



CITIZENS ADVISORY
COUNCIL FOR HOUSING MATTERS



Reply to: 44 Capitol Ave., Suite 301
Hartford, CT 06106
860-278-5688 x203

NEXT MEETING

1:30 p.m.

Wednesday, December 14, 2011

Burroughs Community Center
2470 Fairfield Ave., Bridgeport

Please mark your calendar now.

Minutes of September 14, 2011 Citizens Advisory Council meeting

Persons present: Suzanne Colasanto, Judith Dicine, Jeff Hammer, Michael Flynn, Houston Putnam Lowry, Hon. Vernon Oliver, David Pels, Raphael Podolsky, Cynthia Teixeira, Richard Tenenbaum, Penny Trick

(1) PRELIMINARY MATTERS

(a) Call to order: The meeting was called to order by the chairperson, Raphael Podolsky, at 1:45 p.m. at the Connecticut Bar Association, 30 Bank St., New Britain.

(b) Approval of agenda: The agenda was approved without objection.

(c) Approval of minutes: The minutes of the June 8, 2011, meeting were approved unanimously (moved by Houston Putnam Lowry, seconded by David Pels).

(2) CLOSURE OF THE NEW BRITAIN HOUSING COURT

The Advisory Council conducted an extensive discussion of the Judicial Branch's sudden plan to close the New Britain Housing Court and have New Britain cases heard in Hartford. Based on very limited information available to the Council, it appears that New Britain will be retained as a "filing location," so that papers can presumably be filed there and transferred to Hartford. Judicial will train someone in the New Britain clerk's office to give pro se assistance. One person will be added to the staff of the Hartford Housing Court. The closure will apparently take effect on November 1, 2011. There will be no layoffs in the New Britain clerk's office because all three of its employees are retiring from state service. The Council has received no notice from the Judicial Branch and learned about the plan unofficially only late on the afternoon of September 13. Nor has the Judicial Branch sought any input from the Advisory Council. The New Britain Housing Court, which is one of the original two housing court locations, began operation January 1, 1979. The planned closure

was apparently triggered by the imminent retirements (as of September 30, 2011) of all three of the New Britain Housing Court's staff members.

The discussion revealed strong opposition to the closing of the court and numerous adverse impacts and likely problems if the closure occurs. These included:

(a) The arrangement will be inconvenient for both tenants and landlords. Getting to court in Hartford will be particularly difficult for tenants who do not have a car. Bus availability will be difficult for tenants coming from New Britain and particularly difficult for tenants coming from Bristol.

(b) The reduced access to court is likely to generate a larger number of defaults for failure to appear for trial. Reducing defaults has been one of the major successes of the housing court system.

(c) There is serious risk that the change will have a major adverse impact on the movement of cases in Hartford and result in extended delays there. Based on current caseloads, the transfer will increase the Hartford summary process docket by almost 50% (the number of court days will increase by only 17% and the staff by only one person). It will also eliminate the only day of the week in Hartford with no court docket, which will adversely impact the ability to process cases. This may also make it difficult for staff to monitor notice to quit defects, which could result in more audits and motions to open.

(d) The service level to litigants will decline substantially. Counter help in New Britain will be decreased significantly, and a part-time inexperienced clerical assistant is not an adequate replacement for an experienced and knowledgeable staff.

(e) Access to a Polish language interpreter will be lost. Language Line is available only for counter assistance, not for trials, and its use is exceedingly slow and cumbersome.

(f) The housing prosecutor is likely to lose caseload if local officials are required to attend court in Hartford rather than New Britain.

(g) The transfer raises serious administrative issues concerning docketing, file preparation, and receipt and management of cash payments. This will result from the continued filing of cases in New Britain.

(h) There is a question as to whether this entire transfer of cases is permitted by statute. New Britain and Hartford are in different judicial districts. By statute, summary process venue for New Britain housing matters is in J.D. New Britain. C.G.S. 51-348(c) allows trial to be held "in any courthouse within a judicial district"; but it does not follow that it can be held in any judicial district, rather than at any courthouse in the judicial district of venue. That statute also requires that the courthouse be "convenient to litigants and their counsel." In regard to housing matters in particular, C.G.S. 51-348(c) says that such matters "shall be heard on a docket separate from other matters within the judicial districts of Hartford, New Britain, New Haven, Fairfield, Waterbury and Stamford-Norwalk..." The Council has always assumed that this sentence means that housing cases are to be heard on a separate housing docket within their respective judicial districts, not within any judicial district having a housing court.

It was moved that the Advisory Council opposes the closing of the New Britain Housing Court (motion by Richard Tenenbaum, second by David Pels). The motion was adopted unanimously.

The Advisory Council also unanimously adopted a resolution (moved by Richard Tenenbaum, seconded by Penny Trick) thanking Michael Flynn, clerk of the New Britain Housing Court, and honoring him for his many years of service to the housing court system. Mr. Flynn was one of the two persons originally hired as housing court clerks in 1979 and has served continuously as the clerk for New Britain ever since then.

(3) PROSECUTION MATTERS

(a) Responses to 2011 biennial report: The Council received and reviewed a letter from the Chief State's Attorney reporting on follow-up to his February 16, 2011, meeting with representatives of the Advisory Council. The letter is attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

(b) Identification of housing criminal cases: Judy Dicine reported that she has met with Judy Lee from the Judicial Branch in an effort to develop a simple method for identifying housing criminal cases in the geographical area courts. These discussions are continuing. Housing prosecutors in the GA courthouses apparently do not make reports on the number of housing prosecutions that they file. Criminal cases ordinarily come to those courts either as (i) code enforcement cases (violations of C.G.S. 7-148) brought directly to the housing prosecutor by code enforcement officials or (ii) other criminal violations brought to the court by the police. The Advisory Council has recommended adding a checkbox to the paperwork that is filed so that the filer can indicate whether or not the case is a housing matter. It has also recommended that a simple code (e.g., the letter "H") be added to the docket number to identify it as housing. It is not clear at this time what changes, if any, will be made.

The Judicial Branch has reported, however, that its staff is able to identify the number of criminal cases filed, by courthouse location, in which the criminal charge is based on a violation of one of the 20 statutes identified in Table 2 of the Advisory Council's biennial report. Violations of those statutes are housing matters and should ordinarily be referred to a housing prosecutor. A chart for the years from 2006 through 2011 is attached to Appendix B of these minutes. The chart seems to reveal a large number of probable criminal housing cases in housing court districts that were not referred to the housing prosecutor. The listed cases in non-housing court districts include cases referred to the housing prosecutor but exclude violations of municipal ordinances under C.G.S. 7-148.

(4) CLERK'S OFFICE MATTERS

Staffing: Suzanne Colasanto reported that New Haven has been down one person for about 1½ years. It was able to cover in part by borrowing a temporary assistant clerk (TAC) from the civil court, but that person is no longer available to the housing court. Hartford is also down one person. Bridgeport and Norwalk have lost the TAC position that they formerly shared.

(5) HOUSING SPECIALIST MATTERS

Staffing: Three of the ten housing mediator positions have been eliminated, and one of the remaining housing mediators is retiring on September 30. This will leave the housing court system with only six housing mediators. C.G.S. 47a-69(a) requires at least nine housing mediators.

(6) JUDICIAL MATTERS

Follow-up to meeting with Judge Quinn: The Advisory Council reviewed Judge Quinn's responses to follow-up on her March 4, 2011, meeting with representatives of the Advisory Council. The update is attached to these minutes as Appendix B.

(6) PROGRAMS FOR FUTURE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETINGS

The Council decided to explore including specific programs and presentations in future meetings, beginning in March, 2012. The Connecticut Fair Housing Center will be invited to make a presentation on fair housing law at that meeting.

(7) ADVISORY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

No action has as yet been taken on Advisory Council appointments. The chairperson thinks it likely that the Governor will begin the process before the end of the year and that appointments may be in place by the spring of 2012.

(8) OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Posting of collateral materials on the Council's website: At present, the Council posts on its website minutes, agendas, and formal reports, including its biennial reports. It is in the process of posting archival materials in these areas. The Council tabled to its next meeting the extent to which it should post other materials, such as letters and emails.

(b) Bedbugs: Chief Housing Prosecutor Judith Dicine is looking for a person who is available on October 6 to substitute for her as a trainer on landlord and tenant responsibilities at a forum on the problem of bedbugs.

(c) Housing counseling: Penny Trick reported that the federal government has defunded non-profit counseling agencies that counsel homeowners facing foreclosure. As a result, agencies without access to sufficient other funds may change their focus. The Housing Education and Resource Center (HERC) in Hartford expects to do more landlord-tenant counseling.

(9) NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Advisory Council will be at 1:30 pm on Wednesday, December 14, 2011, at the Burroughs Community Center in Bridgeport.

Appendix A



State of Connecticut
DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
OFFICE OF
THE CHIEF STATE'S ATTORNEY

KEVIN T. KANE
CHIEF STATE'S ATTORNEY

300 CORPORATE PLACE
ROCKY HILL, CONNECTICUT 06067
TELEPHONE (860) 258-5800

September 14, 2011

Raphael L. Podolsky, Chairperson
Citizens Advisory Council for Housing Matters
44 Capitol Avenue, Suite 301
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Dear Mr. Podolsky:

I am writing in response to your e-mail of August 17, 2011, and in follow-up to our most recent meeting at my office. I hope this response addresses your concerns.

The Division has contacted the Judicial Department regarding the identification of housing cases on pending dockets for housing or criminal court. It is expected to be accomplished along with the computerization of housing matters, which we have been advised is currently in progress and will be completed in the near future.

Judith Dicine, Supervisory Assistant State's Attorney for Housing Matters, continues to work cooperatively with the State's Attorneys for the three judicial districts in Eastern Connecticut. In the absence of a full-time housing prosecutor in the Eastern District, Attorney Dicine is handling housing cases in both Danielson and Rockville. Former housing prosecutor, Rafael Bustamante, continues to handle New London and Norwich housing matters.

As of June, 2011, the Division added housing prosecution training conducted by Attorney Dicine to its annual training for new prosecutors. We also have actively recruited experienced prosecutors, investigators and inspectors to attend the landlord/tenant criminal matters classes at POST as a part of our ongoing in-service training efforts. This fall, a training session on housing cases is scheduled for Division inspectors, which Attorney Dicine will conduct with Chief Inspector John Edwards.

Investigators assigned to the G.A. offices have received training in housing matters. These investigators assist housing prosecutors on an as-needed basis. Due to budgetary constraints, no new investigator hire is expected in the housing unit at this time.

Currently, per the directive of Governor Malloy, all executive branch agencies are in a hiring freeze. Despite the Division's budget woes, we have been able to maintain three

Mr. Podolsky
Page 2
September 14, 2011

prosecutors around the state to handle exclusively housing matters. I hope to be able to maintain this staffing level as we continue through these difficult times. The Division currently has two housing vacancies in Bridgeport/Norwalk and the Eastern District. I will also make every effort to fill the two open housing prosecutor positions, but must do so as agency operational needs and funding allows.

Regarding the Council's standards for the hiring of housing prosecutors, this item was agreed to previously.

I hope this answers your inquiry. Please let me know if you need anything further.

Sincerely,



KEVIN T. KANE
CHIEF STATE'S ATTORNEY

KTK/md

cc: Leonard C. Boyle, Deputy Chief State's Attorney for Operations
John J. Russotto, Deputy Chief State's Attorney for Administration
Judith R. Dicine, Supervisory Assistant State's Attorney, Housing Matters
Brian Austin, Executive Assistant State's Attorney

Appendix B

From: Rafie Podolsky [mailto:RPodolsky@larcc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2011 3:34 PM
To: Quinn, Barbara Superior Court Judge
Cc: Carroll, Patrick; 'Hon. Aaron Ment'; Dalesio, Joseph; Kierstead, Nancy; Farley, Melissa
Subject: Citizens Advisory Council for Housing Matters

Dear Judge Quinn –

I'm writing because I was asked by the Citizens Advisory Council for Housing Matters to report back to the Council on the status of recommendations in the Council's 2011 biennial report that we discussed with you last March. I have attached a copy of the summary of that meeting, which I sent you in April. I have identified from that summary four areas where follow-up was anticipated and have listed them below, along with a quotation from the applicable portions of the summary:

(1) Computerization: "...there is a risk that integration of the two systems [civil and housing] will result in losing both the identification of the property address and the ability to search by address. The Council strongly urges Judicial to preserve the address field for summary process and to extend it to foreclosure cases."

Judicial: There are no plans at this time to integrate housing cases into the new civil/family system.

(2) Criminal housing cases:

(a) Identification of GA criminal housing cases: "Judicial says that there is no way in its existing system to identify GA criminal housing cases with a code. They will, however, talk to the Chief State's Attorney about it."

Judicial: Judicial discussed this issue with the Chief State's Attorney's Office. The Judicial Branch can identify cases that contain a charge in which the elements of the offense clearly make it a criminal housing offense. If specific offenses which are consistently deemed criminal housing crimes are identified, the Branch can provide data on the number of cases which included one of the designated housing offenses were prosecuted in each GA over the past few years and can continue to do so for the future. However, the Branch cannot identify as a criminal housing case a criminal offense, such as an assault or a criminal trespass or a criminal mischief, which might involve a landlord/tenant as victim and defendant, but is not specifically and consistently a housing case. Such criminal cases are prosecuted by a GA state's attorney and are prosecuted along with all other criminal cases on the docket.

CACHM: Table 2 on p. 7 of the report includes a list of criminal statutes, the violation of which would ordinarily be handled as housing criminal matters. That list was compiled jointly by Atty. Judith Dicine, the chief housing prosecutor, and the Advisory Council. In addition, housing prosecutors handle violations of municipal housing codes that are brought directly to the housing prosecutor by a code enforcement agency (and are therefore identifiable by the housing prosecutor as housing cases at the time they are filed with the clerk's office). We have suggested that the identification of housing cases could be facilitated by a checkbox on the applicable forms that would indicate housing or non-housing, much as is done with small claims matters (so that housing small claims cases can be placed on a separate docket). Can the Judicial Branch work from Table 2? We believe it would be very helpful if the Branch would provide data counts to the Advisory Council in relation to these statutes. We would also be happy to send a representative of the Advisory Council to participate in any meeting on the mechanics of identifying the housing criminal cases.

Judicial: The attachment should answer this question.

(b) Recording of criminal dispositions: "To the extent that conditions of disposition are not already recorded, Judicial will try to make sure that clerks record them."

Judicial: Training for Housing Session staff to process criminal cases through the CR/MV system begins in October.

(3) Telephone book listings: "Judicial will transfer the 'Housing Court' listing in the blue pages from a subcategory within 'Judicial' to a separate category under 'Housing Courts,' with a cross reference under 'Judicial.'"

Judicial: AT&T does not allow us to represent "Housing Court" as a separate government entity in the past, because headings are by accounting entity. In the past "Housing Court" was not an accounting entity and thereby could only exist under the accounting entity Judicial Superior Court which is why Housing Court is listed with a referral to "see Judicial". We will contact AT&T and report back once AT&T's current policy is determined. The timeframe for changes are dependent on AT&T directory printing rotations. If approved Hartford directory changes are due February 1, 2012.

CACHM: We would very much appreciate your exploring the option with AT&T. I note, however, in looking at the Government pages in the most recent Hartford phone book, that the AT&T practice does not seem to be consistent. For example, there is a separate listing for "Capitol State" with a phone number for "Capitol Tours & Information" which is not listed under "Legislators Legislature." Similarly, the "Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline" has its own listing, rather than being listed under the Department of Children and Families. If AT&T is not willing to transfer the housing courts to a separate "Housing Courts" listing under "CONNECTICUT STATE OF," we would appreciate your directing us to the staff at AT&T who are taking that position. As with other matters recommended by the Council, we would be happy to send a representative to participate with the Branch in a meeting with AT&T if you would like to include us.

Judicial: Waiting for an answer on this question.

(4)(a) Housing small claims/Location of hearings: "Judicial will look at the location of small claims hearings in Bridgeport and New Haven but does not view their location in different buildings as a problem."

There are no significant problems in maintaining the current hearing locations.

(4)(b) Housing small claims/Magistrate training: "Judicial will make housing a part of annual magistrate training

Judicial: A meeting of magistrates was held on January 10, 2011. A portion of the program introduced magistrates to their new website. It contains links to Judicial Branch website pages regarding Housing Matters, publications, and forms. The website also links to reports on the Citizens Advisory Council for Housing Matters website and directly to the *Housing Issues in the Small Claims Division of the Superior Court*. It also links to the Law Libraries' *NewsLog*, which magistrates are encouraged to review as part of their strategy for remaining current with the law. The magistrates are independent contractors to whom the Judicial Branch provides orientation and resource support. The magistrates are expected to remain current with substantive law and are provided with a website, which adds resource material to those they maintain in their practice.

Forty-Two new magistrates were appointed effective July 1, 2011. These magistrates were immediately given access to the internal magistrate website in order for them to become familiar with substantive law. An orientation workshop was held for the new magistrates on August 10, 2011. As part of the workshop, Judge Quinn reviewed the emphasis placed by the Judicial Branch on procedural fairness. The resources on the website were also reviewed in order to remind magistrates to access it for guidance.

Observations of magistrates will be conducted over the next year to help new magistrates as they address the challenges of presiding over the dockets. The observations will also assist experienced magistrates with feedback on their handling of dockets and matters. Information from the observations will be shared with the individual magistrate and trends will be shared with all magistrates and used by the courts to improve processes throughout the state.

CACHM: I am not sure from your response if new magistrates are still being provided with a physical copy of the *Housing Issues* booklet or if they are merely advised that it is a resource that can be found on the Internet. It is the Council's understanding that each one used to get a personal hard copy. If they no longer do, I believe that the Advisory Council still has a number of copies of the most recent edition and would be happy to distribute them to new magistrates if you provide us with a list. In any event, we would like to make sure that each magistrate (or, at least, each magistrate who hears housing cases) has one and would be willing to cooperate with the Branch in any way necessary to make that happen.

The recommendation in the Council's report, however, was really addressed to the annual magistrate training session itself. In at least one year, Suzanne Colasanto and I were invited to make a full presentation on housing law, and I was

under the impression (although I have never confirmed it) that Suzanne had in at least some other years made presentations. The recommendation from the Council was that the annual training session for magistrates (which we assume still occurs) include at least a brief presentation on housing issues. It is not clear to me from your response whether the Branch will do that in the future.

Judicial: The *Housing Issues* booklet itself was distributed to magistrates at the orientation program on August 10, 2011. We also have copies in the office should a magistrate need a replacement.

It is still to be determined whether there will be an annual gathering of the magistrates. The focus for communication with the magistrates has moved from an annual gathering to special email notifications and ongoing updates to their website.

An orientation to the housing docket, similar to the overall orientation conducted in August, will be presented for magistrates who are new to housing.

The orientation approach balances the responsibility of the independent contractors who serve as magistrates to bring their knowledge of the substantive law to the bench with the specific differences between and among the housing docket, other small claims dockets, and the motor vehicle docket. It focuses on the environment in which the magistrate serves and techniques for providing a dignified and impartial review of each case. Substantive law education is the responsibility of the magistrate. The website provides assistance to magistrates in learning and maintaining knowledge of specific areas of the law. For example, there are links to the Law Libraries' "Connecticut Law by Subject" and daily "News Log," which provide research guides, links to websites, Connecticut law, and federal law on many issues including Landlord Tenant.

Note per conversation with Nancy Kierstead 9-12-11: Judicial distributed hard copies of the booklet to new magistrates in August and continues to have a supply of the booklets. The movement, however, is to direct magistrates to the Judicial Branch magistrates' website.

(4)(c) Housing Small claims/Multi-day trials: "Judicial will work out a no-cost arrangement by which files can be accessed in multi-day trials without requiring a trip to Hartford."

Judicial: The cases can be scanned and available electronically.

I'd appreciate it if you could let me know where things stand on each of these recommendations. The Advisory Council's next meeting is September 14, and I am hoping to be able to make a report at that time.

As you may recall, we were unable to get through all of the Council's recommendations when we met in March; and this email addresses only those items that we did discuss. I realize that now is an extremely busy and difficult time for the Judicial Branch in regard to budgetary matters and am therefore not asking for a meeting at this time to complete that discussion. I hope, however, that you would be willing to make time before the end of the year to speak with representatives of the Advisory Council on the remaining matters that were on the March 4 agenda.

Thanks very much for your consideration of our requests.

Sincerely,

Raphael Podolsky, Chairperson
Citizens Advisory Council for Housing Matters
44 Capitol Ave., Suite 301
Hartford, CT 06106
860-836-6355

Housing Cases at GA Courts
(Through 9/9/11)

By court

Court	Year	Cases
Derby, GA 5	2006	4
Derby, GA 5	2007	4
Derby, GA 5	2008	2
Derby, GA 5	2009	3
Derby, GA 5	2010	4
Derby, GA 5	2011	2
Derby, GA 5	Total	19
Milford, GA 22	2006	3
Milford, GA 22	2007	5
Milford, GA 22	2008	5
Milford, GA 22	2009	5
Milford, GA 22	2010	2
Milford, GA 22	Total	20
Danbury, GA 3	2007	2
Danbury, GA 3	2008	3
Danbury, GA 3	2009	3
Danbury, GA 3	2010	3
Danbury, GA 3	2011	1
Danbury, GA 3	Total	12
Danbury JD	2010	3
Danbury JD	Total	3
Bridgeport, GA 2	2006	5
Bridgeport, GA 2	2007	7
Bridgeport, GA 2	2008	3
Bridgeport, GA 2	2009	8
Bridgeport, GA 2	2010	3
Bridgeport, GA 2	2011	5
Bridgeport, GA 2	Total	31
Manchester, GA 12	2006	7
Manchester, GA 12	2007	9
Manchester, GA 12	2008	5
Manchester, GA 12	2009	9
Manchester, GA 12	2010	7
Manchester, GA 12	2011	7
Manchester, GA 12	Total	44
Enfield, GA 13	2006	6
Enfield, GA 13	2007	5
Enfield, GA 13	2008	11
Enfield, GA 13	2009	1
Enfield, GA 13	2010	11
Enfield, GA 13	2011	1
Enfield, GA 13	Total	35
Hartford Comm.Court	2008	1
Hartford Comm.Court	2009	1
Hartford Comm.Court	2010	1
Hartford Comm.Court	2011	2
Hartford Comm.Court	Total	5
Hartford, GA 14	2006	5
Hartford, GA 14	2007	4
Hartford, GA 14	2008	6
Hartford, GA 14	2009	8

Housing Cases at GA Courts
(Through 9/9/11)

By year

Year	Court	Cases
2006	Derby, GA 5	4
2006	Milford, GA 22	3
2006	Bridgeport, GA 2	5
2006	Manchester, GA 12	7
2006	Enfield, GA 13	6
2006	Hartford, GA 14	5
2006	New Britain, GA 15	2
2006	Bristol, GA 17	2
2006	New London, GA 10	10
2006	Norwich, GA 21	2
2006	Bantam, GA 18	4
2006	Middletown, GA 9	14
2006	New Haven, GA 23	4
2006	Stamford, GA 1	1
2006	Norwalk, GA 20	4
2006	Rockville, GA 19	3
2006	Waterbury, GA 4	8
2006	Danielson, GA 11	2
2006	Total	86
2007	Derby, GA 5	4
2007	Milford, GA 22	5
2007	Danbury, GA 3	2
2007	Bridgeport, GA 2	7
2007	Manchester, GA 12	9
2007	Enfield, GA 13	5
2007	Hartford, GA 14	4
2007	New Britain, GA 15	6
2007	Bristol, GA 17	2
2007	New London, GA 10	2
2007	Norwich, GA 21	2
2007	Bantam, GA 18	4
2007	Middletown, GA 9	4
2007	Meriden, GA 7	2
2007	New Haven, GA 23	13
2007	Stamford, GA 1	4
2007	Norwalk, GA 20	1
2007	Rockville, GA 19	2
2007	Waterbury, GA 4	7
2007	Danielson, GA 11	3
2007	Total	88
2008	Derby, GA 5	2
2008	Milford, GA 22	5
2008	Danbury, GA 3	3
2008	Bridgeport, GA 2	3
2008	Manchester, GA 12	5
2008	Enfield, GA 13	11
2008	Hartford Comm.Court	1
2008	Hartford, GA 14	6
2008	New Britain, GA 15	3
2008	Bristol, GA 17	2
2008	Hartford JD	1

Housing Cases at GA Courts
(Through 9/9/11)

Hartford, GA 14	2010	4
Hartford, GA 14	2011	6
Hartford, GA 14	Total	33
New Britain, GA 15	2006	2
New Britain, GA 15	2007	6
New Britain, GA 15	2008	3
New Britain, GA 15	2009	3
New Britain, GA 15	2010	5
New Britain, GA 15	2011	1
New Britain, GA 15	Total	20
Bristol, GA 17	2006	2
Bristol, GA 17	2007	2
Bristol, GA 17	2008	2
Bristol, GA 17	2009	4
Bristol, GA 17	2010	4
Bristol, GA 17	2011	8
Bristol, GA 17	Total	22
Hartford JD	2008	1
Hartford JD	Total	1
New London, GA 10	2006	10
New London, GA 10	2007	2
New London, GA 10	2008	12
New London, GA 10	2009	9
New London, GA 10	2010	12
New London, GA 10	2011	1
New London, GA 10	Total	46
Norwich, GA 21	2006	2
Norwich, GA 21	2007	2
Norwich, GA 21	2008	2
Norwich, GA 21	2009	7
Norwich, GA 21	2010	5
Norwich, GA 21	2011	2
Norwich, GA 21	Total	20
Bantam, GA 18	2006	4
Bantam, GA 18	2007	4
Bantam, GA 18	2008	7
Bantam, GA 18	2009	13
Bantam, GA 18	2010	3
Bantam, GA 18	2011	3
Bantam, GA 18	Total	34
Litchfield JD	2008	1
Litchfield JD	Total	1
Middletown, GA 9	2006	14
Middletown, GA 9	2007	4
Middletown, GA 9	2008	3
Middletown, GA 9	2009	6
Middletown, GA 9	2010	8
Middletown, GA 9	2011	2
Middletown, GA 9	Total	37
Meriden, GA 7	2007	2
Meriden, GA 7	2008	10
Meriden, GA 7	2009	4

Housing Cases at GA Courts
(Through 9/9/11)

2008	New London, GA 10	12
2008	Norwich, GA 21	2
2008	Bantam, GA 18	7
2008	Litchfield JD	1
2008	Middletown, GA 9	3
2008	Meriden, GA 7	10
2008	New Haven, GA 23	9
2008	New Haven JD	1
2008	Stamford, GA 1	2
2008	Norwalk, GA 20	5
2008	Rockville, GA 19	5
2008	Waterbury, GA 4	4
2008	Danielson, GA 11	7
2008	Total	110
2009	Derby, GA 5	3
2009	Milford, GA 22	5
2009	Danbury, GA 3	3
2009	Bridgeport, GA 2	8
2009	Manchester, GA 12	9
2009	Enfield, GA 13	1
2009	Hartford Comm.Court	1
2009	Hartford, GA 14	8
2009	New Britain, GA 15	3
2009	Bristol, GA 17	4
2009	New London, GA 10	9
2009	Norwich, GA 21	7
2009	Bantam, GA 18	13
2009	Middletown, GA 9	6
2009	Meriden, GA 7	4
2009	New Haven, GA 23	13
2009	Stamford, GA 1	2
2009	Norwalk, GA 20	10
2009	Rockville, GA 19	7
2009	Waterbury, GA 4	5
2009	Danielson, GA 11	1
2009	Total	122
2010	Derby, GA 5	4
2010	Milford, GA 22	2
2010	Danbury, GA 3	3
2010	Danbury JD	3
2010	Bridgeport, GA 2	3
2010	Manchester, GA 12	7
2010	Enfield, GA 13	11
2010	Hartford Comm.Court	1
2010	Hartford, GA 14	4
2010	New Britain, GA 15	5
2010	Bristol, GA 17	4
2010	New London, GA 10	12
2010	Norwich, GA 21	5
2010	Bantam, GA 18	3
2010	Middletown, GA 9	8
2010	Meriden, GA 7	8

Housing Cases at GA Courts
(Through 9/9/11)

Meriden, GA 7	2010	8
Meriden, GA 7	2011	3
Meriden, GA 7	Total	27
New Haven, GA 23	2006	4
New Haven, GA 23	2007	13
New Haven, GA 23	2008	9
New Haven, GA 23	2009	13
New Haven, GA 23	2010	7
New Haven, GA 23	2011	6
New Haven, GA 23	Total	52
New Haven JD	2008	1
New Haven JD	2010	1
New Haven JD	Total	2
Stamford, GA 1	2006	1
Stamford, GA 1	2007	4
Stamford, GA 1	2008	2
Stamford, GA 1	2009	2
Stamford, GA 1	2010	3
Stamford, GA 1	2011	1
Stamford, GA 1	Total	13
Norwalk, GA 20	2006	4
Norwalk, GA 20	2007	1
Norwalk, GA 20	2008	5
Norwalk, GA 20	2009	10
Norwalk, GA 20	2010	3
Norwalk, GA 20	2011	3
Norwalk, GA 20	Total	26
Rockville, GA 19	2006	3
Rockville, GA 19	2007	2
Rockville, GA 19	2008	5
Rockville, GA 19	2009	7
Rockville, GA 19	2010	5
Rockville, GA 19	2011	1
Rockville, GA 19	Total	23
Waterbury Comm.Court	2010	1
Waterbury Comm.Court	Total	1
Waterbury, GA 4	2006	8
Waterbury, GA 4	2007	7
Waterbury, GA 4	2008	4
Waterbury, GA 4	2009	5
Waterbury, GA 4	2010	6
Waterbury, GA 4	2011	8
Waterbury, GA 4	Total	38
Waterbury JD	2011	1
Waterbury JD	Total	1
Danielson, GA 11	2006	2
Danielson, GA 11	2007	3
Danielson, GA 11	2008	7
Danielson, GA 11	2009	1
Danielson, GA 11	2010	9
Danielson, GA 11	Total	22
Total		588

Housing Cases at GA Courts
(Through 9/9/11)

2010	New Haven, GA 23	7
2010	New Haven JD	1
2010	Stamford, GA 1	3
2010	Norwalk, GA 20	3
2010	Rockville, GA 19	5
2010	Waterbury Comm.Court	1
2010	Waterbury, GA 4	6
2010	Danielson, GA 11	9
2010	Total	118
2011	Derby, GA 5	2
2011	Danbury, GA 3	1
2011	Bridgeport, GA 2	5
2011	Manchester, GA 12	7
2011	Enfield, GA 13	1
2011	Hartford Comm.Court	2
2011	Hartford, GA 14	6
2011	New Britain, GA 15	1
2011	Bristol, GA 17	8
2011	New London, GA 10	1
2011	Norwich, GA 21	2
2011	Bantam, GA 18	3
2011	Middletown, GA 9	2
2011	Meriden, GA 7	3
2011	New Haven, GA 23	6
2011	Stamford, GA 1	1
2011	Norwalk, GA 20	3
2011	Rockville, GA 19	1
2011	Waterbury, GA 4	8
2011	Waterbury JD	1
2011	Total	64
Total		588