

## EDisposition System Profile - Colorado

System Name: Colorado Electronic Disposition System

Owners: Colorado Bureau of Investigation, Colorado State  
Judicial, Colorado District Attorney, Colorado Integrated  
Criminal Justice Information System

Contact Information: Ted DeRosa, CBI 303-239-4299

Stacey Kirk, SCAO 720-625-5621

Craig Evans, CDAC 303-830-9115

Christopher Wallner, CICJIS 720-544-2220

### Description:

Colorado's Electronic Disposition System uses a middleware architecture to link the state courts' ICON (Integrated Colorado On-line Network) case management system with the Colorado Department of Public Safety's (DPS) Computerized Criminal History system (CCH), and the Colorado District Attorneys Council (CDAC) Action case management system. ICON is a statewide case management system used by all of the state's general jurisdiction courts (District) and limited jurisdiction courts (County). The ICON system is currently being replaced by a new case management system called Judicial Paper on Demand (JPOD), which will continue to provide this functionality. The criminal history system is managed by the Colorado Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and hosted in the Colorado Crime Information Center (CCIC). CCIC is a statewide law enforcement records system that is modeled after the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and is used by all law enforcement agencies to access a variety of records including criminal histories, stolen vehicles and other property, as well as warrants. Both ICON and CCIC are legacy mainframe-style centralized databases.

The three agency systems are linked together through the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (CICJIS), which is a middleware integration and messaging solution. Disposition reporting primarily involves sending data from the courts to CCIC with the exception of no-file reporting by the DA as noted below. CICJIS is responsible for performing all communications between ICON, CCH and Action, and also keeps track of the status of each court case and criminal history record using a state identification number (SID) relationship. This approach retains the traditional relationship between the authoritative source systems where each system is responsible for separate business operations related to the disposition process.

It should be noted the standard for disposition matching in Colorado is when a court case is matched to an arrest. This is due to the fact that there are often many more criminal history records for a given individual in the CCH because individuals are often booked multiple times for the same offense. It is not uncommon for the offender to be booked (fingerprinted) by the arresting agency and booked again by the jail as part of their intake process. Additional records may exist in the CCH when the offender is remanded to custody, transferred to the Department of Corrections based on a mittimus, or when an

offender is picked up on a warrant in one jurisdiction, then transported to the wanting jurisdiction.. These are not true arrests for new charges and therefore would never have a disposition. The state's Board of Working Advisors is addressing the problem of multiple bookings. These extraneous booking records are detrimental to the defendant in states where the criminal history is a public record in addition to being an issue for disposition matching. A solution we are looking at is implementing an offense code that could be submitted with the print that would indicate it is an incarceration booking only, not new charges or a warrant arrest. This code would keep the cycle from displaying to the public and could be used to query for reporting numbers to identify these entries as duplicate (PD/SO entries for same offense) or incarceration only entries.

## **Business Process:**

Colorado's electronic disposition process begins with either a person being arrested and fingerprinted or being summoned to court.

In the case of an arrest, once the fingerprint is processed through AFIS and the arrest/booking applied to the criminal history (CCH), the data portions of the fingerprint submission, including the SID# (state identification number) and PCN# (process control number) are electronically transferred to the ICON system's electronic case filing screen (ECF). It is routed to the correct court location according to the ORI of the arresting agency. The court then accepts the arrest filing to start the case. This process ensures that when charges are filed by the DA, the court case is already attached to the correct arrest cycle, so charges, disposition and sentence information will automatically connect as they are entered in ICON.

Upon completion of the case being created from arrest, it is then transferred through CICJIS to the Colorado District Attorney's Action case management system. The DA staff picks up the case on their electronic case filing screen and files formal charges. Those charges are then transferred back to the ICON system where they are automatically entered into the court case with no manual intervention. A trigger in the court program automatically sends the charges to the criminal history and they are applied to the court section of the arrest cycle.

When the case is started from a summons, either the district attorney staff or the court staff can start the case. In either situation as soon as the case is created it is transferred to the other system to be picked up from the ECF screen. As soon as the DA filed charges are in the ICON case, the charges are transferred to the CCIC system. In this scenario since there is no arrest, the charges go into a temporary file in the CCIC system until a booking is received to attach the filed charges. At first appearance the defendant is given an order to be fingerprinted. As soon as the defendant has been printed, the print is processed through AFIS just like an arrest and it is placed on the criminal history. The court docket# is included on the order to print and law enforcement includes the docket# with the rest of the fingerprint information and that piece of information is used to pull the court charges from the temporary file referenced above, to place them on the cycle with the booking. As soon as a disposition is entered, it attaches to the court charge and then when a sentence is entered it also attaches to the charge and disposition.

If a case is "no-filed" prior to the court ever being involved, the DA's Action system sends a no-file to the arrest cycle on the criminal history. It is the only time the DA sends a disposition; all other dispositions are done by the court.

A monthly report is run between the ICON database and the CCIC database to arrive at the disposition match rate for the month. Those numbers are posted on internal sites for users to view their match rate, and a detailed report is available for the users to look at the cases that are unmatched and work on getting them matched. This may mean prints were not submitted correctly, were rejected, the court did not order prints, or the court failed to create their case from an arrest filing when it was available. This report by county is color coded with green being above 90% match rate with yellow and red showing descending rates. It is a very visual representation of where every location in the state stands, and no one wants to be in the red!

Colorado is consistently at a statewide disposition match rate above 95% using the standard disposition measure described previously. This has reduced workload in multiple situations, plea bargains, pre-sentence investigations, gun checks, and the court having to provide certified copies of a disposition to a defendant to hand carry to the central repository for entry, just to name a few.

### Issues to identify and resolve:

Rejected prints that the agency is not monitoring for, fixing and re-submitting, therefore there is no arrest to match the case to.

The charge/statute table must be in sync between the court, the DA and the central repository. Ideally the statute table would include the law number, law description, charge class and NCIC code. This ensures everyone is working with the same set of information. Problem: keeping livescan machines up to date with repealed and newly created statutes.

When a warrant arrest is made on the wrong individual, many times the agency never removes that arrest from the criminal history. Once it is picked up and becomes connected to a court case, etc, it is difficult to untangle. Possible solution: ID the person prior to submitting prints. While this is difficult in a crowded jail situation, it can be the difference between a lawsuit being filed for wrongful incarceration or at minimum the prints being submitted and then having to go through a paper trail process to remove them once they are applied to the criminal history.

Multiple bookings as discussed above, and the effect on the defendant, as well as disposition rates.

