



PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
EXAMINATION REPORT
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE - AUDITOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE 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 the Prothonotary, Northampton County, Pennsylvania (County Officer), for the period January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2011, pursuant to the requirements of Sections 401(b) and 401(d) of *The Fiscal Code*, 72 P.S. § 401(b) and § 401(d). This Statement is the responsibility of the county office's management. 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. An examination includes 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 Sections 401(b) and 401(d) of *The Fiscal Code* to audit the accounts of each county officer 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 Sections 401(b) and 401(d) of *The Fiscal Code*.

Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

In our opinion, the Statement referred to above presents, in all material respects, the operations of the County Officer as it pertains to receipts made on behalf of the Commonwealth for the period January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2011, in conformity with the criteria set forth in Note 1.

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we are required to report findings of significant deficiencies in internal control, violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements, and abuse that are material to the Statement and any fraud and illegal acts that are more than inconsequential that come to our attention during our examination. We are also required to obtain the views of management on those matters. 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 the internal control over reporting on the Statement or on compliance and other matters; accordingly, we express no such opinions.

A control deficiency 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 misstatements on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the County Officer's ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report data reliably in accordance with the applicable criteria such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the County Officer's Statement that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the County Officer's internal control. We consider the deficiencies described in the findings below to be significant deficiencies in internal control over reporting on the Statement:

- Inadequate Internal Controls Over Receipts.
- Bank Deposit Slips Were Not Validated.

A material weakness is a significant deficiency or combination of significant deficiencies that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the Statement will not be prevented or detected by the County Officer's internal control. Our consideration of the internal control over reporting on the Statement would not necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control that might be significant deficiencies and, accordingly, would not necessarily disclose all significant deficiencies that are also considered to be material weaknesses. We consider all the significant deficiencies described above to be material weaknesses.

The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*

Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eugene A. DePasquale", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

December 4, 2013

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE
Auditor General

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Financial Section:	
Statement Of Receipts And Disbursements.....	1
Notes To The Statement Of Receipts And Disbursements.....	2
Findings and Recommendations:	
Finding No. 1 - Inadequate Internal Controls Over Receipts	4
Finding No. 2 - Bank Deposit Slips Were Not Validated.....	6
Report Distribution	7

PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

Receipts:

Writ Taxes	\$	23,764
Divorce Complaint Surcharges		43,670
Judicial Computer System/Access To Justice Fees		597,892
Protection From Abuse Surcharges and Contempt Fines		44,104
Criminal Charge Information System Fees		<u>15,066</u>
Total Receipts (Note 2)		724,496
Commissions (Note 3)		<u>(713)</u>
Net Receipts		723,783
Disbursements to Commonwealth (Note 4)		<u>(723,783)</u>
Balance due Commonwealth (County) per settled reports (Note 5)		-
Examination adjustments		<u>-</u>
Adjusted balance due Commonwealth (County) for the period January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2011	\$	<u><u>-</u></u>

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

PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
NOTES TO THE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

1. Criteria

The Statement of Receipts and Disbursements provides a summary of receipts and disbursements by category. The categories and the amounts of taxes, surcharges, fines, and fees 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 consist of monies collected on behalf of the Department of Revenue and the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts. These include monies collected for the following taxes, surcharges, fees, and fines:

- Writ Taxes represent a \$.50 or \$.25 tax imposed on taxable instruments filed with the Prothonotary.
- Divorce Complaint Surcharges represent a \$10 surcharge imposed on all divorce decrees.
- Judicial Computer System/Access To Justice Fees represent a \$10 fee imposed for the filing of any legal paper to initiate a civil action or proceeding. These fees were increased to \$23.50 for the period December 8, 2009 to December 31, 2014.
- Protection From Abuse Surcharges represent a \$25 surcharge imposed against defendants when a protection order is granted as a result of a hearing. Effective May 9, 2006, the surcharge was increased to \$100. Protection From Abuse Contempt Fines represent fines of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000 imposed against a defendant who is found to be in violation of a protection from abuse order. Effective May 9, 2006, the fine was increased to a minimum of \$300 and maximum of \$1,000.

PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
NOTES TO THE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

2. Receipts (Continued)

- Criminal Charge Information System Fees represent a fee imposed on all custody cases. Of the fee imposed, 80% is payable to the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC) and 20% is payable to the County in which the action took place. The fee was \$6.50 for the period January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2007, \$7.00 for the period January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2010, and \$7.50 for the period January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2013. The statement of receipts and disbursements only reflects the portion collected on behalf of the AOPC.

3. Commissions

Acting in the capacity of an agent for the Commonwealth, the Prothonotary is authorized to collect a commission of 3 percent on the Commonwealth portion of Writ Taxes. Accordingly, commissions owed the county are not included in the balance due the Commonwealth.

4. Disbursements

Total disbursements are comprised as follows:

Prothonotary checks issued to:	
Department of Revenue	\$ 708,717
Adminstrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts	15,066
Total	\$ 723,783

5. Balance Due Commonwealth (County) For The Period January 1, 2007 To December 31, 2011

This balance reflects a summary of monthly transmittal reports as settled by the Department of Revenue. The balance also reflects a summary of receipts disbursed directly to the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts.

6. County Officer Serving During Examination Period

Holly Ruggiero served as Prothonotary during the period January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2011.

PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

Finding No. 1 - Inadequate Internal Controls Over Receipts

Our examination of the accounting records for the office disclosed that the office gives cash change for services paid by checks.

The office contracted with a computer software vendor for a computer software program for receipts. Our examination disclosed the following deficiencies in the internal control over receipts generated by the office's computer software program:

- The office's computer software program would only use a limited range of receipt numbers between 1000 to 3000. The computer software would start generating receipts at number 1000. Once the software issued receipt number 3000, the software would then revert back to receipt number 1000 again.
- The computer software program could not assign certain receipt numbers. The system would generate an error message and use the next available receipt number.
- The computer software program could not reprint individual receipt numbers in order to verify missing paper receipt issues.
- The computer program could not generate daily receipt reports to account for every receipt issued for that day.
- The computer system vendor only retains 13 months of receipt data.

It should be noted that the testing of receipts indicated that the total amount receipted equaled the total amount deposited.

A good system of internal controls ensures that:

- cash change should not be given for transactions paid for by check(s). If the amount collected exceeds the amount due, a refund check should be disbursed to the remitter.
- the range of numbers used for receipts is not limited to a certain range.
- the computer software program cannot skip over receipt numbers and all receipts should be issued in numerical sequence.

PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

Finding No. 1 - Inadequate Internal Controls Over Receipts (continued)

- the office can account for every receipt number within the range issued for a given business day.
- all receipts are properly accounted for and maintained. All receipt records should be retained until audited by the Auditor General's Department.

Without a good system of internal controls over receipts by the office, the possibility of funds being lost or misappropriated increases significantly.

These conditions existed because the office failed to establish adequate internal controls over its receipts.

Recommendation

We recommend that the office establish and implement an adequate system of internal controls over receipts as noted above.

Management's Response

The County Officer responded as follows:

There have been several flaws with the cashiering software which causes receipt numbers to be skipped. The Prothonotary's Office does have adequate segregation of duties and proper internal controls, however, the office agrees with the findings of the audit. Due to the number of issues with the software and the inability of the vendor to make the necessary modifications, the Prothonotary's Office has begun searching for a new vendor.

Auditor's Conclusion

We will determine if the office complied with our recommendation during our next examination.

PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

Finding No. 2 - Bank Deposit Slips Were Not Validated

Our examination of the Prothonotary's accounting records disclosed that the office copy of the bank deposit slip was not validated by the bank in all 61 deposits tested. The office received a validated receipt from the bank, but this only confirmed the total amount deposited and not the actual make up of the deposit (i.e. cash and check mix).

Good internal accounting controls require that the amount of each check and the total amount of cash deposited are identified on the deposit slip. The office copy of each deposit should be brought to the bank to be validated. If the bank cannot validate the deposit slip, the office should obtain a deposit ticket from the bank that validates total cash and the total deposit. After the office receives the validation from the bank, it should be reconciled to the receipts by someone other than the person preparing or making the deposit.

Without a good system of internal control over funds received by the office, the possibility of funds being lost or misappropriated increases significantly.

The office was not aware of the potential internal control weaknesses caused by not having a validated deposit slip or deposit ticket from the bank. The policy of the bank is only to verbally notify depositors of cash and check mix discrepancies.

Recommendation

We recommend that the office obtain a validation form from the bank as to the mix of cash and checks deposited. We further recommend that the validation is reconciled to receipts by someone other than the person preparing or making the deposit.

Management's Response

The County Officer responded as follows:

The bank's procedure is to return a single line receipt with a total deposit. To correct this issue, the Prothonotary's Office now uses triplicate deposit slips showing the breakdown of cash and checks which the bank is required to acknowledge and return.

Auditor's Conclusion

We will determine if the office complied with our recommendation during our next examination.

PROTHONOTARY
NORTHAMPTON COUNTY
REPORT DISTRIBUTION
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2007 TO DECEMBER 31, 2011

This report was initially distributed to:

The Honorable Daniel P. Meuser
Secretary
Pennsylvania Department of Revenue

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

The Honorable Holly Ruggiero	Prothonotary
The Honorable Stephen Barron	Controller
The Honorable Margaret Ferraro	President of the County Council

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.