ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENT

District Court 38-1-08

Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

For the Period

January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2012

December 2014

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of the Auditor General

Eugene A. DePasquale • Auditor General

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of the Auditor General
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0018
Facebook: Pennsylvania Auditor General
Twitter: @PAAuditorGen

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE
AUDITOR GENERAL

Independent Auditor's Report

The Honorable Daniel P. Meuser
Secretary
Pennsylvania Department of Revenue
Harrisburg, PA 17128

We have examined the accompanying statement of receipts and disbursements (Statement) of District Court 38-1-08, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania (District Court), for the period January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2012, pursuant to the requirements of Section 401(c) of *The Fiscal Code*, 72 P.S § 401(c). The District Court's management is responsible for this Statement. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on this Statement based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and, accordingly, included examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the Statement and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our examination provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

We are mandated by Section 401(c) of *The Fiscal Code* to audit the accounts of each district court to determine whether all moneys collected on behalf of the Commonwealth have been correctly assessed, reported and promptly remitted. *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States include attestation engagements as a separate type of audit. An attestation engagement performed pursuant to *Government Auditing Standards* involves additional standards that exceed the standards provided by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Accordingly, this attestation engagement complies with both *Government Auditing Standards* and Section 401(c) of *The Fiscal Code*.

In our opinion, the Statement referred to above presents, in all material respects, the operations of the District Court as it pertains to receipts made on behalf of the Commonwealth for the period January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2012, in conformity with the criteria set forth in Note 1.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report all deficiencies that are considered to be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in internal control; fraud and noncompliance with provisions of laws or regulations that have a material effect on the Statement; and any other instances that warrant the attention of those charged with governance; noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements, and abuse that has a material effect on the Statement. We are also required to obtain and report the views of responsible officials concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as any planned corrective actions. We performed our examination to express an opinion on whether the Statement is presented in accordance with the criteria described above and not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on internal control over reporting on the Statement or on compliance and other matters; accordingly, we express no such opinions.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the Statement will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control over reporting on the Statement was for the limited purpose of expressing an opinion on whether the Statement is presented in accordance with the criteria described above and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over reporting on the Statement that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. Given these limitations, during our engagement we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified. We did identify certain deficiencies in internal control, described in the finding listed below, that we consider to be a significant deficiency.

- Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures.

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Statement is free from material misstatement, we performed tests of the District Court's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of Statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our engagement, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue, the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, and the District Court and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

We appreciate the courtesy extended by District Court 38-1-08, Montgomery County, to us during the course of our examination. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Michael B. Kashishian, CPA, CGAP, CFE, Director, Bureau of County Audits, at 717-787-1363.

September 30, 2014

Eugene A. DePasquale
Auditor General

CONTENTS

Page

Financial Section:

Statement Of Receipts And Disbursements 1

Notes To The Statement Of Receipts And Disbursements 2

Finding And Recommendations:

Finding - Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures 4

Report Distribution 7

DISTRICT COURT 38-1-08
MONTGOMERY COUNTY
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2009 TO DECEMBER 31, 2012

Receipts:		
Department of Transportation		
Title 75 Fines	$	732,014
Motor Carrier Road Tax Fines		725
Commercial Driver Fines		1,200
Littering Law Fines		475
Child Restraint Fines		1,340
Department of Revenue Court Costs		334,646
Crime Victims' Compensation Bureau Costs		16,759
Crime Commission Costs/Victim Witness Services Costs		11,972
Domestic Violence Costs		4,498
Emergency Medical Service Fines		209,555
CAT/MCARE Fund Surcharges		657,198
Judicial Computer System Fees		178,722
Access to Justice Fees		45,527
Criminal Justice Enhancement Account Fees		1,952
Judicial Computer Project Surcharges		8,902
Constable Service Surcharges		10,144
Miscellaneous State Fines and Costs		6,046
Total receipts (Note 2)		2,221,675
Disbursements to Commonwealth (Note 3)		(2,221,675)
Balance due Commonwealth (District Court) per settled reports (Note 4)		-
Examination adjustments		-
Adjusted balance due Commonwealth (District Court) for the period January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2012	$	-

Notes to the Statement of Receipts and Disbursements are an integral part of this report.

DISTRICT COURT 38-1-08
MONTGOMERY COUNTY
NOTES TO THE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2009 TO DECEMBER 31, 2012

1. Criteria

The Statement of Receipts and Disbursements provides a summary of receipts and disbursements by category. The categories and the amounts of fines, costs, fees, and surcharges assessed are based on Pennsylvania laws and regulations.

The Statement was prepared in accordance with reporting requirements prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue. Under this method, only the Commonwealth portion of cash receipts and disbursements are presented, revenues are recognized when received, and expenditures are recognized when paid.

2. Receipts

Receipts are comprised of fines, costs, fees, and surcharges collected on behalf of the Commonwealth. These fines, costs, fees, and surcharges represent collections made on traffic, non-traffic, civil, and criminal cases filed with the District Court.

3. Disbursements

Total disbursements are comprised as follows:

District Court checks issued to:

Department of Revenue	$ 2,221,675

4. Balance Due Commonwealth (District Court) For The Period January 1, 2009 To December 31, 2012

This balance reflects the summary of monthly transmittal reports as settled by the Department of Revenue.

5. Magisterial District Judges Serving During Examination Period

William R. Householder served at District Court 38-1-08 for the period January 1, 2009 to August 2, 2011.

Various Senior Magisterial District Judges served at District Court 38-1-08 for the period August 3, 2011 to December 31, 2011.

Senior Judge John Murray served at District Court 38-1-08 for the period January 1, 2012 to September 21, 2012.

Katherine E. McGill Magid served at District Court 38-1-08 for the period September 22, 2012 to December 31, 2012.

Finding - Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures

Warrants are used to enforce the collection of monies on traffic and non-traffic cases in which defendants failed to make payments when required. A Warrant of Arrest (AOPC 417) is used to authorize an official to arrest a defendant, to collect fines and costs from the defendant after a disposition, or to collect collateral for a trial. If the defendant does not respond within ten days to a citation or summons, a Warrant of Arrest may be issued.

During our testing of warrant procedures, we noted that warrant procedures established by the *Magisterial District Judge Automated Office Clerical Procedures Manual* (Manual) were not always followed. The Magisterial District Judge did not consistently issue warrants when required. We tested 37 instances in which a warrant was required to be issued. Our testing disclosed that 7 were not issued timely and 14 were not issued at all. The time of issuance ranged from 62 days to 867 days.

In addition, of 23 warrants required to be returned or recalled, 5 were not returned or recalled, and 6 were not returned timely. The time of issuance to the time of return ranged from 225 days to 394 days.

The Manual establishes the uniform written internal control policies and procedures for all district courts.

Warrant Issuance Procedures: The Manual states that on October 1, 1998, new warrant procedures took effect for summary cases. Amendments were made to Pa.R.Crim.P. Rules 430, 431, 454, 455, 456, 460, 461, and 462. To comply with the new changes, the Notice of Impending Warrant (AOPC A418) was created with the purpose of informing the defendant that failure to pay the amount due or to appear for a Payment Determination Hearing will result in the issuance of an arrest warrant. The defendant is also informed that his/her response must be made within ten days of the date of the notice.

According to Pa.R.Crim.P. Rule 430, a Notice of Impending Warrant may be issued in a post-disposition summary case for any of the following reasons:

- A guilty disposition is recorded and no payment is made or a time payment schedule is not created.

- A guilty disposition is recorded and a previously deposited collateral payment, when applied, does not pay the case balance in full.

- A guilty disposition is recorded and the defendant defaults on a time payment schedule.

Finding - Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures (Continued)

According to Pa.R.Crim.P. 430, a warrant SHALL be issued in a summary case for any of the following reasons (a Notice of Impending Warrant is not necessary for the following):

- The defendant has failed to respond to a citation or summons that was served either personally or by certified mail, return receipt requested.
- The citation or summons is returned undeliverable.
- The Magisterial District Judge has reasonable grounds to believe that the defendant will not obey a summons.

Warrant Return Procedures: The Manual states that the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC) recommends that those in possession of arrest warrants should be notified to return warrants that have not been served. For summary traffic and non-traffic cases, outstanding warrants should be returned to the Magisterial District Judge's office within 60 days of issuance. Returned warrants can either be recorded in the Magisterial District Judge System (MDJS) as unserved, if the defendant is unable to be located; or they can be recalled for reissue, if the server has not exhausted all means of finding the defendant.

The failure to follow warrant procedures could result in uncollected fines and unpunished offenders. Additionally, the risk is increased for funds to be lost or misappropriated.

Adherence to the uniform internal control policies and procedures, as set forth in the Manual, would have ensured that there were adequate internal controls over warrants.

Recommendations

We recommend that the district court review the tickler reports for warrants daily and take appropriate action as required by the Manual. We further recommend that the court review warrant control reports and notify police or other officials to return warrants that are unserved for 60 days for summary traffic and non-traffic cases as required by the Manual.

Finding - Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures (Continued)

Management's Response

The Magisterial District Judge responded as follows:

> After we were made aware of the issue with the timely distribution of warrants and returns, we implemented procedures to ensure that all warrants will be issued expeditiously by court staff. Further, we have spoken with our constable to review the warrant return procedure and are confident that all warrant returns will now be delivered to the court in a timely manner.

Auditor's Conclusion

During our next examination, we will determine if the office complied with our recommendations.

DISTRICT COURT 38-1-08
MONTGOMERY COUNTY
REPORT DISTRIBUTION
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2009 TO DECEMBER 31, 2012

This report was initially distributed to:

The Honorable Daniel P. Meuser
Secretary
Pennsylvania Department of Revenue

The Honorable Zygmont Pines
Court Administrator of Pennsylvania
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts

The Honorable Katherine E. McGill Magid	Magisterial District Judge
The Honorable Josh Shapiro	Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners
The Honorable Stewart J. Greenleaf, Jr.	Controller
Michael R. Kehs, Esquire	Court Administrator

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at http://www.auditorgen.state.pa.us. Media questions about the report can be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 231 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120; via email to: news@auditorgen.state.pa.us.