

ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENT

District Court 12-1-02
Dauphin County, Pennsylvania
For the Period
January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017

August 2018



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 statement of receipts and disbursements (Statement) of District Court 12-1-02, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania (District Court), for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017, 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 presenting this Statement in accordance with the criteria set forth in Note 1. 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. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Statement is presented in accordance with the criteria described above, in all material respects. An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about the statement 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 Statement, 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 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*.

Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

In our opinion, the Statement referred to above, for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017, is 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 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 findings listed below, that we consider to be significant deficiencies:

- Evidence Of Authorizing The Disposition Of Citations Was Not Available.
- Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures.

Independent Auditor's Report (Continued)

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*.

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 District Court 12-1-02, Dauphin 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.



Eugene A. DePasquale
Auditor General

July 17, 2018

CONTENTS

Page

Financial Section:

Statement Of Receipts And Disbursements.....1

Notes To The Statement Of Receipts And Disbursements.....2

Findings And Recommendations:

Finding No. 1 - Evidence Of Authorizing The Disposition Of Citations Was Not Available3

Finding No. 2 - Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures5

Summary Of Prior Examination Recommendation8

Report Distribution9

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
 DAUPHIN COUNTY
 STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
 FOR THE PERIOD
 JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Receipts:

Department of Transportation		
Title 75 Fines	\$	145,651
Child Restraint Fines		645
Department of Revenue Court Costs		437,237
Crime Victims' Compensation Bureau Costs		17,068
Crime Commission Costs/Victim Witness Services Costs		12,193
Domestic Violence Costs		4,704
Emergency Medical Service Fines		39,381
CAT/MCARE Fund Surcharges		77,911
Judicial Computer System Fees		196,354
Access to Justice Fees		57,032
Criminal Justice Enhancement Account Fees		9,169
Judicial Computer Project Surcharges		79,897
Constable Service Surcharges		46,042
Miscellaneous State Fines and Costs		<u>140,633</u>
 Total receipts (Note 2)		 1,263,917
 Disbursements to Commonwealth (Note 3)		 <u>(1,263,917)</u>
 Balance due Commonwealth (District Court) per settled reports (Note 4)		 -
 Examination adjustments		 <u>-</u>
 Adjusted balance due Commonwealth (District Court) for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017	 \$	 <u><u>-</u></u>

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

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN COUNTY
NOTES TO THE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

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	<u>\$ 1,263,917</u>
-----------------------	---------------------

4. Balance Due Commonwealth (District Court) For The Period January 1, 2014 To December 31, 2017

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

5. Magisterial District Judge Serving During Examination Period

Barbara Pianka served at District Court 12-1-02 for the period January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2017.

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Finding No. 1 - Evidence Of Authorizing The Disposition Of Citations Was Not Available

During our examination of the district court's case files, we tested 45 cases with dispositions of not guilty, dismissed, discharged, or withdrawn, and cases that had a guilty plea disposition without an accompanying full payment. There was no evidence in 22 withdrawn cases that the disposition was authorized by the Magisterial District Judge.

Good internal accounting controls ensure that there is evidence that the disposition on these cases was authorized by the Magisterial District Judge. The failure to follow this procedure increases the risk for funds to be lost or misappropriated.

Adherence to good internal controls would have ensured that there were adequate internal controls over citations.

This condition existed because the office failed to establish and implement an adequate system of internal controls over documenting that disposition was authorized by the Magisterial District Judge.

Recommendation

We recommend that the district court maintain documentation that the Magisterial District Judge authorized the disposition of these cases and it is available for examination.

Management's Response

The Magisterial District Judge responded as follows:

Magisterial District Court 12-1-02 is routinely running and signing the Dispositional Validation Report out of the MDJS. Unfortunately, this report does not capture "withdrawn" dispositions. For these cases, the affiant initiates the process to withdraw the charge and a copy of that signed request is to be kept in each file. While we understand the need for internal controls to prevent fraud, we fail to see why an MDJ needs to initial the withdraw request that is signed by the affiant and kept as part of the record. Having said that, the court will consider an alternative method of verification for those cases not captured on the Dispositional Validation Report. The office will consider incorporating the use of the Docket Worksheet or Verification of Disposition Form from the AOPC, or another method of making sure that all disposed cases, regardless of disposition type, are verified by the MDJ.

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Finding No. 1 - Evidence Of Authorizing The Disposition Of Citations Was Not Available
(Continued)

Auditor's Conclusion

Although we recognize the district court's concerns as stated above, it is imperative that the district court maintain evidence that the disposition was reviewed and authorized by the Magisterial District Judge. During our next examination, we will determine if the office complied with our recommendation.

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Finding No. 2 - 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 timely. We tested 54 instances in which a warrant was required to be issued in a timely manner. Our testing disclosed that three were not issued timely. The time of issuance ranged from 65 days to 146 days.

In addition, of 54 warrants required to be returned or recalled, 14 were not returned or recalled, and 10 were not returned timely. The time of issuance to the time of return ranged from 270 days to 1,289 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. 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. 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.

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Finding No. 2 - 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 120 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 120 days for summary traffic and non-traffic cases as recommended by the Manual.

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN COUNTY
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Finding No. 2 - Inadequate Arrest Warrant Procedures (Continued)

Management's Response

The Magisterial District Judge responded as follows:

We believe that this finding is the result of a past office manager not running the proper case administration lists in a timely manner. The new office manager makes it a point to monitor the warrant lists daily and take the appropriate action when warranted. We do not believe that this will be an issue in future audits.

Auditor's Conclusion

We appreciate the officeholder's efforts to correct these issues. During our next examination, we will determine if the district court complied with our recommendations.

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN COUNTY
SUMMARY OF PRIOR EXAMINATION RECOMMENDATION
FOR THE PERIOD
JANUARY 1, 2014 TO DECEMBER 31, 2017

Summary Of Prior Examination Recommendation

During our prior examination, we recommended that the district court:

- Establish and implement an adequate system of internal controls over computer downtime manual receipts.

During our current examination, we noted that the district court complied with our recommendation.

DISTRICT COURT 12-1-02
DAUPHIN 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

The Honorable Barbara Pianka
Magisterial District Judge

The Honorable Jeff Haste
Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners

The Honorable Timothy DeFoor
Controller

Deborah S. Freeman, Esq.
District Court Administrator

This report is a matter of public record and is available online at www.PaAuditor.gov. 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: news@PaAuditor.gov.