98TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
98-1062

FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1984

SEPTEMBER 24, 1984.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. KASTENMEIER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 6163]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 6163) to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the places where court shall be held in certain judicial districts, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to realign the boundaries of divisions within three judicial districts, to statutorily create an additional place of holding court in four judicial districts, and to change the place of holding court in one judicial district. In short, the legislation modifies the organization and placement of Federal district courts so as to better reflect the changing demographic patterns and varying societal needs in six states.

BACKGROUND

Each Congress, several bills are introduced to change the geographic organization of the Federal courts. It generally has been the policy of the subcommittee to refrain from authorizing new places of holding court or making changes in the organizational or geographical configuration of individual judicial districts unless such changes have been endorsed by the judicial branch of government—through the Judicial Conference of the United States—and

the executive branch—through the United States Department of Justice.

The Judicial branch has set strict standards for such endorsements. The Judicial Conference approved the following clarified statement of policy at its September 1978 meeting:

> The Judicial Conference reaffirms its previously stated belief that changes in the geographical configuration and organization of existing federal judicial districts should be enacted only after a showing of strong and compelling need. Therefore, whenever Congress requests the Conference's views on bills to:
>
> 1. create new judicial districts;
> 2. consolidate existing judicial districts within a state;
> 3. create new divisions within an existing judicial district;
> 4. abolish divisions within an existing judicial district;
> 5. transfer counties from an existing division or district to another division or district;
> 6. authorize a location or community as a statutorily designated place at which "count shall be held" under Chapter 5 of title 28 of the United States Code; or
> 7. waive the provisions of Section 142 of title 28, United States Code respecting the furnishing of accommodations at places of holding court—
>
> The Director of the Administrative Office shall transmit each such bill to both the chief judge of each affected district and the chief judge of the circuit in which each such district is located, requesting that the district court and the judicial council for the circuit evaluate the merits of the proposal and formulate an opinion of approval or disapproval to be reviewed by the Conference's Court Administration Committee in recommending action by the Conference. In each district court and circuit council evaluation, the views of the affected U.S. Attorneys offices, as representative of the views of the Department of Justice, shall be considered in addition to caseload, judicial administration, geographical, and community-convenience factors. Only when a proposal has been approved both by the district courts affected and by the appropriate circuit council, and only after both have filed a brief report summarizing their reasons for their approval, with the Court Administration Committee, shall the Committee review the proposal and recommend action to the Judicial Conference.[1]

Thus, when a hearing was scheduled on the several bills relating to the geographic organization of the Federal courts, the subcommittee carefully considered the written and oral testimony of the Judicial Conference.[2]

---

[1] Memorandum to all Circuit Court Judges, District Court Judges, and Circuit Executives dated October 12, 1978, from William E. Foley, Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

[2] See District Court Organization: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice of the Comm. on the Judiciary, 98th Cong., 2d Sess. (1984) (testimony of William Foley) [hereinafter referred to as Hearings on District Court Organization, 98th Cong.].

The Subcommittee also requested and considered the testimony of the executive branch of government. The Department of Justice generally consults with the United States Attorneys offices in the affected districts, who are able to assess local needs and conditions. The Department of Justice also considers the fiscal impact of the proposals, including the cost of obtaining the necessary office space and per diem and travel costs for court personnel. On the basis of the recommendations of the respective U.S. Attorneys and the anticipated fiscal impact, the Department is able to formulate a clear and consistent position on court organization issues.[3]

In addition, written materials in support of the proposals were solicited from the sponsoring members of the various bills.

The following discussion of the proposed legislation is divided into two parts: proposals to change divisions within districts and proposals to create or change places of holding court within judicial districts.

A. PROPOSALS TO CHANGE DIVISIONS WITHIN DISTRICTS

1. Northern District of Georgia.—The Northern District of Georgia is divided into four divisions: the Gainesville, Atlanta, Rome and Newman Divisions. The proposed legislation would move three counties—Fannin, Gilmer, and Pickens—from the Atlanta Division to the Gainesville Division.

The testimony received indicated that both divisions have a full complement of facilities and court-related personnel. However, the caseload in the Atlanta Division continues to grow both in the quantity and complexity of cases filed, while criminal filings in the Gainsville Division have decreased. Therefore, it appears reasonable to reduce the Atlanta Division's caseload by transferring to Gainsville the cases arising from primarily rural counties of Fannin, Gilmer and Pickins.

The three counties are geographically located closer to Gainesville than to Atlanta. In the most extreme case, Fannin County is nearly 60 miles closer to Gainesville. Thus, jurors, attorneys, and other interested parties have indicated a preference to travel to Gainsville rather than traveling the mountainous roads to Atlanta. In addition, the Government could realize a savings in the mileage fees paid to jurors who are called to jury service from these three counties.

The proposed legislation is supported by the bar associations of the affected counties and by U.S. District Court Judge William C. O'Kelley, who is assigned to the Gainesville Division. No opposition to the proposal has been identified.

2. Northern District of Illinois.—The Northern District of Illinois is comprised of two divisions—the Eastern Division and the western Division. The proposed legislation would transfer McHenry and DeKalb counties from the Eastern Division to the Western Division.

Court for the Eastern Division is held in Chicago; court for the Western Division is held in Rockford, the second-largest city in Illi-

[3] See Hearings on Federal Court Organization, 98th Cong. (statement of Dennis F. Mullins, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice).

nois. The eastern Division docket is heavily overloaded and the judge who serves the Western Division currently divides his time between Rockford and Chicago. Transferring McHenry and DeKalb counties will shift approximately 200,000 people from the Eastern Division to the Western Division. Cases arising in those two counties will be placed on the Rockford docket, thereby relieving the heavy caseload in Chicago.

McHenry and DeKalb counties are geographically more convenient to Rockford than Chicago. Thus, attorneys, jurors and others in those counties will find access to a Federal court in Rockford easier and less expensive.

The caseload in Rockford would increase sharply as a result of this proposal. However, the facilities in Rockford are currently under-utilized and it appears that the existing facilities are more than adequate to handle the increase. In addition, the increased filings would likely justify placement of a full-time judge in Rockford, thereby making more efficient use of the courthouse there. Because of the exisiting facilities and personnel, the anticipated costs are minimal.

The proposal enjoys the support of the McHenry and DeKalb county bar associations, as well as the bar associations from all of the other counties in the Western Division and the Chief Judge of the Northern District of Illinois. In addition, both the Judicial Conference and the Department of Justice have endorsed the proposal.

3. Southern District of Texas.—The Southern Distict of Texas is currently divided into six divisions. The Brownsville Division presently covers a four-county area which is about 150 miles long. The proposed legislation would transfer Hidalgo and Starr counties from the Brownsville Division to a newly-created McAllen Division, and would leave Cameron and Willacy counties in the Brownsville Divison. Under the proposal, one of the two judges currently sitting in Brownsville would be transferred to the McAllen Division.

The testimony received by the subcommittee indicated that the vast geographical area currently covered by the Brownsville Division necessitates enormous travel costs for court and executive branch employees. The high number of criminal arrests which occur along the Mexican border in the Brownsville Division has created costly prisoner transportation and security problems which would be alleviated with the establishment of a facility in McAllen which could be used for temporarily housing prisoners. Approximately 58% of the jurors summoned to serve in the Brownsville Division must travel to court from Hidalgo and Starr counties, the two counties farthest from Brownsville, creating tremendous inconvenience for the jurors and increased travel costs for the Government.

The creation of a new McAllen Division will significantly reduce the cost of administering justice in the four-county area which currently constitutes the Brownsville Division. The projected savings in jury costs alone is $24,000. In addition, the savings resulting from reduced costs of transporting prisoners and the savings anticipated by the executive agencies in such areas as travel, per diem, transportation, vehicle depreciation and telecommunications is projected to total approximately $431,400 annually. A U.S. Federal building currently exists in McAllen, and all of the executive agen-

cies involved with the court already have duty stations or offices in the McAllen Area. As a consequence, the projected cost of $123,500 per year to acquire the necessary space for courtrooms, judge's chambers and clerk's offices is, in comparison, negligible.

The proposal is endorsed by the bar association of Hidalgo and Starr counties, the Judicial Confidence and the Department of Justice.

B. PLACES OF HOLDING COURT PROPOSALS

1. Central District of Illinois.—The State of Illinois is divided into three judicial districts—Northern, Central and Southern. Court for the Central District is currently held at Danville, Peoria, Quincy, Rock Island, and Springfield. The proposed legislation would add Champaign/Urbana as an additional place of holding court in the Central District.

One of three Federal judges in the Central District currently sits in Danville, near the eastern border of Illinois. The testimony and material submitted indicate that the civil docket in Danville has more than doubled in the last five years, from 250 cases filed in 1979 to 569 in 1983; and that 485 civil suits have been filed during the first half of this year. As a result of the burgeoning caseload, additional court facilities are necessary in this part of the state. Danville is no longer the center of population in this part of Illinois. Champaign/Urbana lies within the largest county in the area, and is more centrally located to the bulk of the population there. In addition, the three interstate highways to Champaign/Urbana and superior air and bus service make it more accessible then Danville for lawyers, litigants and jurors. The University of Illinois College of Law is located in Champaign/Urbana. The law library there would be of great assistance to the judges and the Federal district court; and the law students would be available to assist in providing counsel to prisoners in pro se cases.

The facilities in Danville are inadequate and funds will have to be expended to build an additional courtroom in this part of the state. A large Federal building currently exists in Champaign/Urbana; thus, the cost of adding a courtroom to that building is anticipated to be no higher than the cost of adding a courtroom to the building in Danville.

It was stressed in the supporting documents that Champaign/Urbana will be an additional place of holding court, and that Danville will not be abandoned as a court site. The only opposition to the proposal came from the Vermilion County Bar Association, the county in which Danville is located, which expressed concern over whether Federal court will continue to be held in Danville. Federal Judge Harold A. Baker has indicated that Danville will remain his official station.

The three judges in the Central District of Illinois, as well as the Judicial Conference and the Department of Justice, support this proposal.

2. Eastern District of New York.—The State of New York is divided into four judicial districts—Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western. Court for the Eastern District is currently held in Brooklyn and Hempstead (including the village of Uniondale in Nassau

County). The proposed legislation will add Hauppauge as a place of holding court in the Eastern District.

Hauppauge is located in Suffolk County, Long Island. The testimony received by the subcommittee indicates that Suffolk County has experienced tremendous growth in recent years; its current population is approximately 1.3 million. The corresponding caseload increase has resulted in severe overcrowding of the existing facilities in the Eastern District. Approximately 20% of the district's total caseload arises in Suffolk County, where residents may spend as much as four hours traveling to the courthouse in Uniondale. Although Hauppauge is only 35 miles from Uniondale, the drive along the Long Island Expressway is time-consuming and imposes a great hardship on litigants, lawyers, jurors and witnesses.

The creation of two additional Federal judgeships as part of the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984 [4] makes the need for additional space even more critical. The anticipated cost of leasing the necessary space in Suffolk County is $251,200 per year. It is believed that leasing comparable space in Brooklyn would be considerably more costly.

This proposal has been endorsed by the Judicial Council of the Second Circuit, the judges of the Eastern District, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Department of Justice. No opposition to the proposal has been identified.

3. Judicial District of Vermont.—The State of Vermont constitutes one judicial district. Court is currently held at Brattleboro, Burlington, Montpelier, Rutland, Saint Johnsbury, and Windsor. The proposed legislation would designate Bennington as an additional place of holding court.

The establishment of Bennington as a place of holding court will be useful to the citizens in southwestern Vermont, who currently must travel to Rutland or Brattleboro. The distance to both cities is substantial, and the drive becomes an even greater hardship during the snowy winter months.

Vermont recently acquired the services of a third full-time federal judge. Another judge, Honorable James Holden, recently took senior status and is still hearing cases. Judge Holden has secured the approval of the Vermont Supreme Court to use state court facilities in Bennington. Thus, only nominal costs for leasing space for chambers in a nearby office building will be incurred under this proposal. In addition, this will obviate the need to acquire space in Rutland to accommodate the new judge who will be replacing Judge Holden.

The Judicial Conference, the Department of Justice, and the Vermont Bar Association support the proposal.

4. Judicial District of Colorado.—The State of Colorado constitues one judicial district. Court is currently held at Denver, Durango, Grand Junction, Montrose, Pueblo, and Sterling. The proposed legislation would designate Boulder as an additional place of holding court.

This proposal is aimed at alleviating the congestion in the Denver facility, and making the Federal court more accessible to the citizens of Boulder. The materials submitted indicate that cases

[4] Pub. L. No. 98-353.

heard in Boulder would only involve litigants from that area. Court would be held in the moot courtroom at the University of Colorado Fleming School of Law in Boulder at no cost to the Federal government. The district judge who would sit in Boulder has indicated that the facilities at the law school are adequate for his needs and no additional space would be required. Finally, this proposal would provide an educational benefit to the students at the Fleming School of Law.

The proposal is endorsed by Chief Judge Sherman Finesilver, District Judge Jim Carrigan, the Boulder County Bar Association, the Dean of the Law School, the Judicial Conference, and the Department of Justice.

5. Southern District of Georgia.—The State of Georgia is divided into three judicial districts—Northern, Middle and Southern. The Southern District of Georgia is divided into six division. The proposed legislation would change the headquarters of the Swainsboro Division to Statesboro, rename the division as the "Statesboro Division," and eliminate the designation of Swainsboro as a place of holding court.

The testimony and other materials submitted in support of this proposal show that Statesboro is the geographical, population, and commercial center for the region. The existing Federal courthouse in Swainsboro is in disrepair and no longer adequately serves the needs of the division. By contrast, a new state courthouse exists in Statesboro and space for Federal court would be available in that building at no cost to the Federal government. In addition, the support facilities in Statesboro—restaurants, motels and hotels—are vastly superior, both in number and quality, to those in Swainsboro.

The proposal is supported by all the Federal judges in the Southern District, the bar associations in the Statesboro area, the Judicial Conference, and the Department of Justice. Opposition to the proposal comes from several bar associations in the Swainsboro area.

STATEMENT

On August 9, 1984, the Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice held a one-day hearing on ten legislative proposals which affect district court organization.

Testimony was received from the Honorable E (Kika) de la Garza, the Honorable Robert J. Mrazek, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (William Weller, accompanied by Christy E. Massie), and the U.S. Department of Justice (Dennis F. Mullins, accompanied by David J. Karp and Alfreda Robinson-Bennett). Written statements were received from Hon. Robert A. Roe, Hon. Ed Jenkins, Hon. Lynn Martin, Hon. Carroll Hubbard, Hon. Edward Madigan, Hon. James M. Jeffords, and Hon. Patricia Schroeder.[5]

[5] In conducting its hearings on all pending legislative proposals, the subcommittee followed the pattern set in previous Congresses. See, Federal District Court Organization Act of 1978: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice of the Comm. on the Judiciary, 95th Cong., 2d Sess. (1978); Federal Court Organization and Fifth Circuit Division: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice of the Comm. on the Judiciary, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. (1980).

Following the hearing on August 9, a draft omnibus bill was circulated to the Members of the Subcommittee. With the exception of the proposal to move the district court headquarters in Swainsboro, Georgia to Statesboro, the omnibus bill contained only noncontroversial proposals. The Statesboro proposal was included in the omnibus bill on the basis of its support from the Judicial Conference and the Department of Justice. The bills for which opposition had been identified have been placed in a study category, and action on them has not been foreclosed.

The Subcommittee proceeded to mark up the draft bill, and unanimously voted to report a clean bill (H.R. 6163) to the full Committee. No amendments were offered.

On September 18, 1984, the full Judiciary Committee considered H.R. 6163 and, by voice vote, a quorum of Members being present, ordered the bill reported.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 provides that the proposed legislation may be referred to as the "Federal District Court Organization Act of 1984."

Section 2 amends 28 U.S.C. § 112(c) to designate Hauppauge as an additional place of holding court for the Eastern District of New York.

Section 3(a) amends 28 U.S.C. § 93(a) (1) and (2) by transferring McHenry and DeKalb Counties from the Eastern Division of the Northern District of Illinois to the Western Division of that district.

Section 3(b) provides that the transfer of McHenry and DeKalb Counties shall have no effect on actions which are pending in District Court for the Northern District of Illinois on the effective date of this Act.

Section 4 amends 28 U.S.C. § 93(b) by designating Champaign/Urbana as an additional place of holding court for the Central District of Illinois.

Section 5(a) amends 28 U.S.C. § 124(b) by creating the McAllen Division of the Southern District of Texas, and by transferring Hidalgo and Starr Counties from the Brownsville Division of that district to the McAllen Division.

Section 5(b) provides that the amendments made by section 5(a) shall have no effect on actions which are pending in the Southern District of Texas on the effective date of this Act.

Section 6 (a) and (b) amend 28 U.S.C. § 90(a) by transferring the counties of Fannin, Gilmer, and Pickens from the Atlanta Division of the Northern District of Georgia to the Gainesville Division of that District.

Section 6(c) amends 28 U.S.C. § 90(c) by moving the headquarters of the Swainsboro Division of the Southern District of Georgia to Statesboro, renaming the division as the "Statesboro Division," and repealing the designation of Swainsboro as a place of holding court in the Southern District of Georgia.

Section 6(d) provides that the transfer of three counties from the Atlanta Division of the Northern District of Georgia to the Gainesville Division of that district shall have no effect on actions which

are pending in District Court for the Northern District of Georgia on the effective date of this Act.

Section 7 amends 28 U.S.C. § 85 by designating Boulder as an additional place of holding court for the Judicial District of Colorado.

Section 8 amends 28 U.S.C. § 126 by designating Bennington as an additional place of holding court for the Judicial District of Vermont.

Section 9 provides that the effective date of this legislation is January 1, 1985.

Oversight Findings

In regard to clause 2(l)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee recognizes that, in addition to its responsibility to create judgeships pursuant to fair, systematic and open procedures, it should resolve questions relating to places of holding court and to district and division dividing lines in a similar manner. As a consequence, it is the view of the committee that the processing of district court organization legislation is most efficiently and expeditiously dealt with by formulation of an omnibus bill. Moreover, in this regard, the committee feels that it is better able to sort out meritorious and noncontroversial proposals from those requiring more study or consensus.

In regard to clause 2(l)(3)(D) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no oversight findings have been submitted to the committee by the Committee on Government Operations.

New Budget Authority

In regard to clause 2(l)(3)(B) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the bill creates no new budget authority or increased tax expenditures for the Federal judiciary.

Inflationary Impact Statement

Pursuant to clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee feels that the bill will have no foreseeable inflationary impact on prices or costs in the operation of the national economy.

Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972

The Committee finds that this legislation does not create any new advisory committees within the meaning of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972.

Cost Estimate

In compliance with clause 7 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee estimates that no costs will be incurred in carrying out the provisions of the reported bill.

Statement of the Congressional Budget Office

Pursuant to clause 2(l)(3)(C) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and section 403 of the Congressional Budget

Act of 1974, the following is the cost estimate on H.R. 6163 prepared by the Congressional Budget Office.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 20, 1984.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 6163, the Federal District Court Organization Act of 1984, as ordered reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary, September 18, 1984. We estimate that no significant cost to the federal government or to state or local governments would result from enactment of this bill.

H.R. 6163 would change the boundaries of divisions within certain judicial districts, would designate additional places of holding court in certain judicial districts, and would move the place of holding court in one judicial district. The changes would be made within judicial districts in the states of New York, Georgia, Texas, Illinois, Vermont, and Colorado. The realignments made by H.R. 6163 are expected to result in increased costs to the federal government in some areas, which would be offset by savings in others. Therefore, CBO estimates that no significant costs to the federal government would result from enactment of this bill.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

ERIC HANUSHEK
(For Rudolph G. Penner, Director).

COMMITTEE VOTE

H.R. 6163 was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary by voice vote, a quorum of Members having been present.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION OF COURTS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 5—DISTRICT COURTS

* * * * * * *

§ 85. Colorado

Colorado constitutes one judicial district.

Court shall be held at *Boulder,* Denver, Durango, Grand Junction, Montrose, Pueblo, and Sterling.

* * * * * * *

§ 90. Georgia

Georgia is divided into three judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Middle, and Southern Districts of Georgia.

Northern District

(a) The Northern District comprises four divisions.

(1) The Gainesville Division comprises the counties of Banks, Barrow, Dawson, *Fannin,* Forsyth, *Gilmer,* Habersham, Hall, Jackson, Lumpkin, *Pickens,* Rabun, Stephens, Towns, Union, and White.

Court for the Gainesville Division shall be held at Gainesville.

(2) The Atlanta Division comprises the counties of Cherokee, Clayton, Cobb, De Kalb, Douglas, [Fannin,] Fulton, [Gilmer,] Gwinnett, Henry, Newton, [Pickens,] and Rockdale.

Court for the Atlanta Division shall be held at Atlanta.

* * * * * * *

Southern District

(c) The Southern District comprises six divisions.

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(6) The [Swainsboro] *Statesboro* Division comprises the counties of Bulloch, Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Jenkins, and Toombs.

Court for the [Swainsboro] *Statesboro* Division shall be held at [Swainsboro.] *Statesboro.*

* * * * * * *

§ 93. Illinois

Illinois is divided into three judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Central, and Southern Districts of Illinois.

Northern District

(a) The Northern District comprises two divisions.

(1) The Eastern Division comprises the counties of Cook [De Kalb,] Du Page, Grundy, Kane, Kendall, Lake, La Salle, [McHenry,] and Will.

Court for the Eastern Division shall be held at Chicago.

(2) The Western Division comprises the counties of Boone, Carroll, *De Kalb,* Jo Daviess, Lee, *McHenry,* Ogle, Stephenson, Whiteside, and Winnebago.

Court for the Western Division shall be held at Freeport and Rockford.

Central District

(b) The Central District comprises the counties of Adams, Brown, Bureau, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Coles, De Witt, Douglas, Edgar, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Henry, Iroquois, Kankakee, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macoupin, Macon, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Mercer, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Putman, Rock Island, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermilion, Warren, and Woodford.

Court for the Central District shall be held at *Champaign/Urbana*, Danville, Peoria, Quincy, Rock Island, and Springfield.

* * * * * * *

§ 112. New York

New York is divided into four judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western Districts of New York.

Northern District

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

Eastern District

(c) The Eastern District comprises the counties of Kings, Nassau, Queens, Richmond, and Suffolk and concurrently with the Southern District, the waters within the counties of Bronx and New York.

[Court for the Eastern District shall be held at Brooklyn and Hempstead (including the village of Uniondale).]

Court for the Eastern District shall be held at Brooklyn, Hauppauge, and Hempstead (including the village of Uniondale).

* * * * * * *

§ 124. Texas

Texas is divided into four judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western Districts of Texas.

Northern District

(a) * * *

Southern District

(b) The Southern District comprises [six] *seven* divisions.

(1) The Galveston Division comprises the counties of Brazoria, Chambers, Galveston, and Matagorda.

Court for the Galveston Division shall be held at Galveston.

(2) The Houston Division comprises the counties of Austin, Brazos, Colorado, Fayette, Fort Bend, Grimes, Harris, Madison, Montgomery, San Jucinto, Walker, Waller, and Wharton.

Court for the Houston Division shall be held at Houston.

(3) The Laredo Division comprises the counties of Jim Hogg, La Salle, McMullen, Webb, and Zapata.

Court for the Laredo division shall be held at Laredo.

(4) The Brownsville Division comprises the counties of Cameron, [Hidalgo, Starr,] and Willacy.

Court for the Brownsville Division shall be held at Brownsville.

(5) The Victoria Division comprises the counties of Calhoun, DeWitt, Goliad, Jackson, Lavaca, Refugio, and Victoria.

Court for the Victoria Division shall be held at Victoria.

(6) The Corpus Christi Division comprises the counties of Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Duval, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kleberg, Live oak, Nueces, and San Patricio.

Court for the Corpus Christi Division shall be held at Corpus Christi.

(7) The McAllen Division comprises the counties of Hidalgo and Starr.

Court for the McAllen Division shall be held at McAllen.

* * * * * * *

§ 126. Vermont

Vermont constitutes one judicial district.

Court shall be held at *Bennington,* Battleboro, Burlington, Montpelier, Rutland, Saint Johnsbury, and Windor.

* * * * * * *

○