**TRAC's Report Claiming "Surprising Judge-to-Judge Variation" Fails to Compare Similar Cases, Relies on Poor Quality Data, Uses an Unreliable Method of Identifying Case Type, Uses Incorrect Methods of Reporting Sentence Length, and Contains Numerous Errors.[1]**

On March 5, 2012, the Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC) issued a report entitled "Surprising Judge-to-Judge Variations Documented in Federal Sentencing,"[2] along with a press release claiming that it had discovered "extensive and hard-to-explain variations in the sentencing practices of district court judges."[3] The media interpreted this to mean that federal judges were handing down "widely disparate sentences for similar crimes."[4]

TRAC bases its claim of "wide differences" in sentencing on a crude measure of "judge-to-judge differences." It subtracts the lowest from the highest median sentence among all judges in a district who sentenced at least 40 defendants (to compare sentences within districts) or 50 defendants (to compare sentences across districts) in what it categorizes as "similar" drug or white collar cases in FY2007-2011. It then ranks the districts from highest to lowest difference, and proclaims that this demonstrates "extensive and hard-to-explain variations" between judges in the same districts and across judicial districts.

We previously released a Fact Sheet on TRAC, outlining ways in which TRAC's analysis fails to meet minimal academic standards and should not be a basis for policymaking.[5] Here, our limited analysis reveals that TRAC's assumptions regarding cases and caseloads among judges in the same district are flawed. Further, TRAC uses poor quality data on sentences imposed, an unreliable method of identifying case type, and incorrect methods of reporting sentence lengths. A spot check comparing TRAC data against actual cases reveals serious errors, inconsistencies, and impossibilities in TRAC's reported data.

---

[1] This report was prepared by Amy Baron-Evans, Jennifer Coffin, and Paul J. Hofer of the Sentencing Resource Counsel Project, Federal Public and Community Defenders. For more information, contact Michael Nachmanoff, Federal Public Defender, 703-600-0800.

[2] TRAC, "Surprising Judge-to-Judge Variations Documented in Federal Sentencing" (Mar. 5, 2012), http://trac.syr.edu/tracreports/judge/274/ [hereinafter Surprising TRAC Report].

[3] TRAC, What's New, http://trac.syr.edu/whatsnew/email.120305.html.

[4] *See, e.g.*, *Federal Sentences Still Vary Widely*, Associated Press, Mar. 4, 2012; Mosi Secret, *Wide Sentencing Disparity Found Among U.S. Judges*, The New York Times, Mar. 5, 2012; Chris Sweeney, *Florida Federal Judges Inconsistent on Drug Sentences*, Broward-Palm Beach New Times, Mar 9, 2012; available at http://blogs.browardpalmbeach.com/pulp/2012/03/federal_sentencing_disparities_in_florida.php.

[5] Fact Sheet: TRAC Analysis of Variations in Sentencing Misses the Mark, http://www.fd.org/pdf_lib/Fact%20Sheet%20on%20TRAC%203.7.12.pdf.

**TRAC did not compare median sentences for *similar* white collar or drug cases.**

Instead of comparing median sentences for similar or "matched" white collar or drug cases, TRAC compared median sentences among all judges in a district for all cases categorized by prosecutors as "white collar" or "drug" cases. As a result, TRAC compared cases involving billions of dollars in securities fraud with cases involving food stamp fraud. It compared sentences in all drug cases, whether they involved heroin or marijuana, 1 gram or 1 ton, a mandatory minimum or no mandatory minimum, a first offender or a career offender.

TRAC assumed that the judges compared in the same district have roughly similar *caseloads* and thus sentence a similar mix of cases. But this is often untrue. Many districts have different divisions in different cities with very different caseloads. Academic researchers attempt to avoid drawing inaccurate conclusions that judges sentence similar cases differently by using publicly available data to categorize cases along many different variables, statistically controlling for differences among cases.[6] Or they compare only judges in the same courthouse who are part of the same random case assignment pool. This helps to compensate for individual case differences in the long run, but does not necessarily eliminate it. Even random assignment of cases to judges does not ensure similar options for judges if prosecutors make different charging and plea bargaining decisions depending on the judge assigned to the case.

Indeed, many of the factors that drive sentences in drug cases are not under the control of judges and most are under the control of prosecutors. Sentences in drug cases depend on (1) the applicable mandatory minimum (if any) for the type and quantity of drugs the prosecutor agrees to or proves; (2) whether the prosecutor files a motion for departure below the mandatory minimum based on substantial assistance; and (3) the defendant's criminal history (a fact neither the judge nor the prosecutor controls), which in turn determines whether the prosecutor can charge an even higher mandatory minimum under 21 U.S.C. § 851 (which prosecutors can choose to use as a bargaining chip to induce a plea on their terms or to punish defendants who decline to cooperate or who go to trial), whether the defendant is eligible for "safety valve" relief from a mandatory minimum, and whether the defendant is subject to the severe "career offender" guideline. These factors can vary markedly by the cases a judge draws, by the prosecutor, and by divisions within a district, but TRAC takes no account of these differences.

A few examples illustrate the problem with TRAC's superficial approach.[7]

---

[6] The Commission's annual datafiles of all convicted defendants sentenced in federal court are available through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social and Political Research (ICPSR). *See http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/*. The Federal Justice Statistics Resource Center (FJSRC) contains data from the Commission, the Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, as well as more extensive data from the EOUSA than TRAC used. *See* http://fjsrc.urban.org/index.cfm. These data are also available for online analysis at http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/fjsrc/. These datasets are missing many relevant sentencing variables, but are far more detailed than the data TRAC used.

[7] TRAC's report covers the period 2007-2011. *See* Surprising TRAC Report, *supra* note 2. We were unable to examine the period 2007-2011 because TRAC's "contrast" tables of judges by district go only through 2010. We therefore examined some districts for the period 2006-2010.

Eastern District of Virginia. TRAC rates the Eastern District of Virginia as having the second greatest difference between high and low median sentences in drug cases.[8] TRAC shows the lowest median sentence for drug cases in the district as 52 months (for a judge who sentenced only 41 defendants) and the highest as 121 months, a difference of 69 months between the lowest and highest judge in the district for the period 2006-2010.[9] The Eastern District of Virginia, however, has three divisions in different cities with very different caseloads. Using the Commission's monitoring dataset (which TRAC does not use), we determined that Alexandria has twice as many first offenders as Norfolk or Richmond, a fraction of offenders in the three highest criminal history categories, a fraction of defendants classified as career offenders, and three times the defendants who received a safety valve reduction. Further, Norfolk has the most cases with a 10-year mandatory minimum and the fewest with no mandatory minimum. Looking at TRAC's data for these three different divisions separately produces a very different picture than TRAC presents. The medians for Alexandria range from 52 to 87 months, a difference of 35 months; the medians for Norfolk range from 84 to 121 months, a difference of 35 months; and the medians for Richmond range from 84 to 115 months, a difference of 31 months.

Western District of Texas. The Western District of Texas is also on TRAC's list of top ten districts with the greatest differences between high and low sentences in drug cases. TRAC reports the lowest median sentence for drug cases in the district as 12 months and the highest as 89 months, a difference of 67 months between the lowest and highest judge in the district for the period 2006-2010.[10] There are seven divisions in this district. The median sentence in drug cases in El Paso is 12 or 18 months for each judge, and these comprise a whopping 6,000 cases. Again using the Commission's monitoring dataset (which TRAC does not use), we determined that over 80% of the drug cases in El Paso are marijuana cases. These are smuggling cases with low guideline ranges that would be prosecuted in state court but for the fact that they are cross-border cases.[11] Further, over two-thirds of those sentenced in El Paso are first offenders, over 90% are in the three lowest criminal history categories, and over two-thirds received a safety-valve reduction.

In contrast, the one judge who sits in the Waco division has a median sentence of 84 months. Most of the cases in the Waco division involve cocaine, crack, or methamphetamine. Further, the Waco division has less than half the rate of first offenders as the El Paso division, a fraction of the rate of those receiving the safety-valve reduction, and more than three times the rate of offenders classified as career offenders. Over 40% of offenders sentenced in Waco are in the three highest criminal history categories.

---

[8] *See* Surprising TRAC Report, *supra* note 2.

[9] Sentences, Virg, E, Narcotics/Drugs (2006-2010), http://tracfed.syr.edu/index/index.php?layer=fedstaf&ds=judge.

[10] Sentences, Texas, W Narcotics/Drugs (2006-2010), http://tracfed.syr.edu/index/index.php?layer=fedstaf&ds=judge.

[11] This information was provided by Office of the Federal Defender for the Western District of Texas.

In the Austin division, the two judges have median sentences of 70 and 89 months. Over 60% of cases involve cocaine or crack. Compared to the El Paso division, the Austin division has a substantially lower rate of first offenders, less than one-third the rate of offenders receiving the safety-valve reduction, and a substantially lower rate of offenders classified as career offenders. One third of offenders in the Austin division are in the three highest criminal history categories.

In other words, the difference between the high and low medians in the Western District of Texas is a function of different kinds of cases in different divisions.

Middle District of Florida. The Middle District of Florida is also on TRAC's top ten list for drug cases. TRAC reports the lowest median sentence for drug cases in the district as 54 months and the highest as 120 months, a difference of 66 months between the lowest and highest judge in the district for the period 2006-2010.[12] There are five divisions in this district. The "lowest judge" sits in Orlando. The five "highest judges" (with median sentences of 120, 110, 110, 108, and 108 months) all sit in the Tampa division, where the government prosecutes all of the drug cases involving submersible vessels and nearly all of the drug cases involving boats.[13] These cases, as compared to drug cases generally, involve very large quantities of drugs, usually cocaine, and are subject to very high mandatory minimums and guideline ranges. In cases involving submersible vessels, if no drugs are recovered because the vessel sank (which occurs in nearly every case), the guidelines recommend a starting range of 121 to 151 months for a defendant with no criminal history. It does not take many boat cases to drive up a judge's median sentence.

For example, according to TRAC, Judge Covington had the lowest median sentence of the Tampa judges for the period 2006-2010, at 87 months. In 2006, 2007 and 2008, Judge Covington did not dispose of any boat cases, according to the lead charge reported by TRAC.[14] In those years, her median sentences were 81, 75, and 59 months. In 2009, however, she disposed of 11 boat cases (out of 32 cases) with sentences ranging from 108 to 280 months, and her median sentence shot up to 135 months. In 2010, she disposed of 24 boat cases (out of 90 cases), with sentences ranging from 109 to 210 months, and her median sentence was 108 months. Without these boat cases, Judge Covington's median sentence for 2009 and 2010 would have been 92 and 81 months.[15]

---

[12] Sentences, Fla, M Narcotics/Drugs (2006-2010), http://tracfed.syr.edu/index/index.php?layer=fedstaf&ds=judge.

[13] Information provided by the Office of the Federal Defender for the Middle District of Florida, and available upon request.

[14] We counted as "boat cases" those with the lead charge reported by TRAC as 18 U.S.C. § 2285 (Operation of submersible vessel or semi-submersible vessel without nationality), 46 U.S.C. app. § 1903 (Manufacture, distribution, or possession with intent to manufacture or distribute controlled substances on board vessels) (pre-2006), 46 U.S.C. § 70503 (Manufacture, distribution, or possession of controlled substances on vessels), and 46 U.S.C. § 70506 (Penalties for violations of 46 U.S.C. § 70503).

[15] The impact on the median sentence holds true for 2011 as well. Judge Covington disposed of 7 boat cases in 2011 (out of 23 cases), in which the sentences ranged from 108 to 240 months. In 2011, her

In contrast, Judge Bucklew disposed of boat cases during every year from 2006 to 2010, and had a median sentence for that period of 120 months. In 2007, for example, more than half of Judge Bucklew's drug cases were boat cases, and her median sentence for that year was 135 months. Without these boat cases, however, Judge Bucklew's median sentence in 2007 would have been only 87 months.

When Tampa judges are excluded, the difference between the highest and lowest judges in the Middle District of Florida drops to 43 months, now with Judge Antoon in Orlando reported as having the highest median sentence, at 97 months. But even this "difference" is misleading. In 2006 and 2007, Judge Antoon's median drug sentences were 49 months and 70 months, respectively. Beginning in 2008, Judge Antoon presided over several cases in which the government charged numerous defendants with offenses triggering a ten-year mandatory minimum. Judge Antoon sentenced 33 such defendants in just one case, and his median sentence in 2008 and 2009 shot up to 110 and 120 months. In 2010, Judge Antoon sentenced only 18 defendants, but at least 8 of them were charged with offenses triggering a ten-year mandatory minimum. As a result, his median sentence in 2010 was 120 months. As noted in our previous Fact Sheet on TRAC, "some cases assigned to one judge involve multiple defendants, all of whom may be more or less serious offenders than the typical defendant sentenced in that courthouse."[16]

When the median sentences of Judge Antoon and the judges in the Tampa division are not counted, the difference between the highest and lowest median sentences in the Middle District of Florida drops to only 33 months.

District of Nebraska. The District of Nebraska (along with several others) is ranked tenth on TRAC's top ten list of districts that share a "difference" of 60 months. TRAC reports that the "lowest" judge in the District of Nebraska, who sits in Omaha, has a median sentence of 60 months, and the "highest" judge, who sits in Lincoln, has a median sentence of 120 months. During 2006-2010, the drug prosecutions in these two divisions differed markedly. In Lincoln, where only 30% of the district's drug cases were prosecuted, the government filed post-sentencing Rule 35 motions for reduction of the sentence based on a defendant's cooperation in the large majority of cases.[17] In contrast, the government filed Rule 35 motions in only a

---

median sentence was 102.5 months. However, if boat cases are not included, her median sentence drops to 78 months. Excluding boat cases for the five-year period of 2007-2011 (the period reported by TRAC), Judge Covington's median sentence drops to 78 months.

[16] Fact Sheet: TRAC Analysis of Variations in Sentencing Misses the Mark, http://www.fd.org/pdf_lib/Fact%20Sheet%20on%20TRAC%203.7.12.pdf.

[17] Information provided by the Federal Defender for the District of Nebraska. A compilation of the incidence of Rule 35 motions filed in the two divisions for the period 2008-2010, prepared from records obtained through PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records), is available on request. The number of Rule 35 motions began to wane in 2011, but the *rate* was still significantly higher in Lincoln than in Omaha. This higher rate, combined with the fact that Lincoln judges disposed of approximately half as many drug cases, likely continued to affect the comparative median sentences of the Lincoln and Omaha judges in 2011.

fraction of the drug cases prosecuted in Omaha. The parties understand that a defendant in Lincoln who knows that he will likely receive a favorable Rule 35 ruling is more willing to enter into a cooperation plea agreement stipulating that certain guideline enhancements apply and agreeing not to request a sentence below the guidelines based on relevant factors, which the government often requires. The judge sentencing such a defendant likewise knows that the sentence will soon be reduced and is thus more likely to accept such agreements.

Because TRAC generally records the original sentence as the "sentence imposed" for the District of Nebraska, the median sentences recorded for the Lincoln division appear significantly higher than the actual sentences anticipated by the parties and later imposed by the judge at the Rule 35 proceeding. Excluding the Lincoln judges, the difference between the highest and lowest median sentence drops to only seven months. Thus, the difference between the high and low medians in the District of Nebraska is a function of the government's differing practices in the two divisions.

These few examples demonstrate that important information that might shed light on whether the judges TRAC is comparing are sentencing similar cases is entirely missing from the TRAC study.

**TRAC uses poor quality data not intended for research or policymaking, an unreliable method of identifying case type, and incorrect methods of reporting sentence lengths.**

The data TRAC used is not the source relied upon for quality sentencing data and was not intended for research or policymaking. The sources of the information TRAC reports (*e.g.*, sentence imposed, case type, judge's name) are not made clear on its website.[18] It appears, however, that the primary source is a datafile created and maintained by the Executive Office of the United States Attorneys (EOUSA). The purpose of this datafile is "to justify budget requests, allocate resources among USAOs, and produce management reports."[19] Individual prosecutors (or perhaps clerical staff) enter information about a case, including the sentence imposed, and the "program category" (such as "Weapons-Operation Triggerlock," or "Drugs-Organized Crime Task Force") which TRAC translates into "type of case."[20] It appears that TRAC obtained judges' names by searching for cases in PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records) that matched some of the case characteristics entered in the EOUSA datafile.[21]

---

[18] TRAC, Coverage of the Data, http://tracfed.syr.edu/help/fedstaf/initials/dataCoverage_judge.html.

[19] U.S. Attorneys Manual 3-16.110(A).

[20] TRAC, About the Data, http://trac.syr.edu/tracreports/judge/274/include/side_1.html.

[21] TRAC attempted to obtain docket numbers, case names, and judge names through a FOIA lawsuit against the Department of Justice, but does not appear to have obtained that information because it is exempt from FOIA. *See Long v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 450 F. Supp. 2d 42 (D.D.C. 2006).

There are many opportunities for differences of interpretation, clerical error, and other problems that affect the data at both the input level and the level at which TRAC recorded it. For example, a prosecutor may enter "Weapons-Operation Triggerlock" as the "program category" for a case involving drugs and a gun because the office receives funding or extra personnel for that program. TRAC would presumably record this as a "weapons" case. But if the sentence is driven by a mandatory minimum or guideline range for the drug offense, the case would appropriately be categorized as a drug case, and would be categorized as a drug case by other researchers.

TRAC counts sentences of life without parole as 1200 months.[22] The Commission counts life sentences as 470 months based on the life expectancy of typical offenders. Since it is unlikely if not impossible that anyone would live for 100 years in federal prison, TRAC far overstates actual sentence length, and also diverges from the way in which other researchers count life sentences. In addition, TRAC counts sentences of time served, which are actually a number of months of imprisonment, as zero months.[23] TRAC thus understates actual sentence length in cases in which the judge imposed a sentence of time served.

**A limited spot check reveals serious errors, inconsistencies and impossibilities in TRAC's reported data.**

The following chart shows TRAC's data and the data appearing in the Commission's 2010 Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics for the Eastern District of Virginia.

| **E. Dist of Virginia – 2010** | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **TRAC** | **USSC** |
| **Defendants convicted** | 1,335 | 2,075 |
| **Percent imprisoned** | 93% | 66% |
| **Median prison term** | 37 months | 37 months |
| **Average prison term** | 971 months | 72.7 months |

We discovered other errors, inconsistencies and impossibilities through limited spot checks of TRAC's data and information on PACER. For example, TRAC uses the sentence imposed *before* a Rule 35 motion in some cases (as in the District of Nebraska) and *after* a Rule 35 motion in other cases, sometimes in the same district.[24] We noticed a bank fraud case that was categorized as a drug case, and was also attributed to the wrong judge. We found a sentence of 121 months' imprisonment on PACER that TRAC reports as 121 months' probation; a sentence of 120 months' imprisonment on PACER that TRAC reports as 1200 months' imprisonment; a sentence of 438 months' imprisonment on PACER that TRAC reports as 78

[22] TRAC, About the Data, http://trac.syr.edu/tracreports/judge/274/include/side_1.html.

[23] The source for this information is set forth in the Appendix.

[24] The sources for this information are available upon request.

months' imprisonment. According to TRAC, the average prison sentence for one judge was 16,342 months.[25]

**Conclusion: The TRAC report misinforms the public.**

TRAC cautions: "A key requirement for achieving justice is that the judges in a court system have sufficient discretion to consider the totality of circumstances in deciding that a sentence in a specific case is 'just.' No set of rules, including the federal sentencing guidelines, can substitute for this necessary flexibility."[26] It states that its "goal of systematically examining sentences is not to develop a lockstep sentencing system," but "to provide both the courts and the public with accurate information so that they can examine whether justice is being achieved."[27] However, because TRAC's data and methods fail to meet minimum academic standards, it has misinformed the public.

[25] The sources for this information are set forth in the Appendix.

[26] Surprising TRAC Report, *supra* note 2.

[27] *Id*.

## APPENDIX

### Time served counted as zero months

*United States v. Fredy Leocadio Garcia-Recinos*, 2:09-cr-20147-AJT-VMM-1 (E.D. Mich. June 26, 2009) (Docket No. 24)

- Sentence in PACER – Time served. (Actually served 3 months)
- Sentence in TRAC – Zero months - http://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x664f83354fee.pdf

*United States v. Kwan Lap Yu*, 5:05-cr-40095-JAR-6 (D. Kan. Jan. 24, 2010) (Docket No. 328)

- Sentence in PACER – Time served. (Actually served 18 months.)
- Sentence in TRAC – Zero months - http://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x664f8461013c.pdf

*United States v. Donna Li*, 5:05-cr-40095-JAR-5 (D. Kan. Jan. 26, 2009) (Docket No. 349)

- Sentence in PACER – Time served. (Actually served 12 months.)
- Sentence in TRAC – Zero months - http://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x664f846616cb.pdf

### Data Errors

*United States v. Rebekha Bonachea*, No. 2:04-cr-00103-JES-DNF-1 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 10, 2004) In this case, the defendant was charged with a number of bank fraud offenses and pled guilty to conspiracy to defraud, the facts of which involved bank fraud.

- Sentence in PACER - 24 months in prison, restitution in the amount of $5,990.06. The case was assigned Judge Steele in the Ft. Myers division, and the sentence was imposed by Judge Steele on January 20, 2009.

- Sentence in TRAC – 24 months in prison, restitution in the amount of $5,990.06, incorrectly recorded as imposed by Judge Covington on January 20, 2009 - http://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x664f8c31634e.pdf

- Program Category in TRAC – "Drugs-Drug Trafficking"

*United States v. Antoine Davis*, 1:09-cr-00288-WDQ-23 (D. Md. Sept. 14, 2010) (Docket No. 847)

- Sentence in PACER – 121 months in prison
- Sentence in TRAC – 121 years' probation - http://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x664f7f5eb868.pdf

*United States v. Natosha Sherron McDade*, 4:09-cr-00062-SPM-WCS-1 (N.D. Fla. Apr. 28, 2010) (Docket No. 37)

- Sentence in PACER – 120 months in prison
- Sentence in TRAC – 1200 months in prison - http://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x664f85aa2ed7.pdf

*United States v. John Leo de Marco*, 5:09-cr-00033-RS-1 (N.D. Fla. Jan. 27, 2010) (Docket No. 36)

- Sentence in PACER – 438 months in prison
- Sentence in TRAC – 78 months - http://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x664f848a9637.pdf

## Average Prison Sentence of 16,342 Months

TRAC - People and Staffing

PEOPLE AND STAFFING
*Judges*

Custom Reports
Express
Caseload
Criminal
Profile
Contrast
Compare
List
Civil – Historical
Web Locker
Help
TRAC fed

**Sentences**
**Virg, E (2010)**

| Federal District Court Judge | Prosecutions Completed | Convicted | % Prison (of prosecuted) | % Prison (of convicted) | Median Prison Months | Average Prison Months |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Brinkema, Leonie M. | 87 | 82 | 85 | 90 | 28 | 41 |
| Cacheris, James C. | 62 | 57 | 81 | 88 | 24 | 42 |
| Davis, Mark S. | 59 | 56 | 88 | 93 | 37 | 76 |
| Doumar, Robert G. | 54 | 52 | 93 | 96 | 47 | 79 |
| Friedman, Jerome B. | 82 | 79 | 93 | 96 | 80 | 115 |
| Hilton, Claude M. | 82 | 82 | 95 | 95 | 35 | 55 |
| Hudson, Henry E. | 87 | 85 | 94 | 96 | 57 | 98 |
| Jackson, Raymond A. | 53 | 50 | 89 | 94 | 36 | 77 |
| Lee, Gerald Bruce | 191 | 175 | 85 | 93 | 21 | 49 |
| Magistrate Judge | 21 | 20 | 57 | 60 | 1 | 11 |
| Morgan, Henry C., Jr. | 29 | 28 | 93 | 96 | 37 | 47 |
| O'Grady, Liam | 73 | 72 | 95 | 96 | 35 | 99 |
| Payne, Robert E. | 93 | 85 | 86 | 94 | 45 | 74 |
| Smith, Rebecca Beach | 75 | 74 | 91 | 92 | 80 | 16,342 |
| Spencer, James R. | 96 | 88 | 89 | 97 | 71 | 88 |
| Total | 1,409 | 1,335 | 88 | 93 | 37 | 971 |
| Trenga, Anthony J. | 86 | 82 | 84 | 88 | 28 | 50 |
| Unknown | 119 | 113 | 87 | 91 | 46 | 72 |
| Williams, Richard L. | 60 | 55 | 85 | 93 | 60 | 70 |

Copyright 2012, TRAC Reports, Inc.

*This request took 4.82 seconds of real time (v9.2 build 1495).*

http://tracfed.syr.edu/index/index.php?layer=fedstaf&ds=judge[4/24/2012 2:31:40 PM]