including attorneys who practice full- or part-time, or are located in satellite offices?

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of attorneys:	13.55	8,198	605
	answered question		605
	skipped question		578

5. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial officer?

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of years:	22.72	18,036	794
	answered question		794
	skipped question		389

6. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years serving as a judicial officer?

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of years:	20.26	16,125	796
	answered question		796
	skipped question		387

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS in which you SERVED AS ATTORNEY OF RECORD or PRESIDED OVER AS A JUDICIAL OFFICER in the last five (5) years.

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of cases:	11.38	8,794	773
	answered question		773
	skipped question		410

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS in which you HAVE BEEN INVOLVED AS ATTORNEY in the last five (5) years.

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of cases:	4.71	3,582	760
	answered question		760
	skipped question		423

9. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED TO THE COURT (bench trials without a jury) in which you served as ATTORNEY OF RECORD or PRESIDED OVER AS JUDICIAL OFFICER in the last five (5) years.

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of cases:	40.86	31,138	762
	answered question		762
	skipped question		421

10. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED TO THE COURT (bench trials without a jury) in which you HAVE BEEN INVOLVED AS ATTORNEY in the last five (5) years.

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of cases:	23.11	17,497	757
	answered question		757
	skipped question		426

11. In the civil cases in which you have participated AS ATTORNEY within the last five (5) years, have you primarily represented plaintiffs, defendants, or about an equal number of each?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Plaintiff representation primarily		28.2%	213
Defendant representation primarily		25.8%	195
About an equal amount of plaintiff and defendant representation		32.0%	242
Not applicable--judicial officer		7.1%	54
Not applicable--retired or inactive		6.9%	52
	answered question		756
	skipped question		427

12. In what types of civil cases have you most often been involved AS ATTORNEY in the last five (5) years? If your litigation experience is in more than one substantive area, please select the three areas in which you most often litigate.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Not applicable		7.8%	58
Administrative Law		12.1%	90
Civil Rights		8.9%	66
Construction		9.6%	71
Family Law		34.6%	257
ERISA		1.6%	12
Intellectual Property		1.5%	11
Personal Injury		35.9%	267
Product Liability		4.4%	33
Securities		0.8%	6
Mass Torts		0.7%	5
Bankruptcy		5.5%	41
Complex Commercial Disputes		8.9%	66
Contracts		30.0%	223
Employment Discrimination		11.7%	87
Insurance		7.8%	58
Labor Law		4.0%	30
Professional Malpractice		7.9%	59
Real Property		20.1%	149
Torts (generally)		21.3%	158
Other (please specify)		13.5%	100

answered question 743

skipped question 440

13. In which forum during the last five (5) years has most of your civil litigation experience taken place?


		Response Percent	Response Count
State court		78.1%	586
Federal court		3.3%	25
Roughly equal split of state and federal courts		9.2%	69
Roughly equal split of courts and arbitration panels		1.2%	9
Arbitration panels		0.3%	2
Tribal court		0.0%	0
Administrative agencies		5.7%	43
Other (please specify)		2.1%	16
		answered question	750
		skipped question	433

14. Below is a list of statements describing potential changes to the civil justice system. For each, please indicate your level of agreement with the statement.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. One judge should be assigned to each civil case and handle the matter from beginning to end.	34.0% (255)	36.1% (271)	18.8% (141)	9.1% (68)	2.0% (15)	750
b. Iowa should establish regional courthouses to gain efficiencies in the use of court resources.	25.5% (191)	28.2% (211)	18.2% (136)	14.6% (109)	13.5% (101)	748
c. A streamlined civil justice process should be created for cases valued below a certain dollar amount.	27.4% (204)	47.0% (350)	16.9% (126)	6.0% (45)	2.7% (20)	745
d. A streamlined process for cases valued below a certain dollar amount should replace notice pleadings with fact pleadings.	11.3% (84)	27.5% (205)	29.1% (217)	23.4% (174)	8.7% (65)	745
e. A streamlined process for cases valued below a certain dollar amount should impose limitations on the scope and duration of discovery.	20.0% (149)	43.3% (323)	14.9% (111)	17.7% (132)	4.2% (31)	746
f. A streamlined process for cases valued below a certain dollar amount should prohibit a summary judgment option.	8.7% (65)	16.0% (119)	20.5% (153)	36.9% (275)	18.0% (134)	746
g. Parties should be encouraged to enter into a pre-trial stipulation regarding issues such as liability, admission of evidence, and stipulated testimony.	36.1% (271)	49.2% (369)	9.3% (70)	4.0% (30)	1.3% (10)	750
h. The expert witness fee of \$150.00 per day found in Iowa Code section 622.72 should be increased.	23.6% (177)	32.8% (246)	30.0% (225)	9.5% (71)	4.0% (30)	749
i. Jurors should be allowed to ask questions during trials.	9.3% (69)	21.0% (156)	19.2% (143)	29.0% (216)	21.5% (160)	744

j. Statewide rules should be created to address the ability and extent to which the trial judge can rehabilitate jurors.	13.5% (101)	36.0% (269)	37.3% (279)	9.5% (71)	3.6% (27)	747	
						answered question	753
						skipped question	430

15. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the process for cases valued at a certain dollar amount and below, what should be the dollar value limitation?					
		Response Average	Response Total	Response Count	
Value limitation \$:		29,850.60	19,880,500	666	
				answered question	666
				skipped question	517

16. It would be beneficial to develop specialty courts for specific kinds of disputes.					
		Response Percent	Response Count		
Strongly agree		17.7%	133		
Agree		31.6%	237		
Neither agree nor disagree		31.4%	236		
Disagree		14.1%	106		
Strongly disagree		5.2%	39		
				answered question	751
				skipped question	432

17. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in specific areas, please identify those areas below.

	Response Count
	352
answered question	352
skipped question	831


18. For each statement please indicate your level of agreement.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. Increased judicial oversight would improve the pretrial process.	9.9% (72)	30.2% (220)	24.9% (181)	31.3% (228)	3.7% (27)	728
b. Increased judicial oversight would create unnecessary "busywork."	10.0% (73)	39.0% (284)	22.4% (163)	26.4% (192)	2.2% (16)	728
c. Courts should diverge from the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure if all parties request them to do so.	5.5% (40)	26.9% (195)	20.4% (148)	35.7% (259)	11.4% (83)	725
d. Requiring clients to sign all requests for extensions or continuances would limit the number of those requests.	4.1% (30)	32.1% (233)	17.5% (127)	36.1% (262)	10.2% (74)	726
				answered question		732
				skipped question		451

19. For each of the following statements please give your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. I am familiar with the local rules of the districts in which I practice.	24.1% (174)	56.8% (411)	10.4% (75)	7.6% (55)	1.1% (8)	723
b. I am readily able to locate the local rules of the judicial districts in which I have pending cases.	26.3% (188)	41.1% (294)	13.0% (93)	15.8% (113)	3.9% (28)	716
c. All local rules should be eliminated by adopting statewide uniform rules.	37.1% (271)	34.9% (255)	15.2% (111)	10.4% (76)	2.5% (18)	731
d. Any rules unique to a judicial district should be incorporated into standard scheduling or pre-trial orders.	43.0% (310)	48.1% (347)	5.1% (37)	2.5% (18)	1.2% (9)	721
answered question						732
skipped question						451

20. How often during the last five (5) years have you consulted the local rules of any given judicial district in the State of Iowa?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		25.2%	180
Occasionally		45.3%	324
About 1/2 time		6.2%	44
Often		16.9%	121
Almost always		6.4%	46
answered question			715
skipped question			468

21. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order to achieve a more timely and cost-effective court process for litigants, what would it be and why?

	Response Count
	255
answered question	255
skipped question	928

22. The Following are statements about pleadings. For each, please give your opinion.

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Notice pleading encourages extensive discovery in order to narrow the claims and defenses.	9.1% (62)	39.8% (271)	16.9% (115)	25.1% (171)	9.1% (62)	681
b. A plain and concise statement of the ultimate facts constituting the claim for relief at the pleading stage would narrow the claims and defenses of the case.	13.0% (89)	37.6% (258)	18.5% (127)	25.8% (177)	5.1% (35)	686
c. A plain and concise statement of the ultimate facts constituting the claim for relief at the pleading stage would reduce the total cost of discovery.	21.1% (144)	38.3% (262)	15.4% (105)	20.0% (137)	5.3% (36)	684
				answered question		687
				skipped question		496

23. A motion to dismiss should be an effective tool to narrow claims in the litigation.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree		16.6%	115
Agree		33.3%	231
Neither agree nor disagree		20.9%	145
Disagree		20.9%	145
Strongly disagree		8.4%	58
answered question			694
skipped question			489

24. The following are general statements about discovery. For each statement, please give your opinion.

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Judges are available to resolve discovery disputes on a timely basis.	11.1% (68)	34.3% (209)	19.0% (116)	29.3% (179)	6.2% (38)	610
b. Sanctions allowed by the discovery rules are imposed upon motion when warranted.	36.1% (221)	39.6% (243)	11.7% (72)	10.6% (65)	2.0% (12)	613
c. Conferring with opposing counsel before filing a discovery motion resolves the discovery dispute.	8.4% (52)	29.7% (184)	22.4% (139)	32.1% (199)	7.4% (46)	620
d. Attorneys request limitations on discovery under Rule 1.504(1)(b)(3) (burden or expense outweighs the likely benefit, etc.).	34.2% (204)	45.1% (269)	10.1% (60)	9.2% (55)	1.5% (9)	597
e. Judges invoke Rule 1.504(1)(b) limitations on their own initiative.	74.4% (436)	20.1% (118)	3.4% (20)	1.2% (7)	0.9% (5)	586
f. Discovery is used more to develop evidence for or in opposition to summary judgment than it is used to understand the other party's claims and defenses for trial.	6.1% (37)	38.7% (233)	26.1% (157)	22.1% (133)	7.0% (42)	602
answered question						628
skipped question						555

25. Should judges be more available to resolve discovery disputes?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		55.3%	349
No		17.4%	110
No opinion		27.3%	172
answered question			631
skipped question			552

26. When discovery that is excessive relative to the size of case or scope of issues occurs, how frequently is each of the following the primary cause?

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Inability of opposing counsel to agree on scope or timing of discovery.	12.1% (72)	41.4% (247)	15.9% (95)	25.5% (152)	5.2% (31)	597
b. Desire to delay proceedings.	15.5% (93)	42.3% (254)	9.8% (59)	25.8% (155)	6.7% (40)	601
c. Counsel conducting discovery for the purpose of leveraging settlement.	6.7% (40)	33.4% (200)	15.7% (94)	35.1% (210)	9.2% (55)	599
d. Counsel or client desire to engage in fishing expeditions.	6.8% (41)	32.4% (194)	16.0% (96)	35.9% (215)	8.8% (53)	599
e. Mistrust between counsel on opposing sides of the case.	10.3% (62)	41.9% (252)	18.1% (109)	24.1% (145)	5.5% (33)	601
f. Counsel fear of malpractice claims.	28.1% (167)	39.7% (236)	11.8% (70)	17.2% (102)	3.2% (19)	594
g. Counsel with limited experience conducting or responding to discovery.	8.7% (52)	55.6% (331)	13.6% (81)	19.3% (115)	2.7% (16)	595
answered question						604
skipped question						579

27. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases (excluding small claims) you have litigated or presided over in the last five (5) years in which one or more parties were self-represented (pro se).

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# of cases:	21.85	13,178	603
	answered question		603
	skipped question		580

28. In the cases in which you have been involved that included one or more self-represented (pro se) parties within the last five (5) years, how often did the involvement of the self-represented party cause excessive discovery relative to the size of case or scope of issues?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		59.8%	283
Occasionally		19.7%	93
About 1/2 time		5.1%	24
Often		7.6%	36
Almost always		7.8%	37
	answered question		473
	skipped question		710

29. Please indicate how often in your experience each of the following discovery mechanisms is a cost-effective tool for litigants (i.e., the cost is proportionate to the relevant information obtained).

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Request for admission.	16.4% (100)	30.7% (187)	13.1% (80)	27.4% (167)	12.5% (76)	610
b. Interrogatories.	5.9% (36)	19.6% (120)	21.4% (131)	38.0% (232)	15.1% (92)	611
c. Request for production of documents.	1.6% (10)	10.7% (65)	20.0% (122)	47.7% (291)	20.0% (122)	610
d. Depositions of fact witnesses.	3.2% (19)	16.8% (101)	17.8% (107)	41.9% (252)	20.4% (123)	602
e. Depositions of expert witnesses where expert testimony is limited to the expert report.	11.2% (66)	28.2% (166)	23.6% (139)	27.9% (164)	9.0% (53)	588
f. Depositions of expert witnesses where expert testimony beyond the expert report is permitted.	7.8% (46)	25.0% (147)	19.2% (113)	32.0% (188)	16.0% (94)	588
answered question						614
skipped question						569

30. Limitations could be placed on the number, frequency, timing, or duration of the following discovery devices without jeopardizing the fairness of the litigation process:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. Request for admission.	11.7% (71)	30.8% (187)	16.6% (101)	23.5% (143)	17.4% (106)	608
b. Interrogatories.	14.3% (87)	42.0% (256)	14.3% (87)	19.5% (119)	9.9% (60)	609
c. Requests for production of documents.	13.0% (79)	37.6% (228)	13.3% (81)	24.4% (148)	11.7% (71)	607
d. Depositions of parties.	9.4% (57)	30.7% (186)	17.3% (105)	28.9% (175)	13.7% (83)	606
e. Depositions of non-party fact witnesses.	10.4% (63)	35.4% (215)	18.3% (111)	27.0% (164)	8.9% (54)	607
f. Depositions of expert witnesses.	9.8% (59)	33.8% (203)	17.1% (103)	29.0% (174)	10.3% (62)	601
answered question						609
skipped question						574

31. In your cases, how often do Rule 1.507 discovery conferences occur?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		70.2%	403
Occasionally		23.2%	133
About 1/2 time		4.2%	24
Often		2.1%	12
Almost always		0.3%	2
answered question			574
skipped question			609

32. In your experience, when Rule 1.507 discovery conferences occur, how often do they promote overall efficiency in the discovery process for the course of litigation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		29.0%	142
Occasionally		42.9%	210
About 1/2 time		9.8%	48
Often		14.9%	73
Almost always		3.3%	16
answered question			489
skipped question			694

33. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to achieve a more timely and cost-effective court process for litigants, what would it be and why?

	Response Count
	262
answered question	262
skipped question	921

34. Have you had experience with electronic discovery (e-discovery)?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		41.0%	270
No		59.0%	388
answered question			658
skipped question			525

35. Please give your opinion for each statement regarding e-discovery.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. When properly managed in a case, discovery of electronic records can reduce the overall cost of discovery in the case.	14.7% (37)	32.9% (83)	18.7% (47)	25.4% (64)	8.3% (21)	252
b. E-discovery causes a disproportionate increase in discovery costs (i.e., increase in cost compared to amount or value of relevant information obtained), as a share of total litigation costs.	17.9% (45)	28.7% (72)	23.5% (59)	25.9% (65)	4.0% (10)	251
c. The costs of outside vendors have increased the costs of e-discovery without commensurate value to the client.	16.9% (42)	33.3% (83)	38.6% (96)	9.6% (24)	1.6% (4)	249
d. Courts should be more active in managing e-discovery.	14.9% (37)	38.7% (96)	35.1% (87)	10.5% (26)	0.8% (2)	248
answered question						252
skipped question						931

36. If you have experience with e-discovery that was excessive relative to the value of the case or scope of issues, please give your opinion regarding whether each of the following was a significant cause:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. Clients demanding counsel conduct unnecessary e-discovery.	8.6% (16)	26.7% (50)	33.7% (63)	23.5% (44)	7.5% (14)	187
b. Counsel fear of malpractice claims.	4.9% (9)	26.9% (49)	34.1% (62)	28.6% (52)	5.5% (10)	182
c. Counsel with limited trial experience.	6.0% (11)	33.9% (62)	36.1% (66)	21.3% (39)	2.7% (5)	183
d. Counsel with limited experience conducting or responding to e-discovery.	10.4% (19)	42.6% (78)	31.7% (58)	14.2% (26)	1.1% (2)	183
e. Inability of opposing counsel to agree on scope or timing of e-discovery.	11.3% (21)	50.0% (93)	30.6% (57)	8.1% (15)	0.0% (0)	186
f. Desire to delay proceedings.	4.4% (8)	22.4% (41)	49.2% (90)	22.4% (41)	1.6% (3)	183
g. Counsel conducting e-discovery for the purpose of leveraging settlement.	13.4% (25)	45.5% (85)	31.0% (58)	10.2% (19)	0.0% (0)	187
h. Courts' lack of understanding of how e-discovery works.	12.0% (22)	35.3% (65)	37.5% (69)	14.7% (27)	0.5% (1)	184
i. The presence of pro se litigants.	7.1% (13)	9.9% (18)	48.4% (88)	23.6% (43)	11.0% (20)	182
answered question						189
skipped question						994

37. The following are general statements about summary judgment motions. For each, please give your opinion.

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Summary Judgment motions are used as a tool to leverage settlement, rather than in a good faith effort to narrow the issues.	18.6% (111)	51.3% (306)	10.2% (61)	15.9% (95)	3.9% (23)	596
b. Summary judgment practice increases the cost of litigation without commensurate benefit to judicial economy.	23.0% (137)	39.1% (233)	12.2% (73)	17.3% (103)	8.4% (50)	596
c. Summary judgment practice delays the course of litigation without commensurate benefit to judicial economy.	30.7% (182)	35.5% (210)	12.0% (71)	14.7% (87)	7.1% (42)	592
d. Judges rule on summary judgment motions promptly.	12.8% (75)	29.1% (171)	31.2% (183)	22.1% (130)	4.8% (28)	587
e. Judges are granting summary judgment when appropriate.	9.2% (54)	29.8% (176)	25.6% (151)	28.0% (165)	7.5% (44)	590
f. Judges decline to grant summary judgment motions even when warranted.	17.7% (103)	37.8% (220)	17.5% (102)	22.2% (129)	4.8% (28)	582
g. Attorneys file summary judgment motions without regard for likelihood of success because of malpractice concerns.	46.8% (269)	31.8% (183)	7.8% (45)	9.6% (55)	4.0% (23)	575
answered question						600
skipped question						583

38. The following are statements related to trial dates. For each, please give your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. Trial dates should be set early in the case.	26.7% (160)	39.7% (238)	14.0% (84)	17.0% (102)	2.5% (15)	599
b. Trial dates should be set after discovery is completed.	8.1% (48)	25.6% (152)	14.8% (88)	43.0% (255)	8.4% (50)	593
c. Trial dates should be continued or vacated only under rare circumstances.	14.7% (88)	32.7% (196)	16.5% (99)	31.3% (188)	4.8% (29)	600
d. It is too easy for attorneys to obtain extensions of trial dates already set.	11.8% (71)	23.8% (143)	23.5% (141)	35.1% (211)	5.8% (35)	601
e. Parties should be given a date certain for trial.	28.3% (170)	49.5% (297)	14.7% (88)	5.8% (35)	1.7% (10)	600
f. Parties should be given a date certain for trial subject to priority for criminal trials.	11.7% (70)	35.7% (213)	22.5% (134)	23.3% (139)	6.7% (40)	596
g. Parties should be given a date certain for trial subject to priority for domestic matters.	7.7% (46)	25.2% (150)	25.2% (150)	32.9% (196)	8.9% (53)	595
h. Parties should be given a date certain for trial even if it means a trial date more than 14 months in the future.	19.6% (117)	49.7% (297)	14.1% (84)	13.1% (78)	3.5% (21)	597
i. Parties should be given a date certain for trial even if cases are not assigned to a specific judge.	20.8% (124)	52.9% (315)	13.6% (81)	10.2% (61)	2.5% (15)	596
answered question						605
skipped question						578

39. The following are statements about judicial role in the discovery stage of litigation. Please consider how often the following occur.

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Judges are involved early in case proceedings.	60.1% (342)	34.4% (196)	3.5% (20)	1.6% (9)	0.4% (2)	569
b. Involvement by judges early in the case helps to narrow the issues.	23.0% (128)	39.9% (222)	15.8% (88)	18.3% (102)	2.9% (16)	556
c. Involvement by judges early in a case helps to narrow discovery to the information necessary for case resolution.	26.5% (147)	41.4% (230)	12.1% (67)	17.8% (99)	2.2% (12)	555
answered question						572
skipped question						611

40. The following are statements about judicial role in litigation. For each please give your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. When a judge is involved early in a case and stays involved until completion, clients are more satisfied with the litigation process.	6.5% (37)	35.1% (200)	50.3% (286)	7.2% (41)	0.9% (5)	569
d. One judge should handle a case from start to finish.	24.9% (144)	44.3% (256)	15.6% (90)	13.1% (76)	2.1% (12)	578
e. The judge who is going to try the case should handle all pre-trial matters.	32.5% (187)	46.4% (267)	13.6% (78)	6.8% (39)	0.7% (4)	575
f. It is more important that pre-trial matters are handled promptly than whether the trial judge or another judicial officer handles the matters.	10.1% (58)	37.5% (215)	21.8% (125)	28.1% (161)	2.4% (14)	573
g. Judges with expertise in certain types of cases should be assigned to those types of cases.	21.6% (124)	44.2% (253)	21.6% (124)	10.1% (58)	2.4% (14)	573
answered question						581
skipped question						602

41. The following are statements relating to judicial involvement in settlement. Please give your opinion for each.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. Judges pressure parties to settle cases.	8.3% (48)	37.2% (215)	25.1% (145)	24.7% (143)	4.7% (27)	578
b. Judges pressure parties to settle cases because they do not want to preside over trials.	7.5% (43)	19.5% (112)	23.2% (133)	39.0% (224)	10.8% (62)	574
c. Judges pressure parties to settle cases because of overcrowded court dockets.	7.8% (45)	35.2% (203)	25.3% (146)	26.2% (151)	5.5% (32)	577
d. Judges pressure parties to settle cases because of a shortage of court resources.	7.7% (44)	35.3% (202)	26.2% (150)	25.3% (145)	5.4% (31)	572
answered question						580
skipped question						603

42. Iowa judges should do more or less to encourage parties to settle cases.


		Response Percent	Response Count
More		46.0%	267
Less		10.7%	62
No opinion		43.3%	251
answered question			580
skipped question			603

43. In your experience, how often are Rule 1.602 pretrial conferences held?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		32.2%	171
Occasionally		32.8%	174
About 1/2 time		14.5%	77
Often		13.6%	72
Almost always		7.0%	37
answered question			531
skipped question			652

44. Rule 1.602 pretrial conferences should be held--						
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
in all civil cases in district court.	21.4% (116)	39.9% (216)	24.5% (133)	12.4% (67)	1.8% (10)	542
in all civil cases in disrict court valued below a certain dollar amount.	17.4% (90)	28.2% (146)	34.9% (181)	15.4% (80)	4.1% (21)	518
answered question						545
skipped question						638

45. What effect does holding a Rule 1.602 pretrial conference have on a case? Select all that apply.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Holding a Rule 1.602 conference has no effect on a case		10.4%	51
Identifies the issues		52.2%	256
Narrows the issues		51.4%	252
Informs the court of the issues in the case		66.7%	327
Promotes settlement		53.7%	263
Shortens the time to case resolution		26.9%	132
Lengthens the time to case resolution		2.4%	12
Improves efficiency of the litigation process		50.8%	249
Lowers cost of resolving legal disputes by trial		31.0%	152
Increases cost of resolving legal disputes by trial		4.5%	22
Other (please specify)		4.9%	24
		answered question	490
		skipped question	693

46. With which of the following statements do you most agree?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Rule 1.604 pretrial orders are modified only when necessary to prevent manifest injustice.		48.1%	211
Rule 1.604 pretrial orders are modified too often for less than compelling reasons.		32.6%	143
Rule 1.604 pretrial orders are modified less often than necessary to prevent manifest injustice.		19.4%	85
answered question			439
skipped question			744

47. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were involved were pretrial conferences or hearings held by telephone, video conferencing, or in person?				
		Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
Telephone %:		39.34	17,704	450
Video conferencing %:		0.17	54	324
In person %:		56.84	25,920	456
answered question			485	
skipped question			698	

48. Do you favor amending the Iowa rules to allow video conferencing for pretrial matters?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		66.0%	376
No		16.5%	94
No opinion		17.5%	100
answered question			570
skipped question			613

49. When there are LIMITED ISSUES OF LIABILITY, do you favor allowing the court to enter a verdict similar to a jury verdict and/or judgment without making findings of fact and conclusions of law?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		28.1%	160
No		58.6%	334
No opinion		13.3%	76
answered question			570
skipped question			613

50. In cases involving LIMITED AMOUNTS IN CONTROVERSY, do you favor allowing the court to enter a verdict and/or judgment without making findings of fact and conclusions of law?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		32.7%	187
No		57.4%	328
No opinion		9.8%	56
answered question			571
skipped question			612

51. The following are general statements about litigation costs. For each, please give your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. Continuances increase the overall cost of litigation.	24.4% (139)	38.1% (217)	18.1% (103)	17.2% (98)	2.3% (13)	570
b. Expediting cases increases the overall cost of litigation.	3.0% (17)	13.6% (77)	29.2% (165)	48.3% (273)	5.8% (33)	565
c. When all counsel are collaborative and professional, the case costs the client less.	51.5% (294)	42.2% (241)	3.9% (22)	0.5% (3)	1.9% (11)	571
answered question						574
skipped question						609

52. In your experience how often are litigation costs proportional to the value of the case?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		10.8%	60
Occasionally		30.5%	169
About 1/2 time		30.5%	169
Often		25.2%	140
Almost always		3.1%	17
answered question			555
skipped question			628

53. The primary cause of delay in the litigation process is:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Delayed rulings on pending motions.		7.7%	43
Court continuances of scheduled events.		11.4%	64
Attorney requests for extensions of time and continuances.		23.8%	133
The time required to complete discovery.		20.4%	114
Lack of attorney collaboration on discovery issues and proceedings.		23.3%	130
Other (please specify)		13.4%	75
		answered question	559
		skipped question	624

54. How often does the cost of litigation force cases to settle that should not settle based on the merits?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		5.9%	33
Occasionally		43.8%	245
About 1/2 time		17.9%	100
Often		29.0%	162
Almost always		3.4%	19
		answered question	559
		skipped question	624


55. How often is each of the following a determining factor in the decision to settle a case?

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Expert witness costs	8.1% (44)	46.4% (251)	9.1% (49)	31.6% (171)	4.8% (26)	541
b. Deposition costs	15.7% (85)	46.9% (254)	13.8% (75)	21.0% (114)	2.6% (14)	542
c. Document production costs	36.8% (200)	42.0% (228)	9.4% (51)	10.7% (58)	1.1% (6)	543
d. E-discovery costs	46.8% (238)	34.8% (177)	6.9% (35)	10.0% (51)	1.6% (8)	509
e. Trial costs	8.3% (45)	26.5% (144)	14.0% (76)	36.8% (200)	14.4% (78)	543
f. Legal research costs	49.1% (264)	34.4% (185)	8.4% (45)	6.9% (37)	1.3% (7)	538
g. Motion practice costs	34.6% (186)	41.6% (224)	12.1% (65)	10.0% (54)	1.7% (9)	538
h. Attorney fees	7.2% (39)	26.3% (143)	14.4% (78)	38.3% (208)	13.8% (75)	543
answered question						550
skipped question						633

56. How often is the unpredictability of a jury's verdict a determining factor in the decision to settle a case?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		1.9%	10
Occasionally		16.9%	91
About 1/2 time		22.0%	119
Often		46.3%	250
Almost always		14.1%	76
answered question			540
skipped question			643

57. How often is the unpredictability of the judge a determining factor in the decision to settle a case tried to the court?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Almost never		8.1%	45
Occasionally		39.7%	221
About 1/2 time		19.6%	109
Often		28.7%	160
Almost always		4.3%	24
answered question			557
skipped question			626

58. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round to the nearest whole dollar.

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
Hourly rate \$	188.39	77,807	413
	answered question		413
	skipped question		770

59. Should Iowa require mandatory mediation in civil cases before a party can have access to a trial?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes 	34.7%	199
No 	57.0%	327
No opinion 	8.4%	48
	answered question	574
	skipped question	609

60. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for some cases, would you approve a value-of-the-case dollar limitation below which mediation would be required?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes 	49.5%	281
No 	34.9%	198
No opinion 	15.7%	89
	answered question	568
	skipped question	615

61. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain dollar amount and below, what should be the dollar limitation?

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
Value limitation \$	71,387.79	28,055,402	393
	answered question		393
	skipped question		790

62. If mediation is mandatory or court ordered, should mediators be certified?

	Response Percent	Response Count	
Yes 	77.7%	445	
No 	16.2%	93	
No opinion 	6.1%	35	
	answered question		573
	skipped question		610

63. States requiring mediators to be certified generally require 40 hours of training. Do you believe this would be appropriate for Iowa?

	Response Percent	Response Count	
Yes 	76.0%	425	
No 	16.3%	91	
Other (please specify) 	7.7%	43	
	answered question		559
	skipped question		624

64. Do you perceive most mediators to be well-qualified in terms of the substantive issues involved in mediations?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		66.7%	376
No		14.0%	79
No opinion		19.3%	109
		answered question	564
		skipped question	619

65. If mediators are certified, should they be required to provide a number of hours of pro bono mediation for the indigent or for cases that are too small, such as small claims, to retain a mediator?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		37.6%	211
No		34.9%	196
No opinion		25.5%	143
Other		2.0%	11
		Other (please specify)	17
		answered question	561
		skipped question	622

66. If mediation is mandated, should the state provide free mediation services for the indigent?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		55.2%	313
No		28.2%	160
No opinion		16.6%	94
answered question			567
skipped question			616

67. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation process?				
		Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
Cases resolved through mediation: %		55.49	27,080	488
answered question			488	
skipped question			695	

68. What factors prompt you to seek or acquiesce to mediation processes in a case?

	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Client concerns about cost of attorney fees.	22.4% (113)	28.8% (145)	11.7% (59)	31.2% (157)	6.0% (30)	504
b. Client concerns about cost of discovery.	26.1% (131)	35.7% (179)	11.4% (57)	23.9% (120)	3.0% (15)	502
c. Client concerns about expert witness costs.	21.9% (110)	35.3% (177)	10.2% (51)	27.3% (137)	5.4% (27)	502
d. Client concerns about the length of time for resolution through court litigation process.	9.9% (50)	24.9% (126)	13.0% (66)	39.5% (200)	12.6% (64)	506
e. Client inability to pay or pro bono status.	50.2% (247)	26.8% (132)	5.7% (28)	14.2% (70)	3.0% (15)	492
f. Uncertainty of outcome in court.	3.3% (17)	16.4% (84)	16.8% (86)	45.4% (232)	18.0% (92)	511
g. Client desire to avoid the stress of trial.	9.0% (45)	20.6% (103)	17.0% (85)	43.5% (218)	10.0% (50)	501
h. Attorney desire to avoid the stress of trial.	58.1% (291)	26.7% (134)	7.2% (36)	7.0% (35)	1.0% (5)	501
i. Attorney workload demands.	57.5% (288)	29.1% (146)	5.4% (27)	7.6% (38)	0.4% (2)	501
j. Attorney inexperience in trying cases.	66.2% (329)	22.5% (112)	4.8% (24)	5.6% (28)	0.8% (4)	497
k. Case is weaker on the merits than opponent's case.	11.8% (59)	39.4% (197)	17.8% (89)	26.2% (131)	4.8% (24)	500
l. Case is stronger on the merits than opponent's case.	29.2% (145)	41.2% (205)	14.7% (73)	13.5% (67)	1.4% (7)	497
answered question						516
skipped question						667

69. Do you have civil litigation experience in federal court?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		53.7%	322
No		46.3%	278
answered question			600
skipped question			583

70. Please consider Federal Rule 26(a)(1) initial disclosures and how often the following occur:						
	Almost never	Occasionally	About 1/2 time	Often	Almost always	Response Count
a. Rule 26(a)(1) on initial disclosures reduces the amount of discovery that would otherwise be conducted in the case.	21.8% (61)	38.9% (109)	11.8% (33)	23.6% (66)	3.9% (11)	280
b. Rule 26(a)(1) on initial disclosures reduces the cost of discovery that would otherwise be incurred during the case.	27.6% (77)	35.1% (98)	8.6% (24)	24.7% (69)	3.9% (11)	279
c. Litigants substantially comply with the initial disclosure requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 (a)(1).	3.2% (9)	23.1% (64)	27.1% (75)	35.7% (99)	10.8% (30)	277
answered question						280
skipped question						903

71. Please give your opinion regarding each of the following statements about Federal Rule 26(a)(1) on initial disclosures.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Count
a. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 (a)(1) on initial disclosures should be broadened to require disclosure of all relevant information known by or available to the parties and lawyers.	7.9% (22)	33.8% (94)	18.0% (50)	32.7% (91)	7.6% (21)	278
b. Iowa state courts should require Rule 26 (a)(1) initial disclosures.	13.7% (38)	43.7% (121)	18.8% (52)	16.2% (45)	7.6% (21)	277
c. Iowa state courts should require broader disclosures of all relevant information known by or available to the parties and attorneys.	10.5% (29)	35.5% (98)	19.9% (55)	24.6% (68)	9.4% (26)	276
answered question						278
skipped question						905


72. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) initial disclosures?

	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
% of cases:	83.45	21,698	260
answered question			260
skipped question			923

73. How could Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) initial disclosure requirements better reduce further discovery after initial disclosure?

	Response Count
	81
answered question	81
skipped question	1,102


74. If you have experience in both state and federal court, what are the advantages of litigating in Iowa state court, as compared to the United States District Court for the Northern and Southern Districts of Iowa? Select all that apply.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Not applicable		3.2%	9
I do not do enough litigation to have an opinion on this issue		13.0%	37
There are no advantages to litigating in state court, as compared to federal court		18.2%	52
Less expensive		41.8%	119
Quicker time to disposition		21.4%	61
Less hands-on management of cases by judicial officers		20.7%	59
More hands-on management of cases by judicial officers		2.1%	6
Judicial officers are more available to resolve disputes		6.7%	19
The quality of judicial officers involved in the case		6.0%	17
The court's experience with the type of case		6.7%	19
Geographical area from which the jury is drawn		20.0%	57
Procedures for consideration of dispositive motions		7.7%	22
The applicable rules of civil procedure		13.7%	39
The opportunity to voir dire prospective jurors		35.4%	101
Other (please specify)		11.2%	32

answered question 285

skipped question 898

75. If you have experience in both state and federal court, what are the advantages of litigating in the United States District Court for the Northern and Southern Districts of Iowa, as compared to Iowa state court? Select all that apply.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Not applicable		3.2%	9
I do not do enough litigation to have an opinion on this issue		14.8%	42
There are no advantages to litigating in federal court, as compared to state court		10.6%	30
Less expensive		2.8%	8
Quicker time to disposition		19.0%	54
Less hands-on management of cases by judicial officers		0.0%	0
More hands-on management of cases by judicial officers		41.2%	117
Judicial officers are more available to resolve disputes		27.1%	77
The quality of judicial officer involved in the case		38.0%	108
The court's experience with the type of case		35.2%	100
Geographical area from which the jury is drawn		20.1%	57
Procedures for consideration of dispositive motions		33.5%	95
The applicable rules of civil procedure		24.6%	70
Court-directed voir dire proceedings		7.0%	20

Other (please specify) 	7.4%	21
answered question		284
skipped question		899

76. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to achieve a more timely and cost effective process for litigants in Iowa courts.		
		Response Count
		151
answered question		151
skipped question		1,032

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
1	5	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	5A	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	5	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4	all	Feb 7, 2011 7:56 PM
5	2B	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	5C	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
7	2A	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	2A	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	5C	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
10	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
11	all	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	3rd	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
13	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
14	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
15	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
16	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
17	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
18	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
21	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	1A	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
24	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	2b	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
26	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
27	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28		Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	Sixth	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
31	5c	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
32	2B	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
33	5A	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	First	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
35	2B	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
36	3B	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	3B	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
38	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
39	2a	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
40	2Bf	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
41	3B	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
42	Statewide	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
43	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
44	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
45	2A	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
46	8A	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
47	3A	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
48	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
49	2B	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
50	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
51	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
52	1A	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
53	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
54	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
55	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
56	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
57	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
58	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
59	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
60	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
61	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
65	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
66	1A	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
67	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	3B	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
70	6th	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
71	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
72	6th	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
73	2B	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
74	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
75	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
76	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
78	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	5A	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	Fourth	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	2A	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
84	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
86	6, 2	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
87	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88	5A	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	1B	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
90	5B	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	Fifth	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
92	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	3rd	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	sixth	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
97	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
98	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
101	5b	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
102	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
103	3-b	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
104	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
106	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
107	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	5C	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
109	3rd	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
110	All	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
111	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
112	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113	7,8	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	seventh	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
115		Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
116	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
117	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
118	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
119	Out of State	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120	na	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
121	5-C	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
122	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
123	3B	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
124	3A and 3B	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
125	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
126		Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
127	2B	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
128	Fifth	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
129	3b	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
130	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
131	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
132		Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
133	6th	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
134	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
135	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136		Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
137	2B	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
138	8B	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
139	#3	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
140	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
141	5th	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
142		Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
143	1a	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
144	ALL	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
145	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
146	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
147	5c	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
148	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
149	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
151	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
152	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
153	3B	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
154		Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
155	2A	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
156	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
157	5a	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
158	6th	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
159	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	5C	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
161	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
162	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
163	5th	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
164	2B	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
165	2b	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
166	5c	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
167	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
168	1B	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
169	1a	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
170	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
171	5C	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
172	6th	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
173	3B	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
174	5A	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
175	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
176	Second	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
177	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
178	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
179	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
180	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
181	8A	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
182	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
183	5A	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
184	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
185	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
186		Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
187		Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
188	8A	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
189	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
190	All	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
191	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
192	1A	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
193	5th	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
194	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
195	1A	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
196	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
197	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
198	6th	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
199	3A	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
200	N/A	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
201	5C	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
202	5A	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
203	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
204	1A	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
205	2A	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
206	1a	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
207	3B	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
208	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
209	2A	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
210	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
211	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
212		Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
213	5a	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
214	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
215	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
216	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
217	5A	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
218	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
219	First	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
220	3B	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
221	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
222	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
223	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
224	5A	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
225	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
226	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
227	5C	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
228	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
229	1A	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
230	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
231	5,	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
232	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
233	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
234	2b	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
235	3A	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
236	2B	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
237	5th	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
238	7th	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
239	6	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
240	2A	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
241	6	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
242	5C	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
243	8A	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
244	1B	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
245	5th	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
246	1A	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
247	5C	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
248	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
249	3B	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
250	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
251	First	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
252	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
253	5c	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
254	5A	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
255	5c	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
256	Not one particular County - Statewide	Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
257	6th	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
258	5C	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
259	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
260	2	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
261	6	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
262	3A	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
263	2B	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
264	6th	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
265	6	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
266	6	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
267	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
268	1A	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
269	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
270	6	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
271	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
272	5C	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
273	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
274	7th	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
275	3b	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
276	3B	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
277	3	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
278	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
279	8A	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
280	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
281	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
282	5C	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
283	No longer practice in Iowa	Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
284		Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
285	7	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
286	5B	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
287	5a	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
288	6	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
289	5C	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
290	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
291	6	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
292	5C	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
293	5C	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
294	2B	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
295	5A	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
296	3b	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
297		Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
298	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
299	1A	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
300	5th	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
301	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
302	5A	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
303	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
304	3B	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
305	3A, 3B	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
306	1A	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
307	2B	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
308	5C	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
309	5th District	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
310	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
311	5A	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
312	4th	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
313	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
314	8	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
315		Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
316	7	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
317	6	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
318	unknown	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
319	3B	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
320	2B	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
321	Fifth	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
322	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
323	2B	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
324	5A	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
325	5C	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
326	5A	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
327	5c	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
328		Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
329	5c	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
330	1B	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
331	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
332	3A	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
333	4	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
334	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
335	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
336	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
337	5th	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
338		Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
339	2A	Feb 8, 2011 5:10 PM
340	1B	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
341	5C	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
342		Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
343	5A	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
344	2b	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
345	7	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
346	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
347	1B	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
348	8B	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
349	5	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
350	3	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
351	6	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
352	6	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
353	3b	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
354	5B	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
355	5c	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
356	4	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
357	6th & 7th	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
358	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
359	5C	Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
360	8B	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
361	7	Feb 8, 2011 8:02 PM
362	First	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
363	Sixth	Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
364	2B	Feb 8, 2011 9:11 PM
365	5A & 5B	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
366	1B	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
367	5C	Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
368	4	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
369	6	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
370	5th	Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
371	7th District	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
372	1B	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
373	3	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
374	State wide	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
375	6	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
376	4	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
377	2B	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
378	2A	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
379	6th	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
380	7	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
381	6	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
382	5C	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
383	5C	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
384	8B	Feb 9, 2011 7:33 PM
385	5C	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
386	5C	Feb 9, 2011 8:13 PM
387	3B	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
388	Fifth	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
389	1A	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
390	5	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
391	5C	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
392	6th	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
393	2B	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
394	6	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
395	2a	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
396	7th	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
397	5	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
398	1	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
399	2A	Feb 10, 2011 6:37 PM
400	8A	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
401	5C	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
402	4	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
403	5	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
404	4	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
405	6th	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
406	5	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
407	4	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
408	7	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
409	8	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
410	8A	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
411	5	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 AM
412	4	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
413	7	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
414	5C	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
415	6	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
416	5	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
417	4	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
418	6	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
419	4	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
420	1-A	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
421	5	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
422	fifth	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
423	3	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
424	3A	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
425	5	Feb 12, 2011 2:22 PM
426	first	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
427	3A	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
428	1	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
429	2A	Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
430	5C	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
431	6	Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
432	6th	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
433	2B	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
434	5th	Feb 14, 2011 2:22 PM
435	5C	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
436	8A	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
437	5A	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
438	2b	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
439	Sixth	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
440	Not applicable	Feb 14, 2011 10:14 PM
441	7th	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
442	5A	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
443	5A	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
444	6	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
445	6	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
446	1B	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
447	Fifth	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
448	6	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
449	2B	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
450	3A	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
451	6	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
452	2B	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
453	3B	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
454	5A	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
455	3	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
456	3B	Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
457	1b	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
458	5C	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
459	5C	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
460	V	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
461	3A	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
462	4	Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
463	1A	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
464	2b	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
465	5A	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
466	5C	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
467	6	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
468	2	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
469	Fifth	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
470	6	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
471	7	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
472	77	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
473	5c	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
474	3B	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
475	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
476	5C	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
477	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
478	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
479	7	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
480	5C	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
481	6, 5 then all over	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
482	3B	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
483	6th	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
484	8A	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
485	7	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
486	5C	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
487	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
488	5C	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
489	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
490	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
491	6ht	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
492	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
493	8A	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
494	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
495	4th	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
496	3rd District	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
497	5A	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
498	5th	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
499	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
500	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
501	3B	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
502	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
503	5th	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
504	7	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
505	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
506	6th	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
507	3A	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
508	5C	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
509	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
510	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
511	6th	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
512	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
513	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
514	3B	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
515	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
516	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
517	8B	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
518	3B	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
519	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
520	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
521	5B	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
522	2nd	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
523	1A	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
524	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
525	Fifth	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
526	6th	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
527	2B	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
528	5A	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
529	first	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
530	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
531	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
532	8A	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
533	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
534	1b	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
535	2A	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
536	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
537	5th	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
538	5b	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
539	3B	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
540	5A	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
541	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
542	5th	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
543	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
544	3B	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
545	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
546	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
547	2B	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
548		Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
549	state wide	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
550	8thA	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
551	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
552	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
553	n/a	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
554	1B	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
555	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
556		Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
557	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
558	8A	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
559	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
560	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
561	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
562	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
563	6, 5, all over	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
564	1B	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
565	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
566	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
567	2A	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
568	2a	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
569		Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
570	7th	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
571	8A	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
572	5a	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
573	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
574	8A	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
575	2B	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
576	2A	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
577	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
578	Statewide	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
579	5C	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
580	5A	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
581	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
582	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
583	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
584	1b	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
585	8A	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
586	2B	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
587	3b	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
588	5A	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
589	1B	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
590	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
591	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
592	2b	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
593	8A	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
594	6	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
595	5 A	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
596	Sixth	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
597	3B	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
598	6th	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
599	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
600	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
601	4th	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
602	N/A	Feb 21, 2011 10:09 PM
603	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
604	Sixth judicial district	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
605	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
606	5C	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
607	6	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
608	6	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
609	5A	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
610	5C	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
611	3B	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
612	8A	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
613	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
614	2B	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
615	5A	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
616	8A	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
617	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
618	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
619	4	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
620	2B	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
621	8A	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
622	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
623	4th	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
624	8B	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
625	5C	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
626	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
627	4	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
628	5C	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
629	5A	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
630	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
631	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
632	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
633	8A	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
634	1A	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
635		Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
636	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
637	1B	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
638	5A	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
639	Five	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
640	8A	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
641		Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
642	1st	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
643	2	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
644	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
645		Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
646	5th	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
647	#6	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
648		Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
649	5C	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
650	6th	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
651	3B	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
652	6th	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
653	6	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
654	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
655	6th judicial district	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
656	2A	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
657	5c	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
658	5	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
659	5c	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
660	Sixth	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
661	5c	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
662	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
663	south carolina	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
664	U.S. Attorney's Office, Puerto Rico	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
665	7	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
666	1B	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
667	5th	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
668	Second	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
669	6	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
670	8A	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
671	5a	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
672	3B	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
673	fifth	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
674	5th	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
675	8A	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
676	8B	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
677	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
678	5th	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
679	2A	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
680	6	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
681	7th	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
682	7	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
683	2B	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
684	7	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
685	7	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
686	2A	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
687	6	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
688	1A	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
689	5A	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
690	1A	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
691	6	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
692		Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
693	5C	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
694	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
695	3B	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
696	7	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
697	1A	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
698	8B	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
699	1A	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
700		Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
701	3A and 3B	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
702	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 PM
703	6	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
704	Entire State	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
705	sixth	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
706	5B	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
707	5C	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
708	3b	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
709	5	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
710	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
711	7	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
712	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
713	6	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
714	1A, 7	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
715	n/a	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
716		Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
717		Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
718	5th	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
719	3A	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
720	5	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
721	8A	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
722	3	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
723	Districts 1, 2, 5, 6 all at county seat courthouses	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
724	2b	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
725	8th	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
726	5C	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
727	7	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
728	THIRD	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
729	7	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
730	6	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
731	4	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
732	First	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
733	5	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
734	8B	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
735	2B	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
736	5B	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM
737		Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
738	5C	Feb 23, 2011 3:04 PM
739	8A	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
740	state-wide	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
741	6	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
742	Five	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
743	4	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
744	5A	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
745	8	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
746	Fifth	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
747	5	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
748	55	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
749	2B	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
750	1B	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
751	2A	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
752	8B	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
753	5a	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
754	4	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Judicial District (#)		
755	5c	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
756	6	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
757	Fifth	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
758	1B	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
759	1A	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
760	5A	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
761	1	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
762	6	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
763	5a	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
764	5	Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
765	5A	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
766	5	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
767	5C	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
768	2A	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
769	7	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
770	7th	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
771		Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
772		Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
773	2A	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
774	7	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
775	2	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
776	1B	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
777	3B	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
778	5C	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

County		
1	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	polk	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4		Feb 7, 2011 7:56 PM
5	Marshall	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	Polk, Warren, Dallas	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
7	Cerro Gordo	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	Cerro Gordo	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	Marion	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
10	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
11		Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
13	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
14	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
15	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
16	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
17	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
18	Fayette	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	Wodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
21	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	Dubuque	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
24	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	Greene	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
26	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
27	linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28	polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
31	polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
32	Webster	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
33	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	Winneshiek	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
35	Boone	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
36	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
38	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
39	Cerro Gordo	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
40	Carroll	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
41	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
42	Statewide	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
43	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
44	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
45	CERRO GORDO	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
46	Poweshiek	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
47	Clay	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
48	Harrison	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
49	Story	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
50	Dubuque	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
51	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
52	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
53	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
54	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
55	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
56	Howard	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
57	Muscatine	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

County		
58	Clinton	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
59	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
60	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
61	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62		Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	Benton	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
65	linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
66	Dubuque	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
67	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
70	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
71	Muscatine	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
72	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
73	Carroll	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
74	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
75	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
76	polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
78	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	Mills	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	Hancock	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
84	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	Marion	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
86	Linn, Marshall	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
87	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
90	Clarke	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
92	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
97	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
98	clinton	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
101	Adair	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
102	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
103	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
104	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
106	Scott;Muscatine;Clinton	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
107	Pottawattamie-----and Nebraska	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
109	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
110		Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
111	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
112	Butler	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113	Louisa, Scott, Muscatine, Cedar, Johnson, Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	scott	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
115	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
116	Story	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
117	Muscatine	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
118	Hamilton	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
119		Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120		Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
121	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
122	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
123	Monona	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
124	O'Brien	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
125	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
126	Pottawatamie	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
127	Marshall	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
128	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
129	woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
130	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
131	Jefferson	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
132	Scott in Iowa / Rock Island in Illinois	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
133	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
134	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
135	Hardin	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
137	Story	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
138	Lee	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
139	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
140	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
141	Taylor	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
142	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
143	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
144	ALL	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
145	dallas	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
146	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
147	polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
148	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
149	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	johnson	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
151	All, but mostly Linn and Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
152	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
153	Crawford	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
154	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
155	Cerro Gordo	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
156	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
157	polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
158	Linn, Johnson, Iowa, Tama, Benton, Jones	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
159	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
161	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
162	pott	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
163	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
164	Story	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
165	Balck Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
166	polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
167	Jasper	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
168	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
169	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
170	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
171	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
172	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
173	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
174	Dallas	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
175	polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
176	Carroll, Green, Sac, Calhoun	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
177	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
178	polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
179	black hawk	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
180	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
181	Wapello	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
182	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
183	polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
184	marion	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
185	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
186	polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
187	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
188	Washington	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
189	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
190	All	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
191	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
192	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
193	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
194	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
195	Winneshiek	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
196	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
197	Cerro Gordo	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
198	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
199	Osceola	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
200	N/A	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
201	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
202	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
203	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
204	Dubuque	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
205	Floyd	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
206	Dubuque	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
207	Woodbury	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
208	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
209	Cerro Gordo	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
210	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
211	Scott	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
212	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
213	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
214	scott	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
215	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
216	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
217	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
218	scott	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
219	Winneshiek	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
220	Sioux	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
221	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
222	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
223	Johnson	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
224	Dallas	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
225	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
226	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
227	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
228	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
229	Dubuque	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
230	Pottawattamie	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
231	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
232	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
233	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
234	bremer	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
235	Kossuth	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
236	Webster	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
237	polk	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
238	scott	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
239	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
240	Cerro Gordo	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
241	Linn	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
242	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
243	Wapello	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
244	Black Hawk	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
245	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
246	blackhawk	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
247	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
248	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
249	Plymouth	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
250	Polk	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
251	Buchanan	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
252		Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
253	polk	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
254	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
255	polk	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
256		Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
257	Johnson	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
258	polk	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
259	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
260	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
261	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
262	Osceola	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
263	Marshall	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
264	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
265	6 counties	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
266	Johnson	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
267	woodbury	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
268	Dubuque	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
269	Muscatine	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
270	johnson	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
271	Clinton	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
272	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
273	Scott	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
274	Scott	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
275	Crawford	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
276	woodbury	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
277	Woodbury	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
278		Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
279	Jefferson	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
280	Dubuque	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
281	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
282	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
283		Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
284	Sioux	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
285	Scott	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
286	Clarke	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
287	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
288	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
289	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
290	Black Hawk	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
291	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
292	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
293	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
294	Boone	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
295	Dallas	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
296	Woodbury	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
297	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
298	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
299	Dubuque	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
300	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
301	Scott	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
302	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
303	Warren	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
304	Woodbury	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
305	All counties in 3A and 3B	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
306	Dubuque	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
307	Story	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
308	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
309	Union	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
310	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
311	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
312	Pottawattamie	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
313	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
314	Monroe	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
315	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
316	Scott	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
317	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
318	Pottawattamie	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
319	Woodbury	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
320	Marshall	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
321	Polk and sourrounding counties	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
322	polk	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
323	Story	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
324	Guthrie	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 PM
325	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
326	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
327	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
328	blackhawk County	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
329	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
330	Black Hawk	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
331	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
332	Clay	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
333	Pottawattamie	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
334	Dubuque	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
335	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
336	linn	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
337	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
338	Linn County	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
339	CERRO GORDO	Feb 8, 2011 5:10 PM
340	Black Hawk	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
341	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
342	Story and Polk	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
343	Dallas	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
344	marshall	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
345	scott	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
346	Carroll	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
347	Black Hawk	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
348	Henry	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
349	polk	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
350	Monona	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
351	Linn	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
352	linn	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
353	Woodbury	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
354	Mount Ayr	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
355	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
356	Pottawattamie	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
357	Linn, Johnson, Cedar	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
358	Winneshiek Fayette Clayton Allamakee Howard Chickasaw Dubuque	Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
359	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
360	Henry	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
361	Scott	Feb 8, 2011 8:02 PM
362	Black Hawk	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
363	Johnson	Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
364	Cerro Gordo	Feb 8, 2011 9:11 PM
365	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
366	Black Hawk	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
367	Polk	Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
368	Pottawattamie	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
369	Johnson	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
370	Polk	Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
371	Scott	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
372	Buchanan	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
373	Crawford	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
374	Most all	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
375	Linn	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
376	POTT	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
377	Boone	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
378	Hancock	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
379	Johnson	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
380	Muscatine	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
381	Linn	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
382	POLK	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
383	Polk	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
384	Lee	Feb 9, 2011 7:33 PM
385	Polk	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
386	Polk	Feb 9, 2011 8:13 PM
387	Woodbury	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
388	Polk	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
389	Black Hawk County	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
390	Polk	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
391	Polk	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
392	Linn	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
393	Boone	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
394	Johnson	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
395	butler	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
396	Jackson	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
397	Polk	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
398	Black Hawk	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
399		Feb 10, 2011 6:37 PM
400	Davis	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
401	Polk	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
402	Shelby	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
403	polk	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
404	Pottawattamie	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
405	Johnson	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
406	Polk	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
407	Pottawattamie	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
408	scott	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
409	Polk	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
410	Jefferson	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
411	6 rural counties	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 AM
412	Page	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
413	Scott	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
414	Polk	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
415	Tama	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
416	Polk	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
417	Pottawattamie	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
418	Johnson	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
419	Pott.	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
420	CLAYTON	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
421	Mainly Polk and surrounding counties	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
422	polk	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
423	11	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
424	Dickinson	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
425	Polk	Feb 12, 2011 2:22 PM
426	black hawk	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
427	Osceola	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
428	black hawk	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
429		Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
430	Polk	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
431	Linn	Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
432	linn	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
433	Marshall	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
434	the entire district plus outside the district	Feb 14, 2011 2:22 PM
435	Polk	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
436	Keokuk	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
437	Dallas	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
438	Story	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
439	Linn	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
440		Feb 14, 2011 10:14 PM
441	Scott	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
442	Polk	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
443	Polk	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
444	Linn	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
445	Benton	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
446	Black Hawk	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
447	Polk	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
448	Johnson	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
449	webster	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
450	Dickinson	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
451	Johnson	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
452	Story	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
453	Woodbury	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
454	Warren	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
455	Woodbury	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
456	Plymouth	Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
457	Dubuque	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
458	Polk	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
459	Polk	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
460	Polk	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
461	Kossuth	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
462		Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
463	Dubuque	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
464	Calhoun	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
465	Polk	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
466	Polk	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
467	Linn	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
468	Linn	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
469	Polk	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
470	Benton	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
471	scott`	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
472	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
473	polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
474	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
475	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
476	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
477	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
478	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
479	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
480	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
481	Linn, Johnson, Polk then all over	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
482	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
483	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
484	Mahaska	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
485	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
486	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
487	johnson	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

County		
488	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
489	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
490	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
491	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
492	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
493	Jefferson	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
494	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
495	Pottawattamie	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
496	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
497	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
498	Jasper	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
499	johnson	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
500	polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
501	Plymouth	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
502	O'Brien	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
503	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
504	scott	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
505	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
506	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
507	woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
508	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
509	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
510	Warren	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
511	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
512	Linn and Johnson	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
513	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
514	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
515	linn	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
516	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
517	Des Moines	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
518	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
519	polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
520	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
521	Lucas	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
522	Marshall	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
523	Dubuque	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
524	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
525	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
526	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
527	Hardin	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
528	Dallas	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
529	dubuque	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
530	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
531	Crawford	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
532	Wapello	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
533	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
534	Black Hawk	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
535	Hancock	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
536	Johnson	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
537	polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
538		Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
539	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
540	Jasper	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
541	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
542	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
543	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
544	Woodbury	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
545	polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
546	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
547	Story	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
548	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
549		Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
550	Mahaska	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
551	SAC	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
552	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
553		Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
554	Black Hawk	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
555	mills	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
556	Dubuque	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
557	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
558	Wapello	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
559	polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
560	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
561	Johnson	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
562	Johnson	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
563	Linn, Johnson, Polk, all over	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
564	Black Hawk	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
565	polk county	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
566	Dubuque	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
567	Bremer	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
568	webster	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
569	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
570	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
571	Wapello	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
572	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
573	Appanoose	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
574	Wapello	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
575	Hardin	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
576	Cerro Gordo	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
577	Guthrie	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
578		Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
579	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
580	Guthrie	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
581	Emmet	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
582	pottawattamie	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
583	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
584	black hawk	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
585	Wapello	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
586	Wright	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
587	crawford	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
588	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
589	Black Hawk	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
590	Dallas	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
591	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
592	Carroll	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
593	Jefferson	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
594	linn	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
595	Marion	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
596	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
597	Crawford	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
598	Johnson	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
599	Clinton	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
600	Winneshiel	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
601		Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
602	Mus	Feb 21, 2011 10:09 PM
603	Black Hawk	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
604	Linn County	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
605	Black Hawk	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
606	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
607	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
608	Iowa	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
609	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
610	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
611	Crawford	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
612	Wapello	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
613	Webster	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
614	Boone	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
615	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
616	Mahaska	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
617	Linn	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
618	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
619	Pottawattamie	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
620	Marshall	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
621	Des Moines	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
622	Lee	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
623	shelby	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
624	Des Moines	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
625	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
626	johnson	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
627	Pottawattamie	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
628	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
629	Jasper	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
630	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
631	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
632	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
633	Wapello	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
634	Dubuque	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
635	Scott	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
636	Polk	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
637	Grundy	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
638	Dallas	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
639	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
640	Wapello	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
641	Marion	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
642	Allamakee	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
643	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
644	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
645	wapello	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
646	polk	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
647	Johnson	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
648	Dallas	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
649	polk	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
650	Linn	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
651	Woodbury	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
652	Linn	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
653	Jones	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
654	Pottawattamie	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
655	linn	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
656	CERRO GORDO	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
657	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
658	Marion	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
659	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

County		
660	Johnson	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
661	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
662	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
663		Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
664	San Juan	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
665	scott	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
666	Black Hawk	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
667	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
668	Calhoun	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
669	Johnson	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
670	Mahaska	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
671	dallas	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
672	Woodbury	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
673	polk	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
674	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
675	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
676	lee	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
677	Story	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
678	polk300	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
679	Cerro Gordo	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
680	Linn	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
681	All	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
682	Scott	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
683	Story	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
684	Clinton	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
685	Cedar	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
686	Cerro Gordo	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
687	Johnson	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
688	Black Hawk	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
689	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
690	Dubuque	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
691	johnson	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
692	Pottawattamie	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
693	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
694	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
695	Crawford	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
696	Scott	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
697	dubuque	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
698	Des Moines	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
699	Dubuque	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
700	Johnson	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
701	Lyon	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
702	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

	County	
703	linn	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
704		Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
705	Johnson	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
706	Union	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
707	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
708	Woodbury	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
709	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
710	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
711	Scott	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM
712	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
713	Linn	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
714	Dubuque, Jackson	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
715	n/a	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
716	Orange County, California	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
717	Scott	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
718	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
719	Kossuth	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
720	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
721	Davis	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
722	sioux	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
723		Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
724	Webster	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
725	Des Moines	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
726	Polk	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
727	Muscatine	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
728	CHEROKEE	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
729	Scott	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
730	Johnson	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
731	Pottawattamie	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
732	Chickasaw	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
733	Polk	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
734	DES MOINES	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
735	Boone	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
736	Lucas	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM
737	Pottawatime	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
738	Polk	Feb 23, 2011 3:04 PM
739	POWESHIEK	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
740		Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
741	Linn	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
742	Polk	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
743	Pottawattamie	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
744	Polk	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
745	Henry	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

County		
746	Polk	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
747	Polk	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
748	Polk	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
749	Hamilton	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
750	Black Hawk	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
751	Franklin	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
752	Lee	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
753	Madison	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
754	Pottawatomie	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
755	Polk	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
756	linn	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
757	Jasper	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
758	Black Hawk	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
759	Delaware	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
760	Polk	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
761	Dubuque	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
762	Linn	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
763	Polk	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
764	Polk	Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
765	Polk	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
766	Polk	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
767	Polk	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
768	Bremer	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
769	Muscatine	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
770	?ScoOtt	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
771	Pottawattamie and Page	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
772	polk	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
773	Bremer	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
774	Scott	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
775	Cerro Gordo	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
776	Black Hawk	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
777	Woodbury	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
778	Polk	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
1	430,000	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	250,000	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	dsm	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4		Feb 7, 2011 7:56 PM
5	25000	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
6		Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
7	37,000	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	30,000	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	1600	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
10	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
11		Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	88000	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
13	60,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
14	45000	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
15	500,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
16	300000	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
17	562,900	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
18	2500	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	250000	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	85,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
21	120000	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	300,000 (?)	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	60,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
24	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	4500	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
26	130,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
27	CR, 150000	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28		Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	150,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	100,000 +	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
31	250,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
32	25,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
33	300,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	8000	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
35	12,500	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
36	85000	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	90,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
38	200000	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
39	60000	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
40		Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
41	85,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
42	Statewide	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
43	350,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
44	?	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
45	28000	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
46	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
47	11000	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
48	16000	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
49	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
50	65,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
51	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
52	110000	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
53	400,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
54	120,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
55	125,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
56	1200	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
57	22000	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
58	49000	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
59	100,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
60	60000	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
61	125,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62		Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	2900	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	60000	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
65	225000	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
66	60,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
67	Council Bluffs	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	120,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	75,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
70	250,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
71	24000	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
72	130,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
73	10,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
74	60,000+	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
75	70000	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
76	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	55,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
78	62000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	Davenport	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	500,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	250,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	3000	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
84	300000	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	35000	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
86		Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
87	80000	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88		Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	120000	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
90	9000	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	One Million	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
92	125,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	250000	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	68,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
97	400,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
98	28000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99		Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100		Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
101	2000	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
102	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
103	84,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
104	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	100,000(350K metro)	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
106	100,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
107	400,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
109	150,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
110		Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
111	65000	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
112	2000	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113		Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	100,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
115		Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
116	75000	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
117		Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
118	8,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
119		Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120		Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
121	500000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
122	500,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
123	3000	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
124	5000	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
125		Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
126	200,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
127	26000	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
128	2500000	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
129	85000	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
130	150,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
131	10,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
132	Quad Cities, Iowa and Illinois, 300,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
133	140,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
134	135,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

		Municipality population (#)	
135	3,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136			Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
137	50,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
138	12000		Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
139	82,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
140	200000		Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
141	1500		Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
142			Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
143	68,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
144	15000		Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
145			Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
146	100,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
147			Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
148	120,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
149	130000		Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	100,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
151	> 60,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
152	200,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
153	7500		Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
154			Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
155	Mason City - 29,500		Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
156	7500		Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
157	200,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
158	district 420,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
159	125000		Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	300000		Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
161	430,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
162	60,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
163	Unk.		Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
164	60,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
165			Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
166			Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
167	2500		Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
168	65000		Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
169	32,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
170	100000		Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
171	350000		Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
172	80,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
173	100,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
174	10000		Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
175	40,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
176	10,000; 4,800; 3,000; 2,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
177	120,000		Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
178	13000	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
179	125000	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
180	150000	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
181	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
182	128,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
183		Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
184		Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
185	150,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
186		Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
187		Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
188		Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
189	80,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
190	Entire State of Iowa	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
191	250000	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
192	60000	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
193	1 million	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
194	Population of Des Moines	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
195	8000	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
196	100,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
197	30000	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
198	Cedar Rapids	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
199	3000	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
200	N/A	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
201	200,000 city, 300,000 county	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
202		Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
203	60,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
204	58000	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
205	8,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
206	60,000.00	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
207	Sioux City 85000	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
208	60,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
209	28,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
210	Iowa City	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
211		Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
212	300,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
213	Don't know	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
214	32000	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
215	440,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
216	no idea	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
217	350,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
218	125000	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
219	8500	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
220	32,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
221	300000	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
222		Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
223	75,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
224	3500	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
225	500000	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
226	500,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
227	200000	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
228		Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
229	60,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
230	65000	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
231	350,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
232	500,000	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
233	120000	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
234	9000	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
235	6000	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
236	27000	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
237	350000	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
238	140000	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
239	250000	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
240	25,000	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
241		Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
242	300,000	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
243	20000	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
244	65,000	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
245	429,439	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
246	100000	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
247	200000	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
248	500,000	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
249	9500	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
250	500,000	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
251	6,000	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
252		Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
253	3000,000	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
254	Des Moines	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
255	200,000	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
256		Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
257	70,000	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
258	West Des moines	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
259	300000	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
260		Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
261	200,000	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
262	2500	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
263	26,000	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
264	135,00	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
265	300.000 total?	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
266	68000	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
267	82000	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
268		Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
269	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
270	100000	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
271	30000	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
272	300,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
273	100,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
274	23000	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
275	8000	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
276	90000	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
277	100000	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
278		Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
279	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
280	60000	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
281	85,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
282	200,000 + surrounding area	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
283		Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
284	2500	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
285	101,000	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
286	5000	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
287	250000	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
288	140,000	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
289	200,000	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
290	100000	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
291	150,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
292	Des Moines	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
293	600000	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
294	12,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
295	5000	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
296	85,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
297		Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
298	430,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
299	60000	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
300	300,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
301		Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
302	400,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
303	14,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
304	85,000	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
305		Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
306	60000	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
307	60000	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
308		Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
309	Creston: 9,000	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
310	500,000+	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
311	300,000	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
312	75,000	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
313	575,000	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
314	3,530	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
315	Des Moines	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
316	100000	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
317	120,000	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
318	Council Bluffs	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
319	87,000	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
320	40000	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
321		Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
322		Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
323	7000	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
324	1600	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 PM
325	300,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
326	200,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
327	200,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
328		Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
329		Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
330	66,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
331	150,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
332	11000	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
333	60000	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
334	Dubuque	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
335	Cedar Rapids	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
336	130,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
337	400,000	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
338	120,000	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
339	35000	Feb 8, 2011 5:10 PM
340	80000	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
341	300000	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
342		Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
343	1000	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
344	26000	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
345	100,000	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
346	10,000	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
347	125,000	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
348	8500	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
349		Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
350	2700	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
351	200000	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
352	425000	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
353	126,000	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
354	1500	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
355	600,000	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
356	100000	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
357		Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
358		Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
359		Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
360	8,000	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
361	130,000	Feb 8, 2011 8:02 PM
362	100,000	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
363	50,000	Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
364		Feb 8, 2011 9:11 PM
365		Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
366	125,000	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
367		Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
368	60,000	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
369	50,000	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
370		Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
371	165,000	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
372	6014	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
373	7500	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
374		Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
375	128,000	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
376	80000	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
377	16,000	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
378	3,000	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
379	60,000	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
380	43000	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
381	250000	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
382	300,000	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
383	200,000	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
384	15000	Feb 9, 2011 7:33 PM
385	198,000	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
386	300,000	Feb 9, 2011 8:13 PM
387	85000	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
388	Unknown	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
389	36000	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
390		Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
391	200000	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
392		Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
393	13,000	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
394	100000	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
395	2000	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
396	6,000	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
397	200,000	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
398	75,000	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
399		Feb 10, 2011 6:37 PM
400	2600	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
401	430,000	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
402	5000	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
403	250,000?	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
404		Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
405	80,000	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
406	Des Moines.	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
407	62,000	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
408	100,000	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
409	100000	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
410		Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
411	unknown	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 AM
412	6000	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
413	300,000	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
414	500,000	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
415	18000	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
416		Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
417	90,000	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
418	100,000	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
419	60k	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
420	1300	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
421	500,000	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
422	unknown	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
423	1000	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
424	20,000	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
425		Feb 12, 2011 2:22 PM
426	100000	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
427	2600	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
428	waterloo-70,000	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
429	150,000	Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
430	500,000	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
431		Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
432	200,000	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
433	27,000	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
434	my office was in a town of 2500	Feb 14, 2011 2:22 PM
435	202,000	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
436	2500	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
437	45000	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
438	50000	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
439	est 200,000	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
440		Feb 14, 2011 10:14 PM
441	100,000	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
442	450000	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
443	250,000	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
444	130,000	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
445	3000	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
446	110000	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
447	200,000	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
448	15000	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
449		Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
450		Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
451	100,000	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
452	65000	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
453	80,000	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
454	8000	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
455	82000	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
456	10,000	Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
457	55000	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
458	Des Moines	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
459	203000	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
460	450,000	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
461	6000	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
462		Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
463	57000	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
464	1800	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
465	250,000	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
466	750,000	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
467	128,000	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
468	126,000	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
469		Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
470	24,000	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
471	250,000`	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
472	500,000	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
473	400,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
474	80000	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
475	500,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
476	300,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
477	90,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
478	Des Moines	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
479	300000	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
480	425,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
481	Depends	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
482	82,500	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
483	200,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
484	9000	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
485	150,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
486	40000	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
487	60000	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
488		Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
489	200000	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
490	West Des Moines 50,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
491	200,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
492		Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
493	10,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
494		Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
495	75,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
496	144,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
497		Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
498		Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
499	40000	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
500	500,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
501	10,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
502	5000	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
503	250,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
504	135000	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
505	130000	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
506	126,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
507	90000	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
508	250,000	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
509	250000	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
510	9000	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
511	130000 +	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
512	120,000 and 60,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
513	80,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
514	85000	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
515	120000	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
516	540,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
517	26000	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
518	80,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
519	430000	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
520	100,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
521	9,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
522	26,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
523	58000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
524	200,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
525	500,000 in Des Moines metro area	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
526	150K	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
527	5500	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
528	8000	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
529	60000	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
530	300000	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
531	8,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
532	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
533	500,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
534	100k - Waterloo/Cedar Falls	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
535	3000	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
536	70000	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
537		Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
538		Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
539	80000	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
540	15,250	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
541	400,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
542	500,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
543	?	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
544	80,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
545	300,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
546	250,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
547	57,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
548	30,0006	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
549		Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
550	11,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
551	2500	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
552	120,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
553		Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
554	125,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
555	6500	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
556	92,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
557		Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
558	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
559	250,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
560	205000	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
561	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
562	67000	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
563	Depends	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
564	170000	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
565	500,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
566	60000	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
567	Waverly 10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
568	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
569	500,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
570	Bettendorf	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
571	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
572	200,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
573	12850	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
574	25,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
575	5200	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
576	7777	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
577	3500	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
578		Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
579		Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
580	1600	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
581	6000	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
582	70000	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
583	250,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
584	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
585	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
586	3000	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
587	denison 8300	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
588		Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
589	67,000	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
590	1000	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
591		Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
592	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
593	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
594	128,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
595	7500	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
596	approximately 150,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
597	about 10,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
598	IC	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
599	26000	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
600		Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
601		Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
602		Feb 21, 2011 10:09 PM
603	70,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
604	150,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
605	Waterloo 70K, County >100K	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
606	200,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
607	126,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
608	800	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
609	>500,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
610	300,000+	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
611		Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
612	25,000	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
613	23000	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
614	13000	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
615	750000	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
616	11000	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
617	200000	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
618	100000	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
619	61000	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
620	25000	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
621	26000	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
622	13000	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
623	5000	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
624	26000	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
625	350,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
626	200,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
627	65,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
628	Des Moines	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
629	15,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
630	400,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
631		Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
632	200000	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
633	25,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
634	93,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
635		Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
636	400,000	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
637	1,900	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
638	Adel	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
639	300,000	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
640	20,000	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
641	7,000	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
642	1250	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
643	210,000	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
644	250000	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
645		Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
646		Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
647	130,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
648	30,000 ?	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
649	425,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
650	100,000+	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
651	Sioux City	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
652	180000	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
653	20,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
654	Unknown	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
655	150,00	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
656	23000	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
657	200000	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
658	8000	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
659		Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
660	72000	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
661	350,000	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
662	Des Moines	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
663		Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
664	approx. 500,000	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
665	200,000	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
666	65,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
667		Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
668	2000	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
669	68000	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
670	11,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
671	6000	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
672	90,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
673	700,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
674	300000	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
675		Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
676	9,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
677	55,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
678	300,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
679	28,000	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
680		Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
681	Lots	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
682		Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
683	3800	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
684	28000	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
685	4000	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
686	70,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
687	65000	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
688	50000	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
689		Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
690	50000	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
691	80,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
692	Council Bluffs, 60,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
693	400000	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
694		Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
695	16, 500	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
696		Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
697	60,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
698	26,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
699	60000	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
700		Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
701	2500	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
702	429,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 PM
703	250,00	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
704		Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
705	Iowa City-60,000	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
706	9,500	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
707	430,640 Polk County	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
708	80K	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
709	190,000	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
710	45000	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
711	100,000	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM
712	400,000	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
713	CEDar Rapids	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
714	100,000	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
715	n/a	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
716	1,000,000	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
717	100,000	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
718		Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
719	6000	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
720	300,000	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
721	2600	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
722	7000	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
723		Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
724	Fort Dodge	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
725	27000	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
726	250000	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
727	25000	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
728	6500	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
729	100,000	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
730	100000	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
731	68,000	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
732	3500	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
733		Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
734	26000	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
735	13,000	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
736	Chariton	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM

1. Please provide the Iowa judicial district, county, and estimated population of

Municipality population (#)		
737	50000	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
738	200,000 roughly	Feb 23, 2011 3:04 PM
739	1500	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
740		Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
741	126,326	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
742	Des Moines	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
743	65,000	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
744	Des Moines 300,000	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
745	9000	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
746	200,000	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
747	500,000	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
748	560,000	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
749	6000	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
750	68,400	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
751	4500	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
752	11,000	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
753	6000	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
754	70000	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
755	203000	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
756	126000	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
757	15000	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
758	100,000	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
759	5000	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
760		Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
761	60000	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
762		Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
763	Des Moines	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
764		Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
765	300,000	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
766	750,000?	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
767	430,000	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
768	2100	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
769	25000	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
770	100,000	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
771		Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
772	300000	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
773	9300	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
774	150000	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
775	30,000	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
776	100,000	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
777	100,000	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
778	Des Moines	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
1	11	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	1	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	12	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4	3	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
5	50	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	2	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
7	2	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	4	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
10	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
11	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
13	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
14	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
15	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
16	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
17	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
18	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
19	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
20	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
21	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
22	55	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
23	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
24	45	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
25	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
26	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
27	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
28	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
29	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
30	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
31	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
32	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
33	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
34	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
35	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
36	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
37	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
38	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
39	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
40	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
41	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
42	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
43	45	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
44	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
45	210	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
46	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
47	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
48	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
49	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
50	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
51	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
52	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
53	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
54	16	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
55	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
56	17	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
57	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
58	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
59	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
60	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
61	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
62	13	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
63	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
64	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
65	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
66	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
67	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
68	77	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
69	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
70	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
71	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
72	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
73	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
74	51	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
75	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
76	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
77	13	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
78	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
79	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
80	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
81	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
82	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
83	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
84	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
85	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
86	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
87	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
88	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
89	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
90	45	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
91	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
92	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
93	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
94	18	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
95	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
96	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
97	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
98	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
99	42	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
100	54	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
101	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
102	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
103	400	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
104	19	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
105	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
106	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
107	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
108	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
109	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
110	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
111	18	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
112	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
113	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
114	35	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
115	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
116	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
117	18	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
118	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
119	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
120	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
121	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
122	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
123	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
124	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
125	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
126	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
127	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
128	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
129	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
130	55	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
131	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
132	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
133	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
134	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
135	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
136	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
137	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
138	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
139	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
140	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
141	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
142	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
143	11	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
144	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
145	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
146	9	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
147	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
148	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
149	52	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
150	23	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
151	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
152	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
153	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
154	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
155	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
156	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
157	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
158	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
159	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
160	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
161	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
162	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
163	12	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
164	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
165	26	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
166	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
167	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
168	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
169	9	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
170	16	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
171	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
172	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
173	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
174	200	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
175	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
176	86	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
177	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
178	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
179	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
180	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
181	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
182	13	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
183	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
184	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
185	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
186	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
187	40	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
188	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
189	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
190	8	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
191	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
192	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
193	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
194	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
195	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
196	4	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
197	2	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
198	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
199	7	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
200	6	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
201	27	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
202	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
203	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
204	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
205	18	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
206	45	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
207	2	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
208	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
209	55	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
210	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
211	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
212	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
213	50	Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
214	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
215	40	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
216	11	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
217	4	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
218	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
219	1	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
220	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
221	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
222	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
223	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
224	9	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
225	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
226	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
227	18	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
228	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
229	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
230	1	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
231	6	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
232	120	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
233	40	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
234	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
235	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
236	14	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
237	6	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
238	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
239	17	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
240	40	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
241	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
242	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
243	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
244	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
245	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
246	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
247	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
248	75	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
249	12	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
250	1	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
251	1	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
252	15	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
253	1	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
254	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
255	80	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
256	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
257	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
258	4	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
259	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
260	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
261	9	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
262	60	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
263	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
264	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
265	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
266	8	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
267	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
268	1	Feb 8, 2011 5:10 PM
269	1	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
270	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
271	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
272	1	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
273	10	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
274	3	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
275	18	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
276	1	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
277	1	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
278	2	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
279	1	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
280	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
281	4	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
282	2	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
283	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
284	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
285	45	Feb 8, 2011 8:02 PM
286	1	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
287	19	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
288	9	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
289	4	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
290	2	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
291	0	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
292	2	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
293	15	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
294	6	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
295	1	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
296	2	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
297	1	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
298	7	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
299	1	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
300	5	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
301	5	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
302	1	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
303	150	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
304	3	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
305	2	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
306	4	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
307	5	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
308	3	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
309	25	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
310	1	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
311	18	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
312	2	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
313	5	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
314	1	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
315	16	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
316	1	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
317	4	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
318	5	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
319	1	Feb 11, 2011 7:38 AM
320	5	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
321	13	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
322	1	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
323	12	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
324	400	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
325	1	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
326	1	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
327	12	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
328	2	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
329	2	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
330	3	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
331	10	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
332	4	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
333	13	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
334	1	Feb 12, 2011 11:42 PM
335	1	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
336	7	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
337	3	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
338	5	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
339	2	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
340	35	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
341	3	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
342	5	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
343	2	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
344	1	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
345	1	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
346	1	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
347	3	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
348	4	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
349	3	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
350	1	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
351	130	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
352	1	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
353	50	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
354	1	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
355	2	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
356	8	Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
357	9	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
358	0	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
359	9	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
360	60	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
361	40	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
362	2	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
363	1	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
364	12	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
365	1	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
366	8	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
367	23	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
368	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
369	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
370	40	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
371	55	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
372	18	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
373	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
374	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
375	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
376	45	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
377	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
378	110	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
379	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
380	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
381	50	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
382	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
383	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
384	17	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
385	8	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
386	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
387	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
388	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
389	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
390	75	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
391	17	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
392	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
393	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
394	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
395	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
396	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
397	56	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
398	28	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
399	19	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
400	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
401	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
402	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
403	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
404	14	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
405	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
406	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
407	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
408	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
409	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
410	115	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
411	70	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
412	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
413	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
414	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
415	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
416	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
417	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
418	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
419	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
420	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
421	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
422	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
423	140	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
424	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
425	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
426	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
427	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
428	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
429	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
430	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
431	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
432	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
433	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
434	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
435	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
436	55	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
437	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
438	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
439	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
440	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
441	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
442	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
443	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
444	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
445	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
446	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
447	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
448	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
449	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
450	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
451	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
452	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
453	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
454	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
455	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
456	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
457	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
458	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
459	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
460	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
461	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
462	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
463	58	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
464	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
465	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
466	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
467	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
468	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
469	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
470	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
471	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
472	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
473	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
474	37	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
475	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
476	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
477	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
478	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
479	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
480	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
481	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
482	11	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
483	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
484	9	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
485	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
486	4	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
487	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
488	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
489	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
490	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
491	17	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
492	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
493	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
494	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
495	54	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
496	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
497	9	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
498	13	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
499	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
500	4	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
501	45	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
502	3	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
503	1	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
504	10	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
505	1	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
506	13	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
507	50	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
508	6	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
509	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
510	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
511	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
512	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
513	90	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
514	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
515	1	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
516	11	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
517	14	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
518	40	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
519	4	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
520	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
521	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
522	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
523	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
524	1	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
525	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
526	1	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
527	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
528	7	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
529	1	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
530	7	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
531	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
532	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
533	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
534	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
535	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
536	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
537	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
538	75	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
539	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
540	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
541	9	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
542	9	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
543	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
544	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
545	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
546	3	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
547	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
548	55	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
549	3	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
550	50	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
551	40	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
552	6	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
553	25	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
554	450	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
555	30	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
556	3	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
557	3	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
558	1	Feb 22, 2011 7:12 PM
559	14	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
560	2	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
561	0	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
562	1	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
563	1	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
564	4	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
565	2	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
566	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
567	7	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
568	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
569	9	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
570	1	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
571	1	Feb 23, 2011 3:04 PM
572	1	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
573	1	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
574	4	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
575	15	Feb 23, 2011 4:28 PM
576	1	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
577	7	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
578	1	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
579	3	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
580	12	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
581	1	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
582	5	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
583	1	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
584	1	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
585	7	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
586	6	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
587	11	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
588	1	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
589	38	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
590	1	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
591	16	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
592	40	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
593	6	Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
594	1	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
595	11	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
596	93	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
597	1	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
598	1	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
599	3	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
600	16	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
601	15	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
602	1	Feb 28, 2011 5:03 PM

2. If you are in private practice, how many attorneys are in your firm, including

# of attorneys:		
603	5	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
604	11	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
605	14	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
1	22	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	28	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	36	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4	7	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
5	6	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	18	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
7	14	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	17	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
10	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
11	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
13	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
14	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
15	31	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
16	32	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
17	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
18	18	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
21	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	22	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
24	39	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	13	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
26	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
27	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	24	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
31	39	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
32	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
33	27	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
35	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
36	31	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
38	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
39	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
40	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
41	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
42	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
43	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
44	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
45	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
46	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
47	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
48	21	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
49	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
50	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
51	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
52	19	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
53	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
54	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
55	17	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
56	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
57	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
58	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
59	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
60	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
61	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62	28	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	47	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
65	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
66	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
67	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	11	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
70	24	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
71	53	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
72	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
73	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
74	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
75	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
76	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
78	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	17	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
84	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
86	11	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
87	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	31	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
90	37	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	28	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
92	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	21	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	14	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
97	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
98	39	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	28	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
101	32	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
102	33	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
103	45	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
104	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
106	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
107	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	19	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
109	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
110	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
111	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
112	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113	24	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
115	28	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
116	27	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
117	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
118	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
119	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
121	32	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
122	17	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
123	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
124	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
125	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
126	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
127	17	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
128	29	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
129	14	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
130	29	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
131	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
132	19	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
133	37	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
134	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
135	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
137	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
138	28	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
139	27	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
140	51	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
141	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
142	46	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
143	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
144	23	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
145	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
146	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
147	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
148	24	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
149	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
151	33	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
152	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
153	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
154	27	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
155	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
156	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
157	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
158	34	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
159	39	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	13	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
161	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
162	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
163	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
164	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
165	42	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
166	11	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
167	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
168	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
169	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
170	26	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
171	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
172	11	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
173	29	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
174	17	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
175	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
176	48	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
177	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
178	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
179	37	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
180	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
181	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
182	23	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
183	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
184	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
185	19	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
186	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
187	39	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
188	13	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
189	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
190	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
191	32	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
192	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
193	19	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
194	19	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
195	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
196	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
197	43	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
198	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
199	41	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
200	56	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
201	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
202	31	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
203	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
204	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
205	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
206	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
207	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:18 PM
208	12	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
209	28	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
210	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
211	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
212	8	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
213	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
214	31	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
215	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
216	31	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
217	34	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
218	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
219	33	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
220	32	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
221	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
222	17	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
223	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
224	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
225	17	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
226	34	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
227	37	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
228	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
229	37	Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
230	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
231	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
232	24	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
233	29	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
234	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
235	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
236	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
237	29	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
238	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
239	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
240	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
241	34	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
242	40	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
243	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
244	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
245	23	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
246	16	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
247	24	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
248	22	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
249	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
250	24	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
251	4	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
252	30	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
253	32	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
254	35	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
255	26	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
256	41	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
257	44	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
258	46	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
259	18	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
260	4	Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
261	30	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
262	32	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
263	33	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
264	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
265	19	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
266	30	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
267	33	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
268	34	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
269	43	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
270	14	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
271	27	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
272	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
273	34	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
274	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
275	13	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
276	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
277	37	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
278	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
279	32	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
280	49	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
281	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
282	13	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
283	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
284	35	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
285	36	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
286	40	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
287	32	Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
288	16	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
289	23	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
290	19	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
291	34	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
292	36	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
293	29	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
294	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
295	32	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
296	29	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
297	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
298	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
299	6	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
300	27	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
301	35	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
302	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
303	40	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
304	23	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
305	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
306	25	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
307	36	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
308	28	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
309	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
310	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
311	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
312	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
313	30	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
314	3	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
315	18	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
316	40	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
317	2	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
318	30	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
319	16	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
320	14	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
321	15	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
322	52	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
323	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
324	7	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
325	25	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
326	2	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
327	36	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
328	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 PM
329	22	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
330	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
331	35	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
332	22	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
333	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
334	36	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
335	21	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
336	23	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
337	25	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
338	42	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
339	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
340	27	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
341	23	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
342	13	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
343	27	Feb 8, 2011 5:10 PM
344	34	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
345	24	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
346	14	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
347	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
348	47	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
349	30	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
350	35	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
351	17	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
352	34	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
353	29	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
354	41	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
355	20	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
356	22	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
357	26	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
358	22	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
359	9	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
360	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
361	23	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
362	38	Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
363	2	Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
364	37	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
365	26	Feb 8, 2011 8:02 PM
366	32	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
367	33	Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
368	39	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
369	8	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
370	15	Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
371	40	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
372	32	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
373	10	Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
374	25	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
375	8	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
376	45	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
377	24	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
378	15	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
379	45	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
380	4	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
381	33	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
382	27	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
383	13	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
384	7	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
385	28	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
386	40	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
387	31	Feb 9, 2011 7:33 PM
388	33	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
389	37	Feb 9, 2011 8:13 PM
390	23	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
391	5	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
392	19	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
393	4	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
394	26	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
395	14	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
396	18	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
397	7	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
398	21	Feb 9, 2011 11:52 PM
399	35	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
400	18	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
401	25	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
402	16	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
403	17	Feb 10, 2011 5:58 PM
404	51	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
405	26	Feb 10, 2011 6:37 PM
406	20	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
407	5	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
408	27	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
409	33	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
410	26	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
411	12	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
412	37	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
413	6	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
414	38	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
415	11	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
416	35	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
417	29	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 AM
418	44	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
419	4	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
420	1	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
421	20	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
422	3	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
423	9	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
424	26	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
425	22	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
426	43	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
427	21	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
428	35	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
429	7	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
430	18	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
431	36	Feb 12, 2011 2:22 PM
432	25	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
433	31	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
434	34	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
435	17	Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
436	31	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
437	3	Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
438	24	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
439	15	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
440	38	Feb 14, 2011 2:22 PM
441	23	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
442	24	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
443	25	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
444	27	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
445	26	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
446	23	Feb 14, 2011 10:14 PM
447	23	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
448	30	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
449	42	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
450	33	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
451	4	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
452	3	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
453	19	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
454	12	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
455	18	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
456	7	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
457	32	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
458	4	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
459	16	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
460	9	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
461	20	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
462	23	Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
463	25	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
464	34	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
465	12	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
466	30	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
467	13	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
468	62	Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
469	23	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
470	23	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
471	27	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
472	39	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
473	30	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
474	2	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
475	44	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
476	47	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
477	19	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
478	29	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
479	37	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
480	20	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
481	30	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
482	11	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
483	21	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
484	26	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
485	28	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
486	13	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
487	17	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
488	21	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
489	8	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
490	38	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
491	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
492	26	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
493	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
494	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
495	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
496	27	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
497	35	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
498	43	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
499	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
500	29	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
501	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
502	27	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
503	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
504	12	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
505	8	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
506	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
507	28	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
508	15	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
509	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
510	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
511	12	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
512	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
513	21	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
514	38	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
515	35	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
516	32	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
517	31	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
518	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
519	45	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
520	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
521	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
522	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
523	11	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
524	36	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
525	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
526	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
527	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
528	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
529	35	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
530	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
531	29	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
532	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
533	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
534	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
535	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
536	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
537	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
538	22	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
539	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
540	33	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
541	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
542	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
543	11	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
544	44	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
545	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
546	29	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
547	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
548	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
549	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
550	14	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
551	36	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
552	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
553	29	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
554	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
555	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
556	18	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
557	33	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
558	36	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
559	39	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
560	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
561	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
562	17	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
563	13	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
564	18	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
565	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
566	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
567	45	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
568	22	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
569	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
570	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
571	21	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
572	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
573	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
574	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
575	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
576	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
577	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
578	32	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
579	28	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
580	31	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
581	14	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
582	28	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
583	43	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
584	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
585	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
586	35	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
587	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
588	23	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
589	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
590	33	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
591	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
592	27	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
593	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
594	39	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
595	41	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
596	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
597	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
598	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
599	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
600	31	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
601	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
602	39	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
603	38	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
604	26	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
605	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
606	39	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
607	28	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
608	12	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
609	25	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
610	17	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
611	29	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
612	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
613	26	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
614	26	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
615	35	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
616	36	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
617	22	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
618	35	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
619	6	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
620	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
621	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
622	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
623	36	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
624	34	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
625	30	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
626	35	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
627	34	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
628	11	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
629	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
630	32	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
631	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
632	27	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
633	17	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
634	16	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
635	25	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
636	13	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
637	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
638	9	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
639	17	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
640	18	Feb 21, 2011 11:46 PM
641	36	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
642	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
643	30	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
644	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
645	38	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
646	34	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
647	34	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
648	30	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
649	20	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
650	22	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
651	34	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
652	6	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
653	27	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
654	2	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
655	30	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
656	21	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
657	33	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
658	31	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
659	18	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
660	38	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
661	33	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
662	23	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
663	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
664	14	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
665	35	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
666	13	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
667	30	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
668	45	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
669	27	Feb 22, 2011 12:50 PM
670	50	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
671	23	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
672	32	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
673	24	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
674	24	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
675	30	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
676	33	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
677	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
678	24	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
679	13	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
680	28	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
681	33	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
682	11	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
683	11	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
684	18	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
685	23	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
686	35	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
687	35	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
688	40	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
689	34	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
690	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
691	27	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
692	22	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
693	33	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
694	42	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
695	15	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
696	21	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
697	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
698	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
699	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
700	23	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
701	35	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
702	18	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
703	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
704	31	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
705	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
706	8	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
707	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
708	15	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
709	35	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
710	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
711	26	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
712	32	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
713	26	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
714	47	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
715	31	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
716	6	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
717	3	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
718	30	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
719	32	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
720	35	Feb 22, 2011 5:04 PM
721	16	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
722	19	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
723	15	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
724	26	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
725	2	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
726	22	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
727	25	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
728	19	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
729	16	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
730	21	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
731	3	Feb 22, 2011 7:12 PM
732	28	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
733	36	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
734	34	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
735	36	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
736	25	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
737	10	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
738	7	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
739	7	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
740	40	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
741	33	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
742	15	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
743	19	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
744	4	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
745	35	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
746	34	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
747	18	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
748	35	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM
749	15	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
750	35	Feb 23, 2011 3:04 PM
751	16	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
752	47	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
753	12	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
754	20	Feb 23, 2011 4:28 PM
755	40	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
756	30	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
757	16	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
758	43	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
759	22	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
760	4	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
761	5	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
762	30	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
763	11	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
764	38	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
765	30	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM

3. How many years have you practiced law, including years serving as a judicial

# of years:		
766	27	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
767	35	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
768	3	Feb 24, 2011 3:52 AM
769	12	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
770	39	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
771	11	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
772	16	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
773	16	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
774	7	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
775	9	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
776	11	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
777	45	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
778	11	Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
779	14	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
780	16	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
781	31	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
782	36	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
783	22	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
784	30	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
785	25	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
786	37	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
787	23	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
788	44	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
789	40	Feb 28, 2011 5:03 PM
790	22	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
791	20	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
792	3	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
793	9	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM
794	28	Feb 28, 2011 9:42 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
1	22	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	14	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	36	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4	5	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
5	6	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	18	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
7	14	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	15	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
9	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
10	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
11	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
13	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
14	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
15	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
16	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
17	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
18	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
21	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	22	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
24	39	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	13	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
26	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
27	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	24	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
31	39	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
32	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
33	27	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
35	14	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
36	31	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
38	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
39	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
40	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
41	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
42	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
43	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
44	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
45	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
46	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
47	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
48	21	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
49	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
50	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
51	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
52	19	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
53	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
54	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
55	17	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
56	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
57	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
58	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
59	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
60	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
61	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	28	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	47	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
65	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
66	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
67	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	24	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
70	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
71	24	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
72	53	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
73	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
74	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
75	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
76	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
78	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	11	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	38	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	17	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
84	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
86	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
87	11	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
90	27	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	37	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
92	28	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
95	21	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
97	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
98	9	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	32	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	39	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
101	28	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
102	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
103	32	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
104	31	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
106	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
107	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
109	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
110	19	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
111	23	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
112	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
115	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
116	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
117	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
118	28	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
119	27	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
120	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
121	14	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
122	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
123	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
124	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
125	17	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
126	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
127	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
128	9	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
129	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
130	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
131	29	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
132	14	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
133	29	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
134	29	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
135	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
136	32	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
137	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
138	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
139	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
140	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
141	28	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
142	24	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
143	51	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
144	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
145	46	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
146	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
147	23	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
148	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
149	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
150	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
151	24	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
152	21	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
153	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
154	33	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
155	22	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
156	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
157	27	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
158	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
159	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
160	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
161	34	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
162	39	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
163	13	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
164	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
165	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
166	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
167	9	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
168	42	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
169	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
170	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
171	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
172	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
173	26	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
174	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
175	11	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
176	29	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
177	17	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
178	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
179	48	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
180	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
181	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
182	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
183	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
184	23	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
185	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
186	31	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
187	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
188	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
189	39	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
190	13	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
191	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
192	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
193	32	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
194	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
195	19	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
196	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
197	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
198	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
199	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
200	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
201	41	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
202	56	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
203	13	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
204	31	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
205	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
206	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
207	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
208	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
209	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:18 PM
210	12	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
211	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
212	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
213	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
214	8	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
215	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
216	31	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
217	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
218	31	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
219	34	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
220	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
221	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
222	32	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
223	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
224	17	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
225	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
226	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
227	17	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
228	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
229	37	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
230	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
231	37	Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
232	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
233	9	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
234	24	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
235	29	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
236	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
237	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
238	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
239	29	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
240	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
241	27	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
242	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
243	31	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
244	40	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
245	4	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
246	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
247	23	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
248	16	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
249	24	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
250	17	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
251	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
252	24	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
253	4	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
254	30	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
255	31	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
256	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
257	26	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
258	39	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
259	40	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
260	40	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
261	10	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
262	4	Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
263	30	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
264	13	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
265	33	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
266	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
267	19	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
268	30	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
269	33	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
270	34	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
271	43	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
272	14	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
273	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
274	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
275	29	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
276	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
277	8	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
278	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
279	37	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
280	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
281	28	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
282	46	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
283	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
284	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
285	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
286	35	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
287	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
288	36	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
289	29	Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
290	16	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
291	18	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
292	12	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
293	30	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
294	36	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
295	29	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
296	23	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
297	32	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
298	29	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
299	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
300	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
301	6	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
302	27	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
303	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
304	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
305	35	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
306	23	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
307	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
308	21	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
309	36	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
310	28	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
311	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
312	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
313	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
314	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
315	18	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
316	3	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
317	12	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
318	25	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
319	1	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
320	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
321	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
322	12	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
323	3	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
324	52	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
325	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
326	7	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
327	25	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
328	2	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
329	36	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
330	22	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
331	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
332	35	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
333	22	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
334	6	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
335	35	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
336	21	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
337	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
338	25	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
339	42	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
340	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
341	27	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
342	23	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
343	13	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
344	34	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
345	24	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
346	14	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
347	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
348	47	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
349	30	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
350	15	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
351	17	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
352	34	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
353	29	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
354	15	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
355	20	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
356	22	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
357	26	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
358	14	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
359	6	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
360	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
361	23	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
362	38	Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
363	2	Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
364	34	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
365	26	Feb 8, 2011 8:02 PM
366	32	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
367	33	Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
368	39	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
369	8	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
370	5	Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
371	40	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
372	32	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
373	10	Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
374	25	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
375	7	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
376	45	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
377	24	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
378	8	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
379	45	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
380	4	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
381	33	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
382	27	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
383	13	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
384	5	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
385	28	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
386	40	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
387	31	Feb 9, 2011 7:33 PM
388	33	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
389	37	Feb 9, 2011 8:13 PM
390	33	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
391	5	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
392	19	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
393	4	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
394	2	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
395	1	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
396	44	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
397	3	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
398	15	Feb 9, 2011 11:52 PM
399	35	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
400	18	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
401	20	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
402	16	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
403	6	Feb 10, 2011 5:58 PM
404	37	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
405	26	Feb 10, 2011 6:37 PM
406	5	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
407	5	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
408	27	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
409	33	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
410	26	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
411	12	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
412	37	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
413	6	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
414	38	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
415	8	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
416	35	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
417	29	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 AM
418	44	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
419	4	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
420	1	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
421	20	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
422	3	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
423	5	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
424	26	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
425	22	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
426	43	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
427	10	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
428	35	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
429	7	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
430	18	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
431	25	Feb 12, 2011 2:22 PM
432	25	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
433	31	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
434	34	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
435	15	Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
436	31	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
437	3	Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
438	24	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
439	15	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
440	38	Feb 14, 2011 2:22 PM
441	15	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
442	24	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
443	25	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
444	10	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
445	26	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
446	23	Feb 14, 2011 10:14 PM
447	23	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
448	30	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
449	35	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
450	33	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
451	3	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
452	2	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
453	19	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
454	12	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
455	18	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
456	7	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
457	32	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
458	2	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
459	16	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
460	6	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
461	20	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
462	18	Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
463	23	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
464	34	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
465	12	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
466	30	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
467	11	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
468	62	Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
469	4	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
470	10	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
471	27	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
472	5	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
473	30	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
474	2	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
475	41	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
476	44	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
477	18	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
478	5	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
479	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
480	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
481	30	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
482	11	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
483	21	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
484	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
485	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
486	13	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
487	17	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
488	21	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
489	8	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
490	38	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
491	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
492	16	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
493	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
494	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
495	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
496	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
497	35	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
498	43	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
499	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
500	29	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
501	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
502	27	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
503	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
504	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
505	8	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
506	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
507	28	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
508	15	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
509	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
510	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
511	12	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
512	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
513	14	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
514	37	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
515	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
516	32	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
517	31	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
518	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
519	44	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
520	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
521	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
522	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
523	11	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
524	36	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
525	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
526	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
527	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
528	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
529	35	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
530	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
531	29	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
532	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
533	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
534	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
535	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
536	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
537	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
538	22	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
539	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
540	32	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
541	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
542	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
543	11	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
544	44	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
545	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
546	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
547	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
548	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
549	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
550	22	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
551	26	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
552	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
553	13	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
554	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
555	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
556	18	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
557	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
558	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
559	39	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
560	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
561	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
562	17	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
563	13	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
564	18	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
565	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
566	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
567	42	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
568	22	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
569	18	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
570	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
571	21	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
572	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
573	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
574	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
575	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
576	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
577	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
578	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
579	28	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
580	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
581	14	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
582	28	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
583	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
584	34	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
585	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
586	35	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
587	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
588	23	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
589	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
590	33	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
591	37	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
592	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
593	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
594	39	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
595	41	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
596	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
597	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
598	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
599	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
600	16	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
601	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
602	36	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
603	30	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
604	26	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
605	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
606	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
607	28	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
608	12	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
609	12	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
610	17	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
611	29	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
612	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:15 PM
613	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
614	23	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
615	26	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
616	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
617	36	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
618	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
619	35	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
620	6	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
621	23	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
622	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
623	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
624	36	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
625	34	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
626	26	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
627	30	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
628	32	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
629	11	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
630	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
631	32	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
632	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
633	27	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
634	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
635	16	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
636	25	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
637	13	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
638	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
639	9	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
640	17	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
641	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:46 PM
642	36	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
643	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
644	30	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
645	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
646	38	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
647	34	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
648	34	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
649	20	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
650	12	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
651	22	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
652	34	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
653	6	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
654	27	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
655	1	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
656	25	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
657	13	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
658	33	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
659	31	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
660	18	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
661	38	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
662	33	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
663	23	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
664	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
665	14	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
666	25	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
667	13	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
668	30	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
669	2	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
670	27	Feb 22, 2011 12:50 PM
671	30	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
672	23	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
673	32	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
674	24	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
675	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
676	24	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
677	33	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
678	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
679	20	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
680	6	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
681	28	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
682	33	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
683	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
684	11	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
685	18	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
686	16	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
687	35	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
688	35	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
689	40	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
690	34	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
691	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
692	24	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
693	22	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
694	33	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
695	42	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
696	15	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
697	21	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
698	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
699	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
700	28	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
701	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
702	35	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
703	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
704	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
705	31	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
706	7	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
707	8	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
708	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
709	12	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
710	35	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
711	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
712	26	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
713	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
714	9	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 PM
715	26	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
716	47	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
717	31	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
718	3	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
719	3	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
720	30	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
721	32	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
722	35	Feb 22, 2011 5:04 PM
723	16	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
724	19	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM
725	15	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
726	26	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
727	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
728	22	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
729	25	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
730	19	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
731	16	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
732	21	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
733	3	Feb 22, 2011 7:12 PM
734	28	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
735	36	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
736	34	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
737	33	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
738	25	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
739	10	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
740	7	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
741	7	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
742	40	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
743	33	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
744	15	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
745	17	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
746	4	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
747	6	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
748	32	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
749	13	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
750	20	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM
751	8	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
752	35	Feb 23, 2011 3:04 PM
753	16	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
754	47	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
755	12	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
756	20	Feb 23, 2011 4:28 PM
757	40	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
758	30	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
759	16	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
760	43	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
761	13	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
762	4	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
763	5	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
764	30	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
765	11	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
766	38	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
767	15	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
768	27	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
769	30	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
770	0	Feb 24, 2011 3:52 AM
771	4	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
772	18	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
773	11	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
774	16	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
775	16	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
776	7	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
777	9	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
778	11	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
779	40	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
780	11	Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
781	10	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
782	16	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM

4. How many years of experience do you have in civil litigation, including years

# of years:		
783	31	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
784	36	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
785	20	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
786	29	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
787	25	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
788	37	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
789	6	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
790	40	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
791	15	Feb 28, 2011 5:03 PM
792	15	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
793	20	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
794	3	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
795	7	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM
796	28	Feb 28, 2011 9:42 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
1	0	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
2	3	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
3	1	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
4	1	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
5	0	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
6	0	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
7	13	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
9	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
10	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
11	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
12	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
13	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
14	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
15	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
16	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
17	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
18	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
20	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
21	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
23	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
24	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
26	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
27	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
31	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
32	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
33	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
35	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
36	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
38	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
39	16	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
40	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
41	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
42	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
43	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
44	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
45	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
46	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
47	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
48	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
49	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
50	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
51	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
52	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
53	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
54	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
55	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
56	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
57	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
58	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
59	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
60	250	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
61	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
65	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
66	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
67	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
70	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
71	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
72	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
73	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
74	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
75	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
76	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
78	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
84	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
86	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
87	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
90	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
92	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
97	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
98	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
101	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
102	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
103	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
104	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
106	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
107	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
109	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
110	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
111	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
112	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
115	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
116	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
117	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
118	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
119	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
121	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
122	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
123	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
124	12	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
125	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
126	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
127	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
128	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
129	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
130	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
131	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
132	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
133	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
134	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
135	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
137	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
138	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
139	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
140	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
141	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
142	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
143	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
144	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
145	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
146	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
147	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
148	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
149	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
151	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
152	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
153	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
154	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
155	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
156	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
157	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
158	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
159	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
161	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
162	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
163	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
164	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
165	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
166	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
167	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
168	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
169	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
170	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
171	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
172	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
173	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
174	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
175	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
176	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
177	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
178	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
179	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
180	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
181	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
182	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
183	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
184	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
185	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
186	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
187	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
188	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
189	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
190	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
191	24	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
192	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
193	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
194	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
195	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
196	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
197	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
198	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
199	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
200	31	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
201	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
202	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
203	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
204	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
205	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
206	14	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
207	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
208	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
209	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
210	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
211	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
212	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
213	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
214	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
215	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
216	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
217	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
218	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
219	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
220	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
221	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
222	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
223	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
224	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
225	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
226	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
227	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
228	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
229	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
230	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
231	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
232	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
233	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
234	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
235	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
236	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
237	4	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
238	150	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
239	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
240	18	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
241	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
242	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
243	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
244	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
245	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
246	8	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
247	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
248	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
249	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
250	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
251	15	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
252	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
253	15	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
254	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
255	1	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
256	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
257	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
258	12	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
259	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
260	6	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
261	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
262	15	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
263	4	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
264	150	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
265	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
266	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
267	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
268	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
269	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
270	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
271	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
272	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
273	7	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
274	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
275	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
276	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
277	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
278	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
279	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
280	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
281	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
282	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
283	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
284	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
285	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
286	10	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
287	12	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
288	25	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
289	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
290	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
291	1963	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
292	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
293	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
294	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
295	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
296	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
297	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
298	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
299	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
300	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
301	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
302	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
303	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
304	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
305	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
306	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
307	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
308	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
309	3	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
310	300	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
311	4	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
312	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
313	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
314	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
315	2	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
316	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
317	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
318	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
319	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
320	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
321	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
322	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
323	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
324	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

		# of cases:	
325	0		Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
326	0		Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
327	0		Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
328	0		Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
329	6		Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
330	5		Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
331	5		Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
332	0		Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
333	8		Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
334	70		Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
335	10		Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
336	2		Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
337	2		Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
338	2		Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
339	0		Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
340	0		Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
341	20		Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
342	2		Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
343	10		Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
344	2		Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
345	4		Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
346	2		Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
347	0		Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
348	0		Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
349	3		Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
350	0		Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
351	0		Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
352	5		Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
353	0		Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
354	3		Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
355	11		Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
356	0		Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
357	0		Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
358	0		Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
359	5		Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
360	15		Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
361	0		Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
362	0		Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
363	0		Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
364	2		Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
365	1		Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
366	5		Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
367	0		Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
368	0	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
369	6	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
370	0	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
371	0	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
372	3	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
373	0	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
374	20	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
375	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
376	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
377	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
378	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
379	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
380	12	Feb 9, 2011 8:13 PM
381	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
382	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
383	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
384	20	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
385	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
386	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
387	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
388	0	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
389	0	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
390	0	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
391	5	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
392	2	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
393	0	Feb 10, 2011 5:58 PM
394	0	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
395	17	Feb 10, 2011 6:37 PM
396	4	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
397	2	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
398	0	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
399	100	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
400	0	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
401	4	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
402	2	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
403	5	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
404	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
405	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
406	1	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
407	10	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 AM
408	30	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
409	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
410	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

		# of cases:	
411	2		Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
412	4		Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
413	0		Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
414	0		Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
415	2		Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
416	2		Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
417	0		Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
418	0		Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
419	0		Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
420	0		Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
421	40		Feb 12, 2011 2:22 PM
422	5		Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
423	0		Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
424	0		Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
425	4		Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
426	10		Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
427	0		Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
428	0		Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
429	1		Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
430	15		Feb 14, 2011 2:22 PM
431	0		Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
432	3		Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
433	0		Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
434	0		Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
435	5		Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
436	20		Feb 14, 2011 10:14 PM
437	0		Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
438	8		Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
439	4		Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
440	5		Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
441	3		Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
442	0		Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
443	6		Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
444	0		Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
445	4		Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
446	0		Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
447	7		Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
448	0		Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
449	3		Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
450	0		Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
451	0		Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
452	17		Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
453	1		Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
454	1	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
455	100	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
456	0	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
457	5	Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
458	0	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
459	0	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
460	2	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
461	0	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
462	0	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
463	0	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
464	0	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
465	0	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
466	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
467	4	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
468	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
469	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
470	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
471	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
472	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
473	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
474	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
475	8	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
476	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
477	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
478	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
479	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
480	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
481	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
482	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
483	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
484	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
485	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
486	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
487	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
488	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
489	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
490	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
491	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
492	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
493	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
494	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
495	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
496	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
497	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
498	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
499	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
500	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
501	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
502	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
503	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
504	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
505	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
506	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
507	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
508	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
509	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
510	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
511	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
512	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
513	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
514	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
515	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
516	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
517	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
518	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
519	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
520	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
521	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
522	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
523	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
524	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
525	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
526	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
527	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
528	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
529	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
530	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
531	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
532	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
533	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
534	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
535	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
536	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
537	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
538	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
539	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
540	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
541	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
542	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
543	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
544	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
545	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
546	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
547	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
548	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
549	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
550	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
551	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
552	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
553	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
554	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
555	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
556	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
557	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
558	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
559	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
560	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
561	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
562	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
563	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
564	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
565	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
566	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
567	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
568	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
569	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
570	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
571	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
572	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
573	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
574	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
575	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
576	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
577	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
578	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
579	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
580	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
581	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
582	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
583	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
584	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
585	29	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
586	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
587	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
588	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
589	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
590	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
591	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
592	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
593	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
594	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
595	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
596	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
597	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
598	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
599	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
600	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:15 PM
601	8	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
602	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
603	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
604	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
605	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
606	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
607	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
608	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
609	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
610	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
611	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
612	10	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
613	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
614	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
615	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
616	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
617	10	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
618	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
619	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
620	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
621	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
622	14	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
623	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
624	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
625	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
626	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:46 PM
627	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
628	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
629	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
630	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
631	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
632	12	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
633	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
634	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
635	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
636	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
637	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
638	3	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
639	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
640	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
641	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
642	2000	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
643	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
644	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
645	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
646	6	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
647	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
648	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
649	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
650	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
651	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
652	5	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
653	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
654	8	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
655	25	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
656	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
657	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
658	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
659	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
660	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
661	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
662	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
663	1	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
664	11	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
665	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
666	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
667	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
668	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
669	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
670	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
671	20	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
672	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
673	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
674	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
675	10	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
676	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
677	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
678	7	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
679	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
680	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
681	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
682	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
683	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
684	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
685	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
686	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
687	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
688	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
689	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
690	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
691	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
692	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
693	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
694	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
695	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
696	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 PM
697	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
698	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
699	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
700	6	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
701	6	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
702	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
703	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:04 PM
704	2	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
705	15	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM
706	4	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
707	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
708	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
709	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
710	2	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
711	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
712	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
713	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
714	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:12 PM
715	5	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
716	25	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
717	3	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
718	2	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
719	20	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
720	3	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
721	0	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
722	3	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
723	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
724	12	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
725	1	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
726	0	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
727	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
728	10	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
729	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
730	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM
731	2	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
732	4	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
733	0	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
734	10	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
735	10	Feb 23, 2011 4:28 PM
736	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
737	50	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
738	5	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
739	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
740	300	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
741	0	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
742	0	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
743	0	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
744	2	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
745	10	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
746	0	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
747	50	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
748	0	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
749	0	Feb 24, 2011 3:52 AM
750	1	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
751	17	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
752	1	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
753	5	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
754	0	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM

5. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
755	1	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
756	1	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
757	20	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
758	20	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
759	0	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
760	1	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
761	3	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
762	0	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
763	0	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
764	6	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
765	8	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
766	14	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
767	3	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
768	2	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
769	0	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
770	10	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
771	0	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
772	2	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM
773	1	Feb 28, 2011 9:42 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
1	8	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	0	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	15	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4	1	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
5	10	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	0	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
7	0	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	13	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
10	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
11	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
13	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
14	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
15	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
16	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
17	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
18	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
19	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
21	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
24	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
26	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
27	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
30	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
31	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
32	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
33	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
34	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
35	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
36	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
37	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
38	16	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
39	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
40	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
41	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
42	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
43	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
44	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
45	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
46	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
47	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
48	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
49	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
50	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
51	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
52	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
53	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
54	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
55	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
56	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
57	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
58	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
59	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
60	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
61	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
62	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
63	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
64	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
65	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
66	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
67	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
69	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
70	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
71	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
72	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
73	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
74	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
75	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
76	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
77	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
78	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
82	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
83	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
84	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
85	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
86	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
87	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
88	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
89	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
90	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
91	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
92	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
96	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
97	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
98	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
101	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
102	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
103	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
104	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
105	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
106	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
107	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
108	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
109	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
110	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
111	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
112	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
115	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
116	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
117	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
118	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
119	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
121	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
122	12	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
123	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
124	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
125	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
126	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
127	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
128	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
129	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
130	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
131	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
132	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
133	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
134	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
135	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
137	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
138	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
139	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
140	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
141	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
142	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
143	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
144	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
145	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
146	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
147	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
148	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
149	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
151	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
152	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
153	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
154	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
155	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
156	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
157	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
158	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
159	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
161	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
162	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
163	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
164	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
165	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
166	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
167	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
168	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
169	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
170	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
171	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
172	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
173	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
174	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
175	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
176	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
177	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
178	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
179	12	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
180	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
181	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
182	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
183	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
184	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
185	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
186	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
187	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
188	24	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
189	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
190	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
191	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
192	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
193	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
194	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
195	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
196	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
197	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
198	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
199	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
200	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
201	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
202	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
203	14	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
204	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
205	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
206	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
207	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
208	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
209	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
210	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
211	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
212	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
213	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
214	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
215	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
216	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
217	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
218	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
219	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
220	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
221	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
222	22	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
223	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
224	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
225	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
226	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
227	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
228	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
229	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
230	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
231	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
232	6	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
233	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
234	4	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
235	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
236	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
237	18	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
238	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
239	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
240	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
241	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
242	2	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
243	11	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
244	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
245	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
246	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
247	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
248	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
249	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
250	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
251	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
252	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
253	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
254	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
255	12	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
256	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
257	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
258	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
259	15	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
260	4	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
261	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
262	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
263	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
264	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
265	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
266	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
267	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
268	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
269	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
270	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
271	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
272	3	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
273	5	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
274	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
275	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
276	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
277	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
278	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
279	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
280	1	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
281	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
282	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
283	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
284	12	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
285	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
286	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
287	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
288	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
289	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
290	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
291	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
292	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
293	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
294	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
295	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
296	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
297	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
298	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
299	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
300	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
301	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
302	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
303	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
304	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
305	18	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
306	4	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
307	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
308	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
309	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
310	4	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
311	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
312	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
313	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
314	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
315	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
316	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
317	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
318	3	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
319	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
320	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
321	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
322	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
323	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
324	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
325	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
326	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
327	8	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
328	19	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
329	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
330	4	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
331	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
332	4	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
333	5	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
334	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
335	60	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
336	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
337	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
338	5	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
339	2	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
340	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
341	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
342	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
343	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
344	15	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
345	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
346	5	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
347	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
348	3	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
349	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
350	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
351	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
352	0	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
353	15	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
354	0	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
355	0	Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
356	2	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
357	0	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
358	1	Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
359	5	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
360	0	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
361	0	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
362	6	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
363	0	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
364	0	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
365	5	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
366	0	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
367	20	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
368	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
369	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
370	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
371	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
372	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
373	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
374	1	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
375	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
376	20	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
377	2	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
378	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
379	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
380	0	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
381	0	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
382	3	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
383	0	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
384	2	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
385	0	Feb 10, 2011 5:58 PM
386	0	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
387	10	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
388	8	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
389	0	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
390	10	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
391	0	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
392	25	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
393	2	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
394	5	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
395	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
396	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
397	1	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
398	0	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
399	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
400	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
401	2	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
402	4	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
403	50	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
404	2	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
405	2	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
406	1	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
407	0	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
408	0	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
409	2	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
410	0	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
411	5	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
412	0	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
413	4	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
414	0	Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
415	10	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
416	0	Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
417	0	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
418	1	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
419	0	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
420	3	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
421	0	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
422	5	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
423	5	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
424	7	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
425	8	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
426	8	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
427	5	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
428	5	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
429	0	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
430	0	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
431	0	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
432	4	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
433	0	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
434	7	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
435	0	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
436	3	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
437	0	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
438	0	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
439	13	Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
440	1	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
441	0	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
442	1	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
443	5	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
444	0	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
445	0	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
446	0	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
447	2	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
448	0	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
449	0	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
450	0	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
451	10	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
452	0	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
453	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
454	0	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
455	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
456	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
457	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
458	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
459	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
460	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
461	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
462	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
463	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
464	75	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
465	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
466	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
467	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
468	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
469	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
470	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
471	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
472	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
473	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
474	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
475	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
476	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
477	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
478	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
479	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
480	100	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
481	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
482	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
483	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
484	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
485	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
486	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
487	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
488	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
489	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
490	25	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
491	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
492	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
493	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
494	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
495	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
496	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
497	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
498	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
499	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
500	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
501	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
502	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
503	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
504	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
505	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
506	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
507	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
508	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
509	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
510	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
511	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
512	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
513	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
514	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
515	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
516	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
517	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
518	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
519	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
520	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
521	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
522	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
523	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
524	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
525	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
526	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
527	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
528	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
529	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
530	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
531	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
532	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
533	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
534	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
535	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
536	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
537	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
538	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
539	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
540	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
541	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
542	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
543	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
544	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
545	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
546	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
547	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
548	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
549	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
550	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
551	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
552	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
553	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
554	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
555	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
556	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
557	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
558	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
559	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
560	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
561	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
562	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
563	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
564	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
565	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
566	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
567	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
568	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
569	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
570	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
571	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
572	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
573	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
574	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
575	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
576	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
577	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
578	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
579	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
580	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
581	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
582	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
583	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
584	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:15 PM
585	8	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
586	8	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
587	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
588	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
589	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
590	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
591	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
592	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
593	8	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
594	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
595	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
596	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
597	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
598	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
599	6	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
600	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
601	10	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
602	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
603	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
604	7	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
605	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
606	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
607	10	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
608	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
609	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
610	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
611	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
612	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:46 PM
613	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
614	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
615	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
616	23	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
617	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
618	15	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
619	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
620	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
621	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
622	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
623	3	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
624	3	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
625	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
626	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
627	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
628	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
629	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
630	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
631	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
632	6	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
633	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
634	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
635	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
636	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
637	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
638	5	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
639	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
640	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
641	30	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
642	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
643	300	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
644	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
645	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
646	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
647	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
648	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
649	1	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
650	11	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
651	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
652	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
653	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
654	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
655	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
656	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
657	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
658	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
659	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
660	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
661	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
662	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
663	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
664	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
665	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
666	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
667	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
668	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
669	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
670	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
671	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
672	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
673	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
674	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
675	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
676	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
677	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
678	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
679	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
680	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
681	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 PM
682	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
683	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
684	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
685	4	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
686	6	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
687	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
688	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:04 PM
689	2	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
690	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM
691	4	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
692	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
693	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
694	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
695	2	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
696	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
697	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
698	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
699	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:12 PM
700	5	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
701	5	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
702	0	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
703	3	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
704	60	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
705	5	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
706	7	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
707	3	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
708	1	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
709	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
710	12	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
711	5	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
712	0	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
713	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
714	2	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
715	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
716	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM
717	2	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
718	4	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
719	0	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
720	10	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
721	10	Feb 23, 2011 4:28 PM
722	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
723	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
724	5	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
725	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
726	0	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
727	0	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
728	0	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
729	0	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
730	35	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
731	10	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
732	0	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
733	0	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
734	0	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
735	0	Feb 24, 2011 3:52 AM
736	1	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
737	0	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
738	3	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
739	5	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
740	0	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
741	3	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
742	1	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
743	20	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
744	0	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
745	5	Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
746	0	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
747	0	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
748	3	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
749	0	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM

6. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil JURY TRIALS

# of cases:		
750	0	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
751	6	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
752	1	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
753	14	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
754	0	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
755	4	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
756	0	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
757	10	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
758	0	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
759	2	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM
760	0	Feb 28, 2011 9:42 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
1	10	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	1	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	30	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4	40	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
5	9	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	7	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
7	4	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	5	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
10	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
11	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
13	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
14	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
15	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
16	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
17	45	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
18	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
21	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
24	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
26	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
27	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
31	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
32	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
33	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
35	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
36	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
38	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
39	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
40	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
41	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
42	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
43	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
44	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
45	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
46	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
47	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
48	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
49	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
50	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
51	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
52	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
53	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
54	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
55	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
56	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
57	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
58	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
59	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
60	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
61	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	250	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
65	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
66	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
67	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
70	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
71	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
72	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
73	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
74	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
75	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
76	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
78	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
84	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	8	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
86	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
87	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
90	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	125	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
92	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
97	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
98	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	120	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
101	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
102	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
103	275	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
104	400	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
106	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
107	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
109	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
110	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
111	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
112	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
113	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
115	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
116	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
117	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
118	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
119	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
121	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
122	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
123	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
124	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
125	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
126	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
127	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
128	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
129	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
130	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
131	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
132	14	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
133	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
134	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
135	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
137	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
138	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
139	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
140	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
141	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
142	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
143	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
144	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
145	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
146	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
147	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
148	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
149	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
151	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
152	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
153	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
154	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
155	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
156	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
157	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
158	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
159	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
161	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
162	13	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
163	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
164	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
165	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
166	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
167	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
168	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
169	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
170	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
171	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
172	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
173	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
174	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
175	18	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
176	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
177	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
178	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
179	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
180	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
181	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
182	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
183	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
184	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
185	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
186	300	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
187	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
188	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
189	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
190	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
191	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
192	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
193	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
194	16	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
195	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
196	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
197	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
198	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
199	35	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
200	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
201	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
202	16	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
203	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
204	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
205	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
206	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
207	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
208	60	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
209	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
210	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
211	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
212	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
213	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
214	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
215	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
216	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
217	24	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
218	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
219	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
220	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
221	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
222	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
223	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
224	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
225	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
226	8	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
227	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
228	8	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
229	40	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
230	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
231	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
232	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
233	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
234	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
235	250	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
236	20	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
237	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
238	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
239	7	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
240	15	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
241	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

		# of cases:	
242	25		Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
243	3		Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
244	20		Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
245	12		Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
246	2		Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
247	2		Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
248	0		Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
249	50		Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
250	4		Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
251	0		Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
252	0		Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
253	0		Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
254	3		Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
255	20		Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
256	3		Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
257	0		Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
258	15		Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
259	6		Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
260	25		Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
261	24		Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
262	10		Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
263	200		Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
264	5000		Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
265	30		Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
266	3		Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
267	0		Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
268	4		Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
269	12		Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
270	10		Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
271	15		Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
272	0		Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
273	0		Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
274	0		Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
275	20		Feb 8, 2011 4:02 AM
276	1		Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
277	0		Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
278	5		Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
279	25		Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
280	0		Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
281	4		Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
282	50		Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
283	0		Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
284	5		Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
285	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
286	150	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
287	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
288	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
289	1960	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
290	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
291	25	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM
292	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
293	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
294	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
295	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
296	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
297	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
298	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
299	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
300	1000	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
301	240	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
302	50	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
303	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
304	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
305	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
306	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
307	4	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
308	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
309	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
310	6	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
311	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
312	15	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
313	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
314	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
315	200	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
316	1	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
317	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
318	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
319	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
320	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
321	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
322	8	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
323	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
324	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
325	4	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
326	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
327	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
328	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
329	5	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
330	+21	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
331	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
332	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
333	6	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
334	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
335	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
336	5	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
337	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
338	90	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
339	5	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
340	3	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
341	200	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
342	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
343	25	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
344	3	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
345	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
346	5	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
347	5	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
348	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
349	20	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
350	40	Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
351	3	Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
352	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
353	200	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
354	100	Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
355	50	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
356	10	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
357	0	Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
358	6	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
359	40	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
360	0	Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
361	15	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
362	5	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
363	30	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
364	25	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
365	0	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
366	20	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
367	15	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
368	15	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
369	3	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
370	10	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
371	5	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
372	5	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
373	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
374	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
375	150	Feb 9, 2011 8:13 PM
376	250	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
377	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
378	5	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
379	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM
380	5	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
381	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
382	1	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
383	0	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
384	7	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
385	7	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
386	75	Feb 10, 2011 2:43 PM
387	10	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
388	0	Feb 10, 2011 5:58 PM
389	1	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
390	150	Feb 10, 2011 6:37 PM
391	3	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
392	0	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
393	10	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
394	10	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
395	6	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
396	12	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
397	0	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
398	25	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
399	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
400	2	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
401	20	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
402	150	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 AM
403	150	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
404	30	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
405	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
406	29	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
407	15	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
408	0	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
409	5	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
410	20	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
411	2	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
412	0	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
413	75	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
414	50	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
415	4	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
416	10	Feb 12, 2011 2:22 PM
417	10	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
418	0	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
419	12	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
420	6	Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
421	10	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
422	0	Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
423	100	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
424	100	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
425	100	Feb 14, 2011 2:22 PM
426	0	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
427	6	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM
428	15	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
429	0	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
430	10	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
431	150	Feb 14, 2011 10:14 PM
432	0	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
433	4	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
434	4	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
435	10	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
436	3	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
437	25	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
438	2	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
439	50	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
440	2	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
441	15	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
442	5	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
443	6	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
444	2	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
445	2	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
446	200	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
447	4	Feb 16, 2011 4:55 PM
448	0	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
449	0	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
450	8	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
451	5	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
452	2	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
453	2	Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
454	1	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
455	0	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
456	30	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
457	1	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
458	200	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
459	25	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
460	15	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
461	10	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
462	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
463	30	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
464	300	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
465	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
466	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
467	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
468	200	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
469	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
470	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
471	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
472	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
473	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
474	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
475	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
476	7	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
477	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
478	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
479	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
480	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
481	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
482	150	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
483	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
484	7	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
485	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
486	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
487	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
488	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
489	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
490	5760	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
491	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
492	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
493	20	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
494	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
495	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
496	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
497	70	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
498	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
499	20	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
500	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
501	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
502	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
503	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
504	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
505	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
506	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
507	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
508	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
509	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
510	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
511	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
512	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
513	250	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
514	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
515	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
516	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
517	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
518	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
519	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
520	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
521	300	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
522	6	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
523	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
524	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
525	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
526	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
527	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
528	40	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
529	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
530	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
531	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
532	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
533	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
534	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
535	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
536	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
537	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
538	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
539	235	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
540	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
541	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
542	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
543	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
544	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
545	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
546	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
547	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
548	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
549	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
550	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
551	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
552	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
553	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
554	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
555	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
556	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
557	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
558	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
559	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
560	11	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
561	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
562	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
563	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
564	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
565	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
566	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
567	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
568	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
569	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
570	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
571	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
572	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
573	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
574	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
575	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
576	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
577	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
578	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
579	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
580	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
581	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
582	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
583	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
584	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
585	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
586	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
587	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
588	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
589	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
590	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
591	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
592	40	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
593	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
594	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:15 PM
595	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
596	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
597	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
598	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
599	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
600	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
601	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
602	50	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
603	7	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
604	8	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
605	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
606	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
607	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
608	25	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
609	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
610	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
611	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
612	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
613	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
614	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
615	9	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
616	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
617	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
618	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
619	12	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
620	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
621	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
622	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
623	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:46 PM
624	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
625	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
626	200	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
627	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
628	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
629	50	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
630	15	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
631	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
632	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
633	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
634	20	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
635	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
636	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
637	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
638	2000	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
639	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
640	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
641	15	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
642	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
643	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
644	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
645	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
646	200	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
647	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
648	5	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
649	1	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
650	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
651	2	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
652	1	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
653	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
654	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
655	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
656	10	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
657	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
658	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
659	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
660	30	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
661	200	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
662	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
663	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
664	11	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
665	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
666	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
667	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
668	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
669	20	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
670	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
671	300	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
672	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
673	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
674	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
675	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
676	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
677	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
678	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
679	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
680	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
681	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
682	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
683	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
684	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
685	80	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
686	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
687	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
688	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
689	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
690	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
691	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
692	10	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
693	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
694	10	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
695	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
696	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
697	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM
698	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
699	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
700	2	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
701	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
702	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
703	5	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
704	4	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
705	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:12 PM
706	15	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
707	60	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
708	25	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
709	10	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
710	10	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
711	10	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
712	4	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
713	5	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
714	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
715	10	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
716	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
717	15	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
718	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
719	10	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
720	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
721	4	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
722	0	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
723	0	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
724	0	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
725	1	Feb 23, 2011 4:28 PM
726	10	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
727	100	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
728	30	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
729	5	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
730	300	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
731	4	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
732	10	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
733	2	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
734	5	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
735	15	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
736	0	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
737	50	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
738	5	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
739	0	Feb 24, 2011 3:52 AM
740	1	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
741	35	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
742	30	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
743	5	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
744	0	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
745	3	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
746	0	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
747	5	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
748	10	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
749	60	Feb 25, 2011 10:24 PM
750	50	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
751	2	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
752	4	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
753	50	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
754	3	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
755	10	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
756	5	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
757	12	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM

7. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
758	0	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
759	10	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
760	8	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
761	1	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM
762	1	Feb 28, 2011 9:42 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
1	10	Feb 7, 2011 7:52 PM
2	1	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
3	8	Feb 7, 2011 7:55 PM
4	40	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
5	9	Feb 7, 2011 7:58 PM
6	7	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
7	0	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
8	5	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
9	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
10	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
11	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
12	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
13	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
14	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
15	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
16	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
17	45	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
18	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
19	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
20	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
21	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
22	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
23	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
24	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
25	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
26	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
27	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
28	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
29	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
30	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
31	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
32	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
33	120	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
34	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
35	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
36	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
37	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
38	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
39	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
40	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
41	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
42	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
43	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
44	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
45	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
46	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
47	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
48	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
49	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
50	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
51	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
52	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
53	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
54	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
55	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
56	36	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
57	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
58	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
59	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
60	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
61	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
62	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
63	250	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
64	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
65	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
66	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
67	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
68	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
69	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
70	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
71	12	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
72	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
73	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
74	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
75	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
76	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
77	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
78	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
79	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
80	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
81	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
82	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
83	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
84	70	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
85	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
86	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
87	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
88	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
89	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
90	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
91	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
92	7	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
93	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
94	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
95	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
96	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
97	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
98	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
99	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
100	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
101	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
102	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
103	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
104	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
105	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
106	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
107	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
108	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
109	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
110	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
111	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
112	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
113	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
114	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
115	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
116	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
117	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
118	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
119	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
120	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
121	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
122	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
123	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
124	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
125	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
126	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
127	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
128	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
129	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
130	6	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
131	14	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
132	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
133	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
134	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
135	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
136	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
137	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
138	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
139	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
140	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
141	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
142	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
143	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
144	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
145	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
146	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
147	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
148	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
149	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
150	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
151	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
152	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
153	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
154	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
155	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
156	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
157	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
158	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
159	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
160	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
161	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
162	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
163	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
164	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
165	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
166	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
167	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
168	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
169	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
170	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
171	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
172	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
173	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
174	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
175	18	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
176	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
177	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
178	7	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
179	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
180	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
181	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
182	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
183	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
184	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
185	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
186	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
187	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
188	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
189	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
190	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
191	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
192	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
193	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
194	9	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
195	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
196	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
197	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
198	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
199	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
200	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
201	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
202	16	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
203	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
204	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
205	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
206	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
207	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
208	60	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
209	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
210	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
211	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
212	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
213	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
214	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
215	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
216	24	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
217	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
218	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
219	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
220	7	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
221	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
222	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
223	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
224	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
225	8	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
226	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
227	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
228	40	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
229	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
230	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
231	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
232	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
233	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
234	15	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
235	20	Feb 7, 2011 11:00 PM
236	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
237	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
238	7	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
239	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
240	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
241	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
242	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
243	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
244	12	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
245	2	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
246	2	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
247	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
248	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
249	75	Feb 7, 2011 11:53 PM
250	4	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
251	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
252	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:02 AM
253	10	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
254	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:09 AM
255	20	Feb 8, 2011 12:20 AM
256	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:30 AM
257	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
258	10	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
259	2	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
260	25	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 AM
261	24	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
262	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:45 AM
263	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:01 AM
264	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
265	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
266	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
267	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 AM
268	4	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
269	12	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 AM
270	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
271	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:48 AM
272	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 AM
273	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:29 AM
274	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 AM
275	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
276	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
277	5	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 AM
278	25	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 AM
279	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
280	4	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 PM
281	50	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
282	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:13 PM
283	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:18 PM
284	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
285	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
286	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
287	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 PM
288	1960	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
289	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
290	30	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
291	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
292	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
293	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
294	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
295	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
296	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
297	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
298	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
299	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 PM
300	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:54 PM
301	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
302	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
303	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
304	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
305	15	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
306	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
307	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
308	6	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
309	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
310	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:32 PM
311	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
312	25	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
313	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:49 PM
314	1	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
315	30	Feb 8, 2011 3:54 PM
316	30	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
317	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
318	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
319	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
320	8	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
321	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:20 PM
322	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
323	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
324	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
325	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
326	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:39 PM
327	5	Feb 8, 2011 4:45 PM
328	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
329	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:57 PM
330	4	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
331	6	Feb 8, 2011 5:15 PM
332	1	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
333	3	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
334	15	Feb 8, 2011 5:40 PM
335	5	Feb 8, 2011 5:44 PM
336	90	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
337	10	Feb 8, 2011 5:53 PM
338	5	Feb 8, 2011 6:03 PM
339	18	Feb 8, 2011 6:10 PM
340	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
341	30	Feb 8, 2011 6:41 PM
342	3	Feb 8, 2011 6:51 PM
343	25	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
344	5	Feb 8, 2011 7:16 PM
345	5	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
346	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:24 PM
347	20	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
348	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:42 PM
349	5	Feb 8, 2011 7:43 PM
350	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:56 PM
351	50	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
352	0	Feb 8, 2011 8:53 PM
353	50	Feb 8, 2011 9:23 PM
354	12	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
355	0	Feb 8, 2011 10:33 PM
356	10	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
357	40	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
358	0	Feb 9, 2011 12:24 AM
359	15	Feb 9, 2011 12:58 AM
360	10	Feb 9, 2011 1:45 AM
361	0	Feb 9, 2011 2:14 AM
362	25	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
363	0	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
364	20	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM
365	15	Feb 9, 2011 3:42 PM
366	15	Feb 9, 2011 4:43 PM
367	3	Feb 9, 2011 5:40 PM
368	15	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
369	40	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
370	5	Feb 9, 2011 6:47 PM
371	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:17 PM
372	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:43 PM
373	9	Feb 9, 2011 8:19 PM
374	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:46 PM
375	5	Feb 9, 2011 8:47 PM
376	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:22 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
377	3	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
378	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:37 PM
379	1	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
380	2	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
381	7	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
382	9	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
383	0	Feb 10, 2011 5:49 PM
384	0	Feb 10, 2011 5:58 PM
385	1	Feb 10, 2011 6:34 PM
386	6	Feb 10, 2011 6:41 PM
387	3	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
388	0	Feb 10, 2011 8:40 PM
389	10	Feb 10, 2011 9:28 PM
390	6	Feb 10, 2011 10:25 PM
391	20	Feb 10, 2011 10:46 PM
392	0	Feb 10, 2011 10:51 PM
393	25	Feb 11, 2011 12:57 AM
394	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:37 AM
395	2	Feb 11, 2011 1:41 AM
396	20	Feb 11, 2011 2:33 AM
397	0	Feb 11, 2011 6:07 AM
398	50	Feb 11, 2011 3:14 PM
399	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:21 PM
400	29	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
401	16	Feb 11, 2011 6:55 PM
402	100	Feb 11, 2011 7:24 PM
403	5	Feb 11, 2011 8:49 PM
404	20	Feb 11, 2011 9:37 PM
405	3	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
406	0	Feb 11, 2011 9:40 PM
407	75	Feb 11, 2011 10:44 PM
408	50	Feb 12, 2011 5:24 AM
409	4	Feb 12, 2011 1:30 PM
410	10	Feb 12, 2011 3:55 PM
411	0	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
412	20	Feb 12, 2011 7:35 PM
413	0	Feb 12, 2011 8:37 PM
414	10	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
415	0	Feb 14, 2011 12:13 AM
416	100	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
417	100	Feb 14, 2011 1:34 PM
418	0	Feb 14, 2011 3:11 PM
419	6	Feb 14, 2011 4:23 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
420	10	Feb 14, 2011 5:46 PM
421	5	Feb 14, 2011 7:50 PM
422	10	Feb 14, 2011 9:47 PM
423	5	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
424	4	Feb 15, 2011 12:37 AM
425	6	Feb 15, 2011 12:15 PM
426	3	Feb 15, 2011 1:36 PM
427	5	Feb 15, 2011 2:50 PM
428	25	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
429	2	Feb 15, 2011 7:49 PM
430	50	Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
431	2	Feb 15, 2011 8:44 PM
432	15	Feb 15, 2011 10:06 PM
433	5	Feb 15, 2011 11:22 PM
434	8	Feb 15, 2011 11:31 PM
435	2	Feb 15, 2011 11:57 PM
436	2	Feb 16, 2011 2:51 PM
437	25	Feb 16, 2011 3:48 PM
438	0	Feb 16, 2011 11:31 PM
439	0	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
440	8	Feb 17, 2011 2:44 PM
441	5	Feb 17, 2011 8:10 PM
442	2	Feb 17, 2011 9:09 PM
443	2	Feb 17, 2011 9:15 PM
444	5	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
445	0	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
446	30	Feb 18, 2011 8:57 PM
447	1	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
448	200	Feb 20, 2011 4:42 PM
449	30	Feb 20, 2011 9:33 PM
450	40	Feb 20, 2011 10:06 PM
451	10	Feb 20, 2011 11:25 PM
452	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
453	2	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
454	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:33 PM
455	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
456	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
457	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
458	300	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
459	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
460	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
461	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
462	20	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
463	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
464	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:46 PM
465	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
466	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
467	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
468	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
469	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
470	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
471	150	Feb 21, 2011 8:51 PM
472	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
473	7	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
474	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
475	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
476	3	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
477	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
478	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
479	5760	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
480	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
481	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
482	20	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
483	1	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
484	15	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
485	15	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
486	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
487	90	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
488	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
489	20	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
490	4	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
491	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
492	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
493	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
494	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
495	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
496	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
497	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
498	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
499	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
500	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
501	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
502	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
503	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
504	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
505	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
506	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
507	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
508	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
509	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
510	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
511	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
512	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
513	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
514	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
515	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
516	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
517	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
518	40	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
519	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
520	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
521	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
522	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
523	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
524	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
525	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
526	7	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
527	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
528	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
529	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
530	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
531	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
532	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
533	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
534	8	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
535	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
536	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
537	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
538	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
539	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
540	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
541	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
542	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
543	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
544	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
545	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
546	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
547	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
548	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
549	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
550	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
551	11	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
552	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
553	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
554	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
555	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
556	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
557	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
558	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
559	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
560	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
561	12	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
562	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
563	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
564	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
565	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
566	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
567	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
568	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
569	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
570	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
571	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
572	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
573	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
574	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
575	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
576	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
577	30	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
578	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
579	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
580	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
581	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
582	40	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
583	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
584	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:15 PM
585	25	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
586	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
587	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
588	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
589	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
590	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:37 PM
591	300	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
592	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
593	8	Feb 21, 2011 10:54 PM
594	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
595	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
596	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
597	25	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
598	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
599	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
600	8	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
601	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
602	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:08 PM
603	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:13 PM
604	9	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
605	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
606	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
607	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
608	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
609	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:35 PM
610	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
611	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
612	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:46 PM
613	20	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
614	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:49 PM
615	40	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
616	3	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
617	50	Feb 21, 2011 11:59 PM
618	15	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
619	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 AM
620	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
621	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
622	20	Feb 22, 2011 1:34 AM
623	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
624	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:46 AM
625	3	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
626	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 AM
627	7	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
628	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:29 AM
629	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 AM
630	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
631	15	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 AM
632	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 AM
633	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 AM
634	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
635	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
636	200	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
637	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
638	5	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 AM
639	1	Feb 22, 2011 6:12 AM
640	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
641	3	Feb 22, 2011 1:21 PM
642	1	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
643	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 PM
644	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
645	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:57 PM
646	10	Feb 22, 2011 2:05 PM
647	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:07 PM
648	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
649	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
650	30	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 PM
651	4	Feb 22, 2011 2:40 PM
652	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 PM
653	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:47 PM
654	11	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
655	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:50 PM
656	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
657	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
658	2	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
659	20	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
660	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
661	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
662	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
663	8	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
664	8	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
665	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:17 PM
666	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
667	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
668	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:21 PM
669	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
670	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
671	15	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
672	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
673	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
674	30	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
675	80	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
676	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM
677	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:34 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
678	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
679	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
680	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
681	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
682	10	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
683	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:31 PM
684	10	Feb 22, 2011 4:38 PM
685	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
686	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:04 PM
687	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
688	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:15 PM
689	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:24 PM
690	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:51 PM
691	2	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
692	1	Feb 22, 2011 5:59 PM
693	4	Feb 22, 2011 6:17 PM
694	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
695	5	Feb 22, 2011 7:05 PM
696	7	Feb 22, 2011 7:08 PM
697	5	Feb 22, 2011 7:12 PM
698	10	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
699	15	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
700	0	Feb 22, 2011 8:03 PM
701	25	Feb 22, 2011 8:36 PM
702	10	Feb 22, 2011 8:55 PM
703	10	Feb 22, 2011 9:23 PM
704	15	Feb 22, 2011 9:42 PM
705	4	Feb 22, 2011 9:45 PM
706	5	Feb 22, 2011 9:55 PM
707	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:09 PM
708	10	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
709	3	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
710	3	Feb 22, 2011 11:23 PM
711	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:50 AM
712	2	Feb 23, 2011 3:53 AM
713	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:03 PM
714	0	Feb 23, 2011 12:58 PM
715	4	Feb 23, 2011 2:23 PM
716	0	Feb 23, 2011 3:08 PM
717	0	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
718	0	Feb 23, 2011 4:17 PM
719	1	Feb 23, 2011 4:28 PM
720	10	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM

8. To the best of your ability, please estimate the number of civil cases TRIED

# of cases:		
721	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:11 PM
722	30	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
723	5	Feb 23, 2011 5:39 PM
724	300	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
725	4	Feb 23, 2011 6:36 PM
726	10	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
727	2	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
728	50	Feb 23, 2011 9:02 PM
729	15	Feb 23, 2011 9:03 PM
730	0	Feb 23, 2011 9:38 PM
731	0	Feb 23, 2011 11:43 PM
732	5	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
733	0	Feb 24, 2011 3:52 AM
734	1	Feb 24, 2011 4:15 AM
735	0	Feb 24, 2011 5:31 PM
736	40	Feb 24, 2011 5:40 PM
737	3	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
738	0	Feb 24, 2011 7:52 PM
739	3	Feb 25, 2011 1:21 PM
740	25	Feb 25, 2011 4:20 PM
741	5	Feb 25, 2011 7:54 PM
742	5	Feb 25, 2011 8:41 PM
743	2	Feb 25, 2011 10:11 PM
744	50	Feb 26, 2011 8:32 PM
745	2	Feb 27, 2011 3:59 PM
746	4	Feb 27, 2011 6:23 PM
747	50	Feb 27, 2011 6:58 PM
748	3	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
749	10	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
750	5	Feb 28, 2011 2:25 AM
751	5	Feb 28, 2011 3:11 AM
752	0	Feb 28, 2011 2:57 PM
753	3	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
754	8	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
755	15	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM
756	1	Feb 28, 2011 9:35 PM
757	1	Feb 28, 2011 9:42 PM

10. In what types of civil cases have you most often been involved AS

Other (please specify)		
1	Probate	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
2	Probate and small claims	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
3	Finance Leasing Cases	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
4	collections	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
5	Municipal law issues	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
6	Foreclosure	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
7	Probate and Trust	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
8	Evictions	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
9	Even distribution, as a law clerk	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
10	n/a	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
11	None in the last 5 years.	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
12	business law cases	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
13	federal acquisition	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
14	government contracts	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
15	Consumer Protection	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
16	Debt Collection	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
17	Municipality law	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
18	collection	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
19	Excessive Force	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
20	collection	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
21	Debt Collection	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
22	Employment	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
23	law interpretation	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
24	antitrust	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
25	Immigration	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
26	tax	Feb 7, 2011 11:59 PM
27	consumer protection;	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
28	Enforcement of Federal Trade Commission Act	Feb 8, 2011 12:39 PM
29	mental health/substance abuse	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 PM
30	post conviction relief	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
31	Debt Collection	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
32	collection	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
33	Probate litigation	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
34	disputes arising from probated estates	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
35	creditors rights/ collection	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
36	Employment - Wrongful termination, breach of contract	Feb 8, 2011 5:36 PM
37	sexual harassment	Feb 8, 2011 5:48 PM
38	some juvenile/Ch. 236 Protective Order Hearings/Landlord-Tenant & Small Claims matters	Feb 8, 2011 8:44 PM
39	Probate litigation	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
40	consumer protection and debt collection defense--I only represent consumers	Feb 9, 2011 3:03 AM
41	Have been doing administrative law since 2003	Feb 9, 2011 3:02 PM
42	PROBATE	Feb 9, 2011 3:07 PM

10. In what types of civil cases have you most often been involved AS

Other (please specify)		
43	Postconviction relief	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
44	Debt collection	Feb 9, 2011 6:28 PM
45	environmental	Feb 9, 2011 11:17 PM
46	probate	Feb 10, 2011 2:16 PM
47	Workers' Compensation	Feb 10, 2011 6:58 PM
48	various	Feb 11, 2011 5:30 PM
49	Complex estate proceedings	Feb 13, 2011 4:07 AM
50	collections	Feb 14, 2011 2:39 AM
51	Environmental	Feb 14, 2011 11:31 PM
52	Landlord/Tenant, Debtor/Creditor	Feb 15, 2011 4:57 PM
53	Probate	Feb 18, 2011 12:02 AM
54	NOne	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
55	Probate	Feb 19, 2011 10:00 PM
56	workers compensation	Feb 21, 2011 1:43 PM
57	Nuisance	Feb 21, 2011 2:46 PM
58	na	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
59	collateral attacks on convictions and sentences	Feb 21, 2011 8:39 PM
60	open records	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
61	Municipal- zoning, special permits, open meetings law	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
62	Will Contest	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
63	N/A	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
64	Estate Planning	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
65	employment	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
66	probate	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
67	Constitutional Rights	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
68	Estates	Feb 21, 2011 10:57 PM
69	will contests	Feb 21, 2011 11:02 PM
70	Environmental	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
71	Estate Administration and disputes	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
72	Post Conviction Relief cases	Feb 22, 2011 2:17 AM
73	juvenile court	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 AM
74	consumer law	Feb 22, 2011 1:31 PM
75	I do some civil appellate work	Feb 22, 2011 1:52 PM
76	post conviction relief	Feb 22, 2011 2:25 PM
77	postconviction	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
78	Estate litigation	Feb 22, 2011 2:51 PM
79	Probate	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
80	Will Contests	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
81	immigration	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
82	Coprorate Attorney, not personally involved currently in civil litigation	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
83	collections	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
84	work comp	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
85	Consumer Protection	Feb 22, 2011 3:49 PM

10. In what types of civil cases have you most often been involved AS

Other (please specify)		
86	forfeiture	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
87	Employment	Feb 22, 2011 5:55 PM
88	Workers' Compensation	Feb 22, 2011 6:18 PM
89	Environmental	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
90	Eminent Domain	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM
91	contracts	Feb 23, 2011 5:02 PM
92	Housing, Zoning, Land Use, Code enforcement	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
93	Consumer rights	Feb 24, 2011 12:47 AM
94	zoning / land use	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
95	Small Claims	Feb 27, 2011 9:15 PM
96	Collections	Feb 28, 2011 1:08 AM
97	Served as chair of County Merit Commission - appeals in employment/dismissal matters	Feb 28, 2011 5:03 PM
98	Government	Feb 28, 2011 5:46 PM
99	work involving public entities	Feb 28, 2011 8:39 PM
100	Domestic Violence - protection orders	Feb 28, 2011 8:40 PM

11. In which forum during the last five (5) years has most of your civil litigation

Other (please specify)		
1	Not applicable	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
2	None in the last 5 years	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
3	Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Licensing Board	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
4	Immigration Court followed by state court	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
5	Administrative agencies and then state and appellate courts	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 AM
6	Not in last 5 years	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 AM
7	N/A	Feb 8, 2011 6:39 PM
8	retired	Feb 17, 2011 2:15 AM
9	Noner	Feb 18, 2011 5:41 PM
10	na	Feb 21, 2011 8:34 PM
11	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:45 PM
12	roughly equal between state, federal and admin agencies	Feb 21, 2011 11:38 PM
13	Not applicable	Feb 22, 2011 1:30 AM
14	Not Applicable	Feb 22, 2011 1:14 PM
15	Bankruptcy court	Feb 22, 2011 2:53 PM
16	Condemnation Proceedings Under Iowa Code Chapters 6A and 6B	Feb 23, 2011 3:20 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
1	25000	Feb 7, 2011 7:54 PM
2	20000	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
3	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
4	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
5	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
6	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:01 PM
7	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
8	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
9	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
10	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
11	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
12	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
13	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
14	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
15	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:08 PM
16	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
17	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
18	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
19	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
20	30000	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
21	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
22	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
23	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:13 PM
24	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
25	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
26	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
27	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
28	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
29	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
30	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
31	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
32	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
33	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
34	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
35	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:22 PM
36	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
37	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
38	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:26 PM
39	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:26 PM
40	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
41	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
42	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
43	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
44	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
45	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
46	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
47	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
48	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
49	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
50	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
51	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
52	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:38 PM
53	65000	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
54	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
55	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
56	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
57	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
58	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
59	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
60	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
61	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
62	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
63	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
64	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
65	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
66	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
67	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
68	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
69	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
70	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
71	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
72	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
73	1000000	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
74	2500	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
75	7500	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
76	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
77	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
78	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
79	30000	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
80	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
81	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
82	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
83	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
84	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
85	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
86	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
87	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
88	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
89	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
90	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
91	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
92	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
93	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
94	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
95	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
96	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
97	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
98	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
99	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
100	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
101	15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
102	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
103	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
104	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
105	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
106	15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
107	5000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
108	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
109	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
110	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
111	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
112	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
113	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
114	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
115	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
116	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
117	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
118	30000	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
119	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
120	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
121	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
122	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
123	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
124	75000	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
125	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
126	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
127	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
128	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
129	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
130	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
131	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
132	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
133	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
134	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
135	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
136	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
137	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
138	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
139	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
140	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
141	7500	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
142	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
143	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
144	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
145	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
146	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
147	15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
148	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
149	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
150	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
151	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
152	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
153	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
154	15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
155	5000	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
156	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
157	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
158	15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
159	15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:41 PM
160	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:41 PM
161	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
162	35000	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
163	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
164	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
165	75000	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
166	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
167	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:50 PM
168	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
169	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
170	3000	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
171	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
172	500000	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
173	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
174	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
175	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:01 PM
176	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:03 PM
177	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:12 PM
178	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:12 PM
179	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
180	15000	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
181	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:16 PM
182	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:16 PM
183	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:23 PM
184	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
185	5000	Feb 7, 2011 10:27 PM
186	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
187	5000	Feb 7, 2011 10:29 PM
188	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:29 PM
189	100000	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
190	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
191	100000	Feb 7, 2011 10:35 PM
192	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
193	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:38 PM
194	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:38 PM
195	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
196	100000	Feb 7, 2011 10:40 PM
197	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
198	15000	Feb 7, 2011 10:44 PM
199	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
200	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
201	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:51 PM
202	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:51 PM
203	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:52 PM
204	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
205	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
206	20000	Feb 7, 2011 10:58 PM
207	1000	Feb 7, 2011 10:58 PM
208	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
209	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
210	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
211	50000	Feb 7, 2011 11:02 PM
212	15000	Feb 7, 2011 11:03 PM
213	10000	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
214	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:08 PM
215	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
216	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
217	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:24 PM
218	10000	Feb 7, 2011 11:25 PM
219	50000	Feb 7, 2011 11:31 PM
220	20000	Feb 7, 2011 11:32 PM
221	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:36 PM
222	10000	Feb 7, 2011 11:41 PM
223	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:43 PM
224	15000	Feb 7, 2011 11:55 PM
225	75000	Feb 8, 2011 12:03 AM
226	25000	Feb 8, 2011 12:06 AM
227	25000	Feb 8, 2011 12:08 AM
228	50000	Feb 8, 2011 12:13 AM
229	20000	Feb 8, 2011 12:22 AM
230	10000	Feb 8, 2011 12:32 AM
231	25000	Feb 8, 2011 12:43 AM
232	20000	Feb 8, 2011 1:30 AM
233	5000	Feb 8, 2011 1:41 AM
234	50000	Feb 8, 2011 1:48 AM
235	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:04 AM
236	5000	Feb 8, 2011 2:21 AM
237	20000	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM
238	75000	Feb 8, 2011 2:26 AM
239	100000	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 AM
240	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:44 AM
241	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:46 AM
242	10000	Feb 8, 2011 3:27 AM
243	20000	Feb 8, 2011 3:33 AM
244	5000	Feb 8, 2011 4:04 AM
245	25000	Feb 8, 2011 4:06 AM
246	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:11 AM
247	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:21 AM
248	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:24 AM
249	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:59 AM
250	20000	Feb 8, 2011 12:44 PM
251	25000	Feb 8, 2011 1:07 PM
252	25000	Feb 8, 2011 1:15 PM
253	50000	Feb 8, 2011 1:16 PM
254	50000	Feb 8, 2011 1:20 PM
255	50000	Feb 8, 2011 1:37 PM
256	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:02 PM
257	100000	Feb 8, 2011 2:02 PM
258	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
259	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:13 PM
260	10000	Feb 8, 2011 2:21 PM
261	20000	Feb 8, 2011 2:22 PM
262	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
263	5000	Feb 8, 2011 2:33 PM
264	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:33 PM
265	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:34 PM
266	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
267	5000	Feb 8, 2011 2:37 PM
268	10000	Feb 8, 2011 2:45 PM
269	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:52 PM
270	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:53 PM
271	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:56 PM
272	10000	Feb 8, 2011 2:59 PM
273	500	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
274	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:03 PM
275	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
276	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:16 PM
277	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:25 PM
278	100000	Feb 8, 2011 3:33 PM
279	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:34 PM
280	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:44 PM
281	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:51 PM
282	10000	Feb 8, 2011 3:53 PM
283	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:57 PM
284	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
285	30000	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
286	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:03 PM
287	75000	Feb 8, 2011 4:11 PM
288	75000	Feb 8, 2011 4:11 PM
289	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:19 PM
290	20000	Feb 8, 2011 4:21 PM
291	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
292	25000	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
293	100000	Feb 8, 2011 4:33 PM
294	15000	Feb 8, 2011 4:36 PM
295	25000	Feb 8, 2011 4:41 PM
296	20000	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
297	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 PM
298	50000	Feb 8, 2011 5:03 PM
299	50000	Feb 8, 2011 5:17 PM
300	10000	Feb 8, 2011 5:38 PM
301	50000	Feb 8, 2011 5:46 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
302	50000	Feb 8, 2011 5:51 PM
303	50000	Feb 8, 2011 5:55 PM
304	10000	Feb 8, 2011 6:04 PM
305	25000	Feb 8, 2011 6:14 PM
306	10000	Feb 8, 2011 6:44 PM
307	25000	Feb 8, 2011 6:46 PM
308	5000	Feb 8, 2011 6:56 PM
309	10000	Feb 8, 2011 7:18 PM
310	25000	Feb 8, 2011 7:26 PM
311	75000	Feb 8, 2011 7:26 PM
312	10000	Feb 8, 2011 7:36 PM
313	5000	Feb 8, 2011 8:48 PM
314	25000	Feb 8, 2011 8:56 PM
315	100000	Feb 8, 2011 9:25 PM
316	12500	Feb 8, 2011 9:48 PM
317	100000	Feb 8, 2011 10:36 PM
318	20000	Feb 8, 2011 10:57 PM
319	10000	Feb 8, 2011 11:14 PM
320	25000	Feb 9, 2011 12:25 AM
321	10000	Feb 9, 2011 1:01 AM
322	10000	Feb 9, 2011 1:48 AM
323	25000	Feb 9, 2011 2:18 AM
324	10000	Feb 9, 2011 4:11 AM
325	5000	Feb 9, 2011 3:14 PM
326	5000	Feb 9, 2011 4:45 PM
327	100000	Feb 9, 2011 5:43 PM
328	25000	Feb 9, 2011 6:21 PM
329	20000	Feb 9, 2011 6:30 PM
330	15000	Feb 9, 2011 6:49 PM
331	50000	Feb 9, 2011 7:19 PM
332	25000	Feb 9, 2011 7:35 PM
333	100000	Feb 9, 2011 7:45 PM
334	100000	Feb 9, 2011 8:15 PM
335	50000	Feb 9, 2011 8:21 PM
336	50000	Feb 9, 2011 8:51 PM
337	10000	Feb 9, 2011 9:25 PM
338	25000	Feb 9, 2011 9:38 PM
339	100000	Feb 9, 2011 9:39 PM
340	5000	Feb 9, 2011 9:50 PM
341	25000	Feb 9, 2011 11:19 PM
342	20000	Feb 10, 2011 2:19 PM
343	25000	Feb 10, 2011 2:38 PM
344	10000	Feb 10, 2011 2:45 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
345	50000	Feb 10, 2011 3:14 PM
346	50000	Feb 10, 2011 5:52 PM
347	15000	Feb 10, 2011 6:01 PM
348	7500	Feb 10, 2011 6:38 PM
349	50000	Feb 10, 2011 6:39 PM
350	99000	Feb 10, 2011 6:42 PM
351	8000	Feb 10, 2011 7:00 PM
352	10000	Feb 10, 2011 9:32 PM
353	25000	Feb 10, 2011 10:26 PM
354	10000	Feb 10, 2011 10:48 PM
355	1000	Feb 10, 2011 10:54 PM
356	10000	Feb 11, 2011 1:00 AM
357	25000	Feb 11, 2011 1:40 AM
358	5000	Feb 11, 2011 1:46 AM
359	20000	Feb 11, 2011 2:35 AM
360	20000	Feb 11, 2011 3:20 AM
361	10000	Feb 11, 2011 6:08 AM
362	25000	Feb 11, 2011 3:16 PM
363	15000	Feb 11, 2011 3:22 PM
364	50000	Feb 11, 2011 5:41 PM
365	25000	Feb 11, 2011 6:57 PM
366	10000	Feb 11, 2011 7:25 PM
367	50000	Feb 11, 2011 8:50 PM
368	40000	Feb 11, 2011 9:47 PM
369	100000	Feb 11, 2011 10:47 PM
370	25000	Feb 12, 2011 1:33 PM
371	25000	Feb 12, 2011 2:24 PM
372	10000	Feb 12, 2011 3:57 PM
373	10000	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
374	25000	Feb 12, 2011 7:37 PM
375	50000	Feb 12, 2011 8:54 PM
376	7500	Feb 13, 2011 4:10 AM
377	5000	Feb 14, 2011 2:42 AM
378	10000	Feb 14, 2011 1:37 PM
379	100000	Feb 14, 2011 2:28 PM
380	50000	Feb 14, 2011 3:13 PM
381	25000	Feb 14, 2011 4:25 PM
382	25000	Feb 14, 2011 5:49 PM
383	35000	Feb 14, 2011 7:54 PM
384	25000	Feb 14, 2011 9:49 PM
385	10000	Feb 14, 2011 10:18 PM
386	25000	Feb 14, 2011 11:34 PM
387	25000	Feb 15, 2011 12:17 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
388	75000	Feb 15, 2011 1:38 PM
389	20000	Feb 15, 2011 2:53 PM
390	5000	Feb 15, 2011 4:59 PM
391	50000	Feb 15, 2011 8:20 PM
392	25000	Feb 15, 2011 8:46 PM
393	15000	Feb 15, 2011 10:08 PM
394	20000	Feb 15, 2011 11:25 PM
395	10000	Feb 16, 2011 12:05 AM
396	10000	Feb 16, 2011 2:53 PM
397	15000	Feb 16, 2011 3:50 PM
398	25000	Feb 16, 2011 4:58 PM
399	100000	Feb 16, 2011 11:35 PM
400	20000	Feb 17, 2011 2:17 AM
401	20000	Feb 17, 2011 2:47 PM
402	50000	Feb 17, 2011 8:13 PM
403	20000	Feb 17, 2011 9:11 PM
404	50000	Feb 17, 2011 9:23 PM
405	20000	Feb 18, 2011 12:04 AM
406	5000	Feb 18, 2011 8:59 PM
407	50000	Feb 20, 2011 11:29 PM
408	25000	Feb 21, 2011 1:45 PM
409	10000	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
410	50000	Feb 21, 2011 8:38 PM
411	10000	Feb 21, 2011 8:41 PM
412	15000	Feb 21, 2011 8:41 PM
413	25000	Feb 21, 2011 8:48 PM
414	10000	Feb 21, 2011 8:48 PM
415	15000	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM
416	25000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
417	25000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
418	25000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
419	20000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
420	20000	Feb 21, 2011 8:52 PM
421	25000	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
422	10000	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
423	50000	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
424	25000	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
425	25000	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
426	10000	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
427	100000	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
428	10000	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
429	10000	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
430	50000	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
431	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
432	5000	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
433	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
434	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
435	1000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
436	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
437	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
438	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
439	30000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
440	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
441	5000	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
442	3000	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
443	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
444	5000	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
445	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
446	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
447	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
448	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
449	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
450	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
451	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
452	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
453	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
454	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
455	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
456	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
457	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
458	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
459	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
460	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
461	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
462	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
463	30000	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
464	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
465	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
466	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
467	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
468	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
469	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
470	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
471	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
472	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
473	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
474	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
475	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:22 PM
476	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:22 PM
477	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
478	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
479	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
480	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
481	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
482	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
483	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
484	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
485	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
486	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
487	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
488	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
489	5000	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
490	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
491	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
492	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
493	7500	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
494	5000	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
495	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
496	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
497	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
498	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM
499	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
500	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
501	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
502	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
503	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
504	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
505	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
506	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
507	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:59 PM
508	100000	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
509	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
510	20000	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
511	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
512	50000	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
513	20000	Feb 21, 2011 10:14 PM
514	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:14 PM
515	20000	Feb 21, 2011 10:18 PM
516	20000	Feb 21, 2011 10:23 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
517	50000	Feb 21, 2011 10:29 PM
518	15000	Feb 21, 2011 10:39 PM
519	2500	Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
520	50000	Feb 21, 2011 10:47 PM
521	50000	Feb 21, 2011 10:48 PM
522	30000	Feb 21, 2011 10:58 PM
523	30000	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
524	25000	Feb 21, 2011 11:03 PM
525	25000	Feb 21, 2011 11:03 PM
526	15000	Feb 21, 2011 11:03 PM
527	10000	Feb 21, 2011 11:03 PM
528	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
529	15000	Feb 21, 2011 11:09 PM
530	10000	Feb 21, 2011 11:10 PM
531	25000	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
532	10000	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
533	50000	Feb 21, 2011 11:26 PM
534	20000	Feb 21, 2011 11:26 PM
535	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:26 PM
536	50000	Feb 21, 2011 11:27 PM
537	10000	Feb 21, 2011 11:39 PM
538	7500	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
539	10000	Feb 21, 2011 11:45 PM
540	100000	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
541	50000	Feb 21, 2011 11:51 PM
542	25000	Feb 21, 2011 11:52 PM
543	10000	Feb 21, 2011 11:52 PM
544	10000	Feb 22, 2011 12:01 AM
545	20000	Feb 22, 2011 12:02 AM
546	10000	Feb 22, 2011 12:03 AM
547	50000	Feb 22, 2011 12:10 AM
548	20000	Feb 22, 2011 1:12 AM
549	25000	Feb 22, 2011 1:16 AM
550	5000	Feb 22, 2011 1:36 AM
551	5000	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
552	30000	Feb 22, 2011 1:40 AM
553	50000	Feb 22, 2011 1:48 AM
554	10000	Feb 22, 2011 2:00 AM
555	10000	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
556	50000	Feb 22, 2011 2:38 AM
557	75000	Feb 22, 2011 2:41 AM
558	20000	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 AM
559	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:42 AM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
560	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:52 AM
561	10000	Feb 22, 2011 3:54 AM
562	10000	Feb 22, 2011 3:54 AM
563	35000	Feb 22, 2011 4:28 AM
564	50000	Feb 22, 2011 4:43 AM
565	25000	Feb 22, 2011 12:51 PM
566	5000	Feb 22, 2011 1:17 PM
567	75000	Feb 22, 2011 1:23 PM
568	10000	Feb 22, 2011 1:54 PM
569	20000	Feb 22, 2011 1:55 PM
570	10000	Feb 22, 2011 1:59 PM
571	25000	Feb 22, 2011 2:10 PM
572	15000	Feb 22, 2011 2:41 PM
573	5000	Feb 22, 2011 2:42 PM
574	75000	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
575	30000	Feb 22, 2011 2:54 PM
576	25000	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
577	25000	Feb 22, 2011 2:58 PM
578	10000	Feb 22, 2011 2:58 PM
579	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:12 PM
580	10000	Feb 22, 2011 3:13 PM
581	50000	Feb 22, 2011 3:14 PM
582	10000	Feb 22, 2011 3:15 PM
583	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:20 PM
584	15000	Feb 22, 2011 3:23 PM
585	30000	Feb 22, 2011 3:23 PM
586	10000	Feb 22, 2011 3:23 PM
587	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
588	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:26 PM
589	75000	Feb 22, 2011 3:29 PM
590	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:29 PM
591	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:35 PM
592	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:35 PM
593	15000	Feb 22, 2011 3:37 PM
594	5000	Feb 22, 2011 3:39 PM
595	30000	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
596	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:46 PM
597	20000	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
598	15000	Feb 22, 2011 3:59 PM
599	25000	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 PM
600	25000	Feb 22, 2011 4:34 PM
601	10000	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
602	25000	Feb 22, 2011 4:43 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
603	10000	Feb 22, 2011 5:09 PM
604	10000	Feb 22, 2011 5:17 PM
605	50000	Feb 22, 2011 5:28 PM
606	10000	Feb 22, 2011 5:28 PM
607	5000	Feb 22, 2011 5:57 PM
608	5000	Feb 22, 2011 6:01 PM
609	7500	Feb 22, 2011 6:19 PM
610	5000	Feb 22, 2011 6:20 PM
611	15000	Feb 22, 2011 7:07 PM
612	35000	Feb 22, 2011 7:10 PM
613	10000	Feb 22, 2011 7:15 PM
614	50000	Feb 22, 2011 7:30 PM
615	30000	Feb 22, 2011 8:05 PM
616	10000	Feb 22, 2011 8:57 PM
617	5000	Feb 22, 2011 9:29 PM
618	30000	Feb 22, 2011 9:44 PM
619	10000	Feb 22, 2011 9:46 PM
620	25000	Feb 22, 2011 9:59 PM
621	25000	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM
622	10000	Feb 22, 2011 10:35 PM
623	10000	Feb 22, 2011 11:25 PM
624	75000	Feb 23, 2011 3:55 AM
625	10000	Feb 23, 2011 12:04 PM
626	10000	Feb 23, 2011 1:09 PM
627	25000	Feb 23, 2011 2:02 PM
628	5000	Feb 23, 2011 2:25 PM
629	50000	Feb 23, 2011 3:10 PM
630	200000	Feb 23, 2011 3:23 PM
631	20000	Feb 23, 2011 4:20 PM
632	15000	Feb 23, 2011 4:31 PM
633	10000	Feb 23, 2011 5:06 PM
634	20000	Feb 23, 2011 5:12 PM
635	10000	Feb 23, 2011 5:42 PM
636	25000	Feb 23, 2011 5:44 PM
637	10000	Feb 23, 2011 6:48 PM
638	50000	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
639	25000	Feb 23, 2011 9:05 PM
640	10000	Feb 23, 2011 9:43 PM
641	10000	Feb 23, 2011 11:46 PM
642	1000	Feb 24, 2011 12:50 AM
643	5000	Feb 24, 2011 3:53 AM
644	30000	Feb 24, 2011 5:36 PM
645	25000	Feb 24, 2011 5:42 PM

2. If Iowa were to implement a separate civil justice system to streamline the

Value limitation \$:		
646	20000	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
647	10000	Feb 24, 2011 7:53 PM
648	15000	Feb 25, 2011 1:23 PM
649	3000	Feb 25, 2011 4:22 PM
650	25000	Feb 25, 2011 7:56 PM
651	20000	Feb 25, 2011 8:46 PM
652	10000	Feb 25, 2011 10:13 PM
653	25000	Feb 26, 2011 8:34 PM
654	25000	Feb 27, 2011 4:01 PM
655	25000	Feb 27, 2011 6:26 PM
656	15000	Feb 27, 2011 7:01 PM
657	25000	Feb 28, 2011 1:14 AM
658	15000	Feb 28, 2011 2:26 AM
659	25000	Feb 28, 2011 3:13 AM
660	50000	Feb 28, 2011 3:01 PM
661	5000	Feb 28, 2011 5:49 PM
662	10000	Feb 28, 2011 8:41 PM
663	50000	Feb 28, 2011 9:37 PM
664	20000	Feb 28, 2011 9:44 PM
665	25000	Feb 28, 2011 10:03 PM
666	25000	Feb 28, 2011 11:34 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
1	civil rights Section1983	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
2	Family Law matters - dissolution, custody, and child support matters	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
3	foreclosure	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
4	Family Law Probate	Feb 7, 2011 8:00 PM
5	family law and criminal law.	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
6	contracts, family law, criminal law, probate	Feb 7, 2011 8:04 PM
7	criminal, domestic/family, business, personal injury	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
8	veterans courts	Feb 7, 2011 8:07 PM
9	family law	Feb 7, 2011 8:08 PM
10	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
11	Family Law Court	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
12	criminal, domestic	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
13	Municipal Law Insurance \$10,000 or less \$10,001 - \$29,999 \$30,000 - \$49,999 \$15,000 - 30,000	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
14	Dissolution	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
15	the PAAB has done much to get property tax cases out of the dist cts. Other tax matter could benefit the same way.	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
16	family law; criminal law; complex civil litigation	Feb 7, 2011 8:13 PM
17	Business	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
18	Maybe drugs, family law, domestic abuse	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
19	domestic relations/domestic violence	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
20	family law drug crimes	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
21	work comp	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
22	probate	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
23	Labor and employment, insurance, real estate	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
24	family law	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
25	Family law	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
26	Government practice - Writ of Cert. cases	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
27	motor vehicle accidents, slip and falls,	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
28	Divorce and custody	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
29	I believe it could be beneficial in more populous counties (Polk, Linn, Johnson, etc.) but in the rural areas, it makes absolutely no sense.	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
30	FAMILY	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
31	family law probate and real estate	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
32	med mal construction	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
33	medical and professional malpractice; class actions;	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
34	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
35	Criminal	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
36	business, family	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
37	family law	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
38	Family law (child support)	Feb 7, 2011 8:38 PM
39	family	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
40	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
41	Probate	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
42	Family Law, Probate	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
43	there should not be specialty courts developed	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
44	Divorce, foreclosure	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
45	Municipal infratons	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
46	corporations law	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
47	Family law (not just juvenile court, but especially cases involving child custody - but not have a judge who holds the bias [as demonstrated by their prior rulings] that a child belongs with its mother, no matter what) - it is ridiculous that if you have a dispute regarding child custody in either a dissolution of marriage or domestic relations case, that it takes at least a year, and sometimes two years to get to trial (after being "bumped" several times)	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
48	motor vehncle accidents and contract disputes where damages will be less than \$20,000; child custody cases	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
49	family law	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
50	DOM	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
51	I do not think it feasible in rural Iowa.	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
52	Housing issues (evictions) domestic abuse protective orders family law	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
53	criminal, dissolution, child custody, child support	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
54	Criminal Family Commercial	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
55	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
56	Labor/employment	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
57	Family Law, it seems, would be especially suited for a specialty court	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
58	criminal, civil, domestic	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
59	familyl law	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
60	Family (including child support), real property/foreclosure, drug offenses, other criminal offenses	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
61	Family law court	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
62	business	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
63	Complex business litigation Foreclosures	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
64	product liability malpractice probate disputes	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
65	family law	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
66	family law matters	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
67	Contract Disputes-general- Construction cases Family law Criminal Appeals to Dist. Ct. You can subdivide these catagories	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
68	probate employment juvenile	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
69	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
70	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
71	Commercial (UCC), Contracts, Personal Injury	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
72	family law	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
73	Family, Criminal	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
74	family law	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
75	No comment	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
76	family law, malpractice, tort and contract claims	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
77	I believe it would be beneficial in medical negligence, employment discrimination, and other areas, but don't trust the bench to develop the needed special skill/knowledge.	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
78	patent	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
79	complex litigation where Judges with expertise would preside.	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
80	personal injury auto collision; medical malpractice	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
81	Family law (Relatively minor) torts and contracts disputes	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
82	family law	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
83	probate, owi and assault, domestic	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
84	probate real estate personal injury divorce	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
85	family law	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
86	Consider mandatory arbitration for cases less than \$50,000	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
87	consumer collections including residential foreclosures	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
88	family law, criminal, probate	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
89	Debt Collection	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
90	dissolution; collections	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
91	Family Law Criminal Law	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
92	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
93	Foreclosure and other real property disputes. Commercial disputes.	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
94	Family law, including Guardianships & Conservatorships, Criminal law, Civil law, Juvenile law & Probate.	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
95	Family comes to mind but tort could also benefit although I DO NOT have tort experience, that is opinion only	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
96	family law	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
97	Construction defects Malpractice product liability	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
98	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
99	Family law	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
100	Worker's Compensation Appeals Administrative Appeals	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
101	Family Criminal	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
102	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
103	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
104	drug courts juvenile court domestic violence	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
105	Debt Collection. This is the largest single cause of action in Iowa.	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
106	family law, criminal law and civil law should be separate from each other.	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
107	family law, contracts, real estate	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
108	Medical Malpractice	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
109	Domestic Criminal Juvenile-already done	Feb 7, 2011 10:03 PM
110	prisoner litigation medical/mental health malpractice	Feb 7, 2011 10:12 PM
111	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
112	domestic relations, probate	Feb 7, 2011 10:16 PM
113	mental health; child custody disputes	Feb 7, 2011 10:23 PM
114	family/custody	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
115	criminal, family law	Feb 7, 2011 10:29 PM
116	Construction and business litigation	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
117	Family law	Feb 7, 2011 10:40 PM
118	Family, Juvenile	Feb 7, 2011 10:44 PM
119	Complex commercial	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
120	Family law, Employment law, Business/Commercial disputes, Enviornmental law, Criminal law	Feb 7, 2011 10:51 PM
121	Divorce	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
122	unknown	Feb 7, 2011 10:58 PM
123	trust probate real estate title, boundary and easements	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
124	Real Estate	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
125	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 11:02 PM
126	Family Law	Feb 7, 2011 11:08 PM
127	Business	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
128	drug court	Feb 7, 2011 11:18 PM
129	Family law	Feb 7, 2011 11:43 PM
130	family law	Feb 7, 2011 11:55 PM
131	Business law & complex commercial transactions	Feb 8, 2011 12:06 AM
132	Drugs, other crimes, constitutional/ civil rights, commercial, domestic.	Feb 8, 2011 12:08 AM
133	family law	Feb 8, 2011 12:12 AM
134	Civil v. Criminal Domestic and family law issues Commercial disputes	Feb 8, 2011 12:13 AM
135	family law, juvenile, probate, real estate, torts, criminal	Feb 8, 2011 12:32 AM
136	Family law	Feb 8, 2011 12:45 AM
137	Divorce	Feb 8, 2011 1:30 AM
138	Workers Compensation Abolish the agency and commissioner's office substituting a Div of the District Court with appeal to 3 judge panels by region before appeal to the Supreme Court	Feb 8, 2011 1:41 AM
139	none	Feb 8, 2011 1:48 AM
140	Uncontested divorce, traffic and auto accident, judicial review,	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 AM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
141	Business Courts, Complex Litigation	Feb 8, 2011 2:26 AM
142	Certain types of business disputes	Feb 8, 2011 2:44 AM
143	Personal Injury	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 AM
144	Consumer Rights	Feb 8, 2011 4:11 AM
145	Probate, Family law, criminal	Feb 8, 2011 4:21 AM
146	Negligence Intentional Torts Contracts Dissolution	Feb 8, 2011 4:59 AM
147	Mental Health/Drug courts, family courts	Feb 8, 2011 1:16 PM
148	UCC, Environmental, Real Property, Mass Toxic Tort	Feb 8, 2011 1:20 PM
149	family law criminal	Feb 8, 2011 1:37 PM
150	MED MAL BUSINESS	Feb 8, 2011 2:02 PM
151	Family law (dissolutions, custody, etc.), Probate	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 PM
152	Family Law Construction/Engineering/Architecture/etc.	Feb 8, 2011 2:33 PM
153	probate, landlord-tenant	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
154	Securities; Divorce	Feb 8, 2011 3:03 PM
155	Family law and foreclosures	Feb 8, 2011 3:08 PM
156	Product liability, construction & securities	Feb 8, 2011 3:12 PM
157	family law	Feb 8, 2011 3:53 PM
158	Family law, specifically custody disputes	Feb 8, 2011 3:57 PM
159	business,	Feb 8, 2011 3:59 PM
160	Family law, foreclosure	Feb 8, 2011 4:01 PM
161	Please take a look at RSVP in Blackhawk county. That county is MUCH better since it has this service! Most Defendants deny/dispute the complaint because they simply do not have enough money to pay it all at once.	Feb 8, 2011 4:19 PM
162	Family Law	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 PM
163	family law	Feb 8, 2011 4:27 PM
164	Dissolution proceedings. Claims under \$20,000.00. Foreclosure proceedings.	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
165	Landlord Tenant, collection	Feb 8, 2011 4:55 PM
166	Family, criminal, other civil	Feb 8, 2011 5:51 PM
167	Family, Criminal, Civil	Feb 8, 2011 5:55 PM
168	Crimoinal Family Law everything else	Feb 8, 2011 6:14 PM
169	ALL family law: divorce, custody, child support, show-cause actions, domestic abuse, juvenile	Feb 8, 2011 6:44 PM
170	family law; business contract and securities disputes; criminal law	Feb 8, 2011 6:46 PM
171	family, criminal	Feb 8, 2011 6:56 PM
172	commercial contract, including landlord tennant	Feb 8, 2011 7:26 PM
173	Drug cases, financial disputes including foreclosure	Feb 8, 2011 7:36 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
174	Family Law	Feb 8, 2011 8:48 PM
175	Domestic Abuse	Feb 8, 2011 9:25 PM
176	criminal family juvenile other civil	Feb 8, 2011 10:36 PM
177	Probate and real estate	Feb 8, 2011 10:57 PM
178	family, administrative law	Feb 8, 2011 11:14 PM
179	Family Law, Administrative Law	Feb 9, 2011 1:01 AM
180	Family - Dissolution; Family - Modification;	Feb 9, 2011 1:48 AM
181	small claim intellectual property	Feb 9, 2011 4:11 AM
182	Family courts	Feb 9, 2011 6:30 PM
183	no opinion	Feb 9, 2011 7:19 PM
184	family law	Feb 9, 2011 7:35 PM
185	business and commercial litigation	Feb 9, 2011 7:45 PM
186	Family court Probate court Civil above \$50000 Civil below \$50000 Criminal	Feb 9, 2011 8:51 PM
187	family law probate	Feb 9, 2011 9:25 PM
188	commercial/business family law	Feb 9, 2011 9:39 PM
189	N/A	Feb 9, 2011 9:50 PM
190	family law, patent law, environmental law, bankruptcy,	Feb 9, 2011 11:19 PM
191	family law	Feb 10, 2011 2:45 PM
192	Medical malpractice, business contracts	Feb 10, 2011 6:01 PM
193	rural areas	Feb 10, 2011 6:42 PM
194	criminal law tax law family law	Feb 10, 2011 7:00 PM
195	Family Law	Feb 10, 2011 10:26 PM
196	Family law.	Feb 10, 2011 10:48 PM
197	landlord tenant corporation disputes	Feb 10, 2011 10:54 PM
198	Corporations Family	Feb 11, 2011 1:00 AM
199	Domestic Abuse	Feb 11, 2011 1:46 AM
200	family law	Feb 11, 2011 2:35 AM
201	Family Law Complex Products Liability	Feb 11, 2011 3:20 AM
202	Evictions Real Property disputes	Feb 11, 2011 3:16 PM
203	Complex Commercial Disputes; UCC	Feb 11, 2011 3:22 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
204	Implement Iowa Code Title VI Human Services under Division V with expanded District oversight.	Feb 11, 2011 5:41 PM
205	commercial disputes	Feb 11, 2011 8:50 PM
206	Collections, Foreclosure, Personal Injury, Medical malpractice	Feb 12, 2011 1:33 PM
207	Professional Negligence and product liability	Feb 12, 2011 2:24 PM
208	family law--dissolutions	Feb 12, 2011 4:15 PM
209	probate, accident, contracts, real estate	Feb 12, 2011 7:37 PM
210	debt collection	Feb 12, 2011 8:54 PM
211	Dissolution of marriage should be removed from the adversarial system and moved into a system that focuses on mediation and arbitration. Valuable judicial resources, in my opinion, are tied in deciding who gets the pots and pans. Such a system might also handle child custody issues better than the present adversarial approach.	Feb 13, 2011 4:10 AM
212	other states have successfully created courts for collections cases which actually make money	Feb 14, 2011 2:42 AM
213	Dissolution	Feb 14, 2011 1:37 PM
214	Veterans' court Drug court Homeless court	Feb 14, 2011 3:13 PM
215	Criminal Domestic Civil Damages	Feb 14, 2011 9:49 PM
216	Collection cases.	Feb 14, 2011 10:18 PM
217	Environmental, domestic (dissolution, custody, support)	Feb 14, 2011 11:34 PM
218	Family Law	Feb 15, 2011 2:53 PM
219	Landlord/Tenant Debtor/Creditor	Feb 15, 2011 4:59 PM
220	Family Law, Personal Injury	Feb 15, 2011 8:20 PM
221	Family law	Feb 15, 2011 10:08 PM
222	None	Feb 15, 2011 11:25 PM
223	Family law (especially dissolution of marriages), Probate	Feb 16, 2011 2:53 PM
224	probate, family law, small claims for values under \$25,000	Feb 16, 2011 4:58 PM
225	Commercial transactions and business torts	Feb 16, 2011 11:35 PM
226	car accidents, divorces, other family law matters	Feb 17, 2011 8:13 PM
227	family divorce	Feb 17, 2011 9:23 PM
228	Divorce and Family Law matters.	Feb 20, 2011 4:46 PM
229	foreclosure	Feb 20, 2011 9:36 PM
230	employment law	Feb 20, 2011 10:11 PM
231	family workers comp appeals	Feb 21, 2011 1:45 PM
232	rental of property	Feb 21, 2011 8:36 PM
233	Family law, Probate	Feb 21, 2011 8:48 PM
234	real property, contracts,	Feb 21, 2011 8:48 PM
235	Family & Domestic (allowing for interaction and coordination wjuvenile and criminal if necessary).	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
236	family law, landlord-tenant, debtor/creditor	Feb 21, 2011 8:50 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
237	Criminal, Dissolution; Probate	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
238	Child Support Recovery cases	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
239	Family	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
240	Business-Commercial disputes	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
241	construction complex commerical litigation	Feb 21, 2011 8:59 PM
242	Probate, family,	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
243	Criminal Dissolution	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
244	family, probate, criminal	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
245	Divorce Probate	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
246	domestic relaations	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
247	business courts	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
248	Famuly law/divorce Probate Criminal	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
249	Family law	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
250	Divorce	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
251	construction, home or commercial	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
252	commercial litigation, divorce	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
253	Certainly probate and perhaps other areas, including commercial disputes. Many judges come from a criminal background or tort litigation back ground and do not have adequate business law experience.	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
254	family law,	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
255	civil rights /employment law, family law, personal injury/professional malpractice	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
256	Probate, Family, Criminal, Commercial Transactions, Personal Injury/Medical Malpractice	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
257	As a basic matter, a division between civil and criminal makes sense. Also, a separate family law court should be considered.	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
258	Family Law Probate	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
259	family law	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
260	Family law	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
261	construction	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
262	Family & Domestic (with procedures in place to coordinate with related juvenile and criminal proceedings)	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
263	not sure it works outside of large metropolitan areas	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
264	Disputes involving corporations, such as shareholder and franchise matters.	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
265	Family Law Real Estate/ Probate	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
266	medical malpractice	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
267	dissolution/custody	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
268	construction	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
269	family law estate and probate real property	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
270	family law issues criminal	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
271	Commercial (Contracts & Construction) Probate	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
272	Car accidents, medical costs, custody to name a few	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
273	Family Law	Feb 21, 2011 10:14 PM
274	Perhaps work comp and unemployment could be heard in local court houses rather than have a separate work comp and unemployment division. Same rules would still apply, but we wouldn't need an entirely separate agency for it. Each district could have as many comp judges as it thought it needed to get a handle on its own number of cases.	Feb 21, 2011 10:14 PM
275	workman's compensation and other administrative appeals to the district court	Feb 21, 2011 10:18 PM
276	Cases involong complicated financial matters	Feb 21, 2011 10:39 PM
277	Drug Cases, Family law, Business Law	Feb 21, 2011 10:47 PM
278	small value personal injury and small value property damage	Feb 21, 2011 10:58 PM
279	Family Law	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
280	family law, probate	Feb 21, 2011 11:03 PM
281	Domestic relations court	Feb 21, 2011 11:03 PM
282	Probate matters; medical malpractice; personal injury; family law	Feb 21, 2011 11:09 PM
283	Complex lengthy litigation	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
284	family	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
285	domestic relations	Feb 21, 2011 11:26 PM
286	There are many possible areas.	Feb 21, 2011 11:26 PM
287	Med-mal should be reformed to resemble worker's compensation actions.	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
288	Equity	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
289	I do not think Iowa should develop specialty courts.	Feb 21, 2011 11:51 PM
290	Family Court	Feb 21, 2011 11:52 PM
291	Landlord tenant, medical malpractice, defamation	Feb 21, 2011 11:52 PM
292	Family Law, Probate	Feb 22, 2011 12:02 AM
293	Child Custody Mechanic's Liens Medical Malpractice	Feb 22, 2011 12:10 AM
294	family court	Feb 22, 2011 1:33 AM
295	Landlord/Tenant disputes; Collection matters; domestic relations	Feb 22, 2011 1:37 AM
296	family law	Feb 22, 2011 2:00 AM
297	Traffic; corruption of state and local officials;and mental health commitments.	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 AM
298	enforcement of loans and other types of security agreements	Feb 22, 2011 2:41 AM
299	Divorce Employment	Feb 22, 2011 3:42 AM
300	divorce and custody	Feb 22, 2011 3:54 AM
301	FAMILY LAW	Feb 22, 2011 4:18 AM
302	Personal Injury	Feb 22, 2011 4:43 AM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
303	N/A	Feb 22, 2011 1:17 PM
304	Professional Liability; Products Liability	Feb 22, 2011 1:23 PM
305	medical malpractice, construction	Feb 22, 2011 1:55 PM
306	Drug, domestic abuse, family	Feb 22, 2011 1:59 PM
307	Family Law Criminal Law Civil Litigation	Feb 22, 2011 2:10 PM
308	Employment discrimination and civil rights	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
309	personal injury, employment, domestic relations, administrative appeals, tort (not pi)	Feb 22, 2011 2:52 PM
310	Administrative appeals Probate Real estate Torts	Feb 22, 2011 3:12 PM
311	Family matters/juvenile delinquency Housing	Feb 22, 2011 3:20 PM
312	Governmental Landuse Decisions Civil Rights	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
313	Breach of contract disputes car accident/ accident liability issues	Feb 22, 2011 3:26 PM
314	Commercial Disputes	Feb 22, 2011 3:29 PM
315	Family law, collections	Feb 22, 2011 3:29 PM
316	family law	Feb 22, 2011 3:35 PM
317	Family (Child support) Personal injury	Feb 22, 2011 3:37 PM
318	medical malpractice, auto accidents	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
319	Family law probate	Feb 22, 2011 3:59 PM
320	Construction	Feb 22, 2011 4:34 PM
321	Family law	Feb 22, 2011 4:40 PM
322	domestic relations employment simple commercial criminal	Feb 22, 2011 4:43 PM
323	Mental health courts	Feb 22, 2011 5:17 PM
324	Family law, criminal law	Feb 22, 2011 5:28 PM
325	Family Law	Feb 22, 2011 5:28 PM
326	Construction Medical malpractice Commercial disputes	Feb 22, 2011 7:30 PM
327	family	Feb 22, 2011 8:05 PM
328	Family Law	Feb 22, 2011 9:29 PM
329	Business Law Trust and Estate Law Criminal Law	Feb 22, 2011 9:46 PM
330	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW PROBATE & TRUST	Feb 22, 2011 9:59 PM
331	civil, criminal, juvenile, probate	Feb 22, 2011 10:20 PM

4. If you believe it would be beneficial for Iowa to develop specialty courts in

Response Text		
332	Family law, intellectual property, probate	Feb 22, 2011 10:35 PM
333	BUSINESS MENTAL HEALTH SUBSTANCE ABUSE	Feb 23, 2011 3:55 AM
334	Taxation Business contracts and torts	Feb 23, 2011 1:09 PM
335	FAMILY LAW	Feb 23, 2011 3:10 PM
336	Indigent Divorces	Feb 23, 2011 6:48 PM
337	business courts, non-adversarial process divorce courts	Feb 23, 2011 8:08 PM
338	business/commercial litigation, family law	Feb 23, 2011 9:05 PM
339	Drug Courts, Domestic Violence Courts (See Minnesota)	Feb 24, 2011 3:53 AM
340	probate (not done in District 1) family law	Feb 24, 2011 7:26 PM
341	Drug Courts	Feb 24, 2011 7:53 PM
342	domestic relations (including domestic abuse)	Feb 25, 2011 4:22 PM
343	insurance, contracts	Feb 25, 2011 7:56 PM
344	Already have i.e. probate, bankruptcy	Feb 25, 2011 8:46 PM
345	property damage only; collections	Feb 25, 2011 10:13 PM
346	Family; Domestic Abuse (SEPARATE from Family); expand Juvenile	Feb 26, 2011 8:34 PM
347	family law	Feb 27, 2011 7:01 PM
348	n/a	Feb 28, 2011 1:14 AM
349	Requires more discussion	Feb 28, 2011 5:06 PM
350	Criminal. Government affairs.	Feb 28, 2011 5:49 PM
351	Commercial disputes Land Disputes Family Law	Feb 28, 2011 10:03 PM
352	Family, Probate	Feb 28, 2011 11:34 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
1	Elimination of oral arguments for summary judgments, motions to compel, pretrial motions to dismiss.	Feb 7, 2011 8:02 PM
2	create right to take not more than two pre-filing depositions with appropriate safeguards	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
3	change or enforce summary judgment rules of procedure to eliminate undisputed facts from trial through order deeming such facts as established and providing a written stipulation or order of such undisputed facts be submitted to the jury or court as background for the submission of those issues and facts that are disputed. See Rule 1.981(4); requiring stricter observance of requirements that party resiting summary judgment do so in accordance with Rule and not come to hearing with BS and come-lately arguments designed to avoid outcome, judgment as a matter of law for ineffective resistance and ppush the entire controversy into trial on weak, fabricated or non-existent arguments.	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
4	create MANDATORY penalties for failure to comply with discovery, especially after rulings on motions to compel	Feb 7, 2011 8:13 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

	Response Text	
5	adopt FRCP 4 procedures for service of process	Feb 7, 2011 8:13 PM
6	Provide for electronic filing of all pleadings, as in federal court.	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
7	1.414	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
8	Make it easier to obtain orders compelling discovery and incorporate stiffer penalties for unreasonable refusals to respond to discovery requests.	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
9	Summary Judgment is abused by large defense firms. They use it as a tool to increase billings.	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
10	I would make certified copies of medical records and letters signed by health care providers exempt from hearsay and admissible. This would save medical deposition costs and make trials shorter.	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
11	Allowing foundation for some records to be established by affidavit.	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
12	Make judges hearing bench trials retire to deliberate and answer a verdict form just like a jury does and do away with findings of fact and conclusions of law. This would give litigants a swift and certain option without the expense of a jury trial	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
13	Limitation on extent of discovery	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
14	The production of documents is time consuming and not cost-effective for the individual litigant who has very limited resources and sometimes a reduced education level or ability to understand.	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
15	sanctions for failure to timely provide discovery and failure to provide good faith discovery	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
16	I would renumber the Iowa Rules to correspond with the Federal Rules	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
17	Schedule civil trials much sooner than at present.	Feb 7, 2011 8:36 PM
18	Uniform forms statewide, not by judicial district or county.	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
19	Rule 125 should follow federal rules and require expert reports, not just names	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
20	I would change a lot of rules which require court approval (e.g., amendment of petition) to a rule that says the action is valid unless there is a timely motion to strike.	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
21	Limitations on discovery	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
22	1.302(5) because the turn around time to get a return of service from the sheriff's departments is growing due to budget cuts. Routinely I have to seek an extension on my cases even when I timely seeking service. These extensions take both the attorney's time and the court's time. The number of days should be extended to 120 days.	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
23	Removing the rule giving defendants an additional ten days to answer before a default will be entered when they have already had twenty days to answer and ignored the original notice that was served upon them.	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
24	Readopt the Special Appearance so that jurisdiction issues could be more effectively raised and resolved at the beginning of the case.	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
25	Don't know	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
26	Eliminate the 90-day waiting period for uncontested, or default, dissolutions.	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
27	Late settlement fee IRCP 1.909 Settlement should be encouraged not discouraged. A jury demand should have its own filing fee to cover the cost of calling in a jury.	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
28	The statute concerning offers of judgment should be amended so that costs are defined to include reasonable attorney fees. In states that do so, the rule has teeth and forces parties to realistically value their cases. This change alone would impact the number of trials held in the state.	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

	Response Text	
29	I would change the discovery rules to be more similar to the Federal rules. See Federal Rule 26.	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
30	Motions for summary judgment rule should be amended to require that such motions be filed not less than 120 days prior to trial.	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
31	Extend the time to respond to interrogatories to 60 days. Rarely are they completed within 30 days which results in the need for the attorneys to discuss extensions and often seek an enrolled order reflecting the extension.	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
32	Change Rule 1.442 to allow electronic filing of pleadings and orders.	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
33	no opinion	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
34	I would make mediation mandatory in all civil cases, unless there is good cause (such as domestic abuse) to not try to mediate a case. There should be a mechanism for waiving the costs of mediation or a sliding fee scale for low-income Iowans.	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
35	Prohibit discovery of draft opinions of experts, adopt the federal rules and its numbering system with a few minor variations.	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
36	I would like to see a rule that requires all summary judgment materials , both for and against, be submitted to the court in a time frame that would allow the court to rule on the motion no less than two months prior to the start of trial	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
37	Not sure	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
38	limiting discovery in matters involving lower amounts in controvers	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
39	none	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
40	filing petition electronically. For simplicity and docket control;	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
41	No time standards for processing cases to trial. I could give more but you limit it to one.	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
42	A method for Plaintiffs to avail a "fast-track" upon credible showing of case suitability-unfortunately, many trials are scheduled around the calendars of attorneys whose cases resolve by settlement in 90% of their caseload.	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
43	Very strong penalties for missed discovery deadlines.	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
44	Limit their scope to the Federal Rules and have the numbering system track with the Federal Rules of Ciivil Procedure; streamline the motion practice portion and remove any "substantive" rules from the Rules of Civil Procedure; eliminate the distinction between the "law" and the "equity" dockets	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
45	no comment	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
46	adopt the Federal Rule which requires disclosure by each party of documents which relate to the issues in the case	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
47	Relax rules on admissibility of expert reports and medical expense--use gross medical expense as recoverable amount similar to how it is done in Nebraska.	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
48	discovery	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
49	Use of mandatory mediation or arbitration are the only ways I know of at this time to speed up the process and make it less expensive.	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
50	insurance companies should be required to pay attorney fees when they lose cases	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
51	All the requirements of summary judgment	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
52	adopt manditory ADR and filing pleadings ect only when an issue becomes contested, with the party filing to pay the filing costs, which are much higher than those at present	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
53	1.508 - certification and supplementation of experts is too often used as sword instead of shield by those not truly surprised by content of expert's opinion. Results in wasteful motions to strike or limit.	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
54	Clarify and further define alternative service rules to be less subjective	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
55	I'd change to e-filing in all counties as soon as possible.	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
56	Can't think of one.	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
57	None	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
58	Require initial disclosures like in Federal Court.	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
59	I do not know how changing the rules would accomplish much - the fact is that most people cannot afford attorneys so the courts become the province of the wealthy and are often pitted against people - the majority of people - who cannot afford to defend themselves or to prosecute just causes. I really think this is what is behind the recall of Justices. There is much underlying fear and resentment of the Courts because they are used to foreclose on people, to collect debts, enforce silly fines and lots of criminal penalties, some of which are necessary and some of which are not. Every contact with the legal system is painful and unhappy. Give this fear and resentment a cause to coalesce around and you have a recall.	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
60	In all civil litigation, family law and other civil litigation, the Court should enter an order at the time of filing requiring both parties to disclose records and documents that everyone knows will be necessary to evaluate the case; e.g. in a personal injury case the parties should be required to exchange all medical records, medical bills; lost wages documentation; tax returns etc. In family law the Court should order disclosure similar to that required in the 6th judicial district. In family law, an injunction should be entered in every case at the time of filing prohibiting the parties from depleting assets; changing health insurance, life insurance and asset beneficiaries or titles; from hiding children; from running up debt-6th district has a basic form that could be enhanced. This would take a lot of work off the court in signing these orders and administering discovery disputes	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
61	I would not "change" any rules, but would instead request that the deadlines set forth in the rules be strictly followed, such as the deadlines for expert witnesses. As a plaintiff attorney, it is NOT cost effective to follow the rules yourself when defense attorneys are continuously allowed late filings and opinions with no repercussions. We, then, have to spend more time and money on the file.	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
62	I tend to think the system works pretty well with the current rules.	Feb 7, 2011 9:59 PM
63	Rule 1.909 - Fee for late settlement of jury trial - discourages settlement	Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
64	Require non binding arbitration for claims under \$75,000 with provision if one of the parties rejects the arbiters award the rejecting party pays attorney fees and costs if verdict is more less than the the arbiters award rejected by a party.	Feb 7, 2011 10:12 PM
65	Practice is in federal courts outside the state of Iowa.	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
66	Placing burden on party who does not receive discovery to file motion to compel. Burden should be on party receiving discovery requests to respond.	Feb 7, 2011 10:14 PM
67	Mandatory mediation	Feb 7, 2011 10:17 PM
68	Require standard exchanges of information without discovery requests as in the U.S. District Courts	Feb 7, 2011 10:18 PM
69	special assignment of garden variety tort cases;	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
70	loser pays all costs including full cost of experts and other litigation costs. Right now, Plaintiffs are at a distinct disadvantage and are constantly settling their claims at a reduced value because of the inability to pay and receive reimbursement for litigation costs.	Feb 7, 2011 10:29 PM
71	limit/restrict open ended discovery requests	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
72	Allow attorney fees to the prevailing party & make the offer for confession of judgment similar to the federal rule (attorney fees are cut off as well as costs ie attorney fees are included in "costs")	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

	Response Text	
73	I would lengthen the amount of time to respond to discovery. 30 days is entirely too short to adequately prepare responses, which then turns into motions to compel and additional back and forth with the attorneys that I believe is unnecessarily expensive to clients. Instead the timeframe should be more realistic from the outset.	Feb 7, 2011 10:38 PM
74	1. An affidavit by someone with personal knowledge of the facts should accompany each motion for summary judgment. 2. A person should be able to file a petition to vacate in a small claims case in the same way and for the same reasons as in a district court case. Maybe it would be more efficient to allow the person to file under the same docket number but still require them to personally serve the petition to vacate.	Feb 7, 2011 10:41 PM
75	Limit discovery	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
76	Make plaintiffs provide all documentation of the claim to the defendant within 30 days after answer or face dismissal	Feb 7, 2011 10:43 PM
77	Allow counsel to interview a personal injury plaintiff's treating physicians without opposing counsel present, and require the plaintiff to sign waivers to allow that.	Feb 7, 2011 10:44 PM
78	1.503 needs to be amended to be like Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(2)(C). Plaintiffs' lawyers in employment cases abuse the broad scope of discovery in employment cases to make litigation cost-prohibitive for employers, in order to leverage settlement.	Feb 7, 2011 10:55 PM
79	Reports of Experts Should be able to be submitted like work comp cases - to save time and expense of depositions	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
80	eliminate interrogatories and rely on depositions and Request for admissions	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
81	I frankly cannot think of a rule that, if changed, would result in a substantive difference.	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
82	Get rid of Rule 1.909 that "penalizes" parties for settling on the courthouse steps. In my opinion, the rule was written by someone in an ivory tower who does NOT understand the realities of litigation. The truth is, some people simply will not settle until they literally are at the courthouse door or on the steps. In some cases that is the "grease" which allows the right thing to happen; that is when reality sinks in and things get done. A penalizing court rule will not change human nature. Imposing a \$1000 "fine" is counterproductive to true negotiations and I have seen it stop negotiations in a small case when that amount made a difference in how much could be paid. Better to pay it to a settling party than the court. Also, is Rule 1.944 really needed? It is mostly a "trap" that is sprung for the unwary. There just has to be a better way.	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
83	Encourage the use of motions to dismiss for frivolous cases	Feb 7, 2011 11:20 PM
84	Change the deadline for dispositive motions to 120 days before trial, statewide.	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
85	Eliminate Summary Judgment Motions. Most often they are denied. They take up too much of the court's time. Court's seldom have time to do justice to such motions.	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
86	none	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
87	Limit discovery	Feb 8, 2011 12:08 AM
88	Discovery should be conducted by judges and litigants should respond to requests rather than make them.	Feb 8, 2011 12:11 AM
89	Summary judgments should not be restricted to only those cases where there is no issue of fact.	Feb 8, 2011 12:34 AM
90	Eliminate complicated pretrial compliance for cases which have low dollar values.	Feb 8, 2011 12:45 AM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
91	Standardized procedures for telephone hearings on routine matters such as trial setting conferences, pretrial conferences	Feb 8, 2011 12:47 AM
92	2.15 subpoenas should be signed by the requesting attorney and served upon the opponent, without ever involving the clerk's office.	Feb 8, 2011 1:33 AM
93	Return the Rule for adjudication of law points, and enforce the Rules of Civil procedure. If the rules are enforced and defendants face sanctions for gamesmanship they may be more inclined to either negotiate in good faith or engage in ADR to resolve cases instead of profiting by being part of the problem by billable hours spent in game-playing they should focus on finding a solution.	Feb 8, 2011 1:46 AM
94	limit frivolous motions	Feb 8, 2011 2:23 AM
95	Limit the number of depositions and other types of discovery, such as interrogatories, in order to curb over use and abuse of discovery.	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 AM
96	In claims under 20000 only allow request for production of documents, interrogatories and subpoenas and require hearing set within 6 weeks of petition filing. Give the parties a choice of a trial by article three judge or a binding arbitration without formal rules of evidence by a panel of two arbitrators mutually selected by the attorneys, with the cost paid by the court system. ie privatize small cases to private judges and thereby relieve pressure on the appellate system. The arbitrators would not decide an amount but choose the proposed amount closest to reasonable.	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 AM
97	I would place limits on discovery so that parties do not spend so much money on this part of the process.	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 AM
98	I would significantly limit 1.904(2) motions	Feb 8, 2011 4:08 AM
99	Reinstate motion to adjudicate law points. Many legal issues whose early resolution would lead to settlement can no longer be effectively presented to the court.	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 AM
100	Doing away with boilerplate make-work Interrogatories that are often inapplicable, but sometimes apparently geared to build up "billable hours" would be very helpful	Feb 8, 2011 4:24 AM
101	Limit discovery in some common sense way through a conference with a judge or a referee of some sort to eliminate nuisance discovery and expedite adherence to rules by the delaying attorneys.	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 AM
102	Required use of mediation for all appropriate cases because it would decrease use and expense of civil courts	Feb 8, 2011 1:19 PM
103	Reduce discovery	Feb 8, 2011 1:21 PM
104	A more effective limit on pre trial discovery is needed.	Feb 8, 2011 2:08 PM
105	in mental health, the compulsory requirement of the physical presence of the physician at a trial	Feb 8, 2011 2:14 PM
106	Move the deadline for filing SJ further back from the trial date.	Feb 8, 2011 2:36 PM
107	When parties hire expert witnesses, they often instruct the experts not to create a report, forcing the other party to depose the expert. I would amend rule 1.508 to provide that if a party is to use an expert, the party must have the expert prepare a report on the matter the expert is to testify on and to provide that report to the other parties in the litigation.	Feb 8, 2011 2:38 PM
108	Limit interrogatories to specific subjects and information	Feb 8, 2011 2:46 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
109	Streamline the process for temporary matters hearings, in the 8th district, you submit affidavits 3 business days before the hearing. In some counties in the 5th, you just submit affidavits and argue in front of the judge and in some counties you have testimony. I like that you have to do mediation first in Polk County, I wish we had that in all counties. Otherwise, I wish we could just submit affidavits or at least have the process be the same in every county.	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 PM
110	sanctions for failure to respond to discovery	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
111	Limit discovery so it is not used solely as a weapon to heap work upon the opponent	Feb 8, 2011 3:27 PM
112	Having to personally appear at the court administrator's office to schedule a hearing is inefficient and outdated.	Feb 8, 2011 3:37 PM
113	It's not a rule, but I'd change the portion of pretrial conference order that requires filing of pretrial briefs. It's impossible to produce an accurate statement of facts for a brief before hearing parties & witnesses testimony at trial.	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
114	There should be a more strict imposition of discovery sanctions for abuse of process; that is, if you hold back information or fail to respond, the courts should be allowed and required to impose sanctions that include striking pleadings and striking witnesses or excluding evidence. This penalty should not be for minor technical violations but reserved for blatant discovery abuse.	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 PM
115	none	Feb 8, 2011 4:04 PM
116	Increase the amount for small claims and institute RSVP kinds of hearings on all small claims disputes. 99% of the time RSVP hearing settles disputes in our small claims cases. I believe the courts should allow summary judgment proceedings in small claims because usually the defendant is simply denying the complaint because they don't have the money to pay it all at once. It would also help to put on the required statutory answer for provided to the defendant that they could X admit...as well as deny. It would certainly help IF the answer the Defendant was given to sign required a reason for dispute.	Feb 8, 2011 4:25 PM
117	Guaranteed trial date	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
118	Require summary judgment motions to be filed and heard earlier and have a presumptive date before trial by which time ruling is required. For example, SJ motions to be filed 120 days before trial, heard 90 days before trial and ruled on 45 days before trial.	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 PM
119	Impose a mandatory case evaluation/mediation process, similar to Michigan's case evaluation system. See Michigan Court Rule 2.403. That system shifts the burden of attorney fees depending on the result of case evaluation and the parties' acceptance or rejection of that result.	Feb 8, 2011 5:06 PM
120	number of interrogatories and subparts.	Feb 8, 2011 5:39 PM
121	the rule for discovery responses should have built in consequences for failure to respond in 30 days like a fine of one hundred dollars for each day late that could not be waived by the court.	Feb 8, 2011 5:55 PM
122	None off hand	Feb 8, 2011 5:56 PM
123	I am not sure if it's actually by rule or just practice. The biggest improvement we could make would be to have settlement conferences earlier. Maybe an early (pre-discovery) meeting to identify disputed areas and see if the parties are dedicated to the case. As is now we spend much time and money and then find out it's not really that disputed	Feb 8, 2011 5:57 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
124	mediation requirements in DOMs do not work when mandated. This should be voluntary, otherwise it wastes time and money.	Feb 8, 2011 6:18 PM
125	limit the amount and time of discovery and require that questions be germane and relevant to the case.	Feb 8, 2011 6:52 PM
126	Requirement for mediation in all phases of dissolution cases, whether requested or not.	Feb 8, 2011 9:26 PM
127	Firm trial dates.	Feb 8, 2011 10:01 PM
128	Standard application of sanctions for obstructionist behavior by counsel.	Feb 8, 2011 10:38 PM
129	Rule prohibiting default against an incarcerated defendant without a defense.	Feb 8, 2011 11:15 PM
130	I would eliminate the rule allowing service of process on apartment managers. It is being abused by debt collectors to obtain default judgments without service. I would prohibit the use of Requests for Admissions by debt collectors against pro se litigants in collection cases. The procedure is being used to then obtain summary judgment solely because the pro se litigant does not understand the process. I would require mediators in small claims with pro se litigants to explain that they are not court personnel and are not affiliated with the court and that they do not know how a judge will or will not rule, and that they are not required to agree to and proposed settlement. Consumers are routinely confused by this. Landlords and debt collectors are repeat players in the mediation process and have an unfair advantage over unrepresented consumers.	Feb 9, 2011 3:17 AM
131	arbitration	Feb 9, 2011 4:13 AM
132	HAVING A RULE THAT REQUIRES THAT ALL HEARINGS BE HELD BY TELEPHONE CONFERENCE TO BE PAID BY THE PERSON FILING THE MOTION, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED BY THE COURT.	Feb 9, 2011 5:56 PM
133	I would limit the amount of materials and length of briefs offered in support of or resistance to motions for summary judgment, similar to the appellate rules. Attorneys spend way too much time and money on voluminous motions for summary judgment that could be greatly simplified.	Feb 9, 2011 8:22 PM
134	Make 1.981 contain clearer language about FACTUAL DISPUTES such that defendants are not filing summary judgment on nearly every single case. And, instead, are only filing summary judgment for those cases for which there is truly no factual disputes. It is becoming a matter of course to file summary judgment and should be the exception to the rule. Just as the rules regarding amendments to pleadings indicating that such amendment, "should be freely given" as justice so requires, perhaps the rules relating to summary judgment should read that summary judgment will only be granted "in limited circumstances" as justice so requires. To deprive a plaintiff of his or her day in court, his or her constitutional right to have her case tried to a jury rather than a judge, has wide constitutional implications that the courts and attorneys need to take far more serious than they do.	Feb 9, 2011 8:50 PM
135	Deadlines are enforced	Feb 9, 2011 8:54 PM
136	Do away with summary judgment	Feb 9, 2011 9:26 PM
137	Require litigant to provide good reason for continuation:	Feb 9, 2011 9:54 PM
138	judicial rep	Feb 10, 2011 6:43 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
139	Before any party can file a Motion to Compel, the parties MUST have a meet and confer IN PERSON and are required to discuss the dispute in good faith. Only if the meet and confer fails would a party be allowed to file a Motion to Compel Discovery. Parties would be required to certify they complied with meet and confer requirement. This would eliminate MOST motions in my experience. If a lawyer or unrepresented party refuses to meet and confer in person without good cause, all costs associated with a motion or hearing would be taxed against the lawyer personally or the unrepresented party if the court deems their failure to act in good faith was the cause.	Feb 10, 2011 9:40 PM
140	Forget the Notice of Intent to Take Default. This is a waste of Plaintiff's money and time -- let the burden be on the Defendant to raise the issue within "X" number of days after judgment	Feb 10, 2011 10:27 PM
141	I would impose more automatic consequences for parties who do not respond to discovery in a timely fashion. Even with a motion to compel it is rare to obtain discovery sanctions. Many clients and some attorneys abuse this process and create unreasonable delay in providing discovery. A party who refuses to turn over discovery should suffer some kind of consequence that is more clearly guaranteed.	Feb 10, 2011 10:50 PM
142	Service of process on in-state and out-of-state defendants by certified mail, as an option. Do away with using the Secretary of State or Director of the DOT for out-of-state defendants; a relic of another time. Go to 30 days for an answer to a petition, in- or out-of-state defendants alike. 20 days is strange and too short. Require service of anything after the petition to be allowable by e-mail WITHOUT requiring written consent; the time has come.	Feb 11, 2011 1:02 AM
143	Adopt the Arizona discovery rules	Feb 11, 2011 1:42 AM
144	More definitive explanation of service by publication	Feb 11, 2011 1:49 AM
145	I would require a pretrial or final pretrial conference in every case under Rules 1.601-1.604. At present, this is discretionary, but a mandatory pretrial conference, if held close in time to the trial, helps the parties and the court to prepare for the trial. This is especially true in jury trials. A pretrial conference would also be helpful to pro se litigants and can, sometimes, lead to settlement.	Feb 11, 2011 3:35 AM
146	Allowing the clerks office to set the hearing on a case instead of doing it at walk-in	Feb 11, 2011 3:17 PM
147	Mandatory determination of appropriate settlement factor.	Feb 11, 2011 5:43 PM
148	It might be helpful if expert reports under 1.508 were due at the same time expert designations are due.	Feb 11, 2011 6:59 PM
149	one case - one judge	Feb 11, 2011 8:52 PM
150	Mandatory pre-trial conferences to stipulate to exhibits and to address evidentiary issues before the trial date. I know this is done in some districts now, but not in mine.	Feb 11, 2011 9:46 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text	
151	<p>I WOULD REQUIRE COUNSEL TO MAKE ALL REQUESTS FOR DEPOSITIONS TO BE IN WRITING WITH SUFFICIENT TIME FOR OPPOSING COUNSEL TO SUBMIT AVAILABLE DATES BEFORE SENDING NOTICES OF DEPOSITIONS. MOST ATTORNEYS COORDINATE DEPOSITIONS, BUT MORE AND MORE OFTEN, YOUNGER ATTORNEYS AND THOSE WITH LEGAL ASSISTANTS JUST PICK DATES AND SERVE NOTICES.</p> <p>DISCOVERY REQUEST ADDRESSED TO NON-PARTIES, SUCH AS MEDICAL PROVIDERS, SHOULD ALLOW SUFFICIENT LEAD TIME FOR THEM TO MAKE COPIES AND ALL SUCH REQUESTS SHOULD BE IN WRITING WITH COPIES TO ALL COUNSEL OF RECORD IN THE CASE. DEFENSE COUNSEL OFTEN REQUEST A MEDICAL RELEASE FROM PLAINTIFFS' ATTORNEY, BUT THEN FAIL TO KEEP THEM APPRISED WHEN THE RELEASE IS USED. ANY RECORDS REQUEST SHOULD INCLUDE A REQUEST TO SIMUTANEOUSLY SEND COPIES TO OPPOSING COUNSEL AT THE EXPENSE OF THE REQUESTING PARTY. TAXING FOR COPIES AS PART OF THE COURT COSTS IS NOT SOMETHING THE JUDGE HAS TIME TO REVIEW WHEN THE CASE IS OVER.</p>
152	<p>Summary judgment motions to be filed not less than 120 before the trial date. This would prevent last minute preparation of the case for trial and allow the trial judge adequate time to write a ruling on the motion. I would also permit imposition of fees and costs to the losing party in the motion to prevent the routine filing of such motions that have no real probability of success. I would not impose fines and fees to the losing party in partial motions to encourage specific issue resolution.</p>
153	<p>It seems like too much time is spent on making changes to the rules.</p>
154	<p>Assess some amount of costs to the non-prevailing movant for summary judgment, as well as move the deadline for filing for summary judgment to 90 days before trial.</p> <p>Moving for summary judgment has become too commonplace and often without merit. The practice of regularly filing for summary judgment is abusive to the system -- increasing the costs of litigation to the parties and requiring far too much time on the part of the judges.</p>
155	<p>I believe that it would be reasonable to consider the Illinois rule on jury demands. It is my understanding that Illinois requires a defendant who is demanding a jury to pay a fee along with the answer. As a plaintiff's attorney for the most part, there are times when I do not want a jury. Defendant's counsel almost always requests one. I think if the defendant demands a jury, then, the defendant should bear some of the burden of cost.</p>
156	<p>motion and summary judgment process could be revamped so decisions are made on the papers and prevent sandbagging for oral argument</p>
157	<p>Just have court's enforce discovery rules and sanctions consistently.</p>
158	<p>Imposition of mandatory sanctions on attorneys who don't comply with the present rules. This would help avoid time lost tracking down counsel who ignore Trial scheduling conferences, and other matters, and/or resetting of those hearings, which result in many unnessary continuances/delays. If the sanctions were mandatory the imposition of same would not result in additional time lost in argueing over their imposition and would surely motivate compliance. Maybe base the penalty on how many prior violations a particular attorney has had.</p> <p>Requireing client's to sign off on any application which would result in a delay or continuance of proceedings, as referenced above, is a good suggestion.</p>
159	<p>Requiring expert reports at the time of the designation of experts. It would get the opinion out there sooner, so that the parties could decide what to do with that.</p>

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

	Response Text	
160	1.602: Make pretrial conferences mandatory	Feb 14, 2011 5:53 PM
161	Create a rule which puts a limit on the number of continuances which can be given in a case	Feb 14, 2011 10:20 PM
162	Mandatory sanctions for discovery abuses.	Feb 15, 2011 8:22 PM
163	Extend the response time for discovery from 30 to like 45 days. By the time you get the responses, get them to clients, etc. you have very little time to actually complete them especially with our hectic schedules. If we had a little more reasonable time, then maybe there would be less need to have motions to extend time, motions to compel, etc.	Feb 15, 2011 10:11 PM
164	Make it more difficult for "rich" parties to choke out poor parties using excessive discovery.	Feb 15, 2011 11:38 PM
165	Force Defendants to agree to trial dates within a year of the date of filing unless a delay is agreed to by the Plaintiff. Cases drag out too long primarily because defense attorneys always say they don't have available trial dates in their schedules even though they are in large defense firms. Obviously, I think the parties should jointly be allowed to waive such a deadline, especially in complex cases with extensive discovery issues.	Feb 16, 2011 12:10 AM
166	Summary judgment motions must be filed no later than 90 days from the date of trial	Feb 16, 2011 5:00 PM
167	Demand fact pleading for all Petitions. Notice pleading allows for sloppy pre-filing analysis and premature (or improvidently brought) lawsuits.	Feb 17, 2011 3:49 AM
168	In respect to witness and exhibit lists for trials, parties should be required to submit those 20-30 days before trial, and opposing parties should be required to lodge any and all objections they have to the witnesses and exhibits on the lists ((including but not limited to any and all evidentiary objections to exhibits) within 7-10 days of the submission of the lists. This would help parties and their attorneys determine exactly what witnesses will be necessary for the admission of exhibits at trial, and it will help streamline and shorten the trial process.	Feb 17, 2011 2:55 PM
169	Offer to confess judgment is one sided and fails to take into consideration the issues of lienholders, subrogation and other matters that take more than 3 days to iron out an agreement. In addition the jurisdictional amount for small claims court is too low.	Feb 17, 2011 8:15 PM
170	Imandatory sanctions for failure to timely respond to discover requests	Feb 17, 2011 9:27 PM
171	eliminate local rules	Feb 20, 2011 10:14 PM
172	I would bring back Requests for Admisssions and I would return to a system where briefing is filed as a part of the record for the benefit and education of the bar as a whole and so that a complete record is available on appeal showing what issues were briefed.	Feb 21, 2011 8:43 PM
173	We don't need anymore rules; we just need strict and consistent enfocement of the ones we have expcially, regarding experts designations and disclosures, showing GOOD cause for continuances, etc.	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
174	Require early and mandatory court supervised settlement conferences	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
175	Limit the amount of depositions in smaller dollar cases. Depositions are very costly. The American Arbitration Association, essentially, allows cases to be tried where the only discovery available are Requests for Production of Documents and Interrogatories.	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
176	All summary judgment motions ruled on 30 days before trial.	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
177	No specific rule. The numbering system is foolish waste of time	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
178	Less time to respond to discovery	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

	Response Text	
179	I would like to see uniform application of the Summary Judgment rule. The various Districts are all over the place. Some ignore the requirement that a party file a Resistance. Some Districts set them for hearing, some only do if a party files a response.	Feb 21, 2011 8:57 PM
180	Division V of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure. Changes to somehow streamline the discovery process -- perhaps something akin to initial disclosures, or perhaps encouraging the use of written interrogatories, or requiring a requesting party to show relevancy.	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
181	Motions to compell should only be filed after the moving part shows it has taken a number of concrete steps to obtain discovery. [One e-mail to an opposing party is not enough.]	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
182	Require a discovery planning conference and plan similar to F.R.C.P. 26.	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
183	Late settlement fee. It should be 60 ays before trial and applicable toboth jury nd bench trials	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
184	none	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
185	it is not a rule, it is a format: match them up with the organization and numbering of the federal rules to make it easier for practitioners to know exactly where to look for the same subject matter.	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
186	Enforce the rules we have. If they are all enforced the same by all districts, the process will work fine.	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
187	That unresisted motions are automatically granted, and the process for setting them aside would mirror the rule for setting aside defaults and require good cause. It is annoying to have your motion resisted by the Judge who advocates for the other side at the hearing. If this rule were in place, it would encourage parties to pay attention to the docket and their calendars and get their work done on time.	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
188	Trial scheduling conferences should be held sooner. The time delay seems unnecessary. I can think of no purpose for the wait time. Instead, the TSC should be scheduled within 10 days after an answer is filed. The actual conference may occur weeks later, but there is no reason not to set a date within 10 days of filing an answer.	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
189	Either by rule change or by judicial interpretation, courts should make motions to dismiss and summary judgments relevant again in Iowa. This would cut out marginal claims and allow more time for closer cases.	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
190	Eliminate briefs in support of motions for summary judgment, etc.	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
191	Our problem[s] is not the rules but the availability of judicial resources. In our district (6) civil cases are repeatedly bumped from the docket a few days before trial due to lack of judges, reporters, or courtroom space. This constant rescheduling is very costly to litigants and results in "justice delayed" being "justice denied."	Feb 21, 2011 9:22 PM
192	Without the consent of all parties that good cause be shown as to why a matter should be continued.	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
193	Create an offer of settlement statute like Wisconsin has which provides 12% interest on all claims from the date of the offer plus double court costs if the amount recovered is in excess of the offer of settlement.	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
194	Assign all cases over a jurisdictional threshold, e.g., \$20,000, to a single judge.	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
195	We don't need any new rules; we need the ones we have to be applied consistently, especially with respect to expert designation and disclosures, discovery deadline and continuances only for GOOD cause	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
196	Allow Offers to Accept Judgment to be filed by plaintiffs (in addition to Offers to Confess).	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
197	Reduce motion time to 7 days	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
198	I would reduce the number of days within which to provide discovery because if parties were required to provide discovery more quickly there would be less need to set trials out so far and less likelihood for continuance.	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
199	All trials should be commenced within 90 days of filing	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
200	reduce the allowable requests for production of documents and written interrogatories	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
201	It would be wonderful to have access to a judge more than one day a week. In our county, we have a district court judge readily available on Mondays. It is insufficient. We should have more access and things could get accomplished much quicker. A judge should be working in each county court house every day out of the week so attorneys can access them at any time.	Feb 21, 2011 10:17 PM
202	dispositive motions must be filed not less than 90 days before trial presently the rule is 60 days and that is too short of time to set the hearing and maybe reset it if the hearing is continued and get a ruling out.	Feb 21, 2011 10:21 PM
203	Not IRCP, but Rule 32:3.1. Dismiss frivolous litigation early in the process. Sanction attorneys who bring repeated frivolous claims.	Feb 21, 2011 10:35 PM
204	I would enforce the current rules.	Feb 21, 2011 10:49 PM
205	Deadlines for summary judgment. Summary judgment motions can actually drag out a case. Their purpose is to end a case early when trial is unnecessary. They should be filed early. If you have to do extensive discovery first, you probably don't have a case that is appropriate for summary judgment.	Feb 21, 2011 10:52 PM
206	Plaintiffs should have the option to plead that they claim more or less than an threshold amount (\$30,000?). Cases below that amount can then be limited in terms of discovery depositions and experts (the limitations are too involved to set forth in this box) and those cases should be set for an expedited trial.	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
207	eliminate interrogatories - totally worthless; rarely, if ever, elicits any useful information; canned answers given every time by all parties; postpones depositions; almost sole purpose is to make money for defense attorneys and to harass plaintiff attorneys;	Feb 21, 2011 11:07 PM
208	Create discovery limitations and time restrictions on smaller cases. A 3 tier system might be best. Have small claims (in substantially its current form with perhaps some very limited discovery) up to \$7500 or \$10,000. Then have 'medium claims court' with broader, but still limited discovery, time deadlines for getting the case tried, and perhaps even requirements for early completion of basic discovery and an early settlement conference for all cases where the amount in controversy is greater than small claims, but under \$25,000 - \$50,000.	Feb 21, 2011 11:11 PM
209	mandatory pre-trial settlement conference early in the process	Feb 21, 2011 11:11 PM
210	limit the number of depositions to 10 per case.	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
211	Admissibility of medical records and bills without deposition testimony. These should come into trial just like in a workers' compensation case. You have some attorneys who waste a great deal of time and money doing records depositions when there is not a question as to whether the documents are accurate.	Feb 21, 2011 11:29 PM
212	Require pre-trial conferences and make those more meaningful akin to the federal rules. Most importantly hold hearings on motions in limine and jury instruction conferences ahead of trial.	Feb 21, 2011 11:32 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
213	Have the summary judgment deadline be greater than 60 days before trial - it currently does not give the court time to rule until its already time to prep for trial; and/or Have a pre-trial order that is more like federal court (and make it be due earlier so that you are not getting exhibits and witness lists just the week before trial). The biggest problem is that the rules are not always enforced equally between judges or counties and parties are regularly allowed to miss deadlines without consequences.	Feb 21, 2011 11:42 PM
214	eliminate interrogatories	Feb 21, 2011 11:53 PM
215	In family law cases the "expert witness" requirement in discovery seems to be pointless. Judges give weight to counselors, teachers, etc. over lay witnesses without expert foundation, yet some judges will exclude a witness because of the lack of compliance with the rule. Also, in some districts, the courts will "strongly encourage" parties to supply affidavits at trial in lieu of testimony because of the scarce court days in rural counties. Yet that would never be acceptable in other districts or cities.	Feb 21, 2011 11:57 PM
216	Fee for Late Settlement of Jury Trial should be eliminated due to it's utter uselessness	Feb 22, 2011 12:16 AM
217	limits on discovery	Feb 22, 2011 1:17 AM
218	I wouldn't change any, but I would have the courts actually follow them to the letter	Feb 22, 2011 2:44 AM
219	Consistent enforcement of the current rules is all I ask.	Feb 22, 2011 3:44 AM
220	I would require mandatory mediation in all cases within 120 days after filing the answer.	Feb 22, 2011 4:36 AM
221	Eliminate the special rules on expert witnesses. You should be able to simply list them as with any other witness.	Feb 22, 2011 4:47 AM
222	No sure	Feb 22, 2011 1:19 PM
223	Conduct appeals arguments by telephone. It would save substantial money in travel time for most litigants in Iowa, but would have little effect on the Court's ultimate decision.	Feb 22, 2011 2:15 PM
224	If Defendant(s) file for Summary Judgment and lose, they have to pay the Plaintiff's fees and costs in responding. Particularly in employment cases, motions for summary judgment are fact intensive and rarely won. Yet Defendants continually file them. They waste precious resources of the Court and personnel in having to review.	Feb 22, 2011 2:35 PM
225	require mediation between the parties at the close of discovery - if mediation is a given there would be no bolstering to see which side will begin the negotiation process and at what point.	Feb 22, 2011 2:56 PM
226	limit discovery and unbridled use of experts including multiple medical experts	Feb 22, 2011 2:58 PM
227	Eliminate mandatory Settlement Conferences. If the case has not settled prior to the Settlement Conference date, it is not going to. Official Court Supervised Settlement Conferences waste the Court's time and Client's money.	Feb 22, 2011 3:16 PM
228	Rule on certification of default should be changed- go back to old way of having judge order default, after notice and failure to appear etc. The option for certification by clerk is confusing and contrary to what most judges and attorneys are used to doing. It also burdens the system by giving the party in default another option to show up, usually without counsel, and object--long after deadlines have passed for answer, etc. The Rules already provide for set aside, so why do litigants have to go through this extra burden?	Feb 22, 2011 3:30 PM
229	Limit discovery, especially electronic, to only absolutely critical information	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
230	Allow for small claims in personal injury cases under 25000 in value	Feb 22, 2011 3:37 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
231	Rule 1.909: late settlement fee. I think that any rule that chills settlement discussions would lead to an unnecessary use of scarce court resources on case that otherwise could have been resolved by the parties.	Feb 22, 2011 3:39 PM
232	Enforce the ones we have	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 PM
233	Rule 1.503 to reduce the amount of discovery permitted.	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
234	Clairify that 30 interrogatories include the sub-parts and it would be only under exceptioqanly circumstances the number would be increased. This is regularly abused in our district	Feb 22, 2011 4:42 PM
235	streamline discovery under 1.503	Feb 22, 2011 4:45 PM
236	Increase the amount of time in which a party must file a summary judgment before trial to at least 90 days before trial	Feb 22, 2011 5:19 PM
237	Limit number and length of depositions	Feb 22, 2011 8:08 PM
238	I would change the post judgement rules to allow attacks on judgments/verdicts, particularly default judgments, Specifically, I would allow more time and allow for the fact that they could not find legal counsel to advise them as to their rights to contest the proceedings/judgment. Being poor should not be used against people.	Feb 22, 2011 9:46 PM
239	Courts must be more willing to grant summary judgment Courts must be more willing to impose sanctions for discovery rule violations Petitions to vacate should be treated as regular motions, not petitions	Feb 22, 2011 9:49 PM
240	I would suspend Rule 1.944 until the court has enough judges/court reporters/etc. to actually try civil cases within the timeframes.	Feb 22, 2011 10:22 PM
241	Assign the same trial court judge to a civil case from start to finish so that the judge can be familiar with the facts and the law applicable thereto and make the best decision. This would also enable one judge to become an expert in that case instead of wasting the judge's time learning the case, and the attorneys' time educating the judge about the case.	Feb 22, 2011 10:37 PM
242	No opinion	Feb 23, 2011 3:26 PM
243	STRONGLY LIMIT DISCOVERY	Feb 23, 2011 5:09 PM
244	reduce discovery rules	Feb 23, 2011 8:10 PM
245	Limit the scope of 1.981 because it is often used to create reversible error by parsing the issues. If a judge is right on 4 parts and wrong on 1 part, the case goes on with added expense and delay. The division of a case into subparts and eliminating some of the parts does not necessarily limit the evidence if the case is tried.	Feb 24, 2011 5:50 PM
246	1.981(3) - I do a lot of collection work. In District 1 judges set Motions for summary judgment for hearing even if the motion is unresisted. The hearing is usually 60 days out. This delays the entry of judgments and collection. Judges tell me they think the wording of the rule requires that a hearing be set. Rule should be changed.	Feb 24, 2011 7:28 PM
247	1.310 to allow for service via publication in domestic relations cases in addition to dissolution of marriages (e.g.: custody cases between non-married persons). The reason is that it does not make sense to treat non-married parents differently. It is time consuming and expensive to seek permission from the court for alternative service under rule 1.306 to serve a parent you cannot find in the same way you would serve the respondent in a divorce under rule 1.310.	Feb 25, 2011 4:29 PM
248	If the present rules were uniformly enforced I believe all would go smoothly.	Feb 25, 2011 8:57 PM
249	Make basic discovery mandatory for generic cases (e.g., all family law) and then require attorneys to justify in advance any additional discovery.	Feb 27, 2011 7:06 PM

4. If you could change any one rule of the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure in order

Response Text		
250	I would change Rule 1.509 and attempt to clarify what constitutes a single interrogatory. Presently, the limit of 30 interrogatories is almost meaningless, as litigants commonly include multiple questions in each numbered interrogatory, with the result that most parties actually propound many more than 30 interrogatories on each other. If there were an enforceable limit on the number of written questions each party could ask, perhaps interrogatories would be used more selectively and efficiently. As it is now, it seems that interrogatories are used as much for the burden they impose on the other party as for the purpose of gathering information that will be useful at trial.	Feb 28, 2011 3:31 AM
251	Add a presumption of malicious prosecution (which would trigger a procedure to start summary dismissal and sanctions) after two or more dismissed lawsuits filed by the same pro se plaintiff.	Feb 28, 2011 5:52 PM
252	create more forms for pro se clients such as answer forms, divorce forms where there are children, etc	Feb 28, 2011 8:46 PM
253	I would require expert reports to be submitted with expert designations.	Feb 28, 2011 9:47 PM
254	Extend the time allowed to amend pleadings.	Feb 28, 2011 10:05 PM
255	I would enforce the existing rules uniformly. Standardize expert witness discovery with a requirement for reports to be produced 90 days before trial. Try and avoid the late supplementation of expert witness reports. Adopt the Federal Rules on initial disclosure and discovery. If you are going to enforce the rules of Civil Procedure, notify the bar that business as usual has changed and then do what you say you are going to do--enforce the rules.	Feb 28, 2011 11:44 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
1	1	Feb 7, 2011 7:59 PM
2	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
3	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
4	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
5	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:08 PM
6	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:09 PM
7	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
8	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
9	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
10	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
11	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
12	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:13 PM
13	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
14	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
15	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
16	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
17	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:18 PM
18	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
19	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
20	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
21	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
22	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
23	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
24	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:22 PM
25	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
26	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
27	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
28	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
29	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
30	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
31	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
32	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
33	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
34	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
35	4	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
36	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
37	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:36 PM
38	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:36 PM
39	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
40	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:38 PM
41	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
42	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
43	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
44	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
45	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
46	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
47	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
48	3	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
49	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
50	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
51	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
52	6	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
53	1000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
54	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
55	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
56	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
57	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
58	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
59	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
60	55	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
61	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
62	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
63	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
64	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
65	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
66	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
67	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM
68	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
69	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
70	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
71	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
72	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
73	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
74	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
75	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
76	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
77	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
78	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
79	8	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
80	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
81	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
82	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
83	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
84	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
85	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
86	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
87	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
88	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
89	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
90	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
91	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
92	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
93	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
94	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
95	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
96	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
97	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
98	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
99	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
100	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
101	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
102	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
103	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
104	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
105	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
106	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
107	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
108	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
109	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
110	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
111	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
112	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
113	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
114	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
115	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
116	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
117	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
118	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
119	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
120	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
121	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
122	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
123	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
124	500	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
125	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
126	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
127	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
128	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
129	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
130	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
131	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
132	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
133	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
134	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
135	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
136	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
137	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
138	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
139	4	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
140	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
141	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
142	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
143	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
144	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:50 PM
145	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:50 PM
146	12	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
147	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
148	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
149	3	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
150	1	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
151	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
152	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
153	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
154	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:59 PM
155	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
156	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:01 PM
157	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:01 PM
158	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
159	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
160	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:09 PM
161	3	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
162	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:17 PM
163	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
164	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
165	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:23 PM
166	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
167	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
168	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:32 PM
169	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
170	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
171	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
172	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
173	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
174	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:44 PM
175	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:45 PM
176	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:45 PM
177	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
178	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
179	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
180	2	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
181	4	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
182	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:01 PM
183	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:04 PM
184	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:05 PM
185	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
186	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:09 PM
187	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
188	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
189	1	Feb 7, 2011 11:12 PM
190	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
191	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
192	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:26 PM
193	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:26 PM
194	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:27 PM
195	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:27 PM
196	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:30 PM
197	7	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
198	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
199	3	Feb 7, 2011 11:42 PM
200	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:48 PM
201	25	Feb 8, 2011 12:00 AM
202	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:10 AM
203	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:16 AM
204	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:18 AM
205	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:18 AM
206	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:19 AM
207	3	Feb 8, 2011 12:29 AM
208	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
209	2	Feb 8, 2011 12:50 AM
210	8	Feb 8, 2011 12:54 AM
211	10	Feb 8, 2011 1:38 AM
212	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:54 AM
213	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:57 AM
214	6	Feb 8, 2011 2:19 AM
215	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:27 AM
216	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:34 AM
217	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:34 AM
218	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:37 AM
219	4500	Feb 8, 2011 2:40 AM
220	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:49 AM
221	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 AM
222	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 AM
223	5	Feb 8, 2011 4:21 AM
224	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:32 AM
225	4	Feb 8, 2011 5:08 AM
226	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:52 PM
227	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:15 PM
228	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:24 PM
229	30	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 PM
230	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:29 PM
231	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:43 PM
232	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:06 PM
233	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:13 PM
234	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:17 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
235	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:27 PM
236	2	Feb 8, 2011 2:33 PM
237	3	Feb 8, 2011 2:39 PM
238	1	Feb 8, 2011 2:40 PM
239	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
240	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 PM
241	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:50 PM
242	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
243	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:59 PM
244	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:59 PM
245	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:02 PM
246	40	Feb 8, 2011 3:03 PM
247	15	Feb 8, 2011 3:07 PM
248	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:09 PM
249	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:16 PM
250	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:17 PM
251	75	Feb 8, 2011 3:18 PM
252	3	Feb 8, 2011 3:26 PM
253	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
254	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:39 PM
255	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:41 PM
256	1	Feb 8, 2011 3:56 PM
257	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:56 PM
258	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:00 PM
259	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:05 PM
260	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:07 PM
261	5	Feb 8, 2011 4:12 PM
262	1	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
263	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
264	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:24 PM
265	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 PM
266	3	Feb 8, 2011 4:32 PM
267	2	Feb 8, 2011 4:36 PM
268	3	Feb 8, 2011 4:43 PM
269	5	Feb 8, 2011 5:11 PM
270	2	Feb 8, 2011 5:11 PM
271	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:42 PM
272	1	Feb 8, 2011 5:55 PM
273	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:59 PM
274	2	Feb 8, 2011 6:05 PM
275	5	Feb 8, 2011 6:08 PM
276	50	Feb 8, 2011 6:27 PM
277	25	Feb 8, 2011 6:49 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
278	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:00 PM
279	3	Feb 8, 2011 7:30 PM
280	4	Feb 8, 2011 7:40 PM
281	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:48 PM
282	1	Feb 8, 2011 7:49 PM
283	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:50 PM
284	50	Feb 8, 2011 9:00 PM
285	10	Feb 8, 2011 9:03 PM
286	10	Feb 8, 2011 9:36 PM
287	50	Feb 8, 2011 10:07 PM
288	2	Feb 8, 2011 10:53 PM
289	0	Feb 8, 2011 11:05 PM
290	20	Feb 8, 2011 11:21 PM
291	2	Feb 9, 2011 12:29 AM
292	2	Feb 9, 2011 1:07 AM
293	100	Feb 9, 2011 1:53 AM
294	0	Feb 9, 2011 2:29 AM
295	15	Feb 9, 2011 3:37 AM
296	7	Feb 9, 2011 3:49 PM
297	3	Feb 9, 2011 4:50 PM
298	2	Feb 9, 2011 6:05 PM
299	3	Feb 9, 2011 6:25 PM
300	100	Feb 9, 2011 6:35 PM
301	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:55 PM
302	60	Feb 9, 2011 8:28 PM
303	35	Feb 9, 2011 8:28 PM
304	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:52 PM
305	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:58 PM
306	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:33 PM
307	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:46 PM
308	0	Feb 10, 2011 2:26 PM
309	1	Feb 10, 2011 2:58 PM
310	200	Feb 10, 2011 3:16 PM
311	0	Feb 10, 2011 3:29 PM
312	0	Feb 10, 2011 6:02 PM
313	10	Feb 10, 2011 6:42 PM
314	0	Feb 10, 2011 6:52 PM
315	5	Feb 10, 2011 7:06 PM
316	1	Feb 10, 2011 9:58 PM
317	2	Feb 10, 2011 10:31 PM
318	30	Feb 10, 2011 10:53 PM
319	0	Feb 10, 2011 11:35 PM
320	40	Feb 11, 2011 1:07 AM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
321	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:46 AM
322	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:59 AM
323	0	Feb 11, 2011 2:40 AM
324	60	Feb 11, 2011 3:54 AM
325	25	Feb 11, 2011 6:14 AM
326	5	Feb 11, 2011 3:24 PM
327	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:27 PM
328	11	Feb 11, 2011 5:47 PM
329	5	Feb 11, 2011 7:29 PM
330	2	Feb 11, 2011 7:47 PM
331	0	Feb 11, 2011 8:55 PM
332	0	Feb 11, 2011 9:52 PM
333	00	Feb 11, 2011 10:47 PM
334	0	Feb 11, 2011 10:53 PM
335	10	Feb 12, 2011 2:36 PM
336	0	Feb 12, 2011 4:03 PM
337	0	Feb 12, 2011 7:44 PM
338	1	Feb 13, 2011 4:18 AM
339	100	Feb 14, 2011 2:54 AM
340	15	Feb 14, 2011 1:46 PM
341	100	Feb 14, 2011 4:26 PM
342	0	Feb 14, 2011 4:32 PM
343	0	Feb 14, 2011 6:58 PM
344	0	Feb 14, 2011 9:56 PM
345	0	Feb 15, 2011 12:45 AM
346	1	Feb 15, 2011 12:23 PM
347	5	Feb 15, 2011 1:45 PM
348	1	Feb 15, 2011 3:14 PM
349	5	Feb 15, 2011 5:07 PM
350	0	Feb 15, 2011 8:01 PM
351	3	Feb 15, 2011 8:29 PM
352	0	Feb 15, 2011 8:52 PM
353	0	Feb 15, 2011 10:15 PM
354	1	Feb 15, 2011 11:44 PM
355	1	Feb 16, 2011 12:24 AM
356	5	Feb 16, 2011 3:54 PM
357	3	Feb 16, 2011 5:05 PM
358	0	Feb 17, 2011 4:02 AM
359	2	Feb 17, 2011 3:03 PM
360	0	Feb 17, 2011 8:21 PM
361	0	Feb 17, 2011 9:17 PM
362	8	Feb 17, 2011 9:36 PM
363	200	Feb 18, 2011 9:04 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
364	15	Feb 20, 2011 4:56 PM
365	0	Feb 20, 2011 9:46 PM
366	0	Feb 20, 2011 10:32 PM
367	0	Feb 20, 2011 11:40 PM
368	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:48 PM
369	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:42 PM
370	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:44 PM
371	70	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
372	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
373	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:55 PM
374	2	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
375	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:56 PM
376	6	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
377	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
378	0	Feb 21, 2011 8:58 PM
379	10	Feb 21, 2011 8:59 PM
380	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
381	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
382	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
383	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
384	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
385	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
386	1800	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
387	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
388	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
389	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
390	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
391	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
392	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
393	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
394	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
395	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
396	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
397	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
398	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
399	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
400	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
401	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
402	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
403	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
404	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
405	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
406	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
407	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
408	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
409	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
410	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
411	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
412	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
413	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
414	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
415	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
416	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
417	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
418	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
419	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
420	3	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
421	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
422	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
423	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
424	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
425	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
426	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
427	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
428	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
429	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
430	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
431	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
432	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
433	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
434	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
435	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
436	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
437	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
438	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
439	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
440	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
441	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
442	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
443	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
444	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
445	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
446	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
447	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
448	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
449	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
450	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
451	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
452	4	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
453	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
454	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
455	2	Feb 21, 2011 10:02 PM
456	15	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
457	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:06 PM
458	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
459	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
460	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:17 PM
461	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:18 PM
462	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:22 PM
463	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:26 PM
464	4	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
465	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
466	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:40 PM
467	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:41 PM
468	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:49 PM
469	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
470	20	Feb 21, 2011 10:53 PM
471	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
472	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
473	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:11 PM
474	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:12 PM
475	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:14 PM
476	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:14 PM
477	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
478	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:21 PM
479	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
480	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:26 PM
481	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:27 PM
482	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:32 PM
483	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:33 PM
484	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:34 PM
485	125	Feb 21, 2011 11:41 PM
486	4	Feb 21, 2011 11:47 PM
487	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:52 PM
488	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:54 PM
489	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:55 PM
490	30	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
491	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:58 PM
492	30	Feb 22, 2011 12:08 AM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
493	5	Feb 22, 2011 12:11 AM
494	5	Feb 22, 2011 12:22 AM
495	7	Feb 22, 2011 1:19 AM
496	2	Feb 22, 2011 1:20 AM
497	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 AM
498	2	Feb 22, 2011 1:50 AM
499	1	Feb 22, 2011 1:53 AM
500	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:53 AM
501	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:43 AM
502	1	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 AM
503	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:13 AM
504	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
505	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:01 AM
506	3	Feb 22, 2011 4:13 AM
507	100	Feb 22, 2011 4:24 AM
508	1	Feb 22, 2011 4:52 AM
509	0	Feb 22, 2011 12:56 PM
510	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:26 PM
511	5	Feb 22, 2011 1:32 PM
512	2	Feb 22, 2011 1:41 PM
513	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:00 PM
514	8	Feb 22, 2011 2:01 PM
515	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:06 PM
516	5	Feb 22, 2011 2:26 PM
517	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:30 PM
518	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 PM
519	3	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
520	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:57 PM
521	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:00 PM
522	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:03 PM
523	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:05 PM
524	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 PM
525	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 PM
526	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:19 PM
527	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:22 PM
528	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:24 PM
529	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:27 PM
530	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
531	3	Feb 22, 2011 3:32 PM
532	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:32 PM
533	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:33 PM
534	150	Feb 22, 2011 3:35 PM
535	4	Feb 22, 2011 3:35 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
536	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:36 PM
537	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:42 PM
538	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:44 PM
539	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
540	1	Feb 22, 2011 3:46 PM
541	100	Feb 22, 2011 3:59 PM
542	5	Feb 22, 2011 4:00 PM
543	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:02 PM
544	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:11 PM
545	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:27 PM
546	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:50 PM
547	10	Feb 22, 2011 4:57 PM
548	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:22 PM
549	3	Feb 22, 2011 5:44 PM
550	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:21 PM
551	0	Feb 22, 2011 6:24 PM
552	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:16 PM
553	3	Feb 22, 2011 7:20 PM
554	0	Feb 22, 2011 7:36 PM
555	3	Feb 22, 2011 9:02 PM
556	1	Feb 22, 2011 9:07 PM
557	2	Feb 22, 2011 9:18 PM
558	4	Feb 22, 2011 9:52 PM
559	1	Feb 22, 2011 9:54 PM
560	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:07 PM
561	5	Feb 22, 2011 10:19 PM
562	3	Feb 22, 2011 10:26 PM
563	2	Feb 22, 2011 10:44 PM
564	2	Feb 22, 2011 11:29 PM
565	50	Feb 23, 2011 4:01 AM
566	0	Feb 23, 2011 1:15 PM
567	3	Feb 23, 2011 2:31 PM
568	0	Feb 23, 2011 3:33 PM
569	3	Feb 23, 2011 4:26 PM
570	10	Feb 23, 2011 4:36 PM
571	2	Feb 23, 2011 5:22 PM
572	10	Feb 23, 2011 5:45 PM
573	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:53 PM
574	20	Feb 23, 2011 6:00 PM
575	25	Feb 23, 2011 6:34 PM
576	2	Feb 23, 2011 6:54 PM
577	60	Feb 23, 2011 7:03 PM
578	1	Feb 23, 2011 8:15 PM

4. Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of civil cases

# of cases:		
579	2	Feb 23, 2011 9:11 PM
580	0	Feb 23, 2011 9:49 PM
581	0	Feb 23, 2011 11:53 PM
582	4	Feb 24, 2011 12:58 AM
583	5	Feb 24, 2011 5:46 PM
584	7	Feb 24, 2011 6:08 PM
585	10	Feb 24, 2011 7:35 PM
586	1	Feb 24, 2011 7:57 PM
587	0	Feb 25, 2011 1:32 PM
588	10	Feb 25, 2011 4:32 PM
589	1	Feb 25, 2011 8:00 PM
590	2	Feb 25, 2011 10:17 PM
591	7	Feb 26, 2011 8:41 PM
592	1	Feb 27, 2011 4:07 PM
593	20	Feb 27, 2011 7:13 PM
594	10	Feb 28, 2011 1:24 AM
595	5	Feb 28, 2011 2:33 AM
596	3	Feb 28, 2011 3:31 AM
597	0	Feb 28, 2011 3:15 PM
598	10	Feb 28, 2011 5:57 PM
599	50	Feb 28, 2011 8:57 PM
600	10	Feb 28, 2011 9:41 PM
601	10	Feb 28, 2011 9:52 PM
602	100	Feb 28, 2011 10:11 PM
603	3	Feb 28, 2011 11:52 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
1	I have been fortunate to be involved in very few discovery disputes. I credit this to the professionalism of the defense attorneys I have practiced against.	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
2	require a BATNa and WATNA to be submitted to a permanent position of settlement coordinator/mediator	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
3	Shorten periods of responses from 30 days to 20 days	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
4	revitalization and enforcement of requests for admission rules to narrow factual and legal issues	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
5	Eliminate useless Interrogatories	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
6	limit interrogatories and request for production of documents	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
7	Limit the number of depositions without court approval.	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

	Response Text	
8	Stronger sanctions need to be imposed when 'game playing' occurs during the discovery process. Some lawyers use the Motion to Compel as a 'tickler' system for them to get their work done. This requires judicial resources to police these motions unnecessarily. Strong sanctions should be imposed when such a pattern develops involving a given lawyer.	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
9	Require production of documents by a party rather than a response allowing for inspection and copying at a time convenient to the party. This promotes large "document dumps" and allows a party to be largely unresponsive to a specific request for production of documents.	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
10	Eliminate requests for admissions or allow their use only when other methods of discovery have been unsuccessful. In my experience, they are poorly tailored to actual narrowing of issues and are often used to trip up a pro se party in the hopes that they won't be responded to promptly, will be deemed admitted, and can be the basis for summary judgment.	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
11	For god's sake, enforce the rules.	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
12	Conference with Judge soon after the case is filed to outline the process and impose appropriate limits and timetables	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
13	effective sanctions to prohibit attorneys "defending " depositions from making speaking objections and otherwise interfering with the Q. and A. and prohibiting attorneys who did not request, notice, and schedule a deposition from turning it in to their deposition for use at trial	Feb 7, 2011 8:36 PM
14	more strict adherence to the timelines and stricter penalties for compel motions that are granted.	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
15	Adopt the federal rules regarding mandatory initial disclosures and expert witness disclosure	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
16	Limiting the amount of discovery relative to the amount of damages sought.	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
17	Court imposed sanctions for failure to provide timely and complete discovery responses (written) after a meet and confer.	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
18	There should be some limited discovery in summary cases, like small claims, where often you have no idea of the reasons why a defendant is denying the claim.	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
19	Limitations on frequency, duration	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
20	limitations on depositions of non party witnesses	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
21	Making the ability to obtain a deposition not so cost-prohibitive for clients. When faced with a \$500+ bill per deposition of just fact witnesses, let alone the exhorbitant cost of expert depositions, clients decline to use that discovery tool, which could actually lead to much less time for trial.	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
22	Imposed timelines set out in a trial setting conference order.	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
23	A flat out rule, up or down, on whether subsections to interrogatories count toward the overall number of interrogatories to be asked.	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
24	Require the parties to enter into formal stipulations of fact	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
25	Allow 60 days to respond to interrogatories	Feb 7, 2011 9:02 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

	Response Text	
26	The extent of my civil litigation practice is too limited for me to be able to respond to many of these questions. In some instances in which I have been involved in these cases there has been a fishing expedition approach and a corresponding complete resistance response. The litigation approach seems like foreign territory compared to much of my practice where the parties want to get to a quick, fair solution. There has to be a level of trust between the parties and the attorneys to use the simpler methods. When there is no trust the litigation seems to mushroom. I understand that the parties need to understand the facts and develop their case but some situations seem to really get out of hand. A judge usually does not want to step in too far or to impose sanctions. Judge Statgeman in bankruptcy court in the 1980s didn't always give people their day in court but he did get many matters settled by telling the attorneys to go out in the hall and get it settled. In a recent matter I thought the issues might have been simplified if the judge brought the attorneys in to explain their arguments in chambers and then the judge pushed them to defend arguments. I am sure the judge does not want to appear to have taken sides but a judge can be a devil's advocate against both sides and then send them to the hall to try to settle.	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
27	more focused requests rather than "in any way relating to" requests.	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
28	Limit Depositions to 7 hours like the federal rules.	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
29	Judges should be more willing to impose sanctions for failure to produce discovery when counsel unreasonably delays production.	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
30	Time limit on fact witness depositions.	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
31	I am not sure. Maybe sanctions for attorneys who engage in form discovery that is found not to be applicable to the case they have filed (as plaintiff's attorney) or are participating in as defendant's attorney?	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
32	There needs to be limits and the courts need to actively enforce limits. I hate to generalize, but its been my experience courts tend to be too permissive when it comes to discovery. Also, if Judges would promptly rule on Motions (i.e. take an active role in a case) more cases could be decided before trial. They just need to give some guidance.	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
33	Sanctions that really meant something.	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
34	none	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
35	uniform exchange of info as in the federal system along with enforcement for noncompliance	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
36	Obtaining from the Court an order that will set forth the purpose of given discovery and the scope of the information sought and how it is to be obtained.	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
37	Time limits on depositions	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
38	no opinion	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
39	Enforce deadlines.	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
40	On showing of appropriate reason, allow deposition of parties before tons of written discovery-possibly tied to reasonable estimated dollar risk at stake.	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
41	Limiting the number of expert witnesses the defense can designate in a medical malpractice case. It seems that in every case I have been involved in the defense thinks it is necessary to designate twice as many experts as the plaintiff designates. Rarely are all of these experts called at trial.	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
42	Discovery abuse occurs due to party undertaking form written discovery without regard to the type of case, amount involved, etc.	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

	Response Text	
43	The question is not the Rules, but prompt and efficient access to enforcing the Rules. My experience has been that the cost of obtaining judicial resolution of discovery disputes often outweighs the benefits obtained, and this only encourages delay and footdragging; the best thing to do would be to streamline access to prompt judicial resolution of legitimate discovery disputes. Once the bar realizes that the judge is literally "just a phone call away," the instances of discovery abuse would, in my opinion, drop dramatically	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
44	no comment	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
45	Discovery deadline being imposed	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
46	More complete responses to interrogatories	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
47	Require counsel to meet and discuss discovery early in the case.	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
48	Meaningful answers to Interrogatories. In most cases at present Interrogatories are a meaningless waste of time and money	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
49	Have mandatory disclosures	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
50	Limitation on deposition practice	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
51	Basic interrogatory information	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
52	Discovery in the state courts is very rarely abused. Your committee is wrongheaded and is wasting time pursuing excessive discovery as the enemy of efficiency	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
53	Require informal proceedings under oath where the litigants must be present to review the discovery needed. Try to get as much informally with deadlines for counsel to meet. The good lawyers are just too busy to spend time and discovery becomes a means to start to organize the file. The not so good lawyers use discovery to look like they are accomplishing something, add to the bill, and cya. It needs to be less cumbersome. Perhaps answers to a set of standard discovery should be included as part of the initial pleadings as part of the rules in divorce cases.	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
54	Limits on scope	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
55	So long as notice pleading remains the rule and given that some limitation on discovery will likely be considered, creating standard, basic discovery requests by rule to which each party is entitled on a stated timeline and not included the the limited number of requests would be helpful.	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
56	further limiting the number if interrogatories or perhaps scaling by dollar amount in controversy	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
57	Make all responses electronic PDFs and searchable.	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
58	None	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
59	The automatic exchange and admission of medical bills and reports without having to take depositions of treating physicians to get them in the record.	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
60	Evasive and deferred answers	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
61	Make sanctions for violating discovery rules mandatory. I don't believe that parties take discovery seriously because even when a discovery abuse has been found to have occurred by the court, the court almost never imposes sanctions.	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
62	Limit the number of experts permitted.	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
63	By rule or court order require disclosure of all documents that support the claim or defense within 60 days of the answer. Then discovery for more specific information needed could narrowly focus on those issues.	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
64	The need for "experts' needs to be reduced because most people cannot afford the experts while insurance companies, banks and the like can afford all of the "experts" they desire.	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
65	Limiting discovery in cases under 15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

	Response Text	
66	Requiring all attorneys and expert witnesses to abide by the deadlines set forth in the the Iowa Rules.	Feb 7, 2011 9:59 PM
67	Some judicial oversight re timeliness of responses to discovery	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
68	It would be useful to have automatic disclosure of key facts in certain kinds of case (contracts, for example), with strongly enforced deadlines. However, Requests for Admissions are a powerful tool that should not be limited.	Feb 7, 2011 10:09 PM
69	The use of requests for admissions as a replacement for pre-trial stipulations regarding admissibility of evidence.	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
70	Maybe some automatic defined penalty after some grace period if responses are not filed so as not to involve the court.	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
71	limit discovery in lower dollar cases	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
72	Require standard exchange of information at outset of case, before the start of formal discovery.	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
73	Eliminate contention requests for admissions and interrogatories	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
74	make requesting party pay for the search process in conducting responses to requests for production of documents (including electronic documents such as email)	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
75	In "fishing expeditions" requiring a lot of production of documents etc shift the cost to the requesting party	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
76	Limits on the number and length of depositions.	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
77	As stated earlier, a longer period of time to respond. Overall I get tired of requests of documents or interrogatories that are so broad that the response can only be lengthy when these requests are usually the least relevant to the case.	Feb 7, 2011 10:45 PM
78	Eliminate interrogatories and requests for admission, a complete waste of time, money and effort.	Feb 7, 2011 10:45 PM
79	Specific sanctions, such as dismissal of claims or prohibition of presenting evidence relating to the claim, actually imposed for failing to comply with discovery requests after the attorneys have made good faith efforts to resolve but that the other side fails to provide	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
80	Requests for admissions should be sent with a notice saying that if they are responded to, the requests will be deemed admitted. Pro se litigants that receive requests for admission can easily miss the deadline. If there was a notice on the request for admissions, then this would maybe help response times of pro se litigants.	Feb 7, 2011 10:53 PM
81	Require answers to expert interrogatories (i.e. expert reports) in a timely manner.	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
82	Limits on requests for production of documents	Feb 7, 2011 10:59 PM
83	MAKE THE LOSING PARTY PAY FOR DISCOVERY COSTS INCLUDING ATTY FEES IN CONDUCTING DISCOVERY	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
84	Fewer and shorter depositions. Live Telephone testimony should be permitted. Expert witnesses on lower level cases should be able to testify by report.	Feb 7, 2011 11:12 PM
85	Depos are a waste of time with answers structured by the lawyer	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
86	Limit depositions time	Feb 7, 2011 11:26 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

	Response Text	
87	Get rid of "definitions" in Interrogatories. They are insulting to an experienced trial lawyer's intelligence; they are overbroad in their scope; they seek information that often is way beyond what the rules allow. The word "Identify" as defined in some interrogatories has taken on a huge meaning that boggles one's mind! You want the truth: I almost always ignore the "definitions" and answer the interrogatories with common sense. So far no one has ever complained to me that I did not follow their "definitions". I also believe the so-called "privilege logs" are an incredible waste of time and energy. Sorry. I am from the old school where lawyers trusted each other and acted that way.	Feb 7, 2011 11:27 PM
88	Clarifications of the obligations and limits regarding number of interrogatories, production of medical records, production of medical release, use of medical bills at trial, etc.	Feb 7, 2011 11:27 PM
89	Mandatory scheduling conferences as in federal court	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
90	Less unreasonable and unwarranted objections. Sanctions imposed for this type of abuse.	Feb 7, 2011 11:42 PM
91	Require parties to provide basic information and production within 30 days of filing the answer.	Feb 8, 2011 12:00 AM
92	none	Feb 8, 2011 12:10 AM
93	Limitation on number of interrogatories	Feb 8, 2011 12:16 AM
94	All discovery would be ordered by judges not litigants.	Feb 8, 2011 12:18 AM
95	Require plaintiffs in personl injury cases to produce all medical records from 10 years before the incident to the present without the necessity of formal document requests.	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
96	Limit the duration and number of depositions.	Feb 8, 2011 12:50 AM
97	Reasonable limitations on number and scope of interrogatories, similar to federal rules	Feb 8, 2011 12:54 AM
98	Enforce the sanctions available for denial of Requests for Admissions. If a party is forced to pay for the expenses the other party as a result of the failure to truthfully and fully respond to Requests for Admissions that will clearly limit, or eliminate some issues, defenses, or claims they should pay the economic price as an incentive to stop the abuse of the legal system that jams the docket, and allows defendants to engage in the tactic of deny, delay, defend. Justice delayed is justice denied. Delays occasioned by parties who wrongly respond to Requests for Admission should be sanctioned. Otherwise the abuse of the system becomes systemic. The failure to enforce the rule by imposition of the sanctions set forth therein renders the rule meaningless.	Feb 8, 2011 1:57 AM
99	Limit inerrogatories and request for discovery. They are used as a tool to leverage cases by well financed insurance defense attorneys.	Feb 8, 2011 2:27 AM
100	Limit the number of depositions that could be taken and narrow them to only the most important witnesses in the case, allowing the Court to set such limits.	Feb 8, 2011 2:37 AM
101	Limit discovery to a number of days or months. Plaintiff has 60 days, Defendant then has another 60 days. then both have 30 days to finish up loose ends and it is certified ready for trial.	Feb 8, 2011 2:40 AM
102	Impose sanctions for refusal to comply with discovery requests. I have NEVER had sanctions imposed in any case, even when conduct of opposing counsel is egregious.	Feb 8, 2011 2:49 AM
103	I would impose limitations onthe amount of discovery allowed, especially for lower dollar cases.	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 AM
104	reduce boiler plate discovery	Feb 8, 2011 3:45 AM
105	Get judges more involved in discovery diputes so that they are resolved in a timely fashion by a neutral arbiter.	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 AM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
106	See the answers above	Feb 8, 2011 4:32 AM
107	Requests for production and interrogatories are often used to delay and to add cost to the other side.	Feb 8, 2011 4:37 AM
108	The cost-effectiveness and value of discovery depends on the good faith of the parties and their counsel. You cannot change that by rule.	Feb 8, 2011 12:53 PM
109	Judges using sanctions more quickly to encourage compliance and discourage parties attempting to delay proceedings	Feb 8, 2011 1:27 PM
110	Limitation on number of discovery requests and depositions	Feb 8, 2011 1:43 PM
111	Enforce limits on interrogatories	Feb 8, 2011 2:27 PM
112	Video taping of all witnesses, with the showing of a video taped trial to the jury. This would permit juries to view the tape recorded presentation (like watching TV at home and how many people don't watch TV), which could be done in a conference room. Since all objections could be handled prior to presentation, time would be saved by having to exclude juries, etc. Multiple trials could occur, with the limitation only being the amount of conference rooms, not the number of judges available, freeing judges to handle pretrial matters. The video tape would be available to the courts of appeals, as well as excluded evidence for review. This would obviously involve initial increased costs for equipment and training, but save time and money overall.	Feb 8, 2011 2:33 PM
113	Limit the number of expert witness in medical negligence cases.	Feb 8, 2011 2:42 PM
114	Parties try and hid the substance of the testimony of expert witnesses in hopes that the other party will not pay the cost to depose them. Experts should be required to make reports on the matters they will testify to and the reports should be ordered produced to all parties early in the case.	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 PM
115	Eliminate interrogatories	Feb 8, 2011 2:50 PM
116	Limitation on requests for production of documents	Feb 8, 2011 2:51 PM
117	The scope of discoverable information, whether that be e-discovery or hard copies, the scope becomes inudating, particularly when the matter at hand is nominal, at best.	Feb 8, 2011 3:16 PM
118	abuse of answers to discovery	Feb 8, 2011 3:18 PM
119	Limit interrogatories and depositions	Feb 8, 2011 3:31 PM
120	More initial and automatic disclosures at thestart of the case.	Feb 8, 2011 3:41 PM
121	Make the rules say that openness is the rule - that full disclosure is required unless one levels a valid objection that is specific and identifies what is being withheld.	Feb 8, 2011 4:07 PM
122	limitaion on interrogatorie by subject as well as number counted by subparts; elimination of definitions at least in interrogatories, and elimiation of purported instructions	Feb 8, 2011 4:15 PM
123	Not allow discovery in small claims without leave of court; BUT THEN we must have an "informal" 'hearing/trial' because being a Plaintiff it doesn't matter if you are suing for \$5 or \$50K you have to prove up the case in the same manner and Plaintiff can't do that without discovery.	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 PM
124	Uniform interrogatories and requests to produce	Feb 8, 2011 4:32 PM
125	Require parties to have a discovery conference with the Court early in the process and to develop a more detailed discovery plan other than the standard pretrial order. In particular, identification of issues of most relevance and focused discovery on those issues could lead to earlier resolution by settlement or summary judgment.	Feb 8, 2011 4:36 PM
126	Electronic discovery, the potential for abuse is too great and the documents to be collected too numerous.	Feb 8, 2011 5:11 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
127	see answer to number four	Feb 8, 2011 5:55 PM
128	The biggest problem is lawyers just print up the questions from the last case. You see questions that have nothing to do with the case. I just recieved lost wage questions in a case in which the plaintiff is a high school student. How can you rule lawyers to be thoughtful, decent and effecient?	Feb 8, 2011 6:05 PM
129	Insurance counsel in somewhat lower value personal injury cases are using discovery expenses as a weapon to discourage lawyers from taking these cases and then under paying. As an attorney you spend a lot of money on experts and depositions that are unnecessary or that should be reimbursed.	Feb 8, 2011 6:27 PM
130	limit use of interrogatories	Feb 8, 2011 7:00 PM
131	Adopt mandatory disclosures that must be exchanged similar to those required in the federal system within a given time period	Feb 8, 2011 7:48 PM
132	Use of computer geberated discovery by major firms to pad or increase the billing to the client whether necessary or not. I see the exact same discovery in differant cases from the major firms. Most of the discovery from major firms is irrelevant, immaterial or is used to cover their rear end.	Feb 8, 2011 9:36 PM
133	mandatory disclosure of information for both parties (i.e. car crash - liability policy, medical records and bills, pictures taken, etc.)	Feb 8, 2011 10:53 PM
134	I disagree with the premise of the questions on discovery to the extent of applicability to consumer litigation and the problem of unrepresented parties. Requests for Admissions and other discovery devices or motions for summary judgment against pro se consumers are very cost effective and effective for the debt collector, but that doesn't make them fair or mean a just result is obtained. Our court system is completely broken as it relates to debt collection and the problem of pro se or unrepresented litigants. In small claims, legislation, court rules and judicial opinions have resulted in debt collectors having to prove almost nothing to get judgments. Most consumers cannot afford attorneys to defend. More than 90% default. Many, if not most, have credible defenses that could be raised. A large number simply do not owe the debts that result in judgments against them. Default judgments are routinely entered against consumers that were never served. The system is extremely efficient right now in getting judgments against consumers. That doesn't make it fair. And why on earth do we refund fees to debt collectors who obtain default judgments against consumers. They obtained a service from the court at tax payer expense. Many, if not most of these debt collectors are debt buyers who purchased the debt for pennies on the dollar, they have next to nothing for evidence and no witnesses, and the court gives them default judgments. Then we refund their filing fee. These are professional debt collectors. Let them collect the filing fees from the alleged debtor. Why should the state refund the fee and then have to do collection. Even worse, some of these fees are refunded on the default, and then they are also collected from the consumer as part of the judgment. No wonder the court doesn't have any money.	Feb 9, 2011 3:37 AM
135	INITIAL DISCLOSURES SIMILAR TO FEDERAL SYSTEM WITHIN 90 DAYS OF ANSWER; NO DISCOVERY UNTIL THAT OCCURS	Feb 9, 2011 6:05 PM
136	Allow digital recording of depositions without the necessity of a transcript.	Feb 9, 2011 7:50 PM
137	Limit discovery in cases involving less than \$100,000.	Feb 9, 2011 8:28 PM
138	If answers to interrogatories were more complete, other forms of discovery would be less necessary and important.	Feb 9, 2011 8:28 PM
139	Limit discovery for cases under \$50000	Feb 9, 2011 8:58 PM
140	Faster hearings and ruling on motions to compel	Feb 9, 2011 9:33 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
141	A frustrating aspect of practice is when a trial setting conference is held with a pro se party and a trial date is set. The opposing attorney then will serve requests for admissions on the pro se party who doesn't respond because they think the trial date means nothing will be resolved until then. The attorney then files a summary judgment motion based on the failure to respond and the facts being deemed admitted. I think that there should be an adjustment to the rules to address this injustice.	Feb 10, 2011 3:16 PM
142	No recent experience - retired for 4 years. Would retain limitations on number of written interrogatories and impose restrictions on complex interrogatories. Rules should discourage "punitive" discovery with an effective enforcement process.	Feb 10, 2011 3:29 PM
143	In cases where damages do not exceed 50K, don't allow any depositions. The only discovery allowed would be interrogatories, requests for admissions, requests for production of documents and all discovery must be completed within 6 months of defendants answer. This would force parties to stay focused, be prepared to litigate or resolve quickly. Many small cases clog the court system because the lawyers feel they have to work the file up as hard as they do more substantial matters. When plaintiff files Petition they should be required to state amount claimed for relief in a monetary amount. NO amendments absent a clear showing of new evidence. Verdict can not exceed prayer for relief. If verdict is not at least 75% of prayer, plaintiff required to pay all costs of litigation. Defendants often required to do greater discovery because of vagueness of claims to avoid surprise at trial.	Feb 10, 2011 9:58 PM
144	There should be some sanction for failure to timely respond.	Feb 10, 2011 10:31 PM
145	Again, real impact to failure to cooperate. By the time a friendly extension is requested with no results, then a motion to compel, then a hearing, then an order with more time to comply, and then a motion and then a hearing on sanctions, the other side just gets a lot more time. It is difficult to explain to clients who act in good faith why and how the other side can "get away" with not producing needed information.	Feb 10, 2011 10:53 PM
146	Responses of parties to expert witness interrogatories should strictly limit trial testimony. This would avoid nonspecific answers that usually require a lengthy deposition to determine what the experts' opinions are.	Feb 10, 2011 11:35 PM
147	A ban on those "instructions," "directions," and other boilerplate that has crept onto the start of discovery requests and answers/responses.	Feb 11, 2011 1:07 AM
148	Limitations on numbers of all Discovery so that it doesn't become a disadvantage to lower income party.	Feb 11, 2011 1:59 AM
149	I would limit the number of subparagraphs in interrogatories, so that 30 interrogatories do not turn into 180 questions that become overwhelming to answer within thirty days. Similarly, I would limit requests for production of documents to the time period relevant to the action, so that a sixty year old plaintiff does not have to remember every physician the plaintiff saw during his or her adult life or a party in a dissolution action does not have to produce every financial record and bank statement during a long-term marriage.	Feb 11, 2011 3:54 AM
150	Increase penalties for failure to timely respond, and for proving facts at trial or on Summary Judgment (similar to Request for Admission).	Feb 11, 2011 3:27 PM
151	Limitations placed on smaller claims.	Feb 11, 2011 5:47 PM
152	excessive requests for production	Feb 11, 2011 7:29 PM
153	reduce the number of interrogatories to 20, including sub parts,(without a court order) and enforce the rule	Feb 11, 2011 9:52 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text

154 MODEL SETS OF INTERROGATORIES FOR VARIOUS TYPES OF CASES Feb 11, 2011 10:47 PM

ALONG THE LINES OF THE MODEL JURY INSTRUCTIONS WOULD ALLOW UNIFORM, STANDARD QUESTIONS AND UNIFORM UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT CONSTITUED A COMPLETE ANSWER. MODEL SET OF ACCEPTABLE OBJECTIONS AND THE INFORMATION THAT MUST BE PROVIDED UNDER THE OBJECTION WOULD ALSO BE HELPFUL, FOR EXAMPLE: OBJECTIONS TO PRIVILEGE OR PREPARATION IN ANTICIPATION OF LITIGATION. ARE SUPPOSED TO STATE WHAT EXISTS AND WHERE IT IS, THEN STATE WHY THE PARTY SHOULDN'T HAVE TO PRODUCE IT. TOO OFTEN, HOWEVER, THE OBJECTION IS MADE ALONE AND TIME IS WASTED FINDING OUT WHETHER INFORMATION ACTUALLY EXISTS OR ITS JUST A CANNED ANSWER. RULE 1.503(5) IS SIMPLY NOT FOLLOWED AND IT SHOULD BE A PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO DO SO.

AN INJURED PARTY SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO TRAVEL MORE THAN 100 MILES FOR AN INDEPENDENT MEDICAL EXAMINATION OR TO ATTEND THE DEPOSITION OF THE IME DOCTOR. UNDER THE PRESENT RULES, A DEPOSITON CAN BE SET FOR ANYWHERE WITHIN 100 MILES OF THE IOWA BORDER: SO, A PARTY IN SIOUX CITY COULD BE REQUIRED TO ATTEND A MEDICAL DEPOSTION IN MADISON WISCONSIN. THIS RULE ON DEPOSTIONS IS ABUSED WHEN IT COMES TO HIRED WITNESSES. IT WAS INTENDED TO COVER A FACT WITNESS WHO MOVED OR LIVES OUT OF STATE. WHEN IT COMES TO HIRED WITNESSES, THE INJURED PARTY SHOULD NOT HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN PARTICIPATING REMOTELY OR EXTENSIVE TRAVEL TO BE PERSONALLY PRESENT TO OBSERVE THE WITNESS AND TO LOOK AT EXHIBITS SUCH AS MEDICAL RECORDS AND CONFER WITH COUNSEL. A SEPARATE RULE FOR "RETAINED EXPERT WITNESSES" NEEDS TO BE WRITTEN.

WHEN A REQUEST FOR AN ADMISSION IS DENIED, THE RULE SHOULD REQUIRE THE ANSWERING PARTY TO SET OUT THE REASON FOR THE DENIAL. AT PRESENT, ONLY THE REASON FOR OBJECTING TO THE REQUEST IS REQUIRED.. IF THE REASON FOR A DENIAL WERE STATED, THE REQUESTING PARTY COULD FURNISH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR REPHRASE THE REQUEST. THIS WOULD NARROW THE ISSUES THAT REMAIN FOR TRIAL.

THE RULES ON RETAINED EXPERTS SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE EXPERT MUST ANSWER INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY THE OTHER SIDE AND NOT SIMPLY, SAY "SEE REPORT" AND SIGN THE ANSWER. QUESTIONS ON THE NUMBER OF TIMES THE EXPERT HAS BEEN RETAINED AND WHETHER BY PLAINTIFFS OR DEFENDANTS, THE NAMES OF OTHER CASES THAT HAVE GONE TO TRIAL, COPIES OF REPORTS IN OTHER CASES, ETC. SHOULD BE ANSWERED AS A RETAINED EXPERT IS REQUIRED TO DO IN FEDERAL COURT.

I THINK THE CURRENT RULES ANTICIPATE LAWYERS IN A GIVEN VACINITY KNOW EACH OTHER AND COOPERATE IN DISCOVERY. PROFESSIONAL RESPECT AND ONGOING RELATIONSHIPS MADE IT POSSIBLE TO RELY ON OPPOSING COUNSEL TO BE ABOVE BOARD AND EXTEND THE NORMAL COURTESIES. THAT WAS THE CASE FOR MANY YEARS, BUT IS NO LONGER TRUE.

CLARIFICATION IN THE RULES WOULD ALSO HELP PRO SE LITIGANTS UNDERSTAND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES.

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
155	The deadline for closure of discovery should not be less than 30 days before trial. Discovery disputes often arise because of "last minute" issues caused by late discovery. Generally this is the result of counsel waiting too long to do their final trial preparation.	Feb 12, 2011 2:36 PM
156	My experience is that discovery in the Iowa state courts is usually cost effective and timely. There should be consideration for an approach to allow the use of subpoenas prior to the filing of a lawsuit. As attorneys we are required to make a good faith investigation into the merits of a claim. There are times when subpoena power would benefit this effort. Obtaining material by subpoena, could reduce claims and allow a better understanding of the potential defendants involvement and liability.	Feb 13, 2011 4:18 AM
157	form discovery works well and save the parties money and time	Feb 14, 2011 2:54 AM
158	Have Judges enforce discovery rules	Feb 14, 2011 1:46 PM
159	It seems to me that the discovery processes we have work well when you are working with competent ethical attorneys who, in fact, care about doing a good effecient job for the litigants rather than just looking for every opportunity to generate fees. I don't know that changing rules will ever change that fact.	Feb 14, 2011 4:26 PM
160	Adopt something similar to the federal rule requiring initial disclosures so that you get the basics without wasting time. Sanction parties for failure to prepare timely initial disclosures.	Feb 14, 2011 4:32 PM
161	Make discovery conferences mandatory	Feb 14, 2011 6:58 PM
162	The 30 day time in which to respond/produce information would actually be enforced by the court. All too often, opposing parties/counsel refuse to cooperate with discovery. The judiciary then refuses to legitimize discovery by enforcing sanctions.	Feb 15, 2011 3:14 PM
163	There should be a sanction against the client, and only the client, when the client fails to provide discovery materials to counsel promptly so that discovery can proceed smoothly. Many times, clients do not cooperate with their own attorneys in discovery, then try to blame the attorneys when some aspect of the case doesn't please the clients.	Feb 15, 2011 8:01 PM
164	Awarding of substantial attorney fees for forcing the other side to prove a fact that was denied in Request For Admissions.	Feb 15, 2011 8:29 PM
165	limit expert witnesses as they drive the costs of litigation more than any other factor.	Feb 15, 2011 8:52 PM
166	Require a discovery conference with the court and map out deadlines and details and identify periodically the problems that have arisen in the litigation.	Feb 16, 2011 5:05 PM
167	More sanctions imposed when discovery responses delayed by a party or attorney.	Feb 17, 2011 2:24 AM
168	Before any discovery can be requested, the requesting party must outline the factual details of his case and identify witnesses expected to testify and the facts they are expected to testify about. Not just generalized statements, but specific facts. Discovery costs are way too high and are not only delaying justice, but making it so expensive for litigants that access to justice is impaired.	Feb 17, 2011 4:02 AM
169	Enforcement of timely responses to discovery requests, and more frequent awards of sanctions (attorney fees and costs) for violations of discovery rules.	Feb 17, 2011 3:03 PM
170	Force the insurance defense counsel to answer interrogatories rather than waste everyone's time with baseless defenses.	Feb 17, 2011 8:21 PM
171	lmandatory initial disclosures	Feb 17, 2011 9:36 PM
172	Overly broad and unduly burdensome interrogatories and RFPS	Feb 20, 2011 4:56 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
173	Prevent attorneys from incessant interruption of deposition questioning by their opponent -- to signal the answer the deponent should give, to distract the opposing attorney, to prevent or interrupt an answer damaging to their side. These actions needlessly prolong the deposition process, sometimes for hours and hours! In my observation, bad faith in response to discovery is rampant - documents are altered or completely withheld, deponents regularly "stonewall" or flat-out lie! I am in favor of rules allowing sanctions for these activities.	Feb 20, 2011 10:32 PM
174	limitation of canned interrogatories which have lots of questions that have nothing to do with the facts of the case.	Feb 20, 2011 11:40 PM
175	A clear rule from the Iowa Supreme Court articulating that raising a claim of ineffective assistance of criminal trial counsel waives privilege as to counsel.	Feb 21, 2011 8:49 PM
176	Enforcement of existing discovery rules and court set deadlines (unless extension requested by BOTH parties)	Feb 21, 2011 8:59 PM
177	Requests for production of documents has gotten out of control. Asking for every conceivable piece of paper or electronic document is not necessary. It is extremely difficult to gather the volume of information requested when dealing with a large, multi-officed client.	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
178	Require discovery planning conference and plan similar to F.R.C.P. 26.	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
179	Limit the amount and scope of depositions except for complex civil litigation.	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
180	I tend to believe the district courts generally allow discovery abuses. The state district court, as opposed to the federal district court, does not read the relevancy requirement in Rule 1.503(1) too strictly. Furthermore, with the exception of Admissions, the district courts tend to allow/excuse a party's delays in responding to discovery.	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
181	require manatory initial disclosure	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
182	discovery judge available	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
183	Disclose experts earlier	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
184	Non focused fishing expenditures	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
185	Time limit on depositions to avoid abuse. Court approval could be requested if reason for longer depo could be given.	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
186	Better enforcement on the permissible scope both by parties and, ultimately, by the courts. The relevance permitted is often very, very tenuous at best.	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
187	That there are automatic production requirements in certain types of cases: for example, in all cases, parties must exchange tax returns and paystubs, all written documents in their possession pertaining to the case, a medical release to the Defendant (limited) if personal injury is involved, etc.. A failure to produce these documents within the time under the rules would be grounds for default because it slows everyone down and wastes time.	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
188	Provide a track for cases to proceed with document production and disclosure of witnesses, with no other discovery, if the parties and their counsel agreed.	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
189	Better teeth in sanctions/enforcement. Judges are hesitant to impose sanctions even where delay/refusal to cooperate is obvious.	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
190	Doing away with standard discovery requests where the standard requests are irrelevant to the actual case. That is more a function of attorneys paying attention than any rule changes that could be implemented.	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
191	Have the courts enforce the rules the same.	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
192	Require timely and thorough answers to written discovery requests and eliminate the limits on the number of interrogatories. Forcing attorneys and their clients to thoroughly answer interrogatories results in them knowing the strengths and weaknesses of their case, which in turn facilitates more meaningful settlement negotiations.	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
193	Limit on the length of time of depositions	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
194	I don't view discovery or supposed discovery abuse a significant problem in the Iowa civil justice system.	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
195	Abolish interrogatories and replace with federal type disclosures	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
196	Have the courts actually enforce the relevancy requirements set forth in the Rules of Civil Procedure. Enforcing that one rule, which the federal courts generally do, would solve about 80% of the problems with discovery. It eliminates fishing expeditions, decreases the amount and expense of discovery and most importantly focuses discovery on the issues involved.	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
197	Consistent enforcement of expert and discovery rules and deadlines	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
198	Submit a joint discovery plan to the court, and update it before final discovery.	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
199	giving Judges guidance to properly dispose of claims prior to trial, after appropriate discovery is conducted	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
200	Allow admission of medical documents, with certificate from the source(s).	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
201	Get the information that you ask for	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
202	Limit the number of depositions that can be taken in a case.	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
203	In certain types of cases, parties could be automatically required by the Rules of Civil Procedure to produce certain documents within a set number of days after service of the petition. For example, nearly every family law matter requires review of documentation evidencing the parties' income, assets & liabilities. Further, every family law matter involving children requires review of tax returns, paycheck stubs & health insurance plans to determine the appropriate amount of child support & medical support. Parties shouldn't have to prepare formal discovery requests to get this basic documentation from one another.	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
204	more control by the court	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
205	I'm personally sick of seeing stock interrogatories from opposing parties wherein it is obvious they were sent out by the paralegal or legal assistant and no one put any thought into whether or not the question was actually relevant, or even already known, before filing the request. By the same measure, I'm sick of seeing one or two-word answers, rather than a full and honest attempt to answer.	Feb 21, 2011 10:22 PM
206	more teeth to the time limits so the case can be dismissed if rules are not followed	Feb 21, 2011 10:26 PM
207	Increase penalties for parties and attorneys who act in bad faith during discovery.	Feb 21, 2011 10:40 PM
208	In BI cases practical limitations should be placed on document discovery. Document discovery is the most abused form of discovery.	Feb 21, 2011 11:00 PM
209	More judicial supervision.	Feb 21, 2011 11:04 PM
210	eliminate interrogatories - see previous answer to this question	Feb 21, 2011 11:14 PM
211	Limit discovery in smaller dollar cases. Have mandatory disclosure rules in those cases that requires each side to disclose and produce responses to certain standardized discovery with x number of days from filing their first pleading.	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
212	limitations on discovery	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
213	More harsh standards for parties who routinely object to everything including documents which should obviously be produced and then require a motion to compel be filed. It seems that the parties almost always receive a free pass the first time.	Feb 21, 2011 11:33 PM
214	I think that as we have more electronic discovery, it would be helpful to require the attorneys to have a better discussion about what discovery is going to involve. It might also be helpful to have initial disclosures like they do in federal court - it eliminates the need for some of the standard discovery questions/requests.	Feb 21, 2011 11:47 PM
215	Limit number of depositions; eliminate, by specific rule, the alleged distinction between a "discovery" deposition and a "testimony-preservation" deposition.	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
216	eliminate interrogatories	Feb 21, 2011 11:58 PM
217	The rules should differentiate between family court discovery and other types of discovery. Family law discovery is often used more as a mechanism to drain money and burn time than to actually prepare for trial.	Feb 22, 2011 12:08 AM
218	More frequent imposition of sanctions.	Feb 22, 2011 12:11 AM
219	Limitations on requests for production of Documents. This is a frequently abused Discovery tool when Counsel request documents that they know not to exist.	Feb 22, 2011 12:22 AM
220	To require that expert witness declarations be accompanied by report	Feb 22, 2011 1:19 AM
221	Counsel often use discovery as a shot gun not as a scalpel. Sanctions for over broad or duplicative discovery. Discovery that is unrelated or clearly not leading to admissible evidence.	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 AM
222	more involvement of court in evaluating relevance and excessive burden (in the context of the value of the case) and imposing case specific limit, as appropriate	Feb 22, 2011 2:48 AM
223	Discovery costs should more often be carried by the party requesting the discovery.	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 AM
224	Establish a standard document production obligation on all parties similar to what many districts require in divorce cases. Fair resolution of cases should be based on full disclosure and not on whether you can "ask the right question" or find the hidden treasure.	Feb 22, 2011 4:01 AM
225	reduce amount of time allowed to respond.	Feb 22, 2011 4:13 AM
226	Attorneys use form discovery questions and ask for answers or documents already in their knowledge or possession.	Feb 22, 2011 4:52 AM
227	early mediation before extensive discovery	Feb 22, 2011 12:56 PM
228	Not sure	Feb 22, 2011 1:26 PM
229	Require that requests for production of documents be expressly limited to reasonable period of time and scope.	Feb 22, 2011 2:26 PM
230	I won't work to put limits on discovery or to change the type of discovery. Discovery as we have it now, can, and should be tailored to the specific case in which it is used. Too often I get a set of discovery that is a boilerplate set just sent out without any editing for the case and as a result there will be terms like "accident" in the discovery when the case does not even involve an accident. In a modification case to change child support I was once sent a large set of discovery which went way beyond that which was necessary for the case. When I talked to the other attorney sometime later about it he indicated that he knew it was excessive but he sent it out because he was upset that I sent him formal discovery requests instead of just sending a letter asking for tax returns and W-2's. My reply was "look at what I sent you". I had sent him formal discovery but all I requested was tax returns and w-2's and maybe an interrogatory on benefits. It did not take any more time or expense for him to respond to my formal discovery than if I had just written a letter and I had "protected" myself from any possible problems if there was a delay in his response since I was in a position to file a motion to compel, etc. We just need to limit ourselves to discovery which is appropriate for the case we have.	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
231	limit unbridled use	Feb 22, 2011 3:03 PM
232	elimite the need to confer and brief the issue and go directly to the judge by telephone hearing	Feb 22, 2011 3:06 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
233	Eliminate Interrogatories and Requests for Production in Family Law cases. These discovery devices are simply used as harrassment in these cases. Married people know the answers to the general discovery questions. Discovery in Family Law matters should be by Court Approval only with a Judge reviewing the information requested.	Feb 22, 2011 3:32 PM
234	Increasing the # of interrogatories and requests for admission that can be served without the leave of the court from 30 to 50.	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
235	The court should limit the allowable discovery to keep insurance companies from running up the cost of litigation and discouraging claimants from pursuing their rightful claims. Litigation takes far too long and costs far too much due to unavailability of expert witnesses and prohibitive costs charged by expert witnesses and unlimited discovery conducted usually by the defense.	Feb 22, 2011 4:02 PM
236	Provide for mandatory cost shifting for electronic discovery requests and production. Require paper or PDF discovery of ESI--no more native format absent showing of good cause.	Feb 22, 2011 4:27 PM
237	limit scope of written discovery and production requests	Feb 22, 2011 4:50 PM
238	On complex cases involving more than 2 defendants the court should require defense counsel to provide a list of days available for depositions of all parties and witnesses. I have had to file motions for court ordered discovery to get depositions taken. Then I have had the same defense counsel claim I delayed indiscovery and tried to strike my expert witnesses. IT IS A JOKE	Feb 22, 2011 4:57 PM
239	more court involvement to obtain better results	Feb 22, 2011 5:12 PM
240	Lawyers filing some motions to just drag the case out for fees or to make the one without deep packets and unlimited time to quit.	Feb 22, 2011 6:21 PM
241	Limitations on the amount of time for a deposition. As a plaintiff's/claimant's attorney, I see too many defense depositions where very little time is spent on relevant issues. Most of the time seems to devoted to logging billable hours.	Feb 22, 2011 7:16 PM
242	limit depositions	Feb 22, 2011 8:12 PM
243	change the rule for pro se defendant's responding to requests for admission;	Feb 22, 2011 9:02 PM
244	I would require family law judges to take note of requests to admit in accordance with the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure. I would also require judges to uphold 1.517(5) which says no motion can be filed without first conferring with opposing counsel before filing a motion. In essence, I would require Judges to actually follow the rules of civil procedure, not just the ones they want to when they want to.	Feb 22, 2011 9:52 PM
245	Sanction attorneys who fail to comply with discovery rules. Numerous litigators, particularly in small or solo firms, make the barest of efforts to comply with their discovery obligations. This necessitates motion practice, which often results in the court ordering the offending attorney to do what he/she was supposed to do in the first place.	Feb 22, 2011 9:54 PM
246	Link amount and scope of discovery available (especially electronic discovery) to the amount at stake in the case.	Feb 22, 2011 10:19 PM
247	Follow the federal rules of civil procedures' model for Rule 26(a) mandatory disclosures in all civil cases; this would force both sides to disclose pertinent information at the beginning of a case and stave off needless fishing expeditions, thus saving everyone time and money.	Feb 22, 2011 10:44 PM
248	STANDARDIZE INTERROGATORIES, REQUIRE DISCLOSURE OF BILLING TIME TO DEFENSE CLIENTS, OR JUST MAKE ANSWERS PART OF PLEADING AND REQUIRE RECIPRICOL	Feb 23, 2011 2:08 PM
249	No opinion	Feb 23, 2011 3:33 PM
250	LIMIT THE REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION	Feb 23, 2011 5:22 PM

10. If there were one aspect of discovery that you could change in order to

Response Text		
251	motions to produce usually ask for the kitchen sink and most courts will not limit the scope if there is a sintilia of connection and I'm not sure objecting is worth the time and the cost to the client - there fore I would be in favor of a more limited scope of discovery in production matters	Feb 23, 2011 5:53 PM
252	reduce its availability	Feb 23, 2011 8:15 PM
253	Restrict or eliminate request for admissions because the use at trial is seldom effective.	Feb 24, 2011 6:08 PM
254	Limitations on requests for production of documents, particularly electronic discovery.	Feb 25, 2011 1:32 PM
255	have initial disclosures similar to federal system	Feb 25, 2011 8:00 PM
256	Can't say. I have been fotunate to be able to get along with opposing coundeal, and able to resolve our diputes without Court intervention.	Feb 25, 2011 9:08 PM
257	To actually impose sanctions when Motions to Compel are filed.	Feb 25, 2011 10:17 PM
258	Generic requirements for certain types of cases (e.g., in custody/child support case, both sides automactically produce last two years of tax returns and last three paystubs + list all witnesses w/ summary of testimony)	Feb 27, 2011 7:13 PM
259	I would change Rule 1.509 and attempt to clarify what constitutes a single interrogatory. Presently, the limit of 30 interrogatories is almost meaningless, as litigants commonly include multiple questions in each numbered interrogatory, with the result that most parties actually propound many more than 30 interrogatories on each other. If there were an enforceable limit on the number of written questions each party could ask, perhaps interrogatories would be used more selectively and efficiently. As it is now, it seems that interrogatories are used as much for the burden they impose on the other party as for the purpose of gathering information that will be useful at trial.	Feb 28, 2011 3:31 AM
260	Cut off new opinions by experts to at least 90 days before trial. The current practice allowing updates to within 30 days of trial make the scheduling order/discovery cutoffs meaningless.	Feb 28, 2011 3:15 PM
261	Interrogatories should be in plain English.	Feb 28, 2011 10:11 PM
262	Parties should just answer the questions unless they are really out of line. Giving incomplete answers only increases the cost and wastes everyones time.	Feb 28, 2011 11:52 PM

7. What effect does holding a Rule 1.602 pretrial conference have on a case?

Other (please specify)		
1	Pretrial conferences should be held in front of the trial judge. Too often, at least in Polk County, parties are simply required to submit a trial scheduling order, and the only court personnel involved are those in court administration who keep the calendar. Actually having the judge involved would encourage the parties to narrow the issues and set discovery deadlines, motion deadlines, and trial dates that actually make sense for the case.	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
2	Unless all motions in limine are ruled upon before the pretrial conference, the conference is usually a waste of time.	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
3	Only if the conference is held early enough in the case - about 2 weeks out seems best.	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
4	I have never had a Judge hold one, so I would be guessing as to the effect.	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
5	Does not usually get the case settled as the defendants just attend and use it as another billing opportunity with their insurance carrier.	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM

7. What effect does holding a Rule 1.602 pretrial conference have on a case?

Other (please specify)		
6	never had one	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
7	Unless judges specialise in certain areas, rules like this are meaningless.	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
8	Never had a real pretrial as set forth in 1.602	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
9	Can do all of the above in a particular case, but not the same in all cases, which is why the present system of having them on request is good.	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
10	Minimizes the gamesmanship	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 AM
11	It all depends on the case. It helps often enough to keep doing it/do it more	Feb 8, 2011 6:13 PM
12	This is where the judge who will try the case must be the one that handles the PTC where jury instructions and exhibits etc are discussed	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
13	Final PreTrial conference generally helpful narrowing the trial issues	Feb 10, 2011 10:17 PM
14	Is helpful with self-represented litigants to understand the process and prepare.	Feb 11, 2011 4:05 AM
15	LETS THE COURT KNOW WHETHER THE CASE IS READY FOR TRIAL AND THE ORDER PROVIDES FOR ANY TIME FRAMES THAT VARY WITH THE TRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER. ARE USUALLY HELD BY TELEPHONE. THEY ARE NOT USED AS A SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE. WE USE TO HAVE ENOUGH JUDGES TO HAVE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCES, BUT THIS IS NO LONGER TRUE. TOO BAD.	Feb 11, 2011 10:58 PM
16	Helps achieve stipulations to resolve evidentiary issues	Feb 16, 2011 12:38 AM
17	Typically, non-judicial officers hold the conferences, and those conference are limited to setting dates and deadlines. There is typically no discussion concerning what the case is about, issues in the case, or any other matters that address an efficient trial process.	Feb 17, 2011 3:17 PM
18	no comment	Feb 21, 2011 1:52 PM
19	I have never had a 1.602 conference	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
20	Focuses the attorneys, the parties & the court on the primary issues to be handled at trial	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
21	I have never had a "conference" under this rule. We only get a standard trial scheduling order which people only pay attention to for the deadlines and filing requirements. It doesn't force parties to do anything else that really gets the case moving.	Feb 21, 2011 10:29 PM
22	602 conferences are, in the real world, only used to establish deadlines for joining parties, naming experts, etc. None of the other things listed in this question are ever addressed in any of the several districts where I practice.	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
23	I have no experience with them	Feb 22, 2011 2:59 PM
24	Don't know. Never had one like is contemplated in the rule. Only have final pretrial conferences in District 1, usually 1 week before trial, and nothing substantive is discussed.	Feb 24, 2011 7:51 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
1	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
2	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
3	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
4	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
5	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
6	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
7		Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
8	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
9	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
10	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
11	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
12	70	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
13	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
14	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
15	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
16		Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
17	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
18	65	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
19	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
20	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
21	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
22	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
23	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
24	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
25	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
26	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
27	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
28	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
29	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
30	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
31	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
32	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
33	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
34	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
35	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
36	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
37	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
38	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
39	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
40	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
41	99	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
42	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
43	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
44	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
45	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
46	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
47	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:

48	2	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
49	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
50	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
51	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
52	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
53	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
54	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
55	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
56	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
57	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
58		Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
59	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
60	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
61	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
62	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
63	85	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
64	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
65	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
66	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
67	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
68	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:16 PM
69	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
70	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
71	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
72	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
73	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
74		Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
75	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
76	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
77	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
78		Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
79	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
80	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
81	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
82		Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
83	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
84	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
85	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
86	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
87	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
88	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
89	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
90	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
91		Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
92	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
93	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
94	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
95	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
96	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
97	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
98	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
99	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
100	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
101	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
102	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
103	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
104	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
105	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
106	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
107	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
108	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
109	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
110	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
111	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
112	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
113	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
114	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
115	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
116	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
117	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
118	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
119	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
120	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
121	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
122	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
123	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
124		Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
125	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
126	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
127	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
128	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
129	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:12 PM
130	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
131	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
132	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:16 PM
133	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:19 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
134	60	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
135	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:23 PM
136	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
137	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
138	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:35 PM
139		Feb 7, 2011 10:36 PM
140	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
141	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:43 PM
142	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:43 PM
143	40	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
144	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
145	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
146	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
147	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
148	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:51 PM
149	75	Feb 7, 2011 11:02 PM
150	30	Feb 7, 2011 11:04 PM
151		Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
152	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
153	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:09 PM
154	30	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
155	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
156	30	Feb 7, 2011 11:12 PM
157	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
158	10	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
159	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:19 PM
160	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:20 PM
161		Feb 7, 2011 11:32 PM
162	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:35 PM
163	40	Feb 7, 2011 11:36 PM
164	98	Feb 7, 2011 11:37 PM
165	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:44 PM
166	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:55 PM
167	40	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
168	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:19 AM
169	10	Feb 8, 2011 12:24 AM
170	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:35 AM
171	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:46 AM
172	50	Feb 8, 2011 12:55 AM
173	33	Feb 8, 2011 1:00 AM
174	75	Feb 8, 2011 1:01 AM
175	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:43 AM
176	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
177	80	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 AM
178	25	Feb 8, 2011 2:27 AM
179	25	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 AM
180	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:38 AM
181		Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
182	95	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 AM
183		Feb 8, 2011 2:59 AM
184	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:22 AM
185		Feb 8, 2011 5:16 AM
186	50	Feb 8, 2011 1:00 PM
187	80	Feb 8, 2011 1:29 PM
188	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
189	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
190	60	Feb 8, 2011 1:39 PM
191		Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
192	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 PM
193	90	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
194		Feb 8, 2011 2:28 PM
195	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
196	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:46 PM
197	50	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 PM
198	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:53 PM
199		Feb 8, 2011 2:55 PM
200	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
201	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:09 PM
202	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:12 PM
203	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:12 PM
204	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
205	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:16 PM
206	75	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 PM
207	25	Feb 8, 2011 3:25 PM
208	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:36 PM
209	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:39 PM
210	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:43 PM
211	90	Feb 8, 2011 3:45 PM
212	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
213		Feb 8, 2011 4:03 PM
214	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:04 PM
215	50	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
216	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 PM
217	100	Feb 8, 2011 4:18 PM
218	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:19 PM
219	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
220		Feb 8, 2011 4:29 PM
221	25	Feb 8, 2011 4:36 PM
222	80	Feb 8, 2011 4:38 PM
223	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:41 PM
224	30	Feb 8, 2011 4:54 PM
225	50	Feb 8, 2011 5:17 PM
226	75	Feb 8, 2011 5:17 PM
227	50	Feb 8, 2011 6:00 PM
228	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:13 PM
229	90	Feb 8, 2011 6:13 PM
230	30	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
231	2	Feb 8, 2011 6:53 PM
232	80	Feb 8, 2011 7:21 PM
233	75	Feb 8, 2011 7:28 PM
234	80	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
235	50	Feb 8, 2011 7:44 PM
236	50	Feb 8, 2011 7:57 PM
237	50	Feb 8, 2011 8:21 PM
238	100	Feb 8, 2011 8:36 PM
239	10	Feb 8, 2011 9:09 PM
240	30	Feb 8, 2011 9:24 PM
241	25	Feb 8, 2011 9:42 PM
242	75	Feb 8, 2011 10:12 PM
243	10	Feb 8, 2011 11:01 PM
244	0	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
245	50	Feb 9, 2011 12:33 AM
246	20	Feb 9, 2011 1:12 AM
247	70	Feb 9, 2011 2:01 AM
248	20	Feb 9, 2011 2:40 AM
249	50	Feb 9, 2011 3:46 AM
250	25	Feb 9, 2011 2:17 PM
251	10	Feb 9, 2011 4:55 PM
252	50	Feb 9, 2011 6:12 PM
253	70	Feb 9, 2011 6:17 PM
254	50	Feb 9, 2011 6:39 PM
255	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:00 PM
256	9	Feb 9, 2011 8:36 PM
257	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:37 PM
258	50	Feb 9, 2011 9:05 PM
259	10	Feb 9, 2011 9:40 PM
260	100	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
261	90	Feb 10, 2011 3:02 PM
262		Feb 10, 2011 3:23 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
263	75	Feb 10, 2011 3:39 PM
264	99	Feb 10, 2011 6:48 PM
265	75	Feb 10, 2011 7:06 PM
266	0	Feb 10, 2011 7:10 PM
267	75	Feb 10, 2011 10:17 PM
268	100	Feb 10, 2011 10:33 PM
269	100	Feb 10, 2011 10:56 PM
270	5	Feb 10, 2011 10:56 PM
271	5	Feb 11, 2011 1:12 AM
272	5	Feb 11, 2011 2:07 AM
273	50	Feb 11, 2011 2:44 AM
274	1	Feb 11, 2011 4:05 AM
275	50	Feb 11, 2011 6:21 AM
276	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:28 PM
277	100	Feb 11, 2011 3:31 PM
278	70	Feb 11, 2011 6:08 PM
279	80	Feb 11, 2011 7:33 PM
280	0	Feb 11, 2011 8:02 PM
281	0	Feb 11, 2011 8:59 PM
282	95	Feb 11, 2011 10:58 PM
283		Feb 12, 2011 2:43 PM
284	10	Feb 12, 2011 4:09 PM
285	50	Feb 13, 2011 4:22 AM
286	75	Feb 14, 2011 3:00 AM
287	50	Feb 14, 2011 4:36 PM
288	33	Feb 14, 2011 4:44 PM
289	0	Feb 14, 2011 8:16 PM
290	5	Feb 15, 2011 12:52 AM
291	40	Feb 15, 2011 12:30 PM
292	100	Feb 15, 2011 1:58 PM
293	50	Feb 15, 2011 3:20 PM
294	0	Feb 15, 2011 5:12 PM
295		Feb 15, 2011 8:08 PM
296	100	Feb 15, 2011 8:43 PM
297	50	Feb 15, 2011 8:57 PM
298		Feb 15, 2011 11:51 PM
299	10	Feb 16, 2011 12:38 AM
300	30	Feb 16, 2011 5:15 PM
301	5	Feb 16, 2011 10:17 PM
302	0	Feb 17, 2011 4:12 AM
303	99	Feb 17, 2011 3:17 PM
304	80	Feb 17, 2011 8:28 PM
305	80	Feb 17, 2011 9:23 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
306	00	Feb 17, 2011 9:46 PM
307		Feb 18, 2011 9:09 PM
308	50	Feb 20, 2011 10:41 PM
309	0	Feb 20, 2011 11:48 PM
310	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:52 PM
311	90	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
312	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
313	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
314	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
315	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
316		Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
317	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
318	85	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
319	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
320	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
321	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
322	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
323	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
324	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
325	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
326	70	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
327	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
328		Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
329	40	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
330	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
331	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
332	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
333	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
334	65	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
335	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
336	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
337	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
338	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
339	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
340	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
341	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
342	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
343	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
344	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
345	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
346	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
347	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
348	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
349	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
350	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
351	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
352	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
353	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
354		Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
355	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
356	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
357	40	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
358	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
359	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
360	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM
361	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM
362	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
363	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
364	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
365	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
366	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
367	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM
368	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM
369	33	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
370	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
371	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
372	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:59 PM
373	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
374		Feb 21, 2011 10:03 PM
375	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:06 PM
376	30	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
377		Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
378	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
379		Feb 21, 2011 10:21 PM
380	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:22 PM
381	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:25 PM
382	75	Feb 21, 2011 10:29 PM
383	75	Feb 21, 2011 10:39 PM
384	75	Feb 21, 2011 10:43 PM
385	100	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
386	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
387	75	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
388	2	Feb 21, 2011 11:09 PM
389	25	Feb 21, 2011 11:10 PM
390	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:17 PM
391	15	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
392	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
393	50	Feb 21, 2011 11:21 PM
394	25	Feb 21, 2011 11:29 PM
395	95	Feb 21, 2011 11:31 PM
396	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:31 PM
397	10	Feb 21, 2011 11:43 PM
398	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:44 PM
399	10	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
400	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:51 PM
401	30	Feb 22, 2011 12:01 AM
402	50	Feb 22, 2011 12:05 AM
403	100	Feb 22, 2011 12:14 AM
404	5	Feb 22, 2011 12:15 AM
405	20	Feb 22, 2011 12:22 AM
406	50	Feb 22, 2011 12:27 AM
407	80	Feb 22, 2011 1:25 AM
408	90	Feb 22, 2011 1:54 AM
409	20	Feb 22, 2011 1:58 AM
410	10	Feb 22, 2011 1:59 AM
411	15	Feb 22, 2011 2:04 AM
412	70	Feb 22, 2011 2:58 AM
413	80	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 AM
414	50	Feb 22, 2011 4:03 AM
415	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 AM
416	60	Feb 22, 2011 4:23 AM
417	100	Feb 22, 2011 4:30 AM
418	50	Feb 22, 2011 4:57 AM
419	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:35 PM
420	25	Feb 22, 2011 1:38 PM
421	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:06 PM
422	50	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
423	75	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
424	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
425	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:16 PM
426	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:26 PM
427	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:30 PM
428	10	Feb 22, 2011 3:30 PM
429	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:32 PM
430	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:37 PM
431	75	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
432		Feb 22, 2011 3:41 PM
433	40	Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
434	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:48 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
435	100	Feb 22, 2011 3:48 PM
436	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
437	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
438	80	Feb 22, 2011 4:00 PM
439	95	Feb 22, 2011 4:03 PM
440	90	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 PM
441	25	Feb 22, 2011 4:35 PM
442	10	Feb 22, 2011 4:55 PM
443	75	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
444	2	Feb 22, 2011 5:28 PM
445	20	Feb 22, 2011 5:50 PM
446	100	Feb 22, 2011 7:22 PM
447	20	Feb 22, 2011 7:25 PM
448		Feb 22, 2011 7:42 PM
449	35	Feb 22, 2011 8:19 PM
450	25	Feb 22, 2011 9:07 PM
451	20	Feb 22, 2011 9:14 PM
452	15	Feb 22, 2011 9:58 PM
453	10	Feb 22, 2011 9:59 PM
454		Feb 22, 2011 10:13 PM
455	50	Feb 22, 2011 10:23 PM
456	25	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
457	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:49 PM
458	25	Feb 22, 2011 11:33 PM
459	25	Feb 23, 2011 4:06 AM
460	50	Feb 23, 2011 2:37 PM
461	15	Feb 23, 2011 4:34 PM
462		Feb 23, 2011 5:29 PM
463	5	Feb 23, 2011 5:53 PM
464	90	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
465	50	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
466	0	Feb 23, 2011 8:22 PM
467	50	Feb 23, 2011 8:34 PM
468	30	Feb 23, 2011 9:54 PM
469	30	Feb 24, 2011 6:20 PM
470	50	Feb 24, 2011 7:51 PM
471	15	Feb 25, 2011 4:37 PM
472	10	Feb 25, 2011 8:05 PM
473	40	Feb 25, 2011 9:17 PM
474	50	Feb 27, 2011 4:14 PM
475	20	Feb 27, 2011 4:29 PM
476	2	Feb 27, 2011 7:19 PM
477	90	Feb 28, 2011 1:33 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Telephone %:		
478	20	Feb 28, 2011 2:40 AM
479	95	Feb 28, 2011 3:38 AM
480	50	Feb 28, 2011 3:28 PM
481	100	Feb 28, 2011 6:03 PM
482	70	Feb 28, 2011 9:48 PM
483	40	Feb 28, 2011 10:00 PM
484		Feb 28, 2011 10:15 PM
485	50	Mar 1, 2011 12:02 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
1		Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
2	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
3	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
4		Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
5		Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
6		Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
7		Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
8		Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
9	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
10		Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
11	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
12	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
13	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
14		Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
15	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
16		Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
17	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
18		Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
19	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
20	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
21	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
22	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
23	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
24	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
25	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
26	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
27	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
28		Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
29		Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
30	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
31	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
32		Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
33	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
34	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
35	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
36	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
37		Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
38	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
39	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
40	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
41	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
42	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
43	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
44	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
45	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
46	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
47		Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
48	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
49	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
50	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
51		Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
52	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
53	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
54		Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
55	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
56	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
57	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
58		Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
59	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
60		Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
61		Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
62	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
63	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
64	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
65	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
66	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
67	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
68	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:16 PM
69		Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
70	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
71	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
72		Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
73	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:

74		Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
75		Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
76	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
77	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
78		Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
79	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
80	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
81	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
82		Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
83		Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
84	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
85		Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
86	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
87	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
88	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
89		Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
90		Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
91		Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
92	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
93	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
94	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
95	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
96		Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
97	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
98	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
99	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
100	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
101	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
102	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
103	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
104	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
105	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
106	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
107	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
108		Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
109		Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
110	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
111	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
112		Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
113	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
114	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
115	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
116		Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
117	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
118	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
119	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
120		Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
121	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
122		Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
123		Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
124		Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
125	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
126	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
127	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
128	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
129	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:12 PM
130	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
131	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
132	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:16 PM
133	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:19 PM
134	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
135	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:23 PM
136	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
137		Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
138	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:35 PM
139		Feb 7, 2011 10:36 PM
140	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
141		Feb 7, 2011 10:43 PM
142	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:43 PM
143	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
144		Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
145	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
146		Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
147	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
148	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:51 PM
149		Feb 7, 2011 11:02 PM
150	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:04 PM
151		Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
152		Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
153	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:09 PM
154	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
155	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
156		Feb 7, 2011 11:12 PM
157	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
158	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
159	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:19 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
160	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:20 PM
161		Feb 7, 2011 11:32 PM
162	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:35 PM
163		Feb 7, 2011 11:36 PM
164		Feb 7, 2011 11:37 PM
165	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:44 PM
166	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:55 PM
167	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
168	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:19 AM
169	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:24 AM
170	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:35 AM
171	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:46 AM
172	0	Feb 8, 2011 12:55 AM
173	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:00 AM
174		Feb 8, 2011 1:01 AM
175	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:43 AM
176	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 AM
177	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 AM
178	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:27 AM
179	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 AM
180		Feb 8, 2011 2:38 AM
181		Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
182	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 AM
183	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:59 AM
184	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:22 AM
185		Feb 8, 2011 5:16 AM
186		Feb 8, 2011 1:00 PM
187		Feb 8, 2011 1:29 PM
188	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
189	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
190	0	Feb 8, 2011 1:39 PM
191		Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
192	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 PM
193		Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
194		Feb 8, 2011 2:28 PM
195	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
196	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:46 PM
197	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 PM
198	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:53 PM
199		Feb 8, 2011 2:55 PM
200	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
201	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:09 PM
202	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:12 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
203		Feb 8, 2011 3:12 PM
204		Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
205		Feb 8, 2011 3:16 PM
206	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 PM
207	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:25 PM
208	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:36 PM
209	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:39 PM
210	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:43 PM
211		Feb 8, 2011 3:45 PM
212	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
213		Feb 8, 2011 4:03 PM
214	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:04 PM
215		Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
216	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 PM
217		Feb 8, 2011 4:18 PM
218		Feb 8, 2011 4:19 PM
219	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
220		Feb 8, 2011 4:29 PM
221	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:36 PM
222		Feb 8, 2011 4:38 PM
223	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:41 PM
224	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:54 PM
225	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:17 PM
226		Feb 8, 2011 5:17 PM
227	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:00 PM
228	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:13 PM
229	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:13 PM
230	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
231	0	Feb 8, 2011 6:53 PM
232	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:21 PM
233	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:28 PM
234		Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
235		Feb 8, 2011 7:44 PM
236	0	Feb 8, 2011 7:57 PM
237		Feb 8, 2011 8:21 PM
238		Feb 8, 2011 8:36 PM
239	1	Feb 8, 2011 9:09 PM
240	0	Feb 8, 2011 9:24 PM
241	0	Feb 8, 2011 9:42 PM
242		Feb 8, 2011 10:12 PM
243	0	Feb 8, 2011 11:01 PM
244	0	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
245		Feb 9, 2011 12:33 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
246	0	Feb 9, 2011 1:12 AM
247		Feb 9, 2011 2:01 AM
248		Feb 9, 2011 2:40 AM
249		Feb 9, 2011 3:46 AM
250	0	Feb 9, 2011 2:17 PM
251	0	Feb 9, 2011 4:55 PM
252	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:12 PM
253	0	Feb 9, 2011 6:17 PM
254		Feb 9, 2011 6:39 PM
255	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:00 PM
256	1	Feb 9, 2011 8:36 PM
257	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:37 PM
258		Feb 9, 2011 9:05 PM
259	0	Feb 9, 2011 9:40 PM
260	0	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
261		Feb 10, 2011 3:02 PM
262		Feb 10, 2011 3:23 PM
263	0	Feb 10, 2011 3:39 PM
264	0	Feb 10, 2011 6:48 PM
265	0	Feb 10, 2011 7:06 PM
266	0	Feb 10, 2011 7:10 PM
267	5	Feb 10, 2011 10:17 PM
268		Feb 10, 2011 10:33 PM
269		Feb 10, 2011 10:56 PM
270	0	Feb 10, 2011 10:56 PM
271	0	Feb 11, 2011 1:12 AM
272	0	Feb 11, 2011 2:07 AM
273		Feb 11, 2011 2:44 AM
274	0	Feb 11, 2011 4:05 AM
275		Feb 11, 2011 6:21 AM
276	0	Feb 11, 2011 3:28 PM
277		Feb 11, 2011 3:31 PM
278	0	Feb 11, 2011 6:08 PM
279	0	Feb 11, 2011 7:33 PM
280	0	Feb 11, 2011 8:02 PM
281	0	Feb 11, 2011 8:59 PM
282	00	Feb 11, 2011 10:58 PM
283		Feb 12, 2011 2:43 PM
284	0	Feb 12, 2011 4:09 PM
285	0	Feb 13, 2011 4:22 AM
286	0	Feb 14, 2011 3:00 AM
287	0	Feb 14, 2011 4:36 PM
288	0	Feb 14, 2011 4:44 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
289	0	Feb 14, 2011 8:16 PM
290	0	Feb 15, 2011 12:52 AM
291		Feb 15, 2011 12:30 PM
292		Feb 15, 2011 1:58 PM
293		Feb 15, 2011 3:20 PM
294	0	Feb 15, 2011 5:12 PM
295		Feb 15, 2011 8:08 PM
296	0	Feb 15, 2011 8:43 PM
297		Feb 15, 2011 8:57 PM
298		Feb 15, 2011 11:51 PM
299	0	Feb 16, 2011 12:38 AM
300	0	Feb 16, 2011 5:15 PM
301	0	Feb 16, 2011 10:17 PM
302	0	Feb 17, 2011 4:12 AM
303		Feb 17, 2011 3:17 PM
304	0	Feb 17, 2011 8:28 PM
305	0	Feb 17, 2011 9:23 PM
306	0	Feb 17, 2011 9:46 PM
307		Feb 18, 2011 9:09 PM
308		Feb 20, 2011 10:41 PM
309	0	Feb 20, 2011 11:48 PM
310	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:52 PM
311	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
312		Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
313	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
314	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM
315	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
316		Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
317		Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
318	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
319		Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
320		Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
321	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
322	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
323		Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
324	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
325	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
326	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
327	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
328		Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
329		Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
330	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
331	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:

332		Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
333	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
334	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
335	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
336	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
337		Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
338	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
339	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
340		Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
341	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
342	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
343		Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
344	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
345	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
346	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
347	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
348		Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
349		Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
350		Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
351	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
352	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
353	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
354		Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
355		Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
356	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
357	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
358	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
359	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
360	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM
361	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM
362		Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
363		Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
364	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
365	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
366	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
367	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM
368		Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM
369		Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
370		Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
371	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
372	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:59 PM
373	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
374		Feb 21, 2011 10:03 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
375	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:06 PM
376	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
377		Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
378	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
379		Feb 21, 2011 10:21 PM
380	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:22 PM
381		Feb 21, 2011 10:25 PM
382	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:29 PM
383	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:39 PM
384	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:43 PM
385	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
386	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
387	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
388	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:09 PM
389	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:10 PM
390	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:17 PM
391	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
392	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
393		Feb 21, 2011 11:21 PM
394		Feb 21, 2011 11:29 PM
395		Feb 21, 2011 11:31 PM
396	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:31 PM
397		Feb 21, 2011 11:43 PM
398	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:44 PM
399	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
400	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:51 PM
401	0	Feb 22, 2011 12:01 AM
402	0	Feb 22, 2011 12:05 AM
403		Feb 22, 2011 12:14 AM
404	0	Feb 22, 2011 12:15 AM
405		Feb 22, 2011 12:22 AM
406	0	Feb 22, 2011 12:27 AM
407	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:25 AM
408	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:54 AM
409	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:58 AM
410	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:59 AM
411		Feb 22, 2011 2:04 AM
412	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:58 AM
413	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 AM
414		Feb 22, 2011 4:03 AM
415	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 AM
416	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:23 AM
417		Feb 22, 2011 4:30 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
418	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:57 AM
419	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:35 PM
420	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:38 PM
421	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:06 PM
422		Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
423	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
424	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
425	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:16 PM
426	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:26 PM
427	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:30 PM
428		Feb 22, 2011 3:30 PM
429	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:32 PM
430	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:37 PM
431	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
432		Feb 22, 2011 3:41 PM
433		Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
434	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:48 PM
435		Feb 22, 2011 3:48 PM
436	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
437		Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
438	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:00 PM
439		Feb 22, 2011 4:03 PM
440	0	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 PM
441		Feb 22, 2011 4:35 PM
442		Feb 22, 2011 4:55 PM
443	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM
444	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:28 PM
445		Feb 22, 2011 5:50 PM
446		Feb 22, 2011 7:22 PM
447		Feb 22, 2011 7:25 PM
448		Feb 22, 2011 7:42 PM
449	0	Feb 22, 2011 8:19 PM
450	0	Feb 22, 2011 9:07 PM
451	0	Feb 22, 2011 9:14 PM
452		Feb 22, 2011 9:58 PM
453	0	Feb 22, 2011 9:59 PM
454		Feb 22, 2011 10:13 PM
455	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:23 PM
456	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
457	0	Feb 22, 2011 10:49 PM
458	0	Feb 22, 2011 11:33 PM
459	0	Feb 23, 2011 4:06 AM
460		Feb 23, 2011 2:37 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

Video conferencing %:		
461	0	Feb 23, 2011 4:34 PM
462		Feb 23, 2011 5:29 PM
463	0	Feb 23, 2011 5:53 PM
464		Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
465		Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
466	0	Feb 23, 2011 8:22 PM
467	0	Feb 23, 2011 8:34 PM
468	30	Feb 23, 2011 9:54 PM
469	0	Feb 24, 2011 6:20 PM
470		Feb 24, 2011 7:51 PM
471	0	Feb 25, 2011 4:37 PM
472		Feb 25, 2011 8:05 PM
473	0	Feb 25, 2011 9:17 PM
474	0	Feb 27, 2011 4:14 PM
475	0	Feb 27, 2011 4:29 PM
476	0	Feb 27, 2011 7:19 PM
477	0	Feb 28, 2011 1:33 AM
478	0	Feb 28, 2011 2:40 AM
479	0	Feb 28, 2011 3:38 AM
480	0	Feb 28, 2011 3:28 PM
481		Feb 28, 2011 6:03 PM
482	0	Feb 28, 2011 9:48 PM
483		Feb 28, 2011 10:00 PM
484		Feb 28, 2011 10:15 PM
485		Mar 1, 2011 12:02 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
1	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:03 PM
2	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:10 PM
3	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
4	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:11 PM
5	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
6	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
7	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
8	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
9	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:23 PM
10		Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
11	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
12	30	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
13	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
14	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
15	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
16	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
17	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
18	35	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
19	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
20	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
21	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
22	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
23	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
24	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
25	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
26	85	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
27	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
28		Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
29	65	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
30	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
31	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
32	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
33	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
34	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
35	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
36	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
37	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
38	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
39	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
40	70	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
41	1	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
42	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
43	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
44	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
45	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
46	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
47	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
48	98	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
49	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
50	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
51	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
52	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
53	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
54	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
55	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
56	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
57	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
58	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
59	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
60	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
61	98	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
62	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:13 PM
63	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
64	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
65	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
66	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
67	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
68	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:16 PM
69	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
70	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
71	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
72	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
73	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
74	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
75	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
76	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
77	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
78	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
79	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
80	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
81	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
82	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
83		Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
84	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
85	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
86	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
87	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
88	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
89	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
90	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
91	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
92	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
93	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
94	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
95	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
96	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
97	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
98	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
99	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
100	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
101	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
102	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
103	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
104	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
105	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
106	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
107	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
108	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
109	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
110	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
111	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
112	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
113	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
114	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
115	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
116		Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
117	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
118	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
119	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
120	76	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
121	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
122	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
123	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
124	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
125	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
126	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
127	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
128	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
129	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:12 PM
130	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
131	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
132	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:16 PM
133	95	Feb 7, 2011 10:19 PM
134	40	Feb 7, 2011 10:21 PM
135	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:23 PM
136	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
137	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
138	95	Feb 7, 2011 10:35 PM
139	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:36 PM
140	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
141	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:43 PM
142	70	Feb 7, 2011 10:43 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
143	60	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
144	1	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
145	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
146		Feb 7, 2011 10:49 PM
147	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
148	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:51 PM
149	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:02 PM
150	70	Feb 7, 2011 11:04 PM
151	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
152	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:06 PM
153	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:09 PM
154	70	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
155	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
156	70	Feb 7, 2011 11:12 PM
157	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
158	90	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
159	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:19 PM
160	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:20 PM
161	95	Feb 7, 2011 11:32 PM
162	75	Feb 7, 2011 11:35 PM
163	60	Feb 7, 2011 11:36 PM
164		Feb 7, 2011 11:37 PM
165	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:44 PM
166	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:55 PM
167	60	Feb 8, 2011 12:04 AM
168	100	Feb 8, 2011 12:19 AM
169	90	Feb 8, 2011 12:24 AM
170	100	Feb 8, 2011 12:35 AM
171	95	Feb 8, 2011 12:46 AM
172	50	Feb 8, 2011 12:55 AM
173	67	Feb 8, 2011 1:00 AM
174	25	Feb 8, 2011 1:01 AM
175	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:43 AM
176	90	Feb 8, 2011 2:00 AM
177	20	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 AM
178	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:27 AM
179	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 AM
180	80	Feb 8, 2011 2:38 AM
181	70	Feb 8, 2011 2:43 AM
182	5	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 AM
183	50	Feb 8, 2011 2:59 AM
184	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:22 AM
185	100	Feb 8, 2011 5:16 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
186	50	Feb 8, 2011 1:00 PM
187	20	Feb 8, 2011 1:29 PM
188	100	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
189	95	Feb 8, 2011 1:34 PM
190	40	Feb 8, 2011 1:39 PM
191	100	Feb 8, 2011 1:51 PM
192	90	Feb 8, 2011 2:11 PM
193	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 PM
194	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:28 PM
195	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:31 PM
196	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:46 PM
197	50	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 PM
198	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:53 PM
199	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:55 PM
200	0	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
201	95	Feb 8, 2011 3:09 PM
202	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:12 PM
203	90	Feb 8, 2011 3:12 PM
204	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
205		Feb 8, 2011 3:16 PM
206	25	Feb 8, 2011 3:20 PM
207	75	Feb 8, 2011 3:25 PM
208	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:36 PM
209	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:39 PM
210	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:43 PM
211	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:45 PM
212	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
213	100	Feb 8, 2011 4:03 PM
214	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:04 PM
215	50	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM
216	90	Feb 8, 2011 4:13 PM
217		Feb 8, 2011 4:18 PM
218	90	Feb 8, 2011 4:19 PM
219	90	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
220	60	Feb 8, 2011 4:29 PM
221	75	Feb 8, 2011 4:36 PM
222		Feb 8, 2011 4:38 PM
223	70	Feb 8, 2011 4:41 PM
224	70	Feb 8, 2011 4:54 PM
225	50	Feb 8, 2011 5:17 PM
226	25	Feb 8, 2011 5:17 PM
227	50	Feb 8, 2011 6:00 PM
228	100	Feb 8, 2011 6:13 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
229	10	Feb 8, 2011 6:13 PM
230	70	Feb 8, 2011 6:37 PM
231	98	Feb 8, 2011 6:53 PM
232	20	Feb 8, 2011 7:21 PM
233	25	Feb 8, 2011 7:28 PM
234	20	Feb 8, 2011 7:34 PM
235	50	Feb 8, 2011 7:44 PM
236	50	Feb 8, 2011 7:57 PM
237	50	Feb 8, 2011 8:21 PM
238		Feb 8, 2011 8:36 PM
239	89	Feb 8, 2011 9:09 PM
240	170	Feb 8, 2011 9:24 PM
241	75	Feb 8, 2011 9:42 PM
242	25	Feb 8, 2011 10:12 PM
243	90	Feb 8, 2011 11:01 PM
244	50	Feb 8, 2011 11:11 PM
245	50	Feb 9, 2011 12:33 AM
246	80	Feb 9, 2011 1:12 AM
247	30	Feb 9, 2011 2:01 AM
248	20	Feb 9, 2011 2:40 AM
249		Feb 9, 2011 3:46 AM
250	75	Feb 9, 2011 2:17 PM
251	15	Feb 9, 2011 4:55 PM
252	50	Feb 9, 2011 6:12 PM
253	30	Feb 9, 2011 6:17 PM
254	50	Feb 9, 2011 6:39 PM
255	0	Feb 9, 2011 7:00 PM
256	90	Feb 9, 2011 8:36 PM
257	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:37 PM
258	50	Feb 9, 2011 9:05 PM
259	90	Feb 9, 2011 9:40 PM
260	0	Feb 10, 2011 2:33 PM
261	10	Feb 10, 2011 3:02 PM
262	100	Feb 10, 2011 3:23 PM
263	25	Feb 10, 2011 3:39 PM
264	1	Feb 10, 2011 6:48 PM
265	25	Feb 10, 2011 7:06 PM
266	1	Feb 10, 2011 7:10 PM
267	20	Feb 10, 2011 10:17 PM
268		Feb 10, 2011 10:33 PM
269		Feb 10, 2011 10:56 PM
270	95	Feb 10, 2011 10:56 PM
271	5	Feb 11, 2011 1:12 AM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
272	95	Feb 11, 2011 2:07 AM
273	50	Feb 11, 2011 2:44 AM
274	15	Feb 11, 2011 4:05 AM
275	50	Feb 11, 2011 6:21 AM
276	100	Feb 11, 2011 3:28 PM
277		Feb 11, 2011 3:31 PM
278	30	Feb 11, 2011 6:08 PM
279	20	Feb 11, 2011 7:33 PM
280	100	Feb 11, 2011 8:02 PM
281	100	Feb 11, 2011 8:59 PM
282	5	Feb 11, 2011 10:58 PM
283	100	Feb 12, 2011 2:43 PM
284	90	Feb 12, 2011 4:09 PM
285	50	Feb 13, 2011 4:22 AM
286	25	Feb 14, 2011 3:00 AM
287	50	Feb 14, 2011 4:36 PM
288	66	Feb 14, 2011 4:44 PM
289	100	Feb 14, 2011 8:16 PM
290	95	Feb 15, 2011 12:52 AM
291	60	Feb 15, 2011 12:30 PM
292		Feb 15, 2011 1:58 PM
293	50	Feb 15, 2011 3:20 PM
294	100	Feb 15, 2011 5:12 PM
295	100	Feb 15, 2011 8:08 PM
296	0	Feb 15, 2011 8:43 PM
297	50	Feb 15, 2011 8:57 PM
298	100	Feb 15, 2011 11:51 PM
299	90	Feb 16, 2011 12:38 AM
300	70	Feb 16, 2011 5:15 PM
301	95	Feb 16, 2011 10:17 PM
302	100	Feb 17, 2011 4:12 AM
303	1	Feb 17, 2011 3:17 PM
304	20	Feb 17, 2011 8:28 PM
305	20	Feb 17, 2011 9:23 PM
306	5	Feb 17, 2011 9:46 PM
307	100	Feb 18, 2011 9:09 PM
308		Feb 20, 2011 10:41 PM
309	100	Feb 20, 2011 11:48 PM
310	0	Feb 21, 2011 1:52 PM
311	5	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
312		Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
313	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
314	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:02 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
315	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
316	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
317	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
318	15	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
319	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
320	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
321	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
322	20	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
323		Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
324	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
325	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
326	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
327	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
328	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
329	60	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
330	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
331	70	Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
332	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
333	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
334	35	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
335	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
336	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
337		Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
338	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
339	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
340	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
341	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
342	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
343	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
344	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
345	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
346	95	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
347	95	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
348	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
349	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
350		Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
351	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
352	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
353	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
354	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
355	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
356	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:41 PM
357	60	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
358	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
359	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
360	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM
361	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:44 PM
362		Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
363	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
364	70	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
365	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
366	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
367	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM
368	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM
369	67	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
370	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
371	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
372	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:59 PM
373	1	Feb 21, 2011 10:00 PM
374	100	Feb 21, 2011 10:03 PM
375	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:06 PM
376	70	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
377	3	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
378	90	Feb 21, 2011 10:20 PM
379	100	Feb 21, 2011 10:21 PM
380	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:22 PM
381	90	Feb 21, 2011 10:25 PM
382	25	Feb 21, 2011 10:29 PM
383	25	Feb 21, 2011 10:39 PM
384	25	Feb 21, 2011 10:43 PM
385	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
386	90	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
387	25	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
388	98	Feb 21, 2011 11:09 PM
389	75	Feb 21, 2011 11:10 PM
390	100	Feb 21, 2011 11:17 PM
391	85	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
392	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
393	50	Feb 21, 2011 11:21 PM
394	75	Feb 21, 2011 11:29 PM
395	5	Feb 21, 2011 11:31 PM
396	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:31 PM
397	90	Feb 21, 2011 11:43 PM
398	95	Feb 21, 2011 11:44 PM
399	90	Feb 21, 2011 11:50 PM
400	10	Feb 21, 2011 11:51 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
401	70	Feb 22, 2011 12:01 AM
402	50	Feb 22, 2011 12:05 AM
403		Feb 22, 2011 12:14 AM
404	95	Feb 22, 2011 12:15 AM
405	70	Feb 22, 2011 12:22 AM
406	50	Feb 22, 2011 12:27 AM
407	20	Feb 22, 2011 1:25 AM
408	10	Feb 22, 2011 1:54 AM
409	90	Feb 22, 2011 1:58 AM
410	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:59 AM
411	85	Feb 22, 2011 2:04 AM
412	30	Feb 22, 2011 2:58 AM
413	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:18 AM
414	50	Feb 22, 2011 4:03 AM
415	100	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 AM
416	40	Feb 22, 2011 4:23 AM
417		Feb 22, 2011 4:30 AM
418	50	Feb 22, 2011 4:57 AM
419	0	Feb 22, 2011 1:35 PM
420	75	Feb 22, 2011 1:38 PM
421	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:06 PM
422	50	Feb 22, 2011 2:33 PM
423	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:07 PM
424	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:11 PM
425	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:16 PM
426	90	Feb 22, 2011 3:26 PM
427	95	Feb 22, 2011 3:30 PM
428	90	Feb 22, 2011 3:30 PM
429	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:32 PM
430	100	Feb 22, 2011 3:37 PM
431	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:38 PM
432	95	Feb 22, 2011 3:41 PM
433	60	Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
434	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:48 PM
435		Feb 22, 2011 3:48 PM
436	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
437	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
438	20	Feb 22, 2011 4:00 PM
439		Feb 22, 2011 4:03 PM
440	10	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 PM
441	75	Feb 22, 2011 4:35 PM
442		Feb 22, 2011 4:55 PM
443	25	Feb 22, 2011 5:07 PM

9. In the last five (5) years in what percentage of civil cases in which you were

In person %:		
444	98	Feb 22, 2011 5:28 PM
445	80	Feb 22, 2011 5:50 PM
446		Feb 22, 2011 7:22 PM
447	80	Feb 22, 2011 7:25 PM
448	100	Feb 22, 2011 7:42 PM
449	65	Feb 22, 2011 8:19 PM
450	75	Feb 22, 2011 9:07 PM
451	80	Feb 22, 2011 9:14 PM
452	85	Feb 22, 2011 9:58 PM
453	90	Feb 22, 2011 9:59 PM
454	100	Feb 22, 2011 10:13 PM
455	50	Feb 22, 2011 10:23 PM
456	75	Feb 22, 2011 10:33 PM
457	100	Feb 22, 2011 10:49 PM
458	75	Feb 22, 2011 11:33 PM
459	75	Feb 23, 2011 4:06 AM
460	50	Feb 23, 2011 2:37 PM
461	85	Feb 23, 2011 4:34 PM
462	100	Feb 23, 2011 5:29 PM
463	25	Feb 23, 2011 5:53 PM
464	10	Feb 23, 2011 6:23 PM
465	50	Feb 23, 2011 6:58 PM
466	100	Feb 23, 2011 8:22 PM
467	50	Feb 23, 2011 8:34 PM
468	40	Feb 23, 2011 9:54 PM
469	70	Feb 24, 2011 6:20 PM
470	50	Feb 24, 2011 7:51 PM
471	85	Feb 25, 2011 4:37 PM
472	90	Feb 25, 2011 8:05 PM
473	60	Feb 25, 2011 9:17 PM
474	50	Feb 27, 2011 4:14 PM
475	80	Feb 27, 2011 4:29 PM
476	98	Feb 27, 2011 7:19 PM
477	10	Feb 28, 2011 1:33 AM
478	80	Feb 28, 2011 2:40 AM
479	5	Feb 28, 2011 3:38 AM
480	50	Feb 28, 2011 3:28 PM
481		Feb 28, 2011 6:03 PM
482	30	Feb 28, 2011 9:48 PM
483		Feb 28, 2011 10:00 PM
484	100	Feb 28, 2011 10:15 PM
485	50	Mar 1, 2011 12:02 AM

3. The primary cause of delay in the litigation process is:

Other (please specify)		
1	Difficulty in getting a trial date	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
2	Lack of judicial supervision in cases where one or more parties are represented by unconstructive attorneys.	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
3	Trial dates being set too far out and still routinely continued by the Court due to lack of judges or court reporters.	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
4	I think it's a combination of a lack of attorney collaboration on discovery issues and proceedings and a delay in setting deadlines and trial dates. I would rather see a trial date and all relevant deadlines set within a few weeks after the defendants have answered and have those dates be farther in the future than wait to have them set and then have them come up quickly.	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
5	I do mostly foreclosures, and defense counsel often will stall unless you stop them.	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
6	scheduling conflicts of either attorneys, judges or court calendar	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
7	To do a thorough job takes time. It's often worth the time, however. Discovery yields valuable findings.	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
8	Attorneys failing to control their clients; attorneys doing whatever their client requests, or running up billable hours at the expense of the system, filing "spaghetti against the wall" summary judgment motions not caring what the result is, and only getting serious about settlement when ever pre-trial attempt to avoid getting to the real issues has been exhausted but the case still survives.	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
9	Delayed rulings on motions and discovery abuses.	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
10	To force settlement of meritless cases	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
11	none to my knowledge	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
12	Inability to obtain timely trial date.	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
13	There really isn't excessive delay in iowa state courts. There just isn't sufficient money to run a state court system optimally .	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
14	access to the court	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
15	getting bumped because the 6th judicial district has too few judges. I have a cases that has been bumped 4 times. Once due to the 2008 flood, once the plaintiff was hospitalized the week before trial, and twice due to lack of judges. The case is not set for trial until late 2011!	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
16	The conflict inherent in cases from counsel and clients results in lack of collaboration among counsel toward moving the case forward. Also, lawyers are just busy.	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
17	Continuances are usually sought because somebody needs more time.	Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
18	Docket delays	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
19	Lack of Court time. Hearings on routine matters are set to the distant future due to a lack of Court time and court reporters.	Feb 7, 2011 10:06 PM
20	Lack of available trial dates	Feb 7, 2011 10:19 PM
21	lack of judicial resources	Feb 7, 2011 10:38 PM
22	Lazy or busy attorneys	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
23	the number of pending cases	Feb 7, 2011 10:52 PM
24	available trial dates	Feb 7, 2011 11:18 PM
25	delay in getting trial dates	Feb 7, 2011 11:20 PM
26	Mostly outside influences e.g. difficulties in obtaining medicare cooperation, difficulties in obtaining medical records and depositions of doctors, interference by criminal cases, too many counties, too few judges in rural areas but sometimes judges are unavailable in larger towns as well.	Feb 7, 2011 11:42 PM

3. The primary cause of delay in the litigation process is:

Other (please specify)		
27	parties fighting more	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
28	Lack of judges	Feb 8, 2011 12:56 AM
29	Lack of attorney preparation and involvement	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 AM
30	Clogged court calendar	Feb 8, 2011 1:46 AM
31	gamesmanship	Feb 8, 2011 2:14 AM
32	Unfortunately, many defense counsel today go through an entire series of discovery procedures and practices without any effort or intent to really analyse the case and establish the true need for such procedures. We know that building up "billable hours" is the polestar by which much civil litigation is done today, especially in the larger firms.	Feb 8, 2011 5:04 AM
33	Limitations on court availability. Repeated trial setting where cases are on standby and don't get reached.	Feb 8, 2011 2:52 PM
34	Attorneys and/or clients not provided needed information, plain old scheduling conflicts	Feb 8, 2011 3:14 PM
35	waiting for a trial date	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
36	I mainly do small claims. These cases are set way to soon after the defendant answers in order for us to try to work the rest of our schedule around it. I schedule 3 months out; and often trial is set within several weeks. I often have conflicts with the trial setting. Courts are not much in favor of extending time or coordinating the setting of a trial. In one case the trial was scheduled and I had a conflict. The court did allow that continuance, but then didn't coordinate a new trial date and the trial was set when I was going to be out of the country and the court wouldn't re-set the trial again.	Feb 8, 2011 4:44 PM
37	All of the above. We all know it will go slow. We all fear the deadlines in the scheduling order so we put it way out so we have time to get ready within the time limits	Feb 8, 2011 6:29 PM
38	lack of judge or ruling	Feb 8, 2011 6:40 PM
39	scheduling	Feb 8, 2011 8:42 PM
40	availability of a trial date.	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
41	parties unwillingness to settle	Feb 10, 2011 3:25 PM
42	Attorney lack of preparation; hoping for settlement instead of going to trial.	Feb 10, 2011 11:43 PM
43	Ridiculous attorneys	Feb 11, 2011 2:09 AM
44	Judges do not actively enforce discovery rules. The same lawyers do the same things over and over and the bench seems oblivious.	Feb 11, 2011 10:02 PM
45	ITS DIFFICULT TO GET A CASE READY FOR TRIAL 2 OR 3 TIMES BECAUSE OF BEING BUMPED SOMETIMES AS LATE AS THE DAY BEFORE TRIAL WAS TO BEGIN. ALL THE DEALS ON CRIMINAL CASES ARE DONE AT THE LAST MINUTE AND YET THEY GET PRIORITY EVEN WHEN THE DEFENDANT IS NOT IN JAIL. THIS NEEDS TO CHANGE. SEPARATE, DESIGNATED DATES NEED TO BE ESTABLISHED FOR CHILD CUSTODY DISPUTES AND THAT SCHEDULE NEEDS TO HAVE NO OVERLAP WITH CIVIL JURY TRIALS. CIVIL JURY TRIALS AND TRIALS TO THE COURT WITH WITNESSES WHO MUST TRAVEL OR WHICH ARE COMPLEX SHOULD HAVE THEIR OWN PRIORITY WEEKS.	Feb 11, 2011 11:13 PM
46	Attorney calendar congestion	Feb 14, 2011 10:06 PM
47	The dleay in setting trial	Feb 15, 2011 2:00 PM
48	Client interference, e.g., client wanting to change something of failing to timely cooperate during discovery.	Feb 15, 2011 8:13 PM
49	Attorneys being lazy.	Feb 15, 2011 8:45 PM

3. The primary cause of delay in the litigation process is:

Other (please specify)		
50	Defense attorney's schedules in setting trial dates	Feb 16, 2011 12:42 AM
51	Medical treatment concluding.	Feb 17, 2011 8:31 PM
52	Court calendar and attorney schedules.	Feb 18, 2011 9:11 PM
53	Lack of good faith, prompt, complete discovery -- stalls mediation attempts.	Feb 20, 2011 10:45 PM
54	having trial dates bumped for other cases	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
55	too few judges, insufficient resources	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
56	Getting a trial date within 12 months of filing on some jurisdictions	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
57	none	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
58	desire and willingness of Judges to appropriately manage the system, including the willingness to try cases	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
59	It may be any of these factors or others depending on the case	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
60	attorney/client not diligently pursuing the case	Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
61	None of the above	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
62	failure to set a speedy and firm trial date	Feb 21, 2011 10:06 PM
63	The only time I've experienced what I would consider to be unnecessary delay in litigation is when opposing counsel somehow has "no time available for trial for at least the next 12 to 14 months..." I understand that certain areas of law require massive amounts of discovery & trial preparation, so an attorney's schedule involves more than just the trial dates already on his or her calendar. That said, there are several attorneys whom I believe intentionally claim to be busier than they are to gain a time advantage in a particular case. One example would be putting off trial in a quiet title action in order to hold up or prevent a sale or other conveyance of the subject property. Another example might be where a party in a dissolution action has a favorable temporary custody arrangement & wants to prolong that arrangement so he or she has time to obtain different housing or get the parties' children enrolled in his or her school district or see a therapist before the trial.	Feb 21, 2011 10:31 PM
64	Attorney overall workload often delays attention attorneys can give a certain matter to help bring it to settlement.	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
65	All of the above except court continuance occur with equal frequency.	Feb 21, 2011 11:54 PM
66	Limited number of trial dates. Thus lots of things must be set at the same time.	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
67	Clients with big money behind them swamp the little guy with paperwork.	Feb 22, 2011 4:59 AM
68	All of the above	Feb 22, 2011 2:08 PM
69	Shortage of court resources	Feb 22, 2011 3:28 PM
70	Attorneys not initiating discovery in a timely manner and not focusing the scope of their discovery	Feb 22, 2011 3:37 PM
71	Awaiting court dates and decisions on rulings	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
72	attorney schedules	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
73	client and attorney distrust of the judicial process.	Feb 22, 2011 10:00 PM
74	The fact we are scheduling trials 12-18 months out into the future, which are often times bumped by criminal cases.	Feb 24, 2011 8:02 PM
75	lack of judicial/court resources	Feb 25, 2011 8:07 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
1	300	Feb 7, 2011 8:05 PM
2	225	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
3	225	Feb 7, 2011 8:12 PM
4	160	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
5	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
6	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:25 PM
7	125	Feb 7, 2011 8:26 PM
8	280	Feb 7, 2011 8:27 PM
9	125	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
10	250	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
11	125	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
12	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
13	225	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
14	190	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
15	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
16	200	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
17	160	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
18	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
19	210	Feb 7, 2011 8:39 PM
20	325	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
21	130	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
22	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
23	180	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
24	125	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
25	275	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
26	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
27	230	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
28	200	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
29	465	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
30	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
31	220	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
32	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
33	225	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
34	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
35	200	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
36	320	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
37	175	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
38	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
39	130	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
40	150	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
41	250	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
42	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
43	200	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
44	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
45	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
46	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
47	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
48	275	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
49	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
50	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:09 PM
51	200	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
52	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
53	200	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
54	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
55	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
56	225	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
57	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:16 PM
58	470	Feb 7, 2011 9:16 PM
59	265	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
60	200	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
61	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
62	275	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
63	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
64	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
65	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
66	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
67	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:23 PM
68	270	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
69	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
70	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
71	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
72	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
73	225	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
74	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
75	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
76	190	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
77	300	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
78	225	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
79	115	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
80	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
81	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
82	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:38 PM
83	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
84	285	Feb 7, 2011 9:40 PM
85	200	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
86	225	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
87	250	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
88	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
89	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
90	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
91	270	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
92	165	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
93	150	Feb 7, 2011 9:50 PM
94	175	Feb 7, 2011 9:50 PM
95	135	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
96	200	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
97	185	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
98	135	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
99	220	Feb 7, 2011 10:01 PM
100	125	Feb 7, 2011 10:02 PM
101	200	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
102	150	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
103	200	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
104	200	Feb 7, 2011 10:06 PM
105	120	Feb 7, 2011 10:06 PM
106	210	Feb 7, 2011 10:09 PM
107	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:15 PM
108	250	Feb 7, 2011 10:17 PM
109	200	Feb 7, 2011 10:19 PM
110	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:22 PM
111	125	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
112	150	Feb 7, 2011 10:28 PM
113	300	Feb 7, 2011 10:32 PM
114	175	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
115	130	Feb 7, 2011 10:38 PM
116	410	Feb 7, 2011 10:45 PM
117	200	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
118	140	Feb 7, 2011 10:47 PM
119	225	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
120	160	Feb 7, 2011 10:52 PM
121	140	Feb 7, 2011 10:52 PM
122	160	Feb 7, 2011 10:53 PM
123	125	Feb 7, 2011 11:04 PM
124	200	Feb 7, 2011 11:07 PM
125	200	Feb 7, 2011 11:08 PM
126	190	Feb 7, 2011 11:11 PM
127	200	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
128	250	Feb 7, 2011 11:19 PM
129	205	Feb 7, 2011 11:20 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
130	200	Feb 7, 2011 11:22 PM
131	150	Feb 7, 2011 11:34 PM
132	225	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
133	125	Feb 7, 2011 11:38 PM
134	155	Feb 7, 2011 11:39 PM
135	150	Feb 7, 2011 11:42 PM
136	200	Feb 7, 2011 11:58 PM
137	185	Feb 8, 2011 12:05 AM
138	300	Feb 8, 2011 12:22 AM
139	150	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
140	250	Feb 8, 2011 12:27 AM
141	165	Feb 8, 2011 12:48 AM
142	170	Feb 8, 2011 12:56 AM
143	140	Feb 8, 2011 1:03 AM
144	180	Feb 8, 2011 1:46 AM
145	220	Feb 8, 2011 2:14 AM
146	150	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 AM
147	150	Feb 8, 2011 2:39 AM
148	160	Feb 8, 2011 2:45 AM
149	275	Feb 8, 2011 3:02 AM
150	200	Feb 8, 2011 3:05 AM
151	250	Feb 8, 2011 4:19 AM
152	150	Feb 8, 2011 4:26 AM
153	175	Feb 8, 2011 5:19 AM
154	310	Feb 8, 2011 1:04 PM
155	150	Feb 8, 2011 1:23 PM
156	300	Feb 8, 2011 1:30 PM
157	200	Feb 8, 2011 1:36 PM
158	175	Feb 8, 2011 1:40 PM
159	250	Feb 8, 2011 1:52 PM
160	225	Feb 8, 2011 2:12 PM
161	225	Feb 8, 2011 2:29 PM
162	180	Feb 8, 2011 2:32 PM
163	250	Feb 8, 2011 2:44 PM
164	300	Feb 8, 2011 2:49 PM
165	150	Feb 8, 2011 2:50 PM
166	300	Feb 8, 2011 2:57 PM
167	175	Feb 8, 2011 3:16 PM
168	130	Feb 8, 2011 3:18 PM
169	180	Feb 8, 2011 3:22 PM
170	200	Feb 8, 2011 3:27 PM
171	165	Feb 8, 2011 3:42 PM
172	300	Feb 8, 2011 3:47 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
173	190	Feb 8, 2011 3:51 PM
174	250	Feb 8, 2011 4:06 PM
175	180	Feb 8, 2011 4:10 PM
176	175	Feb 8, 2011 4:21 PM
177	175	Feb 8, 2011 4:30 PM
178	175	Feb 8, 2011 4:38 PM
179	200	Feb 8, 2011 4:44 PM
180	175	Feb 8, 2011 5:19 PM
181	200	Feb 8, 2011 5:19 PM
182	210	Feb 8, 2011 6:02 PM
183	200	Feb 8, 2011 6:15 PM
184	250	Feb 8, 2011 6:29 PM
185	180	Feb 8, 2011 6:40 PM
186	175	Feb 8, 2011 6:55 PM
187	200	Feb 8, 2011 7:22 PM
188	250	Feb 8, 2011 7:36 PM
189	210	Feb 8, 2011 7:46 PM
190	250	Feb 8, 2011 7:58 PM
191	140	Feb 8, 2011 8:42 PM
192	250	Feb 8, 2011 9:44 PM
193	200	Feb 8, 2011 10:14 PM
194	170	Feb 8, 2011 11:03 PM
195	185	Feb 8, 2011 11:14 PM
196	139	Feb 9, 2011 12:35 AM
197	175	Feb 9, 2011 1:14 AM
198	125	Feb 9, 2011 2:03 AM
199	275	Feb 9, 2011 3:51 AM
200	150	Feb 9, 2011 2:19 PM
201	150	Feb 9, 2011 4:07 PM
202	120	Feb 9, 2011 4:56 PM
203	300	Feb 9, 2011 6:14 PM
204	175	Feb 9, 2011 6:20 PM
205	200	Feb 9, 2011 6:41 PM
206	175	Feb 9, 2011 7:02 PM
207	250	Feb 9, 2011 7:54 PM
208	150	Feb 9, 2011 9:43 PM
209	250	Feb 10, 2011 2:35 PM
210	125	Feb 10, 2011 3:04 PM
211	125	Feb 10, 2011 3:43 PM
212	95	Feb 10, 2011 7:10 PM
213	130	Feb 10, 2011 7:12 PM
214	150	Feb 10, 2011 10:20 PM
215	225	Feb 10, 2011 10:34 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
216	180	Feb 10, 2011 10:57 PM
217	300	Feb 10, 2011 11:43 PM
218	150	Feb 11, 2011 1:14 AM
219	200	Feb 11, 2011 1:57 AM
220	225	Feb 11, 2011 2:09 AM
221	180	Feb 11, 2011 2:46 AM
222	150	Feb 11, 2011 3:29 PM
223	225	Feb 11, 2011 3:37 PM
224	175	Feb 11, 2011 6:10 PM
225	200	Feb 11, 2011 7:35 PM
226	150	Feb 11, 2011 8:10 PM
227	140	Feb 11, 2011 10:02 PM
228	210	Feb 11, 2011 11:13 PM
229	150	Feb 12, 2011 4:11 PM
230	170	Feb 12, 2011 4:35 PM
231	200	Feb 13, 2011 4:23 AM
232	200	Feb 14, 2011 3:02 AM
233	175	Feb 14, 2011 1:57 PM
234	150	Feb 14, 2011 4:38 PM
235	0	Feb 14, 2011 4:49 PM
236	250	Feb 15, 2011 12:53 AM
237	300	Feb 15, 2011 12:31 PM
238	275	Feb 15, 2011 2:00 PM
239	100	Feb 15, 2011 3:22 PM
240	0	Feb 15, 2011 5:14 PM
241	150	Feb 15, 2011 8:13 PM
242	250	Feb 15, 2011 8:45 PM
243	175	Feb 15, 2011 11:54 PM
244	250	Feb 16, 2011 12:42 AM
245	300	Feb 17, 2011 2:31 AM
246	225	Feb 17, 2011 4:16 AM
247	225	Feb 17, 2011 3:19 PM
248	175	Feb 17, 2011 8:31 PM
249	150	Feb 17, 2011 9:25 PM
250	220	Feb 17, 2011 9:49 PM
251	235	Feb 20, 2011 5:08 PM
252	150	Feb 20, 2011 11:51 PM
253	150	Feb 21, 2011 1:53 PM
254	225	Feb 21, 2011 9:01 PM
255	225	Feb 21, 2011 9:03 PM
256	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:05 PM
257	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
258	225	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
259	210	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM
260	295	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
261	125	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
262	220	Feb 21, 2011 9:11 PM
263	175	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
264	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
265	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
266	175	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
267	165	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
268	220	Feb 21, 2011 9:17 PM
269	140	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
270	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
271	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:20 PM
272	140	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
273	175	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
274	280	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
275	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
276	135	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
277	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
278	175	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
279	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
280	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
281	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
282	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
283	265	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
284	250	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
285	165	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
286	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
287	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
288	160	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
289	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
290	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
291	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:38 PM
292	175	Feb 21, 2011 9:39 PM
293	300	Feb 21, 2011 9:42 PM
294	175	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
295	225	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
296	175	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
297	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
298	225	Feb 21, 2011 9:47 PM
299	200	Feb 21, 2011 9:48 PM
300	250	Feb 21, 2011 9:52 PM
301	160	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
302	150	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM
303	130	Feb 21, 2011 9:55 PM
304	130	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
305	125	Feb 21, 2011 9:59 PM
306	175	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
307	240	Feb 21, 2011 10:06 PM
308	175	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
309	125	Feb 21, 2011 10:10 PM
310	150	Feb 21, 2011 10:14 PM
311	200	Feb 21, 2011 10:14 PM
312	150	Feb 21, 2011 10:15 PM
313	270	Feb 21, 2011 10:23 PM
314	150	Feb 21, 2011 10:24 PM
315	150	Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
316	150	Feb 21, 2011 10:30 PM
317	175	Feb 21, 2011 10:31 PM
318	220	Feb 21, 2011 10:40 PM
319	270	Feb 21, 2011 10:43 PM
320	185	Feb 21, 2011 10:45 PM
321	175	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
322	175	Feb 21, 2011 11:10 PM
323	225	Feb 21, 2011 11:12 PM
324	150	Feb 21, 2011 11:18 PM
325	200	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
326	200	Feb 21, 2011 11:22 PM
327	275	Feb 21, 2011 11:23 PM
328	250	Feb 21, 2011 11:30 PM
329	0	Feb 21, 2011 11:32 PM
330	200	Feb 21, 2011 11:34 PM
331	150	Feb 21, 2011 11:45 PM
332	225	Feb 21, 2011 11:53 PM
333	145	Feb 21, 2011 11:54 PM
334	175	Feb 22, 2011 12:04 AM
335	200	Feb 22, 2011 12:07 AM
336	150	Feb 22, 2011 12:17 AM
337	175	Feb 22, 2011 12:22 AM
338	125	Feb 22, 2011 12:30 AM
339	250	Feb 22, 2011 1:27 AM
340	140	Feb 22, 2011 1:56 AM
341	125	Feb 22, 2011 2:03 AM
342	200	Feb 22, 2011 2:11 AM
343	275	Feb 22, 2011 3:01 AM
344	180	Feb 22, 2011 3:20 AM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
345	200	Feb 22, 2011 4:07 AM
346	195	Feb 22, 2011 4:07 AM
347	175	Feb 22, 2011 4:26 AM
348	150	Feb 22, 2011 4:32 AM
349	150	Feb 22, 2011 4:59 AM
350	200	Feb 22, 2011 1:38 PM
351	200	Feb 22, 2011 1:39 PM
352	250	Feb 22, 2011 1:48 PM
353	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:08 PM
354	160	Feb 22, 2011 2:12 PM
355	125	Feb 22, 2011 2:37 PM
356	200	Feb 22, 2011 2:55 PM
357	170	Feb 22, 2011 3:01 PM
358	175	Feb 22, 2011 3:10 PM
359	175	Feb 22, 2011 3:13 PM
360	220	Feb 22, 2011 3:19 PM
361	180	Feb 22, 2011 3:28 PM
362	150	Feb 22, 2011 3:39 PM
363	250	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
364	190	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
365	195	Feb 22, 2011 3:47 PM
366	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
367	150	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
368	190	Feb 22, 2011 4:02 PM
369	175	Feb 22, 2011 4:13 PM
370	260	Feb 22, 2011 4:36 PM
371	235	Feb 22, 2011 4:57 PM
372	200	Feb 22, 2011 5:08 PM
373	200	Feb 22, 2011 5:29 PM
374	200	Feb 22, 2011 5:52 PM
375	150	Feb 22, 2011 7:27 PM
376	250	Feb 22, 2011 7:43 PM
377	150	Feb 22, 2011 9:08 PM
378	225	Feb 22, 2011 9:17 PM
379	175	Feb 22, 2011 9:24 PM
380	150	Feb 22, 2011 10:00 PM
381	200	Feb 22, 2011 10:01 PM
382	150	Feb 22, 2011 10:16 PM
383	210	Feb 22, 2011 10:25 PM
384	250	Feb 22, 2011 10:35 PM
385	175	Feb 22, 2011 10:52 PM
386	125	Feb 22, 2011 11:34 PM
387	125	Feb 23, 2011 2:15 PM

8. If you bill clients for your time, what is your usual hourly rate? Please round

Hourly rate \$		
388	150	Feb 23, 2011 2:38 PM
389	175	Feb 23, 2011 4:36 PM
390	100	Feb 23, 2011 5:32 PM
391	175	Feb 23, 2011 6:26 PM
392	150	Feb 23, 2011 6:49 PM
393	150	Feb 23, 2011 6:59 PM
394	200	Feb 23, 2011 8:24 PM
395	180	Feb 23, 2011 8:38 PM
396	185	Feb 23, 2011 9:17 PM
397	190	Feb 24, 2011 5:51 PM
398	200	Feb 24, 2011 8:02 PM
399	195	Feb 25, 2011 1:38 PM
400	175	Feb 25, 2011 4:38 PM
401	250	Feb 25, 2011 8:07 PM
402	290	Feb 25, 2011 9:20 PM
403	118	Feb 25, 2011 10:21 PM
404	275	Feb 26, 2011 8:47 PM
405	245	Feb 27, 2011 4:31 PM
406	150	Feb 27, 2011 7:21 PM
407	225	Feb 28, 2011 1:36 AM
408	200	Feb 28, 2011 2:42 AM
409	180	Feb 28, 2011 3:32 PM
410	260	Feb 28, 2011 9:49 PM
411	200	Feb 28, 2011 10:01 PM
412	200	Feb 28, 2011 10:16 PM
413	175	Mar 1, 2011 12:04 AM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
1	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
2	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:13 PM
3	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
4	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
5	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
6	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:26 PM
7	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
8	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
9	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
10	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
11	1000000	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
12	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
13	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
14	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
15	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
16	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
17	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:38 PM
18	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
19	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
20	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
21	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
22	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
23	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
24	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
25	500000	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
26	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
27	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
28	15000	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
29	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
30	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
31	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
32	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
33	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
34	100000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
35	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
36	25000	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
37	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
38	5000	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
39	20000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
40	10000	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
41	50000	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
42	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
43	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
44	500000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
45	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
46	15000	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
47	75000	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
48	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
49	1000000	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
50	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
51	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
52	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:16 PM
53	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
54	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
55	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
56	5000	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
57	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
58	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
59	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
60	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
61	2000	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
62	5000	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
63	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
64	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
65	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
66	1000000	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
67	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
68	30000	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
69	40000	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
70	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
71	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
72	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
73	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
74	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
75	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
76	7500	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
77	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
78	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
79	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
80	75000	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
81	100000	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
82	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
83	1000000	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
84	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
85	5000	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
86	20000	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
87	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
88	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
89	50000	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
90	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
91	10000	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
92	250000	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
93	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
94	25000	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
95	7500	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
96	7500	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
97	100000	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
98	75000	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
99	20000	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
100	15000	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
101	1000	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
102	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
103	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
104	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:09 PM
105	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:17 PM
106	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
107	15000	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
108	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
109	100000	Feb 7, 2011 10:22 PM
110	100000	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
111	75000	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
112	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
113	10000	Feb 7, 2011 10:40 PM
114	50000	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
115	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
116	500000	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
117	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:53 PM
118	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:55 PM
119	25000	Feb 7, 2011 10:55 PM
120	50000	Feb 7, 2011 11:07 PM
121	50000	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
122	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
123	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
124	100000	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
125	10000	Feb 7, 2011 11:18 PM
126	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:21 PM
127	0	Feb 7, 2011 11:25 PM
128	50000	Feb 7, 2011 11:41 PM
129	100000	Feb 7, 2011 11:41 PM
130	25000	Feb 7, 2011 11:41 PM
131	15000	Feb 7, 2011 11:49 PM
132	00	Feb 8, 2011 12:07 AM
133	100000	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
134	1000000	Feb 8, 2011 12:29 AM
135	100000	Feb 8, 2011 12:32 AM
136	30000	Feb 8, 2011 12:50 AM
137	75000	Feb 8, 2011 12:59 AM
138	2	Feb 8, 2011 1:48 AM
139	5000	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
140	5000	Feb 8, 2011 2:38 AM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
141	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:40 AM
142	75000	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 AM
143	20000	Feb 8, 2011 2:53 AM
144	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:06 AM
145	500000	Feb 8, 2011 3:07 AM
146	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:21 AM
147	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 AM
148	20000	Feb 8, 2011 5:10 AM
149	10000	Feb 8, 2011 5:23 AM
150	15000	Feb 8, 2011 1:31 PM
151	50000	Feb 8, 2011 1:38 PM
152	100000	Feb 8, 2011 1:42 PM
153	50000	Feb 8, 2011 1:55 PM
154	100000	Feb 8, 2011 2:14 PM
155	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:24 PM
156	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
157	20000	Feb 8, 2011 2:34 PM
158	20000	Feb 8, 2011 2:40 PM
159	25000	Feb 8, 2011 2:45 PM
160	50000	Feb 8, 2011 2:52 PM
161	5000	Feb 8, 2011 2:53 PM
162	1000	Feb 8, 2011 2:56 PM
163	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
164	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:02 PM
165	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:17 PM
166	5000	Feb 8, 2011 3:18 PM
167	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
168	35000	Feb 8, 2011 3:24 PM
169	30000	Feb 8, 2011 3:39 PM
170	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:41 PM
171	25000	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
172	50000	Feb 8, 2011 3:53 PM
173	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:07 PM
174	100000	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 PM
175	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:24 PM
176	20000	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 PM
177	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:37 PM
178	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:40 PM
179	50000	Feb 8, 2011 4:46 PM
180	10000	Feb 8, 2011 4:47 PM
181	50000	Feb 8, 2011 5:21 PM
182	10000	Feb 8, 2011 5:52 PM
183	50000	Feb 8, 2011 6:04 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
184	25000	Feb 8, 2011 6:17 PM
185	10000	Feb 8, 2011 6:31 PM
186	10000	Feb 8, 2011 6:56 PM
187	50000	Feb 8, 2011 7:23 PM
188	20000	Feb 8, 2011 7:38 PM
189	10000	Feb 8, 2011 7:48 PM
190	100000	Feb 8, 2011 8:31 PM
191	25000	Feb 8, 2011 9:13 PM
192	10000	Feb 8, 2011 9:34 PM
193	10000	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
194	20000	Feb 8, 2011 10:15 PM
195	100000	Feb 8, 2011 10:23 PM
196	75000	Feb 8, 2011 11:06 PM
197	20000	Feb 8, 2011 11:16 PM
198	50000	Feb 9, 2011 12:37 AM
199	100000	Feb 9, 2011 2:06 AM
200	25000	Feb 9, 2011 2:48 AM
201	0	Feb 9, 2011 4:19 AM
202	25000	Feb 9, 2011 2:22 PM
203	10000	Feb 9, 2011 4:58 PM
204	100000	Feb 9, 2011 6:16 PM
205	100000	Feb 9, 2011 6:23 PM
206	25000	Feb 9, 2011 7:04 PM
207	1000000	Feb 9, 2011 7:55 PM
208	500000	Feb 9, 2011 8:39 PM
209	100000	Feb 9, 2011 9:08 PM
210	10000	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
211	50000	Feb 9, 2011 9:58 PM
212	50000	Feb 10, 2011 2:38 PM
213	10000	Feb 10, 2011 3:06 PM
214	50000	Feb 10, 2011 3:48 PM
215	5000	Feb 10, 2011 7:14 PM
216	20000	Feb 10, 2011 7:16 PM
217	50000	Feb 10, 2011 10:26 PM
218	25000	Feb 10, 2011 10:35 PM
219	10000	Feb 10, 2011 10:58 PM
220	50000	Feb 10, 2011 11:01 PM
221	2500	Feb 11, 2011 1:15 AM
222	25000	Feb 11, 2011 1:59 AM
223	5000	Feb 11, 2011 2:12 AM
224	50000	Feb 11, 2011 2:48 AM
225	20000	Feb 11, 2011 4:10 AM
226	50000	Feb 11, 2011 3:31 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
227	20000	Feb 11, 2011 3:38 PM
228	300	Feb 11, 2011 6:11 PM
229	10000	Feb 11, 2011 7:36 PM
230	40000	Feb 11, 2011 11:18 PM
231	100000	Feb 12, 2011 2:47 PM
232	10000	Feb 12, 2011 4:13 PM
233	100000	Feb 12, 2011 4:42 PM
234	50000	Feb 13, 2011 4:25 AM
235	15000	Feb 14, 2011 1:59 PM
236	25000	Feb 14, 2011 3:26 PM
237	50000	Feb 14, 2011 4:40 PM
238	100000	Feb 14, 2011 4:54 PM
239	25000	Feb 14, 2011 8:19 PM
240	25000	Feb 14, 2011 10:08 PM
241	25000	Feb 15, 2011 12:34 PM
242	75000	Feb 15, 2011 2:02 PM
243	500000	Feb 15, 2011 3:24 PM
244	5000	Feb 15, 2011 5:16 PM
245	5000	Feb 15, 2011 8:14 PM
246	75000	Feb 15, 2011 8:48 PM
247	50000	Feb 16, 2011 5:19 PM
248	50000	Feb 16, 2011 10:20 PM
249	50000	Feb 17, 2011 4:18 AM
250	100000	Feb 17, 2011 3:23 PM
251	75000	Feb 17, 2011 8:33 PM
252	20000	Feb 17, 2011 9:27 PM
253	50000	Feb 17, 2011 9:53 PM
254	1000000	Feb 18, 2011 9:13 PM
255	0	Feb 20, 2011 5:20 PM
256	25000	Feb 21, 2011 1:55 PM
257	100000	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
258	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
259	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
260	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
261	75000	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
262	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
263	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
264	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
265	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
266	30000	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
267	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
268	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
269	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
270	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
271	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
272	5000	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
273	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
274	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
275	500000	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
276	1000000	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
277	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
278	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
279	1000	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
280	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
281	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
282	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
283	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
284	50000	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
285	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
286	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
287	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:45 PM
288	100	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
289	25000	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
290	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
291	20000	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
292	10000	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
293	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
294	100000	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
295	15000	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
296	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
297	50000	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
298	100000	Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
299	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:16 PM
300	20000	Feb 21, 2011 10:16 PM
301	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:17 PM
302	100000	Feb 21, 2011 10:26 PM
303	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:26 PM
304	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:31 PM
305	10000	Feb 21, 2011 10:33 PM
306	25000	Feb 21, 2011 10:41 PM
307	50000	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
308	5000	Feb 21, 2011 10:44 PM
309	500000	Feb 21, 2011 10:51 PM
310	100000	Feb 21, 2011 11:15 PM
311	50000	Feb 21, 2011 11:16 PM
312	100000	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
313	500000	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
314	25000	Feb 21, 2011 11:27 PM
315	500000	Feb 21, 2011 11:32 PM
316	20000	Feb 21, 2011 11:54 PM
317	100000	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
318	10000	Feb 22, 2011 12:03 AM
319	50000	Feb 22, 2011 12:10 AM
320	0	Feb 22, 2011 12:13 AM
321	10000	Feb 22, 2011 12:18 AM
322	150000	Feb 22, 2011 12:20 AM
323	20000	Feb 22, 2011 12:25 AM
324	100000	Feb 22, 2011 12:33 AM
325	50000	Feb 22, 2011 1:29 AM
326	50000	Feb 22, 2011 1:32 AM
327	100000	Feb 22, 2011 2:06 AM
328	5000	Feb 22, 2011 2:14 AM
329	100000	Feb 22, 2011 3:04 AM
330	20000	Feb 22, 2011 3:22 AM
331	200000	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 AM
332	10000	Feb 22, 2011 4:29 AM
333	50000	Feb 22, 2011 5:01 AM
334	25000	Feb 22, 2011 1:03 PM
335	10000	Feb 22, 2011 1:41 PM
336	75000	Feb 22, 2011 1:41 PM
337	10000	Feb 22, 2011 2:09 PM
338	100000	Feb 22, 2011 2:10 PM
339	50000	Feb 22, 2011 2:15 PM
340	100000	Feb 22, 2011 2:42 PM
341	10000	Feb 22, 2011 2:57 PM
342	30000	Feb 22, 2011 3:22 PM
343	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
344	10000	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
345	75000	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
346	25000	Feb 22, 2011 3:44 PM
347	5000	Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
348	15000	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
349	5000	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
350	50000	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
351	25000	Feb 22, 2011 4:03 PM
352	50000	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
353	50000	Feb 22, 2011 4:08 PM
354	100000	Feb 22, 2011 4:16 PM
355	250000	Feb 22, 2011 4:39 PM

3. If Iowa were to require mandatory mediation for cases valued at a certain

Value limitation \$		
356	0	Feb 22, 2011 5:20 PM
357	5000	Feb 22, 2011 5:31 PM
358	100000	Feb 22, 2011 6:35 PM
359	15000	Feb 22, 2011 7:26 PM
360	50000	Feb 22, 2011 7:29 PM
361	50000	Feb 22, 2011 7:45 PM
362	75000	Feb 22, 2011 9:26 PM
363	5000	Feb 22, 2011 10:02 PM
364	10000	Feb 22, 2011 10:02 PM
365	25000	Feb 22, 2011 10:36 PM
366	10000	Feb 22, 2011 10:55 PM
367	10000	Feb 22, 2011 11:36 PM
368	75000	Feb 23, 2011 4:11 AM
369	50000	Feb 23, 2011 2:18 PM
370	5000	Feb 23, 2011 2:41 PM
371	50000	Feb 23, 2011 4:37 PM
372	50000	Feb 23, 2011 5:36 PM
373	10000	Feb 23, 2011 7:01 PM
374	25000	Feb 23, 2011 8:26 PM
375	20000	Feb 23, 2011 8:42 PM
376	25000	Feb 23, 2011 9:20 PM
377	10000	Feb 23, 2011 9:59 PM
378	50000	Feb 24, 2011 5:53 PM
379	10000	Feb 24, 2011 8:01 PM
380	20000	Feb 24, 2011 8:02 PM
381	20000	Feb 25, 2011 1:39 PM
382	25000	Feb 25, 2011 8:08 PM
383	5000	Feb 25, 2011 9:27 PM
384	10000	Feb 25, 2011 10:23 PM
385	10000	Feb 26, 2011 8:48 PM
386	50000	Feb 27, 2011 4:34 PM
387	50000	Feb 27, 2011 7:24 PM
388	0	Feb 28, 2011 3:43 AM
389	50000	Feb 28, 2011 3:36 PM
390	15000	Feb 28, 2011 6:07 PM
391	5000	Feb 28, 2011 8:57 PM
392	20000	Feb 28, 2011 10:03 PM
393	25000	Mar 1, 2011 12:07 AM

5. States requiring mediators to be certified generally require 40 hours of

Other (please specify)		
1	Assuming they are admitted to the Iowa Bar, 10 hours specific to mediation seems appropriate.	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
2	I have no opinion on this	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
3	Mediation has its benefits, but for indigent pro se parties, who often can best benefit from a process that reduces the expenses of litigation, it also has distinct downfalls. Specifically, pro se parties often don't know or understand that they don't have to reach an agreement in mediation. Mediators often weigh in on the likelihood of success on the merits, and where the mediators aren't attorneys, they are often wrong. For someone who cannot afford to hire an attorney, this may be all the "legal advice" they get. This has been one of the biggest problems with mediation in Polk County's small claims court. If mediators will be used in civil cases, they should be well-trained in the substantive areas of the law, and there should be significant judicial oversight to ensure that parties are advised of their rights and to ensure that there are not issues (such as jurisdictional issues) that would be best addressed by the court.	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
4	40 seems like a low amount of training hours	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
5	only lawyers and judges should be mediators	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
6	practicing attorney with more than 10 years experience in the area.	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
7	The idea that mandatory mediation is better for lower valued cases vs. higher valued cases is nonsensical!!!!	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
8	maybe scaled by dollar amount, a seasoned practitioner with 20 hrs of training can certainly handle a 10k case whereas more might be expected for the 100k case	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
9	I think experience should be a factor	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
10	40 hours would be fine if the mediators were experienced lawyers. Otherwise, more training would be necessary.	Feb 7, 2011 11:07 PM
11	more hours	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
12	Depends upon the training. 40 hours from an outfit that is not providing competent training is worthless. It is the quality of training that will determine the quality of the mediator; not merely the time spent. Training should be done by certified or recognized trainers/schools.	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
13	Mediators should be Lawyers	Feb 8, 2011 2:38 AM
14	No training is necessary.	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 AM
15	Yes, with mandatory periodic updates.	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
16	The number of hours is less important than the mediator's experience, knowledge and commitment to the goal of settlement.	Feb 8, 2011 3:24 PM
17	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:36 PM
18	20	Feb 8, 2011 3:41 PM
19	Used a mixed system. Either 40 hours of training or 10 years of civil litigation experience.	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
20	RSVP - Retired Senior citizens Volunteer Program does great in Blackhawk County as mediators...	Feb 8, 2011 4:47 PM
21	It depends who the mediator is and who is doing the training.	Feb 9, 2011 4:00 AM
22	Senior Judges or approved counsel would be preferable	Feb 10, 2011 7:16 PM
23	Certification does not necessarily insure the best mediator. There are many good mediators who have extensive trial practices, great people skills, are good communicators who would qualify as a competent mediator.	Feb 10, 2011 10:26 PM
24	60	Feb 11, 2011 6:11 PM
25	more than 40	Feb 11, 2011 9:02 PM

5. States requiring mediators to be certified generally require 40 hours of

Other (please specify)		
26	40 HOURS INITIALLY AND 10 ANNUALLY IN EACH FIELD OF LAW IN WHICH THEY CONDUCT MEDIATION	Feb 11, 2011 11:18 PM
27	This would be appropriate unless the mediator were a retired or senior trial judge.	Feb 12, 2011 2:47 PM
28	There are lots of mediators qualified by their experience not by sitting in a class.	Feb 14, 2011 4:40 PM
29	If its an annual requirement its too much time. The good ones know what they are doing and don't need 40 hours of training annually./	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
30	They should have more training	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
31	More should be required.	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
32	That would depend on the mediator and his or her experience in the area of the case. Lawyers are pretty good at identifying appraite mediators for their cases.	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
33	Depends on the experience level of the attorney both in ADR techniques and specific legal issues he /she intends to be a mediator for.	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
34	I am opposed to the imposition of mediation	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
35	I would think refresher training should also be required, as well as a foundational amount of training.	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
36	20 would be fine.	Feb 21, 2011 10:41 PM
37	mandatory mediation is wrong. If Judges and parties will work to get cases tried, mediation will be used when appropriate, not as a way to allow judges to avoid work	Feb 22, 2011 12:13 AM
38	Give us trial time (dates) NOT more road blocks to get there.	Feb 22, 2011 1:59 AM
39	15	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 AM
40	40 hours or requisite level of experience	Feb 22, 2011 2:15 PM
41	CERTIFICATION DOES NOTHING TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE MEDIATION	Feb 23, 2011 5:36 PM
42	I don't have an opinion. I choose my mediators based on reputation, style, and knowledge of the subject matter, not training.	Feb 28, 2011 10:19 PM
43	I am not qualified to answer this question.	Mar 1, 2011 12:07 AM

7. If mediators are certified, should they be required to provide a number of

Other (please specify)		
1	small claims cases should not require a mediator. However, why is it the mediator (attorneys) who are always asked to provide pro bono services. The same can't be said for judges, court personnel, experts. Each of them are paid commensurate with their service to the process.	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
2	judges and lawyers should be the mediators	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
3	Maybe but it would have to be a small number of hours, we as attys and maybe atty/mediators already have to give a lot of pro bono	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
4	sure, just as soon as the attorneys are required to do the same based on their respective cost/earnings to the litigation system. why make a mediator do mandatory work when their common fee might be \$1,000 and plaintiffs or defense attorneys are billing tens of thousands?	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
5	requested and recommended--but not required	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
6	Mediators pro bono requirements should be the same as lawyers.	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM

7. If mediators are certified, should they be required to provide a number of

Other (please specify)		
7	If mandatory, mediation should be provided free of charge in all cases regardless of the amount in controversy.	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 AM
8	That would depend. If mediation is mandatory, it should be a court not individual expense. Therefore once again increased costs to both litigants and the state.	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
9	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:36 PM
10	Should be strongly encouraged.	Feb 8, 2011 6:17 PM
11	I really object to the insinuation that smaller cases require less justice or less court attention. To my low income clients, a \$2-5,000 judgment is a really, really big deal. A judgment against them around \$10,000 is a home losing, wage and bank garnishment, can't feed the kids or pay for medical care disaster. In fact, a \$10,000 judgment against one of my client's is a lot bigger deal than a ten million dollar judgment against an insurer or an fortune 500 corporation. How many suicides have resulted from such a judgment against such an insurer or corporation? I know of two in Iowa resulting from the smaller consumer judgment variety.	Feb 9, 2011 4:00 AM
12	Not a requirement but a request or recommendation	Feb 9, 2011 2:22 PM
13	No different than lawyers doing pro bono.	Feb 10, 2011 10:26 PM
14	In my experience as a mediator, pro bobo work was required in Iowa.	Feb 20, 2011 10:50 PM
15	Yes, or pay the ISBA a fee.	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
16	The mediators who are privately retained by the parties should not be required to perform additional pro bono hours.	Feb 22, 2011 2:42 PM
17	Indigent yes. Too small?	Feb 25, 2011 9:27 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
1	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:06 PM
2	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:13 PM
3	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:14 PM
4	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM
5	65	Feb 7, 2011 8:20 PM
6	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:24 PM
7	20	Feb 7, 2011 8:26 PM
8	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
9	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
10	15	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
11	70	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
12	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:29 PM
13	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:30 PM
14	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
15	66	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
16	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
17	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM
18	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:32 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
19	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
20	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
21	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:34 PM
22	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:35 PM
23	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:37 PM
24	70	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
25	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:42 PM
26	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:43 PM
27	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
28	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
29	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
30	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:47 PM
31	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
32	95	Feb 7, 2011 8:49 PM
33	0	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
34	60	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
35	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:50 PM
36	80	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
37	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
38	65	Feb 7, 2011 8:51 PM
39	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
40	99	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
41	10	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
42	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:54 PM
43	99	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
44	5	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
45	40	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
46	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
47	75	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
48	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:00 PM
49	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
50	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
51	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
52	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM
53	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:04 PM
54	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
55	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
56	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:06 PM
57	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
58	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
59	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
60	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:11 PM
61	85	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
62	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:15 PM
63	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:16 PM
64	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
65	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
66	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
67	85	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
68	70	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
69	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
70	2	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
71	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
72	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
73	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
74	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:24 PM
75	95	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
76	85	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
77	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:25 PM
78	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
79	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
80	85	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
81	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
82	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
83	15	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
84	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
85	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
86	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
87	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
88	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
89	5	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
90	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
91	99	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM
92	99	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
93	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
94	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:36 PM
95	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
96	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
97	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
98	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
99	90	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
100	60	Feb 7, 2011 9:42 PM
101	20	Feb 7, 2011 9:44 PM
102	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
103	98	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM
104	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:48 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
105	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
106	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
107	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
108	40	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
109	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:52 PM
110	30	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
111	66	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
112	25	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
113	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
114	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
115	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
116	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
117	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
118	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:58 PM
119	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
120	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
121	85	Feb 7, 2011 10:04 PM
122	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
123	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:05 PM
124	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
125	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
126	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
127	25	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
128	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:08 PM
129	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:09 PM
130	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:17 PM
131	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
132	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
133	60	Feb 7, 2011 10:20 PM
134	75	Feb 7, 2011 10:22 PM
135	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:24 PM
136	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
137	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:30 PM
138	95	Feb 7, 2011 10:31 PM
139	20	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
140	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:39 PM
141	66	Feb 7, 2011 10:40 PM
142	30	Feb 7, 2011 10:42 PM
143	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:46 PM
144	40	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
145	95	Feb 7, 2011 10:48 PM
146	0	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
147	98	Feb 7, 2011 10:53 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
148	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:53 PM
149	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:54 PM
150	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:55 PM
151	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:55 PM
152	90	Feb 7, 2011 11:07 PM
153	80	Feb 7, 2011 11:09 PM
154	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:10 PM
155	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
156	70	Feb 7, 2011 11:13 PM
157	90	Feb 7, 2011 11:16 PM
158	80	Feb 7, 2011 11:17 PM
159	5	Feb 7, 2011 11:18 PM
160	25	Feb 7, 2011 11:20 PM
161	65	Feb 7, 2011 11:21 PM
162	75	Feb 7, 2011 11:21 PM
163	90	Feb 7, 2011 11:25 PM
164	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:25 PM
165	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:37 PM
166	20	Feb 7, 2011 11:41 PM
167	50	Feb 7, 2011 11:41 PM
168	60	Feb 7, 2011 11:41 PM
169	85	Feb 7, 2011 11:49 PM
170	40	Feb 8, 2011 12:01 AM
171	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:07 AM
172	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:26 AM
173	1	Feb 8, 2011 12:27 AM
174	5	Feb 8, 2011 12:29 AM
175	10	Feb 8, 2011 12:40 AM
176	95	Feb 8, 2011 12:50 AM
177	90	Feb 8, 2011 12:59 AM
178	20	Feb 8, 2011 1:05 AM
179	70	Feb 8, 2011 1:08 AM
180	90	Feb 8, 2011 1:48 AM
181	95	Feb 8, 2011 2:20 AM
182	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:33 AM
183	10	Feb 8, 2011 2:38 AM
184	90	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 AM
185	70	Feb 8, 2011 3:06 AM
186	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 AM
187	25	Feb 8, 2011 5:10 AM
188	65	Feb 8, 2011 5:23 AM
189	90	Feb 8, 2011 1:26 PM
190	50	Feb 8, 2011 1:31 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
191	50	Feb 8, 2011 1:38 PM
192	90	Feb 8, 2011 1:40 PM
193	70	Feb 8, 2011 1:42 PM
194	80	Feb 8, 2011 1:55 PM
195	15	Feb 8, 2011 2:14 PM
196	50	Feb 8, 2011 2:30 PM
197	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:34 PM
198	60	Feb 8, 2011 2:40 PM
199	33	Feb 8, 2011 2:45 PM
200	40	Feb 8, 2011 2:52 PM
201	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:53 PM
202	95	Feb 8, 2011 2:59 PM
203	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
204	60	Feb 8, 2011 3:15 PM
205	5	Feb 8, 2011 3:17 PM
206	0	Feb 8, 2011 3:18 PM
207	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:23 PM
208	98	Feb 8, 2011 3:24 PM
209	50	Feb 8, 2011 3:36 PM
210	60	Feb 8, 2011 3:39 PM
211	30	Feb 8, 2011 3:44 PM
212	75	Feb 8, 2011 3:50 PM
213	75	Feb 8, 2011 3:53 PM
214	3	Feb 8, 2011 4:07 PM
215	0	Feb 8, 2011 4:08 PM
216	50	Feb 8, 2011 4:12 PM
217	25	Feb 8, 2011 4:17 PM
218	60	Feb 8, 2011 4:21 PM
219	10	Feb 8, 2011 4:24 PM
220	50	Feb 8, 2011 4:31 PM
221	20	Feb 8, 2011 4:37 PM
222	80	Feb 8, 2011 4:40 PM
223	90	Feb 8, 2011 4:46 PM
224	80	Feb 8, 2011 4:47 PM
225	50	Feb 8, 2011 5:21 PM
226	50	Feb 8, 2011 5:21 PM
227	0	Feb 8, 2011 5:52 PM
228	90	Feb 8, 2011 6:04 PM
229	95	Feb 8, 2011 6:17 PM
230	98	Feb 8, 2011 6:31 PM
231	80	Feb 8, 2011 6:43 PM
232	25	Feb 8, 2011 6:56 PM
233	100	Feb 8, 2011 7:23 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
234	70	Feb 8, 2011 7:38 PM
235	75	Feb 8, 2011 7:48 PM
236	20	Feb 8, 2011 8:00 PM
237	90	Feb 8, 2011 8:31 PM
238	100	Feb 8, 2011 8:48 PM
239	30	Feb 8, 2011 9:13 PM
240	1	Feb 8, 2011 9:34 PM
241	2	Feb 8, 2011 9:46 PM
242	90	Feb 8, 2011 10:15 PM
243	95	Feb 8, 2011 11:06 PM
244	98	Feb 9, 2011 12:37 AM
245	20	Feb 9, 2011 1:16 AM
246	100	Feb 9, 2011 2:06 AM
247	50	Feb 9, 2011 2:48 AM
248	75	Feb 9, 2011 4:00 AM
249	75	Feb 9, 2011 2:22 PM
250	50	Feb 9, 2011 4:11 PM
251	5	Feb 9, 2011 4:58 PM
252	75	Feb 9, 2011 6:16 PM
253	70	Feb 9, 2011 6:23 PM
254	35	Feb 9, 2011 6:44 PM
255	75	Feb 9, 2011 7:04 PM
256	75	Feb 9, 2011 8:39 PM
257	0	Feb 9, 2011 8:40 PM
258	75	Feb 9, 2011 9:08 PM
259	70	Feb 9, 2011 9:45 PM
260	10	Feb 10, 2011 2:38 PM
261	90	Feb 10, 2011 3:06 PM
262	65	Feb 10, 2011 3:28 PM
263	25	Feb 10, 2011 3:48 PM
264	95	Feb 10, 2011 7:14 PM
265	15	Feb 10, 2011 7:16 PM
266	95	Feb 10, 2011 10:26 PM
267	50	Feb 10, 2011 10:35 PM
268	60	Feb 10, 2011 10:58 PM
269	50	Feb 10, 2011 11:01 PM
270	90	Feb 10, 2011 11:45 PM
271	2	Feb 11, 2011 1:15 AM
272	75	Feb 11, 2011 1:59 AM
273	80	Feb 11, 2011 2:12 AM
274	25	Feb 11, 2011 2:48 AM
275	50	Feb 11, 2011 6:24 AM
276	80	Feb 11, 2011 3:31 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
277	75	Feb 11, 2011 3:38 PM
278	1	Feb 11, 2011 6:11 PM
279	99	Feb 11, 2011 7:36 PM
280	95	Feb 11, 2011 8:12 PM
281	5	Feb 11, 2011 9:02 PM
282	50	Feb 11, 2011 10:05 PM
283	80	Feb 11, 2011 11:18 PM
284	90	Feb 12, 2011 4:13 PM
285	95	Feb 13, 2011 4:25 AM
286	0	Feb 14, 2011 3:03 AM
287	90	Feb 14, 2011 1:59 PM
288	25	Feb 14, 2011 3:26 PM
289	80	Feb 14, 2011 4:40 PM
290	70	Feb 14, 2011 4:54 PM
291	75	Feb 14, 2011 8:19 PM
292	90	Feb 14, 2011 10:08 PM
293	80	Feb 15, 2011 12:55 AM
294	50	Feb 15, 2011 12:34 PM
295	90	Feb 15, 2011 2:02 PM
296	40	Feb 15, 2011 3:24 PM
297	0	Feb 15, 2011 5:16 PM
298	90	Feb 15, 2011 8:48 PM
299	80	Feb 15, 2011 9:01 PM
300	50	Feb 15, 2011 11:58 PM
301	40	Feb 16, 2011 12:45 AM
302	0	Feb 17, 2011 4:18 AM
303	80	Feb 17, 2011 3:23 PM
304	95	Feb 17, 2011 8:33 PM
305	5	Feb 17, 2011 9:27 PM
306	90	Feb 17, 2011 9:53 PM
307	60	Feb 18, 2011 9:13 PM
308	75	Feb 20, 2011 5:20 PM
309	60	Feb 20, 2011 10:50 PM
310	10	Feb 20, 2011 11:55 PM
311	50	Feb 21, 2011 1:55 PM
312	60	Feb 21, 2011 8:53 PM
313	80	Feb 21, 2011 8:54 PM
314	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:00 PM
315	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
316	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:04 PM
317	85	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
318	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:06 PM
319	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:08 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
320	70	Feb 21, 2011 9:09 PM
321	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
322	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
323	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
324	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:13 PM
325	40	Feb 21, 2011 9:14 PM
326	40	Feb 21, 2011 9:15 PM
327	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
328	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
329	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
330	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
331	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
332	95	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
333	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
334	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
335	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
336	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
337	70	Feb 21, 2011 9:25 PM
338	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:26 PM
339	25	Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
340	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
341	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
342	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
343	0	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
344	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:29 PM
345	90	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
346	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
347	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:31 PM
348	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
349	5	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
350	1	Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
351	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:34 PM
352	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
353	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
354	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:40 PM
355	60	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
356	75	Feb 21, 2011 9:46 PM
357	60	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
358	60	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
359	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
360	2	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
361	80	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
362	95	Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
363	50	Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
364	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:56 PM
365	10	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
366	30	Feb 21, 2011 9:58 PM
367	17	Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
368	50	Feb 21, 2011 10:02 PM
369	70	Feb 21, 2011 10:04 PM
370	60	Feb 21, 2011 10:05 PM
371	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:07 PM
372	50	Feb 21, 2011 10:13 PM
373	50	Feb 21, 2011 10:16 PM
374	50	Feb 21, 2011 10:16 PM
375	90	Feb 21, 2011 10:17 PM
376	10	Feb 21, 2011 10:26 PM
377	0	Feb 21, 2011 10:26 PM
378	5	Feb 21, 2011 10:31 PM
379	100	Feb 21, 2011 10:33 PM
380	80	Feb 21, 2011 10:33 PM
381	90	Feb 21, 2011 10:41 PM
382	60	Feb 21, 2011 10:49 PM
383	75	Feb 21, 2011 10:51 PM
384	80	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
385	90	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
386	75	Feb 21, 2011 11:15 PM
387	1	Feb 21, 2011 11:16 PM
388	100	Feb 21, 2011 11:20 PM
389	80	Feb 21, 2011 11:24 PM
390	90	Feb 21, 2011 11:25 PM
391	75	Feb 21, 2011 11:27 PM
392	80	Feb 21, 2011 11:32 PM
393	75	Feb 21, 2011 11:34 PM
394	50	Feb 21, 2011 11:37 PM
395	30	Feb 21, 2011 11:48 PM
396	80	Feb 21, 2011 11:56 PM
397	30	Feb 22, 2011 12:10 AM
398	50	Feb 22, 2011 12:13 AM
399	50	Feb 22, 2011 12:18 AM
400	95	Feb 22, 2011 12:20 AM
401	5	Feb 22, 2011 12:25 AM
402	10	Feb 22, 2011 12:33 AM
403	95	Feb 22, 2011 1:29 AM
404	95	Feb 22, 2011 1:32 AM
405	50	Feb 22, 2011 1:59 AM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
406	75	Feb 22, 2011 2:06 AM
407	50	Feb 22, 2011 2:13 AM
408	85	Feb 22, 2011 2:14 AM
409	80	Feb 22, 2011 3:04 AM
410	20	Feb 22, 2011 3:22 AM
411	50	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 AM
412	80	Feb 22, 2011 4:10 AM
413	50	Feb 22, 2011 4:29 AM
414	50	Feb 22, 2011 5:01 AM
415	90	Feb 22, 2011 1:03 PM
416	25	Feb 22, 2011 1:41 PM
417	75	Feb 22, 2011 1:41 PM
418	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:10 PM
419	85	Feb 22, 2011 2:15 PM
420	90	Feb 22, 2011 2:42 PM
421	75	Feb 22, 2011 2:57 PM
422	5	Feb 22, 2011 3:03 PM
423	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:05 PM
424	90	Feb 22, 2011 3:16 PM
425	90	Feb 22, 2011 3:22 PM
426	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:31 PM
427	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
428	60	Feb 22, 2011 3:43 PM
429	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:44 PM
430	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
431	2	Feb 22, 2011 3:50 PM
432	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
433	80	Feb 22, 2011 3:51 PM
434	80	Feb 22, 2011 3:54 PM
435	25	Feb 22, 2011 3:55 PM
436	85	Feb 22, 2011 4:03 PM
437	2	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
438	70	Feb 22, 2011 4:16 PM
439	80	Feb 22, 2011 4:39 PM
440	70	Feb 22, 2011 4:59 PM
441	5	Feb 22, 2011 5:20 PM
442	75	Feb 22, 2011 5:31 PM
443	50	Feb 22, 2011 5:54 PM
444	50	Feb 22, 2011 7:26 PM
445	75	Feb 22, 2011 7:29 PM
446	98	Feb 22, 2011 7:45 PM
447	0	Feb 22, 2011 9:10 PM
448	50	Feb 22, 2011 9:21 PM

9. What percentage of your mediated cases are resolved through the mediation

Cases resolved through mediation: %		
449	60	Feb 22, 2011 9:26 PM
450	30	Feb 22, 2011 10:02 PM
451	20	Feb 22, 2011 10:02 PM
452	100	Feb 22, 2011 10:18 PM
453	67	Feb 22, 2011 10:26 PM
454	60	Feb 22, 2011 10:36 PM
455	20	Feb 22, 2011 10:55 PM
456	75	Feb 22, 2011 11:36 PM
457	25	Feb 23, 2011 4:11 AM
458	50	Feb 23, 2011 2:14 PM
459	75	Feb 23, 2011 2:18 PM
460	0	Feb 23, 2011 2:41 PM
461	90	Feb 23, 2011 4:37 PM
462	75	Feb 23, 2011 5:36 PM
463	75	Feb 23, 2011 6:28 PM
464	45	Feb 23, 2011 6:51 PM
465	50	Feb 23, 2011 7:01 PM
466	50	Feb 23, 2011 8:26 PM
467	50	Feb 23, 2011 8:42 PM
468	90	Feb 23, 2011 9:20 PM
469	50	Feb 23, 2011 9:59 PM
470	50	Feb 24, 2011 5:53 PM
471	75	Feb 24, 2011 8:01 PM
472	98	Feb 24, 2011 8:02 PM
473	70	Feb 25, 2011 1:39 PM
474	5	Feb 25, 2011 4:40 PM
475	80	Feb 25, 2011 8:08 PM
476	50	Feb 25, 2011 9:27 PM
477	80	Feb 25, 2011 10:23 PM
478	85	Feb 26, 2011 8:48 PM
479	90	Feb 27, 2011 4:18 PM
480	80	Feb 27, 2011 4:34 PM
481	80	Feb 27, 2011 7:24 PM
482	25	Feb 28, 2011 1:40 AM
483	75	Feb 28, 2011 3:36 PM
484	15	Feb 28, 2011 8:57 PM
485	95	Feb 28, 2011 9:51 PM
486	50	Feb 28, 2011 10:03 PM
487	85	Feb 28, 2011 10:19 PM
488	90	Mar 1, 2011 12:07 AM

3. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after

% of cases:		
1	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:08 PM
2	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:15 PM
3	25	Feb 7, 2011 8:16 PM
4	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:19 PM
5	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:21 PM
6	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:26 PM
7	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:28 PM
8	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
9	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
10	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
11	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
12	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
13	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:38 PM
14	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:38 PM
15	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:41 PM
16	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:45 PM
17	90	Feb 7, 2011 8:46 PM
18	50	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
19	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
20	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:53 PM
21	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
22	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
23	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
24	100	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
25	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
26	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
27	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:05 PM
28	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
29	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
30	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
31	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
32	85	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
33	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
34	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
35	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
36	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
37	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
38	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
39	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
40	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
41	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:22 PM
42	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
43	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM

3. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after

% of cases:		
44	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
45	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:31 PM
46	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:32 PM
47	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
48	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
49	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
50	75	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
51	80	Feb 7, 2011 9:43 PM
52	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
53	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
54	50	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
55	85	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
56	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:50 PM
57	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:51 PM
58	10	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
59	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
60	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
61	100	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
62	0	Feb 7, 2011 9:59 PM
63	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
64	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:01 PM
65	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
66	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:09 PM
67	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:10 PM
68	10	Feb 7, 2011 10:11 PM
69	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:13 PM
70	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:23 PM
71	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:24 PM
72	50	Feb 7, 2011 10:25 PM
73	5	Feb 7, 2011 10:26 PM
74	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
75	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:37 PM
76	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:44 PM
77	90	Feb 7, 2011 10:50 PM
78	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:52 PM
79	80	Feb 7, 2011 10:56 PM
80	100	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
81	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:14 PM
82	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
83	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM
84	90	Feb 7, 2011 11:43 PM
85	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:46 PM
86	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:46 PM

3. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after

% of cases:		
87	100	Feb 7, 2011 11:56 PM
88	80	Feb 8, 2011 12:29 AM
89	100	Feb 8, 2011 12:31 AM
90	99	Feb 8, 2011 12:36 AM
91	100	Feb 8, 2011 12:42 AM
92	100	Feb 8, 2011 12:53 AM
93	100	Feb 8, 2011 1:02 AM
94	100	Feb 8, 2011 1:11 AM
95	50	Feb 8, 2011 1:50 AM
96	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:25 AM
97	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:39 AM
98	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:09 AM
99	90	Feb 8, 2011 5:28 AM
100	100	Feb 8, 2011 1:08 PM
101	100	Feb 8, 2011 1:33 PM
102	5	Feb 8, 2011 1:42 PM
103	100	Feb 8, 2011 1:57 PM
104	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:15 PM
105	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
106	75	Feb 8, 2011 2:47 PM
107	100	Feb 8, 2011 2:56 PM
108	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:00 PM
109	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:06 PM
110	10	Feb 8, 2011 3:37 PM
111	100	Feb 8, 2011 3:53 PM
112	50	Feb 8, 2011 4:23 PM
113	40	Feb 8, 2011 4:28 PM
114	100	Feb 8, 2011 4:33 PM
115	100	Feb 8, 2011 4:43 PM
116	90	Feb 8, 2011 4:48 PM
117	75	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
118	100	Feb 8, 2011 5:24 PM
119	100	Feb 8, 2011 5:24 PM
120	100	Feb 8, 2011 5:49 PM
121	20	Feb 8, 2011 6:06 PM
122	100	Feb 8, 2011 6:20 PM
123	100	Feb 8, 2011 6:34 PM
124	100	Feb 8, 2011 7:50 PM
125	100	Feb 8, 2011 8:02 PM
126	100	Feb 8, 2011 8:34 PM
127	100	Feb 8, 2011 8:50 PM
128	20	Feb 8, 2011 9:47 PM
129	100	Feb 8, 2011 10:16 PM

3. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after

		% of cases:	
130	100		Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
131	0		Feb 9, 2011 1:17 AM
132	100		Feb 9, 2011 4:07 AM
133	50		Feb 9, 2011 6:19 PM
134	100		Feb 9, 2011 6:26 PM
135	100		Feb 9, 2011 9:48 PM
136	100		Feb 10, 2011 3:51 PM
137	0		Feb 10, 2011 7:19 PM
138	100		Feb 10, 2011 10:30 PM
139	100		Feb 10, 2011 11:00 PM
140	100		Feb 10, 2011 11:05 PM
141	100		Feb 10, 2011 11:49 PM
142	85		Feb 11, 2011 1:17 AM
143	100		Feb 11, 2011 3:33 PM
144	0		Feb 11, 2011 6:12 PM
145	100		Feb 11, 2011 8:14 PM
146	50		Feb 11, 2011 9:05 PM
147	35		Feb 12, 2011 4:16 PM
148	100		Feb 13, 2011 4:28 AM
149	0		Feb 14, 2011 3:05 AM
150	100		Feb 14, 2011 4:42 PM
151	100		Feb 15, 2011 12:58 AM
152	100		Feb 15, 2011 12:36 PM
153	30		Feb 15, 2011 2:05 PM
154	1		Feb 15, 2011 8:17 PM
155	100		Feb 15, 2011 8:50 PM
156	100		Feb 16, 2011 12:51 AM
157	100		Feb 17, 2011 4:21 AM
158	100		Feb 17, 2011 3:30 PM
159	100		Feb 17, 2011 8:39 PM
160	90		Feb 17, 2011 9:59 PM
161	50		Feb 20, 2011 10:53 PM
162	75		Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
163	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
164	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:10 PM
165	25		Feb 21, 2011 9:12 PM
166	10		Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
167	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:16 PM
168	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
169	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
170	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
171	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:21 PM
172	90		Feb 21, 2011 9:22 PM

3. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after

		% of cases:	
173	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:23 PM
174	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:24 PM
175	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
176	0		Feb 21, 2011 9:27 PM
177	80		Feb 21, 2011 9:28 PM
178	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
179	50		Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
180	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
181	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:33 PM
182	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:36 PM
183	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:37 PM
184	75		Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
185	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
186	100		Feb 21, 2011 9:51 PM
187	95		Feb 21, 2011 9:52 PM
188	50		Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
189	0		Feb 21, 2011 9:54 PM
190	75		Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
191	0		Feb 21, 2011 10:01 PM
192	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:08 PM
193	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:09 PM
194	80		Feb 21, 2011 10:12 PM
195	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:18 PM
196	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:19 PM
197	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:28 PM
198	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:43 PM
199	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:46 PM
200	100		Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
201	95		Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
202	100		Feb 21, 2011 11:03 PM
203	50		Feb 21, 2011 11:17 PM
204	50		Feb 21, 2011 11:19 PM
205	100		Feb 21, 2011 11:21 PM
206	98		Feb 21, 2011 11:29 PM
207	100		Feb 21, 2011 11:33 PM
208	60		Feb 21, 2011 11:51 PM
209	100		Feb 21, 2011 11:57 PM
210	100		Feb 22, 2011 12:00 AM
211	100		Feb 22, 2011 12:12 AM
212	100		Feb 22, 2011 12:20 AM
213	100		Feb 22, 2011 1:38 AM
214	50		Feb 22, 2011 2:14 AM
215	100		Feb 22, 2011 2:19 AM

3. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after

% of cases:		
216	100	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 AM
217	100	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
218	50	Feb 22, 2011 5:04 AM
219	100	Feb 22, 2011 1:45 PM
220	0	Feb 22, 2011 2:11 PM
221	100	Feb 22, 2011 2:16 PM
222	90	Feb 22, 2011 2:54 PM
223	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 PM
224	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:26 PM
225	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:42 PM
226	100	Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
227	0	Feb 22, 2011 3:52 PM
228	50	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
229	100	Feb 22, 2011 3:57 PM
230	100	Feb 22, 2011 4:05 PM
231	65	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
232	100	Feb 22, 2011 4:15 PM
233	100	Feb 22, 2011 4:43 PM
234	50	Feb 22, 2011 5:22 PM
235	100	Feb 22, 2011 5:32 PM
236	100	Feb 22, 2011 5:56 PM
237	25	Feb 22, 2011 7:29 PM
238	100	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
239	0	Feb 22, 2011 9:12 PM
240	100	Feb 22, 2011 10:04 PM
241	100	Feb 22, 2011 10:28 PM
242	100	Feb 22, 2011 10:38 PM
243	100	Feb 22, 2011 11:02 PM
244	50	Feb 23, 2011 4:13 AM
245	100	Feb 23, 2011 4:41 PM
246	50	Feb 23, 2011 8:30 PM
247	100	Feb 23, 2011 8:44 PM
248	100	Feb 23, 2011 9:23 PM
249	100	Feb 25, 2011 1:41 PM
250	50	Feb 25, 2011 8:09 PM
251	90	Feb 25, 2011 9:36 PM
252	100	Feb 27, 2011 4:20 PM
253	50	Feb 27, 2011 4:37 PM
254	100	Feb 28, 2011 1:44 AM
255	100	Feb 28, 2011 3:45 AM
256	100	Feb 28, 2011 3:41 PM
257	0	Feb 28, 2011 8:58 PM
258	100	Feb 28, 2011 9:53 PM

3. What percentage of your federal court cases require further discovery after

		% of cases:	
259	100		Feb 28, 2011 10:05 PM
260	90		Mar 1, 2011 12:11 AM

4. How could Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) initial disclosure requirements better

Response Text		
1	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) initial disclosure requirements should be eliminated	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
2	should give most documents	Feb 7, 2011 8:31 PM
3	By requiring that Plaintiff have an expert at the start of any case on liability and damage issues and that all such experts be identified along with opinions.	Feb 7, 2011 8:38 PM
4	Narrows the potential targets of discovery.	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
5	I think Rle 26(a)(1) extends about as far as can be reasonably expected.	Feb 7, 2011 8:55 PM
6	Don't require that the parties await the 26(f) conference to propound discovery.	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
7	Sanction parties when you find out something was not initially disclosed	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
8	Need to place limits on what discovery can be done. If there are no limits, lawyers will do everything allowable whether it is necessary or not.	Feb 7, 2011 9:18 PM
9	can't	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
10	The interrogatories, depositions and Requests for Admissions are more focused on the issues and generally shorter (or less requests).	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
11	I don't think they can. Initial disclosures are fine, but there is still a role for the discovery process when much of a party's case is in the exclusive control and knoweldge of the opponent or third parties, which needs to be obtained and assessed through the discovery process.	Feb 7, 2011 9:29 PM
12	Initial disclosures are abused by the defense.	Feb 7, 2011 9:33 PM
13	It cant . Depositions are necessary and valuable and pecipitate settlement	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
14	involvement by the court	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
15	I don't think they can	Feb 7, 2011 9:46 PM
16	They would not matter, because the judicial work load in many Iowa judicial districts (6th for one) is so much higher than in federal court, that state court judges would not take this seriously. Also in federal court this procedure works against the plaintiff and in defendants favor.	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
17	unknown	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
18	Automatic exchange of documents and expert reports, medical bills, and items that are coming into evidence eventually anyway.	Feb 7, 2011 10:00 PM
19	Stricter enforcement of the rule	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
20	Expand the disclosures	Feb 7, 2011 10:24 PM
21	pretty good as is	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
22	Eliminate the rule	Feb 7, 2011 10:52 PM
23	I don't think they would reduce it at all; discovery is the best way for some lawyers to bill on cases that they know are likely to settle.	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
24	Be more extensive	Feb 7, 2011 11:15 PM
25	No opinion	Feb 7, 2011 11:28 PM

4. How could Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) initial disclosure requirements better

	Response Text	
26	The rule is too much a game. Never have liked it and don't think it really makes much difference. You still have to serve the regular discovery in most cases. Just a lot of busy work to satisfy a court rule.	Feb 7, 2011 11:46 PM
27	Not sure	Feb 7, 2011 11:46 PM
28	Possibly broadening the witness disclosure to include both subject and substance of knowledge	Feb 7, 2011 11:56 PM
29	do not know	Feb 8, 2011 12:29 AM
30	Unknown.	Feb 8, 2011 12:53 AM
31	I don't see how.	Feb 8, 2011 1:02 AM
32	Mandated earlier production of patient authorizations and other usual discovery documents forces attorneys to begin discovery process earlier and helps avoid delays in obtaining basic information and documents	Feb 8, 2011 1:11 AM
33	Helps to focus the effort and reduce or eliminate fishing expeditions or delaying tactics.	Feb 8, 2011 2:25 AM
34	Problem is sorting out what client knew and when. Often do not know right away. Dependent on client diligence to comply--with attrys at risk for client failures, causing attys to delay or provide less than complete info.	Feb 8, 2011 5:28 AM
35	They are helpful, but rarely reduce further discovery	Feb 8, 2011 2:35 PM
36	It can't. It is a total waste of time and judicial resources. Iowa should not adopt this very stupid rule.	Feb 8, 2011 2:56 PM
37	Broaden to require disclosure of all relevant information with sanctions if relevant information not timely disclosed.	Feb 8, 2011 3:53 PM
38	Family courts in Iowa require a financial affidavit; this is helpful. Similarly, the initial disclosures do a very good job of providing the basic data necessary to fairly evaluate the strength and weaknesses of a case. Lawyers have to be trained to complete these steps, however. Old dogs resist change.	Feb 8, 2011 4:23 PM
39	narrow the issues and basic background research on experts	Feb 8, 2011 4:43 PM
40	no opinion	Feb 8, 2011 5:00 PM
41	Broaden it, enforce it, make both parties put as many facts on the table at the outset as possible -- but give all parties sufficient time to do it in a meaningful fashion.	Feb 8, 2011 6:20 PM
42	discloses much of what needs to be discovered initially	Feb 8, 2011 8:34 PM
43	If you are going to have such up-front questions, they need to be as thorough as interrogatories would be, thereby replacing the need for those initial interrogatories. As it has been interpreted by the courts, the requirements are too incomplete, requiring all the same interrogatories you would have in the absence of Rule 26. So the rule accomplishes nothing at all.	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
44	I can't see that the initial disclosures reduce discovery, but they do make the process more fair in requiring disclosure. It also can jump start discovery, but the problem in federal court is the disclosures are not required earlier in litigation.	Feb 9, 2011 4:07 AM
45	A DESCRIPTION OF THE LEGAL ISSUES THAT A PARTY ANTICIPATES TO BE INVOLVED IN THE CASE UP TO THAT TIME	Feb 9, 2011 6:19 PM
46	No opinion	Feb 10, 2011 3:51 PM
47	By requiring the actual documents to be produced and not just a list of documents.	Feb 10, 2011 11:00 PM
48	Limit all trial evidence to that disclosed, with no exceptions.	Feb 10, 2011 11:49 PM
49	I think that the Federal courts should return to the Iowa system. I do not find the initial disclosures helpful. It is make work!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Feb 13, 2011 4:28 AM
50	By requiring more detailed responses.	Feb 15, 2011 2:05 PM

4. How could Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) initial disclosure requirements better

Response Text		
51	The main advantage is that it speeds the process. In other words, I get documents and information faster.	Feb 15, 2011 8:50 PM
52	I do not think the goal of having initial disclosures is to eliminate the need for further discovery. I believe the goal is to help begin the discovery process early and have the parties exchange information early that will generally be of value. I do not view initial disclosures as a replacement of traditional discovery nor should it be a replacment.	Feb 17, 2011 3:30 PM
53	I'm not sure; it's so difficult being in Federal Court that the mere mention of state courts thinking they should be more like it makes me want to find another job.	Feb 17, 2011 8:39 PM
54	sanctions for failure to comply	Feb 17, 2011 9:59 PM
55	Enforcemewnt of 26-a-1-A-ii-- all docuemtns to support claim or defense.	Feb 21, 2011 9:19 PM
56	By expanding the disclosure requirements.	Feb 21, 2011 9:22 PM
57	Broader disclosures	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
58	It now reduces further discovery. It does not eliminate the need for additional discovery.	Feb 21, 2011 9:49 PM
59	It focuses the issues	Feb 21, 2011 9:52 PM
60	Impose a duty to supplement, 30 days out from trial.	Feb 21, 2011 9:57 PM
61	It doesn't necessarily reduce discovery but rather helps focus it.	Feb 21, 2011 10:12 PM
62	Doubt that it could.	Feb 21, 2011 10:19 PM
63	The disclosure requirements of Rule 26 are useless in most cases. In most cases the required disclosures would be made via interrogatories in any event. At most the rule just moves-up the disclosures of certian items by 30 days or so. Even this doesn't help because other discovery still needs to be done. In a few cases some of the required disclosures are irrelevant to the case. For those cases Rule 26 actually requires useless activity and expense.	Feb 21, 2011 11:01 PM
64	More faithfully enforced or followed	Feb 21, 2011 11:19 PM
65	While you still have to do some discovery, you know from the get go what the main documents and persons with knowledge are, so you can eliminate a number of the "basic" requests that we have to do in state court to get anything from the other side. I think 26(a)(1) disclosures work well.	Feb 21, 2011 11:57 PM
66	Unknown.	Feb 22, 2011 12:00 AM
67	I am not sure	Feb 22, 2011 12:12 AM
68	require certification that there are no other relevant facts or documents	Feb 22, 2011 1:38 AM
69	this will occur only if further discovery is limited by rule	Feb 22, 2011 3:08 AM
70	Penalties for frivolous discovery.	Feb 22, 2011 5:04 AM
71	There is an apparent assumption in the question that all evidence is available to counsel at the time of the disclosure which is, many times, a false assumption. You may want to consider a supplemental disclosure after a period of time, such as 120 days.	Feb 22, 2011 2:54 PM
72	stream lines the subsequent discovery and prevents broad objections to production form opposing part	Feb 22, 2011 3:45 PM
73	Perhaps by excluding the "unless solely for impeachment" clauses	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
74	Broaden the areas for initial disclosure	Feb 22, 2011 7:48 PM
75	I do not believe they can	Feb 22, 2011 10:04 PM

4. How could Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) initial disclosure requirements better

Response Text		
76	The judiciary could review the disclosures carefully and if a party fails to comply with 26(a)(1), a judge should grant the other side's motion to exclude evidence not divulged in such disclosures. The judiciary now allows non-complying litigants to get away with non-disclosure with no penalty. If the complying party really wants/needs the information, it is then forced to file additional motions to compel, conduct additional discovery, etc. The non-conforming party is rewarded for its bad behavior.	Feb 22, 2011 11:02 PM
77	Forces attys to give serious thought earlier in process. Provides road map for discovery; gets attys out of the bleachers.	Feb 23, 2011 8:44 PM
78	A better understanding by the lawyers, although due to duration of rules it has improver significantly	Feb 25, 2011 9:36 PM
79	if the party making the disclosures was held to them and not able to present conflicting facts to what was disclosed.	Feb 28, 2011 1:44 AM
80	I can't see how it could be done.	Feb 28, 2011 3:41 PM
81	In my experrience it reduces additional discovery.	Mar 1, 2011 12:11 AM

5. If you have experience in both state and federal court, what are the

Other (please specify)		
1	just much more experience and therefore more familiarity and comfort with state court	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
2	Federal courts are more willing to grant a dispositive motion against a plaintiff and as such are regarded as a more hostile environment for plaintiffs.	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
3	Generally state court judges display a more even and impartial judicial temperment than can be found in certain federal judges in the Northern District and display a lesser inclination to "try the case from the bench" or include excessive personal commentary in judicial rulings.	Feb 7, 2011 9:01 PM
4	I prefer the rules in federal court. They are more certain and more readily enforced.	Feb 7, 2011 9:07 PM
5	State courts are more user friendly	Feb 7, 2011 9:45 PM
6	The federal rules are not evenly applied by the federal court, they are often used by judges to get rid of plaintiff's cases. Some federal judges are not accomodating and have a GOD complex!	Feb 7, 2011 9:53 PM
7	The respect and understanding of the state court judiciary in the treatment of attorneys, litigants and the matters before the court.	Feb 7, 2011 10:01 PM
8	More flexible regarding extension of deadlines and continuances	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
9	More relaxed atmosphere	Feb 7, 2011 11:46 PM
10	Location of courtrooms - I must travel nearly four hours to get to the federal courthouse. Makes producing witnesses a challenge.	Feb 7, 2011 11:56 PM
11	Procedural and discovery rules less rigidly adhered to when good cause is demonstrate; Summary judgment procedures much less cumbersome in state court	Feb 8, 2011 1:11 AM
12	The federal courts try to run and try the cases for the litigants. This should be avoided at all costs. It is a waste of valuable judicial resources and operates under the assumption that Iowa lawyers don't know what they are doing and need a judge to tell them.	Feb 8, 2011 2:56 PM
13	State court is less predictable.	Feb 8, 2011 4:23 PM

5. If you have experience in both state and federal court, what are the

Other (please specify)		
14	less jumping through hoops	Feb 8, 2011 6:34 PM
15	It varies from judge to judge in both jurisdictions.	Feb 8, 2011 10:55 PM
16	State court's rules are better in requiring a defendant to appear in Iowa for deposition. The exception being small claims, where there are no depositions and debt collection litigation there has evolved into an inquisition of the debtor with the creditor being required to produce next to nothing for evidence or witnesses, and what they do produce are multiple hearsay documents of questionable credibility with no witness available to cross examine.	Feb 9, 2011 4:07 AM
17	A more fair and balanced judiciary. I think the federal courts are anti-plaintiff in many cases and look for ways to dismiss cases.	Feb 10, 2011 11:00 PM
18	The state courts are much more laid-back and the judges/rules in court much friendlier to attorneys and clients.	Feb 10, 2011 11:05 PM
19	Over the past 20 years the federal courts have discouraged civil litigation by imposing extensive and expensive paper shuffling. See, for example, the procedure for submitting a motion for summary judgment.	Feb 10, 2011 11:49 PM
20	the judges are less rigid and easier to work with.	Feb 12, 2011 4:16 PM
21	Judges are too sloppy about rules; they should enforce the rules instead of being accommodating.	Feb 17, 2011 4:21 AM
22	The only advantage is that in some cases federal court micromanagement can be a burden. However, in general I believe the federal system is better than the state system. I understand that there are many more resources available to federal judges than state judges and that has a huge impact; however, federal judges enforce the rules of civil procedure and local rules, and parties and attorneys know that so they behave better in federal court.	Feb 17, 2011 3:30 PM
23	Federal Courts are a forced march with Judges that are arrogant and love nothing better than to dismiss our cases for the slightest reason. I'd rather have a tooth pulled.	Feb 17, 2011 8:39 PM
24	The rules of civil procedure are more strictly interpreted and enforced.	Feb 20, 2011 5:24 PM
25	state court litigation has become a wholesale attempt to mass produce justice. federal courts are much more likely to have an individualized outcome	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
26	Federal Courts are much more efficient at case resolution than Iowa District Courts.	Feb 21, 2011 9:22 PM
27	Federal Judges are often unusually harsh.	Feb 21, 2011 9:43 PM
28	State Court rules are less ridged and judges more flexible typically. In Federal court	Feb 21, 2011 10:09 PM
29	None, for me the experience in Federal Court is superior	Feb 21, 2011 11:19 PM
30	More flexibility	Feb 22, 2011 10:28 PM
31	convenience to the parties	Feb 23, 2011 8:30 PM
32	I have confidence in the Iowa Courts and recommend that they not remove them depending on the judge assigned in State Court. This however may be a toss up.	Feb 25, 2011 9:36 PM

6. If you have experience in both state and federal court, what are the

Other (please specify)		
1	A date certain is set for trial early on that is not moved.	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM

6. If you have experience in both state and federal court, what are the

Other (please specify)		
2	Feds have money. . so they still have law clerks , electronic courtrooms, less crowded dockets, bailiffs, more pleasant environment and well paid judges with the time to analyze substantive issues in major cases	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
3	Court facilities Availability of immediate appeal of some issues that would otherwise require interlocutory request	Feb 7, 2011 9:56 PM
4	Consistency in the application of the rules	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
5	Pretrial procedures are much more thorough and helps to avoid surprises and uncertainties at trial	Feb 7, 2011 11:56 PM
6	More likely to be resolved through summary judgment.	Feb 8, 2011 12:53 AM
7	Daubert.	Feb 8, 2011 1:02 AM
8	Efficiencies of electronic filing; specifically assigned judges	Feb 8, 2011 1:11 AM
9	Pretrial conference and certainty of a trial date.	Feb 8, 2011 3:06 PM
10	Having the Federal judges working electronically I believe makes them much more efficient.	Feb 8, 2011 6:20 PM
11	Federal electronic filing is far superior to the antiquated filing procedures in Iowa. The federal pretrial order is far better in streamlining trial and encouraging settlement.	Feb 9, 2011 4:07 AM
12	See answer to question #5.	Feb 17, 2011 3:30 PM
13	The court house has better security, but other than that there is no advantage.	Feb 17, 2011 8:39 PM
14	The rules of civil procedure are more strictly interpreted and enforced.	Feb 20, 2011 5:24 PM
15	more professional and judicial than state court system	Feb 21, 2011 9:07 PM
16	In the N.D. Iowa, Western Division, it entirely depends on whether your case is a Judge Bennett case or a Judge O'Brien case. If Judge Bennett, quicker time to disposition and more hands-on management. If O'Brien, no advantages to federal court.	Feb 21, 2011 9:18 PM
17	One judge tends to handle the case. Rules are enforced. Summary judgment is viewed as a legitimate means of resolving a case.	Feb 22, 2011 4:17 AM
18	Due to the federal court's limited jurisdiction and apparent additional resources, it seems that the opportunity to resolve a case earlier by summary judgment is more available than in state court.	Feb 22, 2011 2:54 PM
19	ELECTRONIC FILING!	Feb 22, 2011 3:53 PM
20	Consistent rules applied throughout the state, instead of haphazard patchwork of rules that vary by courthouse, county, judge, etc.	Feb 22, 2011 11:02 PM
21	The court's time to acquire knowledge and familiarity of the case	Feb 23, 2011 8:30 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
1	I firmly believe uniform rules across the state, assignment of judges to the case early in the process and mandatory mediation for all civil cases would be beneficial and should be implemented.	Feb 7, 2011 8:17 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
2	Thank you for your time to this project - this is needed. We need regional litigation centers, most judges i encounter are unfortunately dealing mostly with family law matters and so matters invovling commercial litigation or personal injury become a real burden to the court - unfortunately. We definitely need family law courts in this state. The criminal docket needs some work, some judges are requiring defendants to be present for misdemeanor pleas and sentencing proceedings - this is a waste of time for the court and counsel. Tama county judges do not require you to appear for a misdemeanor plea or sentencing - go to Story County, they associated judges make you appear for both - with client - no sense.	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
3	Iowa's garnishment rules are archaic and more expensive for judgment creditors and for judgment debtors and unnecessarily burden Clerks of Court. South Dakota's garnishment rules should be adopted.	Feb 7, 2011 8:33 PM
4	enforcement of sanctions for attorney dilatory conduct in discovery and motion practice	Feb 7, 2011 8:40 PM
5	Although politically unpopular, Iowa should develop regional litigation centers. Speciality courts should be established. Discovery abuses should be curtailed. The overuse of Summary Judgment should be discouraged. Alternative dispute methods should be integrated into the process by allowing judges to become involved in the process without violating ethics rules.	Feb 7, 2011 8:44 PM
6	Stop allowing the legislature to control the purse strings of the judicial branch.	Feb 7, 2011 8:48 PM
7	Uniformity among processes, schedules, trial orders, forms for all counties and districts.	Feb 7, 2011 8:52 PM
8	I believe Iowa trial judges to an excellent job overall. However, I believe that the bench, the bar and the litigants would all benefit from adoption of Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure that mirror the Federal Rules, both in substance and also numerically so as to lead to greater efficiencies.	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
9	We have too many courthuses. Civil courts should be held in many fewer locations around the state and should be given higher priority to resolution than at present. In addition, judges hould be assigned to each civil case to promote efficiency and consistency.	Feb 7, 2011 8:56 PM
10	The biggest improvement I would make would be for judges to take the rule about granting partial summary judgment seriously. If there are 15 issues in a case, and the opposing party in response to a MSJ only raises issues of fact on 3 of them, the court often will deny the MSJ in full, when it really under the rule should grant partial SJ on the 12 issues, and set a trial on the 3 remaining issues only.	Feb 7, 2011 8:57 PM
11	If one party is willing to pay for the cost of hiring a court reporter require the other party/parties to agree to an earlier trial date using a senior status judge if necessary.	Feb 7, 2011 8:58 PM
12	I would consider a form of "loser" pays some attorney fees and certainly more of the expenses than under the current system. For example, the "loser" should pay all deposition costs, not just for those used by the prevailing party and should pay some attorney fees even if there is not a rule1.413 sanction motion.This reduces the burden on the party that prevails and and forces party's with weak cases to recognize that and deal with it early on. In that same vein, trial court's should more aggressively impose "request to admit" costs.	Feb 7, 2011 8:59 PM
13	Judges should not be reluctant to dismiss cases or enter summary judgment rulings on the belief that it is better for a jury to decide. This only serves to increase the cost and backlog of cases. Frivolous suits should be summarily dealt with by the Courts.	Feb 7, 2011 9:03 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
14	I really like the e-filing in federal court. It would be so nice for Iowa to do that.	Feb 7, 2011 9:08 PM
15	Mediation sessions have been helpful in many agricultural debt situations. A good mediator can get the parties talking again and can simplify issues.	Feb 7, 2011 9:10 PM
16	It is becoming ridiculous that from the day the petition is filed it is going to be at least a year, sometimes two or more, before you will get to trial. In the last two years, I have had six trials that have been "bumped" at least twice. You have to prepare for trial because you are not informed by the court administrator until the day before you are supposed to start whether or not you will have a judge (and now we are informed that there is a shortage of court reporters, but they will allow the trial to proceed if the parties will pay for the court to hire a court reporter - that is outrageous - those who can afford it get justice and the rest can lump it). I have tried to check a week or to in advance and am always told she (the ct admin) cannot say. Then, once the trial is bumped, it is months or over a year before you can get a new date. In order to be first in the list (of civil trials) for a client whose case has been pending since 2006, in April, 2010, I had to accept a trial date to begin in July, 2011. This is no guarantee that the trial will go forward. Especially here in Linn County, the standard for our courts has become justice delayed, justice denied for civil litigants.	Feb 7, 2011 9:12 PM
17	Better education for lawyers.	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
18	Change to a system where the loser pays the winner's attorney fes	Feb 7, 2011 9:14 PM
19	Iowa needs to consolidate counties and if the legislature and executive branches are unwilling to do this, then the judicial branch needs to consolidate court houses from the county level to a regional level.	Feb 7, 2011 9:17 PM
20	Parenting coordinators should be implemented throughout Iowa to help with post decree issues. Mandatory mediation prior to divorce/custody trials would also help a great deal. People should not have to pay \$50 to file a contempt of court action - especially for non payment of child support or alimony.	Feb 7, 2011 9:19 PM
21	Motions to Dismiss should be granted if the law so indicates. Amend the offer of judgment statute to define costs to include attorney fees. The prevailing party should be awarded reasonable attorney fees in accordance with ability to pay.	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
22	none	Feb 7, 2011 9:20 PM
23	Thank you for your work and efforts to try to make the judicial system better.	Feb 7, 2011 9:21 PM
24	Rigid Court control will dictate time and cost to the litigants if the Court would exercise such control	Feb 7, 2011 9:26 PM
25	In the rural area the courts function very well. No changes are requested.	Feb 7, 2011 9:27 PM
26	Electronic filing of pleadings and orders would greatly reduce travel time for attorneys (and thus expense for clients) and resolve some issues with service hours and availability of staff at county courthouses. While I think the local clerk of court office needs to be retained at the county level in some capacity, electronic filing could be used to increase access for filing and obtaining information and copies while having less local staff and office hours. I think the federal district court and bankruptcy court electronic filing systems works very well.	Feb 7, 2011 9:28 PM
27	Please note that I am an Iowa-admitted attorney who resides and practices primarily in the State of Minnesota. I have tried several cases in Iowa, including a jury trial in Des Moines two months ago, and have attempted to focus my perspective on the Iowa courts as opposed to my experiences with the Minnesota state courts. Good luck.	Feb 7, 2011 9:30 PM
28	I served as a Magistrate in a small claims system that had the benefit of mandatory mediation. It was very effective for us. Even small claims with counsel benefited and attorneys were surprised at how much it benefited a case	Feb 7, 2011 9:34 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
29	<p>Figure out the average length of time that different types of cases take, and schedule trial dates, discovery deadlines, etc. accordingly. Set relatively early deadlines for discovery but allow for submission of a second round of discovery if needed based on new information. Set deadlines for motions to compel discovery so that discovery disputes are not continuing right up to trial.</p> <p>Also, in considering any recommendations to achieve a more timely and cost effective process, keep in mind that many low-income lowans are litigants in Iowa courts. Their circumstances and needs are often different than those of higher-income lowans. Many of them are unrepresented or do not obtain representation until later in the process (so they may be unaware of their rights, unfamiliar with court proceedings and legal terminology, or at a disadvantage in mediation). They may have limited access to transportation (making it hard to get to a regional courthouse). They may have outside responsibilities, such as work, school, and child care, that affect their ability to meet deadlines or attend court dates. They may have language barriers or disabilities that affect their ability to access the court system.</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:35 PM
30	<p>Returning to pre FCRP discovery is not an answer. E discovery is a problem in some class actions and complex cases which are primarily in federal courts, not state courts. Depositions and motion practice abuse is not a problem in the typical state court tort or contract litigation.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the real answer is to simply eliminate numerous courthouses /counties Regionalize the process. Adopt the Minnesota system where a case is only filed when an issue needs judicial attention. At that time the party requesting judicial action pays a filing fee for all of the documents to be filed . The fee can be substantial. Mandatory ADR as in Minnesota is also a good idea.</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:37 PM
31	<p>I strongly urge consideration of arbitration in addition to consideration of mediation. Illinois has mandatory arbitration in cases under \$50,000 using three member (all attorneys who go through training to be able to participate and are paid a nominal fee of \$100 per case they sit on) panels. If the parties accept the judgment, the court enters it accordingly. If they don't accept it and want to proceed to trial, an additional fee is collected from them.</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:39 PM
32	<p>Separate domestic/family courts, assign 1 judge to case from very beginning,</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:47 PM
33	<p>Iowa Judges sometimes lack the time and experience to properly handle civil litigation and therefore make mistakes which result in verdicts which have to be set aside. Our Judges should have trial experience before they go on the Bench and have ongoing training in the rules of evidence and the drafting of instructions. Many Judges do not know how to manage a trial and it results in a lack of confidence in the system.</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:49 PM
34	<p>Two things need to be done, in my opinion.</p> <p>One, somehow prevent plaintiffs from pleading multiple causes of action when they know, or should know, that most of the causes pled are fancifu.</p> <p>Two, prevent corporate defendants from abusing the discovery process which they do regularly either by objecting to all plaintiff discovery or by conducting scorced earth discovery of their own.</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:50 PM
35	<p>none</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:54 PM
36	<p>How about have regional courts. Get rid of county courts. 99 court houses is a joke. The work load among judges is not near equal. Judges should be re-assigned based upon volume of work. And the courts should also enforce the deadlines for judges to get rulings out. They aren't enforced, and if an attorney complains an order wikll come down, but it will be against the attorney who complained!</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
37	<p>E-file. E-file. E-file.</p>	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

	Response Text	
38	I think small claims needs a higher cap, there are too many worthless cases in district court that would be done in 2 weeks with SC, I also think that mandatory mediation (at least in family law) has created more problems than it has solved. I see a growth in cases that initiate already settled but in mediation counties the parties are forced to take a pointless step at an additional cost. It can literally add 30% to the total cost for no good reason. The parties should at least be able to certify that they are settled or that they absolutely cannot resolve one or more issues and thereby avoid an unnecessary step.	Feb 7, 2011 9:55 PM
39	Require pro se litigants to submit their pleadings to a judge to ensure that there is a least a colorable claim before they are allowed to file in state court.	Feb 7, 2011 9:57 PM
40	Increasing numbers of pro se parties will remain a reality in Iowa courts. Some system for facilitating legal forms and information to pro se parties is essential. Consider the model of the Legal Assistance Center in Grand Rapids, Michigan.	Feb 7, 2011 10:03 PM
41	Quit changing and renumbering the rules. it is a waste of time.	Feb 7, 2011 10:07 PM
42	Mandated mediation would cause delays in litigation. Mediation is really only beneficial when it is voluntary. Summary judgments and partial summary judgments need to be granted more often. Too many issues and cases precede to trial that should have been disposed of at the summary judgment level.	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
43	bring back the court reporters	Feb 7, 2011 10:34 PM
44	I know that judicial resources are limited, but the most significant thing that could be done would be to increase judicial involvement in the early stages of the case in setting limits on discovery. Children are much better behaved when the teacher is on the playground.	Feb 7, 2011 10:52 PM
45	Anyone can file a lawsuit and claim a lot of damages. If you limit cases to a certain dollar amount, you will need to decide how this will be figured. Will it be in the pleadings or based on Gordon v. Noel interrogatories? The courts should have more teeth to grant motions to dismiss (these are almost never granted) or summary judgment (even if granted, a lot of time, overturned by appellates because of desire to be decided by the jury). If want to create economy and save resources, give judges the power to get rid of cases that do not have legitimate proof of the claim.	Feb 7, 2011 10:57 PM
46	Any committee examining this issue should include solo attorneys, big firm attorneys, plaintiff specialists, defense specialists, judges, younger attorneys and older attorneys.	Feb 7, 2011 11:11 PM
47	Cost of depositions and expert testimony is too high.	Feb 7, 2011 11:29 PM
48	Iowa needs a business court to handle business matters quickly.	Feb 7, 2011 11:48 PM
	A loser pays system could weed out frivolous cases.	
49	Frankly, I live in an area where the judges are generally high quality and thoughtful. This and quality counsel makes litigation much less difficult than in some areas. Scheduling has become somewhat more difficult but not as bad as we once thought. Occasionally, a judge will not be available for a court trial (jury trials are all specially assigned) but I don't know how to avoid that 100% of the time - there are more counties and courthouses than judges and they can't be two places at once. So I guess I don't have any suggestions because I don't think the system is all that problematic now.	Feb 8, 2011 12:00 AM
50	avoid increses to forms available to pro se litigants they tie up the systm and make it harder for clients to be fairly heard in court	Feb 8, 2011 12:07 AM
51	none	Feb 8, 2011 12:29 AM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

	Response Text	
52	Civil litigation is too expensive, the outcome is uncertain & it takes too long to resolve disputes. The court system appears to process criminal matters relatively satisfactorily but civil cases are an embarrassment. The only civil litigant who feels good about the current system is the occasional plaintiff who accepts the risks in hopes of a big payoff by skillfully playing the judicial lottery.	Feb 8, 2011 12:47 AM
53	The real issue is the oversupply of attorneys. Reduce the number of licensed lawyers in this state and lawyers will not feel economically compelled to file any case that walks through the door. Instead, they would take the time to evaluate and advise clients about the benefits and detriments of litigation. I see many lawyers who are filing and then over working cases because they need the money. They need the money because of the laws of supply and demand. I know it is counter-intuitive, but consider the possibility that reducing attorney supply would have a beneficial effect on costs, use of court resources, and overall access.	Feb 8, 2011 1:12 AM
54	1. Fewer Rules like the Fed Crt Sys. 2. Assign Judges to cases from the start. 3. Early involvement in a discovery plan after disclosures. 4. Abolish the Wrker's Comp Comm. agency; Establish a Div of Dist Court; Associate Dist Crt Judges doing nothing but comp; 3 judge regional appeal panels; then appeal to Sup Crt. Look at the Nebraska system. 5. Enforce sanctions for breach of Req. for Admissions.	Feb 8, 2011 2:39 AM
55	deny continuances execept in cases of emergency. Limit discovery to 60 days each side in cases under 20000. create specialty courts that resolve specific cases and allow judges to act in a quasi inquisitorial manner.	Feb 8, 2011 2:55 AM
56	Mandatory mediation is not the answer. The judicial branch needs a much larger operating budget so cases may proceed in accordance with the litigants' needs, and not based on the costs involved.	Feb 8, 2011 4:34 AM
57	I hate to say this, really, but in the years since I began in practice attorneys have evolved from a (1) resolution-based approach to cases, to one in which the prime consideration is too often (2) the maximum amount of fee charges that can be established.	Feb 8, 2011 5:23 AM
58	Higher upper limit for Small Claims would help. Maqybe ten thousand rather than current five. Standard collection cases routed to a fast track.	Feb 8, 2011 5:30 AM
59	I encourage mandatory mediation for most cases	Feb 8, 2011 1:43 PM
60	The judges have been delegating their research and other responsibilities to their law clerks who are fresh out of law school and have never handled a case. The judges are using law clerks to avoid doing the basic work of a judge. Law clerks should not be provided to judges so that the judges would have to do their own legal research and writing. This will improve the quality of the work done by the judges and will make the judges more knowledgeable in the law.	Feb 8, 2011 3:01 PM
61	Mediation if fair does little to reduce costs of litigation. It does help to flush out issues which may never be heard by a jury and is a "kinder and gentler" way of resolution, but since the case is generally already prepared for trial, other than pretrial motions, it does little to reduce discovery costs.	Feb 8, 2011 3:10 PM
62	Quicker rulings would be very helpful. It shows parties with weak claims that they cannot surge forward and increase costs for weak claims -- narrowing the issues would cut the excess and money would be spent on the actual issue at hand. Also, motions to dismiss should be utilized more often to knock out poorly plead claims that either have no merit or are so unlikely to even be litigated.	Feb 8, 2011 3:26 PM
63	Let's not reinvent the wheel.	Feb 8, 2011 4:09 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
64	<p>Some the answers herein may not be in relation to what or why you are asking because I do 95% small claims and few cases above \$5000.</p> <p>Small claims limit should be raised. I am located in Illinois and most of my work is done by phone.</p>	Feb 8, 2011 4:49 PM
65	none	Feb 8, 2011 5:01 PM
66	The court dockets are so loaded that it is near impossible to secure a hearing/trial date with a corresponding block of time necessary. In two of the counties that I practice, it is not uncommon for the county to only have a judge available 6 days per month. It is very difficult for all of a county's matters criminal and civil to be heard with so few days.	Feb 8, 2011 5:55 PM
67	Date certain trial scheduling is important for litigants and witnesses. Judges should be available and moved around if necessary to assure a scheduled trial will occur. Court Admin needs to be careful about double booking and generally do not double book a jury trial where there are insufficient facilities.	Feb 8, 2011 6:45 PM
68	A unified "family court" with specific judges assigned (i.e. not rotating through) would provide continuity and predictability for litigants and lawyers. The issues in family law cases often overlap - e.g. CHINA and child support; domestic abuse and custody; etc. Consistency of judges, court locations, and administration procedures would greatly improve efficiency across all areas, and would free up the civil docket to operate on its own. And to those who say no judge would volunteer to preside in family court - I strongly disagree. I think it would attract qualified attorneys and judges with a genuine interest and experience, which again improves the quality of the court experience for litigants.	Feb 8, 2011 7:00 PM
69	I practice in all eight districts in Iowa and all 99 counties. I spend an absurd amount of time trying to figure out not only the local rules for that district, but for specific counties within that district, and specific rules for individual judges. I also spend a lot of time trying to figure out the unwritten local rules that many judges expect attorneys to just know (one of the worst counties for this is Polk County). This is very frustrating for and results in a lot of wasted time not only for myself but for everyone involved.	Feb 8, 2011 7:59 PM
70	Having different judges hear different motions throughout the case is time consuming and leads to inconsistent results in smaller districts.	Feb 8, 2011 8:04 PM
71	no	Feb 8, 2011 8:50 PM
72	Cases should be double booked for judges, with standby cases indicated. this is not done in Polk County and i find it very helpful in other counties. Abolish the priority for domestic abuse cases which requires the court to stop whatever is being done to hear the DA case. This is very expensive to attorneys and clients and very disruptive. If it were possible to place a penalty for failure to obtain the one year order after getting the ex parte 7 day order, it would cut done on the frivolous actions filed to get rid of a roommate or to gain an advantage in a dissolution proceeding which seems to be the primary use of this proceeding. QUIT CHANGING THE RULES OF PROCEDURE ON A WEEKLY BASIS. IF CHANGE IS WARRANTED DO SO IN A COMPREHENSIVE MANNER WHICH DOESN'T REQUIRE CONTINUOUS RECHECKING OF THE RULES, ESPECIALLY IN APPEALS.	Feb 8, 2011 9:53 PM
73	I also practice in Michigan, and the procedures for trying cases in Iowa is vastly superior to Michigan's. Rules are the same, but the little conventions and practices (e.g., how jurors are struck, plain English instructions, and the like) are much more sensible here. There's always room for improvement, particularly with regard to the cost of trying little cases, but please don't mess up a good thing by going to the type of central management system used in the federal courts. That works fine in really big cases, but would be a mess for smaller ones.	Feb 8, 2011 10:59 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

	Response Text	
74	Regarding personal injury cases, raising the jurisdictional ceiling to \$25,000 for small claims would allow a more speedy and fair resolution to a good number of claims. In addition, we need to increase the reimbursement rates for expert witness fees to more accurately compensate plaintiffs litigation costs. I would also have the loser pay all litigation costs.	Feb 8, 2011 11:10 PM
75	I don't think a more timely or cost effective process is a goal that should override access to courts by litigants, many who are pro se. Our system is broken as far as consumers are concerned. We have an adversary system. An adversary system does not work where one side is a credit card bank with an army of specialized lawyers against low income consumers with no lawyer at all. The legislature and courts have made the system worse by attempting to streamline the process, resulting in creditors being able to obtain judgments on junk debt with little or no credible evidence. We have discovery, procedures and rules of evidence for a reason. We want to ensure a just result. Relax or eliminate procedures and rules of evidence, and you relax or eliminate the outcome of a just result.	Feb 9, 2011 4:18 AM
76	Rehire court reporters. In the "rural" counties (even the not-so-rural), we have hearings set, judges available, and attorneys ready to try cases but no court reporters, so the hearings must be rescheduled or one court reporter has to bounce between several judges all day in different courtrooms. I like the idea of having a quicker and less arduous process for lower value cases, by increasing the small claims threshold or having another track for cases above small claims and below \$10,000 or \$25,000 which don't require as much discovery and time spent on motions practice prior to trial as high-dollar civil cases.	Feb 9, 2011 2:25 PM
77	Dissolution and family issues seem to occupy a large percentage of the time of District Court Judges. Specialized family courts and judges should be considered.	Feb 9, 2011 6:27 PM
78	Use digital recording to make the official court record.	Feb 9, 2011 7:57 PM
79	I suggest expanding the dollar amount limit for small claims court to 10000. Get more funding for the judiciary branch of government, require law students to clerk at least one full semester for a judge prior to obtaining a law license, encourage judges to sustain more motions for summary judgment or directed verdict -way too many cases go to juries that should be dismissed. When a jury returns a defense verdict in civil matters in less than 30 minutes it strongly suggests the case should never have proceeded to trial in the first place. Cases involving damages less than 50000 should require mandatory mediation	Feb 10, 2011 10:37 PM
80	'the use and abuse of discovery is the reason for the extremely high costs of litigation. Everyone involved in litigation has answers thousands of interrogatories and produced thousands of documents, most of which will never be offered into evidence. Depositions go on for hours with inquiries about where the witness grew up, went to school, etc. before getting to the issues involved in the case. If discovery could be reined in, litigation costs would be greatly reduced. Sometimes I think common law pleading and practice would be an improvement over the system of notice pleading plus endless discovery that we have.	Feb 10, 2011 11:53 PM
81	I think you have covered it pretty well.	Feb 11, 2011 4:11 AM
82	Form structure such as California in certain types of matters. i.e., Family Case Consolidation (which is comprehensive to include financial, criminal, and domestic.	Feb 11, 2011 6:13 PM
83	I practice in both Iowa and Nebraska and have noticed the caliber of mediators available in Nebraska is generally higher than those in Iowa. Frequently, mediators in Iowa have no actual mediation training, and limited experience. A certified mediator makes a big difference in not just the ability resolve a case through the mediation process, but also the time it takes to come to a resolution.	Feb 11, 2011 7:37 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text

- 84 Many judges (by no means all) do not have experience (at the time they are appointed) with managing a busy litigation practice. These judges don't seem to understand that some lawyers don't disclose exhibits and witnesses as they are supposed to do, don't produce discovery on a timely basis, and in general cost my clients money because it is a time consuming struggle to enforce compliance. Having one judge assigned to one case will allow patterns of conduct to emerge so I think that is a good idea. I think this survey is not going to be helpful because in general the rules are ok, its the enforcement that needs some attention. Feb 11, 2011 10:14 PM
- 85 THE FORMULA FOR APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES BASED UPON CASES FILED AND POPULATION HAS NEVER REALLY BEEN FOLLOWED. THE LEGISLATURE NEEDS TO STEP UP AND PROVIDE FUNDING FOR MORE JUDGES. Feb 11, 2011 11:37 PM
- I'M NOT CONVINCED THE "MIDDLE MANAGEMENT" COURT ADMINISTRATION IS WORTH THE MONEY SPENT ANNUALLY ON IT. IT WOULD HELP RURAL COUNTIES IF JUDGES COULD JUST MEET WITH COUNSEL AND SET DATES FOR DISCOVERY AND TRIAL LIKE WE DID DURING THE 60s AND 70s.
- I THINK WE SHOULD LOOK BACK AT THE DAY WHEN THERE WERE MORE, BUT SMALLER DISTRICTS. THE JUDGES DIDN'T HAVE TO SPEND AS MUCH TIME ON THE ROAD AND WERE MORE FAMILIAR WITH THE CASES. ONE OF THE PURPORTED REASONS FOR ENLARGING THE DISTRICTS WAS TO GIVE JUDGES IN THE CITIES A BREAK FROM CRIMINAL CASES. AN ANNUAL OR SEMI-ANNUAL 4-6 WEEK ROTATION OUT OF THE CITY FOR MOTION DAYS AND 1-2 DAY CIVIL BENCH TRIALS SHOULD TAKE CARE OF THAT PROBLEM. RURAL JUDGES COULD BE ROTATED IN TO COVER THE CRIMINAL TRIALS. THERE WAS ALSO SOME NOTION THAT JUDGES IN RURAL AREAS WITH NO LARGE CITY HAD IT EASIER THAN JUDGES IN OTHER DISTRICTS. THAT'S NOT TRUE. COMPLEX REAL ESTATE DISPUTES, FARM RELATED LITIGATION AND PROBATE LITIGATION REQUIRE CONSIDERABLE LEGAL RESEARCH ON THORNY ISSUES . PROBLEMS IN RURAL AREAS DO NOT MAKE FOR A LIGHTER WORK LOAD OR AN EASIER DAY. NOT TOO LONG AGO, I WALKED IN TO TRY A COMPLEX REAL ESTATE DISPUTE AND HAD THE JUDGE SAY HE HAD NEVER HANDLED THIS SORT OF CASE EITHER AS AN ATTORNEY OR A JUDGE. BECAUSE OF THE SIZE OF THE DISTRICT, IT WAS HIS TURN TO BE THERE. A LOT OF EXTRA TIME WAS REQUIRED TO BE SURE THE JUDGE UNDERSTOOD THE ISSUES AND LAW. MORE EXPENSIVE FOR ALL THREE PARTIES IN THE CASE.

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text

- 86 The answers are not easy and likely never will be. Many times the current rules are abused and not followed, and then it takes court involvement in matters that should not have needed it. Feb 12, 2011 5:18 PM
Frequently insurance companies and their attorneys are unwilling to settle until the plaintiff has gone through all the hoops to be ready for trial, and the adjuster or attorney half heartedly concedes that if this goes to trial there could be an adverse verdict. This may have nothing to do with the merits of the claim. Some insurance companies/counsel won't even make a settlement offer, or a reasonable offer, until the matter is ready for trial one-two years after the case has been filed. While mediation can provide resolutions, when will the parties be required to mediate? It seems like the mediation needs to be tried early in the lawsuit, or ideally, before the lawsuit is filed, if there is going to be real cost savings to the plaintiff and court. This mediation needs to be meaningful and the mediator needs authority to recommend settlement or provide penalties. Otherwise, mediation is just another hoop to go through, and it becomes useless.
- It is nice to use mediation as a last ditch effort to seek settlement a few weeks before trial, and it may save the cost of a trial, but by then all the discovery, depositions, motions, etc. have been completed and the costs incurred.
- 87 The problems faced by the Iowa courts are NOT related to the current Rules of Civil Procedure or number of personal injury/tort cases that are being filed. The Courts, it seems to me, are overwhelmed with domestic relations issues, including dissolution of marriage, domestic abuse, child custody, and related matters. Feb 13, 2011 4:32 AM
Judges do not have the support staff that they need. Taking away the court reporters was a penny-wise and pound foolish decision. The court reporter did more for the judge than just transcribe court testimony. The court reporter was a key assistant to a judge providing secretarial and logistical support. Now, it seems that trial judges are left, more or less, to fend for themselves. This is not fair, nor does it promote justice.
- 88 a focus on administration and fairness and redesigning the system based on the type of cases would result in significant cost savings and actual profitability. 40% of the filing are collection cases and a well balanced system would result in dsavings other states have achieved Feb 14, 2011 3:09 AM
- 89 More court resources Feb 14, 2011 2:00 PM
- 90 Pro se litigants should be required to participate fully in their cases. Too often, pro se litigants are able to avoid taking responsibility for discovery, attendance at hearings, etc. by claiming ignorance. This leads to additional attorney fees and court costs for the represented party. Where a litigant refuses to seek counsel, they should face stringent expectations in the litigation process, not pampering. They should also be taxed with attorney fees and court costs when their own behaviors and/or lack of participation lead to delays and additional litigation. It's frustrating to watch judges pander to pro se litigants, especially where their own reprehensible actions have led to the court case at hand. Feb 15, 2011 3:38 PM
- 91 We need more judges and more space. The Polk County Courthouse is not large enough. I believe the old Polk County Jail building should be made an annex to the courthouse. Feb 15, 2011 8:19 PM
- 92 We will see a dramatic increase of cases settling when we force the loser to pay the other side's attorney fees. Feb 15, 2011 8:52 PM
- 93 One of the biggest issues will be finding resources to improve the civil litigation process given the priority of criminal, juvenile, and family law cases. I think civil litigation is important and that the court should have adequate resources to handle it in a timely manner. Feb 16, 2011 10:22 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
94	The effort to broaden discovery has only added to the cost of litigation, is too often used for the purpose of "fishing" or harassment, and in many cases has made litigation so expensive that justice is denied. The cost of litigation is a strategic tool for counsel and parties because it is used by them to gain an advantage over a less-flush opponent.	Feb 17, 2011 4:24 AM
95	Require mediation in all civil cases. Set the deadline earlier for filing motions for summary judgment; 60 days before trial is not long enough for judges to be able to consider and rule on the motions. Adopt rules for summary judgement that more closely resemble those in federal court. Enforce discovery rules and award sanctions more frequently against those who abuse the discovery rules and/or disregard them.	Feb 17, 2011 3:34 PM
96	Please don't turn the state courts into mini-federal courts.	Feb 17, 2011 8:39 PM
97	I think the focus of the ICJRTF on non family law matters will ultimately lessen the helpfulness of its recommendations to the court. Non -family law cases compose a much smaller part of the state court docket than the other areas of law. The need for change in court administration and the rules of civil procedure and the forms any change should take should not be based on the needs of these cases alone. The entire workload of our state court system should be looked at in any effort to improve access to justice and the public's perception of our court system's fairness and efficiency.	Feb 20, 2011 5:43 PM
98	Please remember the costs to all Iowa citizens when considering closing court houses -- this would increase the burden of travel so greatly , on so many more people, that the ultimate impact on the environment and our economy would far outstrip any dollars of "savings" any closure would offer.	Feb 20, 2011 11:00 PM
99	none	Feb 21, 2011 1:55 PM
100	Trial dates should be set far enough out so everyone has something to work toward, and not be continued from there. Trial judges should be assigned, but any judge may hear motions in that case Certain discovery must be produced along with each party's first pleading State law which provides that no witness who is subpoenaed to a deposition or a trial may charge more than \$X/per hour. Doctors depositions are too expensive for most litigants and keep the small practitioners out of PI arena entirely, which is unfair to them	Feb 21, 2011 9:30 PM
101	I am a state of Iowa administrative law judge. We follow the Iowa Rules of Civil Procedure for discovery. Providing mandatory disclosure of relevant documents by all parties and limiting motions to compel- to be filed only after the moving party has shown that it actively tried to resolve the issue-- would help the process.	Feb 21, 2011 9:32 PM
102	Forced mediation is added expense in divorce cases and seldom effective.	Feb 21, 2011 9:35 PM
103	It was not a bad system, but the budget constraints have created problems.	Feb 21, 2011 9:50 PM
104	Waste alot of time on frivolous counter claims. A system to eliminate such claims would be beneficial.	Feb 21, 2011 9:52 PM
105	The state court judges in general run a very effective bench or jury trial but don't devote as many resources to motions practice as the federal courts. This may be because they lack law clerks and magistrates or because pretrial motions practice is not placed in the hands of a single judge. The latter problem can be remedied, and should be.	Feb 21, 2011 9:53 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text

- 106 While I know where to find the written local rules easily, it was my experience when moving from Black Hawk to Polk county that many of the important differences between Polk county and most of the rest of the state are not addressed in the local rules or the local rules are not followed. While most of my non-family law and non-small claims litigation experience was in Black Hawk, most of my experience in the last 4 years has been in Polk in either small claims or family law. My responses to the questions concerning mediation are based on experiences with small claims mediators who are not well trained, blatantly misstate the law to litigants and essentially tell them they are going to lose when there is a clear legal defense and family law mediators who are generally quite knowledgeable and well-trained. My reasons for mediating are because in small claims it is the next best thing to discovery and in family law, it is required. Feb 21, 2011 10:11 PM
- 107 Granting valid motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment as they generally do in federal court as well as enforcing relevancy requirements for discovery as they generally do in federal court would solve a broad range of problems. Cases that lacked jurisdiction, merit or both would be promptly disposed of, discovery would be more focused and less burdensome. The state rules are basically the same as the federal rules they just aren't followed and there is a consistent lack of guidance from our state appellate courts (again generally unlike the federal courts) with respect to these issues. The state system is very broken for civil litigants, especially defendants.

Absent actually following the existing rules as suggested above assigning a judge to preside over the case from beginning to end works well where that is done. Feb 21, 2011 10:26 PM
- 108 Too many useless "hearings" and way too many continuances for no reason at all. Many times get to the courthouse and find the case was continued without any notice. Civil cases go on and on and on, tying up attorneys and delaying everything. Feb 21, 2011 10:27 PM
- 109 Although I have & do try civil cases, the majority of my experience is in the area of family law, so many of my answers are based upon that experience. Feb 21, 2011 10:34 PM
- 110 Insurance companies defending suits have too much financial leverage. Doctors see litigation as an opportunity to charge excessive fees for expert testimony. Feb 21, 2011 10:34 PM
- 111 One problem our county has is everyone's matter being set for 9:30 a.m. Monday morning which means everyone has to be at court and sit around and wait for their turn with the judge. Cases should be set for a specific time and parties should be expected to meet with the judge no later than that time and to have conferred with one another prior to the time for their hearing. Also, there is some delay perceived with defense firms having their attorneys handling 50 or 100 files at any given time. No one can do that competently or effectively and when they finally get on a case, they think they need another 8 or 9 months just to work it up to be ready, when really they need 2 or 3 months, but are just too busy to give it any attention. It ends up costing me a lot more in postage and fax costs to get them to look at their files as often as I need them to. Feb 21, 2011 10:36 PM
- 112 Thi survey is far too lengthy. Feb 21, 2011 10:52 PM
- 113 Judges need to have and exercise greater discretion to terminate frivolous suits earlier in the process. In the effort to ensure due process for all, we have created a culture rife with judicial inefficiency caused by the court's inability or unwillingness to dismiss cases that have little or no merit. Scarce judiial capital is spent on cases that should not survive an initial motion to dismiss. Too many cases go on for too long. Feb 21, 2011 10:55 PM
- 114 While I think assigning a judge to each case is a good idea, beyond that I have few complaints regarding our current system and believe the flexibility we now have should be maintained. Feb 21, 2011 10:56 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
115	<p>1. The courts must get electronic filing up and running.</p> <p>2. Regional litigation centers would help to stretch scarce resources -- even if the actual trials were still held in rural counties.</p> <p>3. No amount of "tweaking" rules or procedures will fully resolve the problems caused by the gross underfunding of the courts.</p> <p>4. The survey question about mandatory mediation had it just backwards. Mandatory mediation should apply to cases ABOVE a certain threshold not cases below a threshold. Mandatory mediation is a waste of court resources in little cases. Most of those will get settled without a mediator if the parties are disposed to settle. It is in the big complicated cases where court resources are actually conserved by active court participation in the settlement process.</p>	Feb 21, 2011 11:05 PM
116	<p>1) One judge for each file.</p> <p>2) Enforce the rules of civil procedure and deadlines.</p> <p>3) Discourage continuances and delays.</p>	Feb 21, 2011 11:17 PM
117	We need electronic filing of all documents.	Feb 21, 2011 11:19 PM
118	too many rules re litigation are geared toward the defense; most discovery matters and summary judgment motions result solely in meaningless work by plaintiff attorneys and defense attorneys with the exception that defense attorneys can and do charge their clients for these worthless efforts while plaintiff attorneys must endure this masquerade of justice just to finally get settlement or trial	Feb 21, 2011 11:30 PM
119	Enforce sanctions for frivolous suits and motions and for obvious delay in responding to discovery. Courts are generally gutless when it comes to imposing Rule 11 sanctions....	Feb 22, 2011 12:06 AM
120	Let lawyers try their cases without so much judicial meddling. Get a trial date, set deadlines and try the case. We don't need so much mediation, special oversight and other gimmicks. Just let the lawyer try his or her case. Judges should make decisions and not be case administrators.	Feb 22, 2011 12:14 AM
121	Give the Judges the resources to do the job and then hold them accountable for moving cases through the process. We need Judges hearing cases more than participating in committees which take them away from their real job. Judges should not be afraid of making difficult decisions on meritless claims or defenses and should use the tools available to hold attorneys and parties accountable for unnecessary delays and untenable positions.	Feb 22, 2011 12:15 AM
122	MAKE MEDIATION MANDATORY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Feb 22, 2011 12:22 AM
123	Mandatory arbitration is something that should be studied seriously.	Feb 22, 2011 12:33 AM
124	The courts should not be reluctant to grant summary judgment when it is appropriate just because a factual issue may magically appear.	Feb 22, 2011 1:47 AM

The rules of procedure are not broken now and searching for a problem to fix is counter productive to saving resources. Leave things alone for a few years.

There is no need for 99 courts anymore and consolidation is a good idea.

Granting more interlocutory appeals could save a lot of money and court time in more cases.

Public policy decisions are better left to the legislature in most instances.

Trial dates are good to have set but continuances (not repeated requests) are not to be denied just to have uniformity.

When motions for directed verdict are warranted, grant them.

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
125	Mediation as an option is a good thing. Mandatory mediation clogs the mediation process with cases that one or both parties know will not be settled, only delayed. Also, cases that are settled before going to mediation STILL have to go thru the process, so more time and expense to the parties. Setting a two tier civil process system based on an arbitrary dollar amount will only make the civil process more confusing and cause some litigants to feel that because the dollar amount is lesser they get a lesser level of justice.	Feb 22, 2011 2:08 AM
126	Please do not forsake the parties' right to a jury trial in the name of a "more efficient" process. Too often in my practice, courts are too eager to streamline a case from their perspective when they have not lived with the case as the attorneys of record have, so the court's perception of what may streamline a case may, in fact, be contrary to the best interests of the parties.	Feb 22, 2011 2:22 AM
127	Mandatory award of attorney fees to the successful party in litigation if outcome is not within a set percentage of claim asserted would eliminate many questionable cases where someone is rolling the dice at manipulating some settlement. I do not believe this would have any real or significant impact on our citizens' ability to have fair access to the court system. Strictly from a judicial resource management perspective, this would likely lead to greater use of alternative resolution methods before court actions are filed. It also may lessen the use of the drop the anchor and delay resolution defense tactic some parties practice.	Feb 22, 2011 4:15 AM
128	Assignment of judges to handle a case from start to finish is the one change we can make immediately that will significantly improve management of civil litigation.	Feb 22, 2011 4:18 AM
129	I appreciate the efforts to improve litigation quality in Iowa. One issue of concern is that the Iowa Supreme Court has appeared desirous of being on the cutting edge of technology. Would it be better to monitor other states and allow other states to implement innovative procedures which may or may not work? Iowa appears to focus a lot on technology but we have difficulty in completing the essentials of litigation due to the lack of Judges and court reporters. Just a thought.	Feb 22, 2011 2:59 PM
130	Although I am of course an attorney, I am disgusted with many attorneys who knowingly take on cases or pursue cases regardless of the facts and merits of the case in order to pursue a substantial attorney's fee. I am very concerned with how the pursuit of those marginal cases unnecessarily burdens the judicial system and also the unethical actions of attorneys who continue to bring such cases in order to get a large fee. Some litigants continue to burden the system repeatedly and for years, often using the same attorneys on their frivolous matters with the goal being to get a substantial judgment AND a substantial fee. That is one reason I personally chose not to practice law in the courts, and to pursue corporate work instead. Something needs to be done. In nearly 20 years of practice of law in Iowa, I have seen an increase in litigation, a substantial increase in courts being over-burdened, and many good businesses substantially hurt or closed due to cost of having to defend frivolous claims from greedy litigants. This Task Force cannot change greed; however, I hope that strong measures can be taken to prevent the unethical and greedy attorneys and litigants that continue to clog the system thereby making it difficult for legitimate cases to proceed in a timely manner. It is time for stronger ethical standards and time for earlier review of the merits by the judiciary. Thank you.	Feb 22, 2011 3:40 PM
131	Iowa law needs to be changed to create a mandatory retirement age of 72 for all judges. Having a 88 year old associate probate judge in Polk County continue to make obvious errors that are often made public undermines public confidence in the judiciary. Also, is it just a matter of time before a 72 year old Iowa judge challenges the constitutionality/rational basis of the law that makes all other judges retire at age 72 except her?	Feb 22, 2011 3:48 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
132	Judges need to enforce the rules fairly and consistently	Feb 22, 2011 3:52 PM
133	Although I favor requiring the parties to attempt to resolve disputes at mediation, the coercive power of the court should be limited to requiring an attempt, not requiring a settlement. I have been in mediation sessions before (in small claims, but mediation sessions nonetheless) where my clients have been pressured by the mediator to settle or abandon claims.	Feb 22, 2011 3:55 PM
134	No more cases continued due to unavailability of a judge. Personal injury cases should be given higher priority, not lower. If priorities are set forth, there should be a requirement that in any case the claimant be allowed to give a sworn statement that it would cause financial hardship to continue the trial or have it given a lower priority, and these statements should be reviewed by the Court in determining whether to continue a trial or give it lower priority.	Feb 22, 2011 3:56 PM
135	State court judges need to become judicial in the manner that federal judges are judicial. For state court judges the rules of procedure only have meaning when a judge decides they do at a particular moment in time; otherwise, they are ignored. By ignoring the rules of procedure state court judges push everything toward trial even when dismissal or summary judgment is warranted. If state court judges acted judicial in the same way that federal court judges do timeliness and cost-effectiveness for litigants in Iowa would be greatly improved.	Feb 22, 2011 3:59 PM
136	A firm trial date in all districts and not being "bumped" for other cases. In the 6th district, it is difficult to explain to a client that they will wait 18 months for a trial and not know until a few days prior to trial if they will have to wait another 6 to 12 months.	Feb 22, 2011 4:06 PM
137	Discovery must be limited because now it is utilized as a weapon by insurance companies to intimidate and oppress claimants and to greatly inflate the costs of litigation.	Feb 22, 2011 4:19 PM
138	Summary judgment must be used as a favored tool to weed out meritless claims. Courts are too often unwilling to grant summary judgment.	Feb 22, 2011 10:05 PM
139	I believe Judges sometimes forget they serve the people. I think that Judges sometimes make decisions based more on personallikes or dislikes of people and not on the facts, the law, or the rules. I also think Judges do not fear appeals because they know just how incredibly expensive appeals are. I think we need an expedited appeal process for when a judge refuses to follow a rule because it would hurt the party they favor.	Feb 22, 2011 10:21 PM
140	County attorneys in larger counties and their assistant county attorneys need to devote their full-time efforts to their government work, not to their private practice clients. The public is being short-changed by this arrangement.	Feb 22, 2011 11:03 PM
141	MANDATORY INTERROGATORY QUESTIONS, MANDATORY DOCUMENT PRODUCTION LIST, MANDATORY ATTORNEY AND PARTIES FACE TO FACE MEETINGS ON COURT DAYS SO JUDGE IS AVAILABLE TO NEGOTIATE BEFORE DEPOSITIONS, REQUIRE EXCESS INTERROGATORY OR DOCUMENT DEMAND REVIEW BY COURT AND APPROVAL, DISCLOSURE OF INSURANCE DEFENSE FEES AND COSTS, ONE SET OF RULES FOR ALL COUNTIES, NOT THE MISHMASH NOW EXISTING OF 101 RULES FOR 99 COUNTIES.	Feb 23, 2011 2:21 PM
142	After a long and diverse career I believe that Small Claims Court procedures would produce a result in most cases equal to or better than the burdensome process we have now. Of course there are cases with genuine technical complications that would require procedures much like we have now, but they are few.	Feb 23, 2011 5:47 PM

1. Please add any additional comments you may have regarding efforts to

Response Text		
143	There is a growing concern that cost is a driving factor in avoiding judicial decisions. Further, it appears that the cost is driving procedural decisions in how cases are handled. Justice should not depend upon cost and the best procedures should be implemented.	Feb 23, 2011 8:31 PM
144	District court judges are not granting motions for summary judgment because they are afraid of being overturned. There are a lot of cases out there that lack merit. Federal judges are getting rid of such cases on motion - state court needs to do the same. And we need more judges and support staff so things can get done timely!	Feb 24, 2011 8:02 PM
145	Mandatory mediation is a cost effective way to achieve a more timely and cost effective process for litigants in Iowa courts. The statistics confirm that mediation works.	Feb 24, 2011 8:02 PM
146	The realignment of County Seat towns, in an attempt to even out the trial schedules of the Courts. There are a number of Counties that haven't tried a Jury on Non-Jury case in many years. A little like school consolidation. No one likes it but it is going to happen as a by product of cost. Some lawyers may have to drive further to attend hearings but with video capabilities this could be solved. No one may have to leave their permanent office is the video capabilities are properly utilized. Win Win all around,	Feb 25, 2011 9:45 PM
147	In my judicial district (the Sixth) we have a very serious problem with cases being bumped from the trial docket a few days before scheduled trial date due to lack of judges or court reporters. I have several cases that have been bumped multiple times resulting in greatly increased expense to the parties and substantial delay in resolution of the matter. "Justice delayed is justice denied."	Feb 27, 2011 4:40 PM
148	Develop a "fast track" for certain cases, which is used in some federal courts outside of Iowa, to push cases to trial or settlement faster.	Feb 28, 2011 1:45 AM
149	I primarily represent low income clients. Any changes in pleadings and discovery need to be made carefully so not to limit a indigent person's access to litigation. It is already very difficult for a low income person to litigate pro se in district court. Adding mandatory mediation and changes to streamline cases maybe be helpful but should not be cost-prohibitive.	Feb 28, 2011 9:04 PM
150	I generally think our civil justice system does a good job and would suggest only minor tinkering, e.g., limiting number of experts you can have on a single issue and requiring true expert reports.	Feb 28, 2011 10:06 PM
151	Continuances should be the exception not the rule. Attorneys should engage in voluntary discovery.	Feb 28, 2011 10:19 PM