# ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENT

# Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas/Prothonotary Indiana County, Pennsylvania For the Period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017

March 2019



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 www.PaAuditor.gov

EUGENE A. DEPASQUALE AUDITOR GENERAL

## Independent Auditor's Report

The Honorable C. Daniel Hassell Secretary Pennsylvania Department of Revenue Harrisburg, PA 17128

We have examined the accompanying statements of receipts and disbursements (Statements) of the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas/Prothonotary, Indiana County, Pennsylvania (County Officer), for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017, pursuant to the requirements of Sections 401(b) and 401(d) of *The Fiscal Code*, 72 P.S. § 401(b) and § 401(d). The County Office's management is responsible for presenting these statements in accordance with the criteria set forth in Note 1. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these Statements 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. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Statements are presented in accordance with the criteria described above, in all material respects. An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about the statements of receipts and disbursements. The nature, timing and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgement, including an assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the Statements, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide 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 Statements referred to above, for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017, are presented in accordance with the criteria set forth in Note 1, in all material respects.

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 Statements; 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 Statements. 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 Statements are presented in accordance with the criteria described above and not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on internal control over reporting on the Statements 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 Statements 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 such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the Statements 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 Statements was for the limited purpose of expressing an opinion on whether the Statements are presented in accordance with the criteria described above and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over reporting on the Statements that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. 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.

#### Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Statements are free from material misstatement, we performed tests of the County Office'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*. However, we did note another matter that, while not required to be included in this report by *Government Auditing Standards*, has been included in the finding below:

• Inadequate Assessment Of Criminal Charge Information System Fees - Prothonotary.

The purpose of this report is to determine whether all moneys collected on behalf of the Commonwealth have been correctly assessed, reported and promptly remitted. This report is not suitable for any other purposes.

We appreciate the courtesy extended by the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas/Prothonotary, Indiana 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.

February 22, 2019

Eugn f. O-Paspur

Eugene A. DePasquale Auditor General

## CONTENTS

Financial Section:
Statements Of Receipts And Disbursements:
Clerk Of The Court Of Common Pleas1
Prothonotary2
Notes To The Statements Of Receipts And Disbursements
Finding And Recommendation:
Finding - Inadequate Assessment Of Criminal Charge Information System Fees - Prothonotary
Report Distribution

# Page

Receipts:

Department of Transportation	
Title 75 Fines	\$ 206,806
Overweight Fines	2,405
Department of Revenue Court Costs	78,642
Crime Victims' Compensation Costs	163,143
Crime Commission Costs/Victim Witness Services Costs	114,218
Domestic Violence Costs	16,047
Emergency Medical Services Fines	13,758
DUI - ARD/EMS Fees	17,138
CAT/MCARE Fund Surcharges	49,462
Judicial Computer System/Access to Justice Fees	91,227
Offender Supervision Fees	478,836
Constable Service Surcharges	256
Criminal Laboratory Users' Fees	198,304
Probation and Parole Officers' Firearm Education Costs	14,441
Substance Abuse Education Costs	106,605
Office of Victims' Services Costs	16,091
Miscellaneous State Fines and Costs	 287,435
Total receipts (Note 2)	1,854,814
Disbursements to Commonwealth (Note 4)	 (1,854,814)
Balance due Commonwealth (County) per settled reports (Note 5)	-
Examination adjustments	 
Adjusted balance due Commonwealth (County) for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017	\$ 

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

## PROTHONOTARY INDIANA COUNTY STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Receipts:

Writ Taxes	\$ 2,205
Divorce Complaint Surcharges	8,235
Judicial Computer System/Access To Justice Fees	186,266
Protection From Abuse Surcharges and Contempt Fines	1,175
Criminal Charge Information System Fees	 3,355
Total Receipts (Note 2)	201,236
Commissions (Note 3)	 (66)
Net Receipts	201,170
Disbursements to Commonwealth (Note 4)	 (201,170)
Balance due Commonwealth (County) per settled reports (Note 5)	-
Examination adjustments	 
Adjusted balance due Commonwealth (County) for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017	\$ 

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

#### 1. <u>Criteria</u>

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

The Statements were 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. <u>Receipts</u>

### Clerk Of The Court Of Common Pleas

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 summary and criminal cases filed with the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas' Office.

#### Prothonotary

Receipts are comprised of taxes, surcharges, fees, and fines 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 \$23.50 fee imposed for the filing of any legal paper to initiate a civil action or proceeding. Effective July 10, 2014, Act 126 increased the fee to \$33.50. Effective August 8, 2014, Act 113 increased the fee to \$35.50. Effective October 30, 2017, Acts 40 and 44 increased the fee to \$40.25.

#### 2. <u>Receipts (Continued)</u>

#### Prothonotary (Continued)

- Protection From Abuse Surcharges represent a \$100 surcharge imposed against defendants when a protection order is granted as a result of a hearing. Protection From Abuse Contempt Fines represent fines of not less than \$300 nor more than \$1,000 imposed against a defendant who is found to be in violation of a protection from abuse order.
- 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 \$7.50 for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014. The fee was increased to \$8.00 for the period January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2017. The statement of receipts and disbursements only reflects the portion collected on behalf of the AOPC.

#### 3. <u>Commissions</u>

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. <u>Disbursements</u>

## Clerk Of The Court Of Common Pleas

Total disbursements are comprised as follows:

Clerk of the Court checks issued to:

Department of Revenue	\$ 1,847,615
Game Commission	2,400
Office of Attorney General	1,775
State Police	697
Department of Corrections	55
Department of Transportation	2,272
Total	\$ 1,854,814
Prothonotary	
Total disbursements are comprised as follows:	
Prothonotary checks issued to:	
Department of Revenue	\$ 197,815
Adminstrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts	 3,355
Total	\$ 201,170

#### 5. <u>Balance Due Commonwealth (County) For The Period January 1, 2014 To</u> December 31, 2017

#### Clerk Of The Court Of Common Pleas

This balance reflects a summary of monthly transmittal reports as settled by the Department of Revenue. The balance also reflects a summary of any receipts disbursed directly to other state agencies.

#### Prothonotary

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

#### 6. <u>County Officer Serving During Examination Period</u>

Randy Degenkolb served as the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas/Prothonotary for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017.

## CLERK OF THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS/ PROTHONOTARY INDIANA COUNTY FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

## <u>Finding - Inadequate Assessment Of Criminal Charge Information System Fees -</u> <u>Prothonotary</u>

Our examination disclosed that the office did not assess Criminal Charge Information System Fees as mandated by law. Our testing revealed that none of the Divorce filings that included Custody as an additional count, filed from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2017, were properly assessed the Criminal Charge Information System Fee.

Act 119, 42 Pa. C.S. 1725 (a) (1) imposes Criminal Charge Information System Fees on all civil actions involving custody.

The improper assessing of these fees resulted in 101 cases where the payee was not assessed the proper amount of fees associated with the custody filing; and a loss of revenue to the Commonwealth totaling \$646.40.

This condition existed because the office's case management software vendor updated the system in January 2016 and it was not properly evaluated by the office to ensure that all fees on divorce complaint filings were being assessed correctly.

#### Recommendation

We recommend that the office review the laws noted above to ensure that Criminal Charge Information System Fees are assessed as mandated by law.

#### Management's Response

The County Officer responded as follows:

In regards to the finding, please know that a fee increase was instituted in January of 2016 which affected both the Clerk of Courts and Prothonotary divisions. To implement a fee increase requires that the software vendor (of the case management system for the Prothonotary division) correctly adjust the ledger module of the software such that the "new" allocations are correct. The software vendor is [company name removed] and the name of the case management system is [system name removed]. We have utilized this system since 2013.

The allocations to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania regarding the Act 119 funds (commonly referred to as the "Jen & Dave" Fee) was incorrectly allocated from January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017. Please know that when the State Auditor brought this to our attention we immediately contacted the software vendor to correct the allocations going forward. This has now been corrected.

## CLERK OF THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS/ PROTHONOTARY INDIANA COUNTY FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

## <u>Finding - Inadequate Assessment Of Criminal Charge Information System Fees -</u> <u>Prothonotary (Continued)</u>

## Auditor's Conclusion

We appreciate the corrective action taken to resolve this deficiency. During our next examination, we will determine if the office complied with our recommendation.

CLERK OF THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS/ PROTHONOTARY INDIANA COUNTY REPORT DISTRIBUTION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

This report was initially distributed to:

#### The Honorable C. Daniel Hassell

Secretary Pennsylvania Department of Revenue

#### The Honorable Thomas B. Darr

Court Administrator of Pennsylvania Supreme Court of Pennsylvania Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts

### Mr. Thomas J. Dougherty Director Division of Grants and Standards Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole

## The Honorable Randy Degenkolb Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas/Prothonotary

# The Honorable Michael A. Baker

Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at <u>www.PaAuditor.gov.</u> Media questions about the report can be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of the Auditor General, Office of Communications, 229 Finance Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120; via email to: <u>news@PaAuditor.gov</u>.