The Role of the Juvenile Court in Our Legal System

Judge Leo J. Yehle

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr>

Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Judge Leo J. Yehle, *The Role of the Juvenile Court in Our Legal System*, 41 Marq. L. Rev. 284 (1958).
Available at: <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/mulr/vol41/iss3/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Marquette Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marquette Law Review by an authorized administrator of Marquette Law Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact megan.obrien@marquette.edu.

THE ROLE OF THE JUVENILE COURT IN OUR LEGAL SYSTEM

LEO J. YEHLE*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Juvenile Court is undoubtedly one of the most recent judicial tribunals which has been added to our American jurisprudence. Dean Roscoe Pound called it “. . . the greatest step forward in the administration of Anglo-Saxon justice since the signing of the Magna Charta.” The first such court in this country and as a matter of fact, in the world, was established in Chicago (Cook County), Illinois, on April 14, 1899, and was known as the Family Court of Cook County.

During the same year and but a few months after the formation of that court, the Hon. Ben B. Lindsey set up a similar court to operate within the framework of the County Court of Denver County, Colorado. At that time he was clerk of the court and had succeeded in having a “School Law” enacted by the legislature. This law provided:

“ . . . that every child between the ages of eight and sixteen years, who is an habitual truant from school, or vicious or immoral in conduct, or who habitually wanders about the streets and public places, having no business or lawful occupation, shall be deemed a Juvenile Disorderly Person, subject to the provisions of this act.”

In 1901 Ben Lindsey became judge of the County Court of Denver County and two years later the legislature created a separate Juvenile Court for Denver County.

Thereafter courts of similar structure sprang up in many progressive communities throughout the country. Originally the fundamental difference between these new courts and the existing courts was that the hearings were held in private and were heard separate and apart from those in which adults were involved. Gradually these courts have increased throughout the country so that today there are juvenile courts in every state and most territories of the United States.

II. PHILOSOPHY OF THE JUVENILE COURTS

The committee of the Cook County Bar which drew up the first juvenile court act described the philosophy of the law as follows:

“The fundamental idea of the Juvenile Court Law is that the state must step in and exercise guardianship over a child found under such adverse social or individual conditions as develop crime. . . . It proposes a plan whereby he may be treated, not as a criminal, or legally charged with a crime, but

* Judge, Onondaga County (New York) Children's Court; President of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges; Trustee of the National Juvenile Court Foundation, Inc.; and Past President of the New York State Association of Children's Court Judges.

as a ward of the state, to receive practically the care, custody and discipline that are accorded the neglected and dependent child, and which shall approximate as nearly as may be, that which should be given by its parents."¹

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, formerly known as the Association of Juvenile Court Judges of America, in order to clarify the place, purpose and function of the Juvenile Court published in 1940 the following declaration:

"The Juvenile Court is designed, within the scope of its legal powers, for the care and protection of dependent and neglected children; for safeguarding the interests and enforcing the obligations of responsible adults; and for the correction, reeducation, redirection and rehabilitation of the delinquent youth.

"The Juvenile Court, although operating as a socialized court, must recognize and protect the rights of those brought before it as provided by law and the constitution.

"The Juvenile Court is a tribunal with jurisdiction to proceed informally, and charged with the duties of diagnosing difficulties upon hearing aided by pre-hearing investigation, of determining disposition, prescribing treatment and directing supervision.

"The Juvenile Court is limited both by the laws controlling its organization and jurisdiction and by the community facilities that are made available to it for carrying out the constructive treatment that it finds necessary to prescribe.

"The Juvenile Court should be housed in quarters separate and apart from criminal and other courts in surroundings assuring dignity and the necessary privacy and should be furnished with the staff and equipment to adequately discharge its functions.

"The Juvenile Court is not charged primarily with delinquency prevention activities, but the presence and prestige of the Court act persuasively in this regard and the educational work of the Court, together with the activities of the Court's probation staff, tend to exert preventive influence."²

The Juvenile Court has at times been referred to as a socialized court where not only law, but social, mental and medical sciences are evoked to bring about the rehabilitation of the child involved. The court operates with the theory that punishment does not necessarily prevent delinquency. The purpose of the court is remedial not punitive; to give the child as near as may be, such treatment as he should receive from a wise and understanding parent. It recognizes the individuality of the child.

¹ Excerpt from the report of the Cook County Bar Association Committee that drafted the first Juvenile Court Law.

² Taken from the minutes of the annual conference of the Association of Juvenile Court Judges of America, held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, May 23, 1940.

As stated in *People v. Lewis* by Crouch, J., a case decided by the Court of Appeals (the highest appellate court in the State of New York),³ in which the constitutionality of the Children's Court Act of the State of New York and the informality of its procedure were upheld:

"The delinquency hearing is a civil proceeding. The concept of crime and punishment disappears. To the child delinquent through the commission of an act criminal in its nature, the state extends the same aid, care and training which it had long given to the child who was merely incorrigible, neglected, abandoned, destitute or physically handicapped. The state does not seek to punish a malefactor. It seeks to salvage a boy who is in danger of becoming one. The problem for determination by the judge is not, has this child committed a specific wrong, but what is he, how has he become what he is, and what had best be done in his interest and in the interest of the state to save him from a downward career?"

The court is not set up as a preventive agency. It can only handle the cases which are legally brought before it. Many of the public regard the juvenile court as an agency for the prevention of delinquency and are inclined to hold the court responsible for the increase of delinquency within its jurisdiction. This, of course, is not the fact, for the court can only deal with the cases referred to it by law enforcing agencies and others. The court does not actually have any legal authority until after the delinquency has taken place and then it is called upon to do something to rehabilitate the child involved.

The court can however work in the preventive field. This can be done in several ways, for instance by assisting the individual child who has become delinquent to avoid recidivism; by, through the efforts of an alert probation officer, helping others in the family to avoid becoming involved with the law; by taking a leading role in the community and civic activities set up to prevent or curb delinquency; by serving on various child caring and group working agency boards and youth program committees; by interpreting to the public the need for adequate public support to obtain the same.

The proceedings of the juvenile court are not secret, but they are private and confidential. The court opposes the publication of the names and other identifying data of a child and his parents. Some well meaning, but misinformed, people favor such publication on the theory that this policy will deter delinquency by shaming the youth and by embarrassing his parents. This latter idea is based upon the mistaken belief that parents are responsible for all of the unlawful acts of their children. These ideas are not sound. Statistics show that publicity increases rather than reduces delinquency. The greater

³ *People v. Lewis*, 260 N.Y. 171, 183 N.E. 353 (1932).

percentage of delinquencies are committed by thoughtless youth who have failed to consider the consequences of their acts, to say nothing of the idea of publicity for their escapades. Furthermore the average child does not appreciate at the time the detrimental effect of publicity. In regard to disgracing parents, there is no question but that publicity would do just that and undoubtedly the parents who would suffer the most are those who deserve it the least. In most instances where such behavior could be attributed to them it is usually because they fail to appreciate that their attitude or lack of discipline of the child has caused or contributed to the delinquency.

The juvenile court opposes publication of a child's name or identifying data for several reasons. In the first place such publicity would tend to handicap the possibility of rehabilitative success, thus defeating the very objective the court is attempting to accomplish. Then, too, publishing a youth's name might have another detrimental effect; it might convince him that he is all bad and make him determined to live up to that reputation. It is likewise true that in some instances it would please the child to have his name published because it would tend to make him a "big shot" or "tough guy" among his peers. Furthermore publishing delinquent children's names would be used by some vengeful children to deliberately embarrass and disgrace their parents because the latter might have properly disciplined them or justly refused some childish request.

On occasion there have been unusual cases which have convinced some people that publicity is the answer. This is understandable in a limited number of instances, but often a policy which would seem to be justified in a specific case is not proper in the great majority. Every juvenile court judge is deeply concerned by serious delinquent behavior. That, however, does not deter him from endeavoring to salvage the youth involved. A general policy must be followed for the protection of the majority even though a few undeserving might seem to be benefited thereby; otherwise who would determine when to publish and when not to. First disclosures often prove to be inaccurate. When once the names are published, however, nothing done later can alleviate the situation.

III. PROCEDURE

The procedure varies in the different courts throughout the country. In some, cases of delinquency and neglect are handled both formally and informally. In the former, all such cases are heard by the court whereas in the latter, although the usual careful investigation is made, the cases are either referred to a case work agency or deferred indefinitely without any court appearance by the child or his parents.

There is also a variance in the method of handling formal court cases. Some courts have the child brought before the court upon the

filing of a delinquency petition or complaint and at that time the child is given the opportunity of admitting or denying the allegations of the complaint. If he admits the misbehavior the case is adjourned for investigation and disposition. The more progressive procedure however is to ascertain, usually through the probation department, whether the child is going to admit the delinquency. If that is determined in the affirmative a complete investigation is made of the circumstances surrounding the offense and particularly the child's background, including his home and neighborhood environment; his school record, including not only the regularity of his attendance and academic standing, but also his relationship with his peers and his teachers; his religious training and activities; his physical and mental condition and in some instances when deemed advisable an examination by psychiatrists and also a study of his attitude and behavior if held in a detention facility pending the disposition of his case. All of this data is compiled by the probation department and is contained in the child's file which also usually contains the recommended plan of rehabilitation made by the probation officer. The file is reviewed by the judge before the child appears in court. At the court appearance the judge apprises the child of the contents of the complaint and the child is asked, in the presence of his parents and his attorney, if he has counsel, whether or not he admits committing the misdeed. If he admits the unlawful conduct the case is usually disposed of at that time. All cases are regarded as continuing proceedings. If the plan which the court decides to try for the rehabilitation of the child is not successful, the case can be returned to court and another program followed. The practice of disposing of the case with one court appearance saves time, not only for the court, but also for the child and his parents and thus avoids the necessity of the child losing time from school and the parents losing time from their employment. If the recommended plan cannot be put into effect at the time of the hearing it might be necessary to adjourn the matter or to try some other program.

At the court hearing, should the child deny the conduct complained of, even though he had previously admitted it to both the police and the probation officer, the case is adjourned until a future date for trial. This procedure is likewise followed if the child denies the allegations of the petition to the probation officer in the first instance. In this latter event, however, and the same is true if he first admits the unlawful behavior to the probation officer and later denies it when he appears in court, the judge advises the child and his parents that it will be necessary to have a trial and that it is their right and privilege to have a lawyer represent the child and protect his interests. If it is stated that they desire counsel but cannot afford one the court

either assigns a lawyer or refers them to the Legal Aid Society, if there is such an agency in the community.

The procedure for such trial of delinquency or neglect in juvenile court is the same as in any civil proceeding. The trial is ordinarily conducted in private and only the child, his parents and attorney are present in the court room and the witnesses are called in when they testify. Only legal evidence is acceptable and as stated in *People v. Lewis*:⁴

"To serve the social purpose for which the Children's Court was created provision is made in the statute for wide investigation before, during and after the hearing. But that investigation is clinical in its nature. Its results are not to be used as legal evidence where there is an issue of fact to be tried. There must be a reasonably definite charge. The customary rules of evidence, shown by long experience as essential to getting at the truth with reasonable certainty in a civil trial must be adhered to. The findings of fact must rest on the preponderance of evidence adduced under those rules. Hearsay, opinion, gossip, bias, prejudice, trends of hostile neighborhood feeling, the hopes and fears of social workers are all sources of error and have no more place in children's courts than in any other court."

IV. JURISDICTION OF THE JUVENILE COURTS IN THE COUNTRY

The juvenile court does not deal with delinquency alone. The structure of the courts throughout the country varies, not only as to jurisdiction in territory, age and subject matter, but also as to the medical, sociological, psychiatric and other auxiliary services available. In the category of territorial jurisdiction the range is from city- to state-wide, with the jurisdiction varying between these extremes from municipal to county to district.

The age limit likewise varies from sixteen years in some states to a maximum of twenty-one in others, with most states having a seventeen or eighteen year age limit for neglected and delinquent children. In some jurisdictions the children are not characterized as either delinquent or neglected but are designated as wards of the state. For age limits in the various states see Appendix A.

In regard to subject matter practically all courts have jurisdiction of abandoned, delinquent, dependent, neglected, mentally defective and physically handicapped children. Some have jurisdiction in adoption proceedings, others do not. In some juvenile courts, out-of-wedlock (illegitimacy or paternity or formerly known as bastardy) proceedings are heard. Some have jurisdiction in domestic relations matters, such as support, custody of children and family quarrels, others include matrimonial actions, such as annulment, divorce and separation. Then, too, some juvenile courts have limited jurisdiction in

⁴ 260 N.Y. at 173, 183 N.E. at 355.

criminal matters where children are involved, as for instance, contributing to delinquency or neglect; impairing the health or morals of children and violations of the education and labor laws. For jurisdiction of the juvenile courts in the several states see Appendix B.

V. STRUCTURE OF THE COURTS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY

There is likewise a variance in the type of court handling juvenile cases. This range is from Inferior to Intermediate to the Superior Court. Some are courts of record while others are not. It is also interesting to note that the titles of the courts include Children's, Juvenile, Youth, Family, Peoples' and Domestic Relations. In some instances the courts are newly created tribunals whereas in others they are parts or divisions of previously existing courts. There are thirty-two different titles applied to courts throughout the country functioning in juvenile work, with some states having several different courts serving in this field. Alabama, for example, has six different courts, to wit: County Court, Court of Common Pleas, Inferior Court, Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, Law and Equity Court and the Probate Court. Several states have five different courts and they range from there on down to those states which have state-wide courts, such as Connecticut and Rhode Island. The various titles of these courts will be found in Appendix C.

As previously mentioned some courts are equipped with the services of probation officers, physicians, psychologists, psychiatrists, child guidance clinics and detention facilities. Other courts have some of these services and some have none. The latter attempt to do an adequate job by calling upon social agencies and lay volunteers to assist in their rehabilitative work. Few, if any of the courts, have all of the necessary facilities they require. A court must take advantage of its community resources. If they are lacking, it is the duty of the court to create a public demand for the needed personnel and facilities.

VI. FUNCTION OF JUVENILE COURT JUDGES ORGANIZATIONS

One must wonder when realizing the variance, not only in the titles of the courts handling juvenile cases, but also the differences in set-up, jurisdiction and even methods of disposition, what has been done or is being done to bring about a uniformity of procedure in the method of handling such cases. It must be remembered that the juvenile court is a new venture in legal tribunals. There have been no precedents to follow. The creation and operation of State, Regional and National organizations of juvenile court judges, which meet annually and oftener, have contributed greatly to indoctrinate the younger judges in the functions of the court; have afforded an opportunity for the mutual exchange of ideas and methods of operation and procedure; have made possible a survey of the work of the more progressive

courts and have enabled the judges to collectively consider, endorse and support proper legislation affecting domestic relations and the problems of children. Through the efforts of these groups a Juvenile Court Manual has been published; the National Juvenile Court Foundation, Inc., publishes a quarterly journal, a monthly bulletin and a weekly pamphlet; courses pertaining to juvenile court work have been established in some of our law colleges; judges have taken ideas from each other and modernized their procedure; federal laws have been passed for the return of runaway children and reciprocal legislation has been enacted by the various states. Examples of the latter will be found in the Uniform Support of Dependent Law and the Interstate Compact for the Return of Runaway Juveniles.

In the State of Pennsylvania the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons have financed the Pennsylvania Mason Juvenile Court Institute, which, since its inception in December, 1956, has conducted six separate week-long sessions where judges from every state in our country have lived together for the period of the institute for mutual enlightenment and have experienced the detailed operation of the handling and disposition of actual cases in a modernized juvenile court. (The Juvenile Court of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.)

There are thirteen states in which the judges have established state organizations. The southern states hold an annual week-long conference at the Blue Ridge Assembly in the Blue Ridge Mountains in North Carolina, known as the Blue Ridge Training Institute for Southern Juvenile Court Judges. Several states in the western part of our country have a similar meeting known as the Intermountain Juvenile Court Institute.

On a national level we have the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges; the National Juvenile Court Foundation, Inc.; and the Juvenile Court Judges Advisory Group of the National Probation and Parole Association, all functioning in a sincere effort to unify and modernize the procedure of the juvenile courts throughout the land.

APPENDIX A
COURT JURISDICTION OVER JUVENILES

<i>State</i>	<i>Juvenile Court</i>	<i>Criminal Court Concurrent</i>	<i>Exclusive</i>
Alabama	18	14-18	none
Arizona	18	all	none
Arkansas	21	12-21	none
California	21	18-21	none
Colorado	18	10-21	capital and life
Connecticut	16	16-18	none
Delaware	18f, 17m	16-18	capital offenses
Florida	18f, 17m	all	any crime
Georgia	16	all	capital & life
Idaho	18	all	none
Illinois	18f, 17m	10 & up	crimes of violence

Indiana	18	16-18	traffic violations
Iowa	18	all	capital & life
Kansas	16	none	murder
Kentucky	18f, 17m	all	none
Louisiana	17	none	murder, rape, att'd. rape
Maine	17	none	infamous crimes
Maryland	18	18-21	capital & life
Massachusetts	17	none	capital & life
Michigan	17	15-19	none
Minnesota	18	all	none
Mississippi	18	14-18	capital & life
Missouri	17	12-17	none
Montana	18	all	murder, mansl., armed crimes
Nebraska	18	16-18	none
Nevada	18	all	none
New Hampshire	18	none	none
New Jersey	18	16-18	murder, traffic
New Mexico	18	all	none
New York	16	15	none
N. Carolina	16	none	10 yrs. imprisonment
N. Dakota	18	18-21	none
Ohio	18	all	none
Oklahoma	18f, 16m	none	none
Oregon	18	all	none
Pennsylvania	18	16-18	murder
Rhode Island	18	16-18	traffic violations
S. Carolina	1f, 16m	all	capital & life
S. Dakota	18	all	none
Tennessee	17	none	capital & life
Texas	18f, 17m	none	homicide
U. S.	18	all	capital & life
Utah	18	14-18	none
Vermont	16	none	capital offenses
Virginia	18	none	none
Washington	18	17-18	none
W. Virginia	18	14-18	capital offenses
Wisconsin	18	16-18	none
Wyoming	21f, 19m	all	none
D. C.	18	16-18	none

Source: Hon. Dudley F. Sicher, retired justice, Domestic Relations Court, New York. From Juvenile Court Judges Journal.

APPENDIX B

JURISDICTION OF JUVENILE COURTS IN THE SEVERAL STATES

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Nature and extent of jurisdiction</i>
Alabama	Exclusive original. Juvenile Court in counties 100,000 or more, and counties where probate court acts as juvenile court, may transfer delinquent over 14 to court having jurisdiction of offense. Children between 16 and 18 brought before any court of criminal jurisdiction may be transferred to juvenile court for delinquency proceedings in counties of 75,000 or more and counties where probate courts acts as juvenile court.
Arizona	Exclusive original. Court may permit criminal prosecution after examination in chambers.
Arkansas	Exclusive original if arrested without warrant. Concurrent if arrested upon warrant. Court issuing warrant may try case or may transfer child to juvenile court. Juvenile court may transfer child to court having jurisdiction of offense.
California	Exclusive original over children under 18; concurrent original over children 18 to 21; Juvenile Court has no jurisdiction over minors between 18 and 21, if capital offense has been committed or attempted.

	Juvenile court may order criminal prosecution of delinquent violating any State law or ordinance defining crime.
Colorado	Exclusive original with following exceptions: (a) Criminal charges against minor under 21 may be tried in district court, county court, or juvenile court in counties 100,000 or more; (b) misdemeanor charges against minors 17 or more may be heard by justice of peace or police magistrate.
Connecticut	Exclusive original. Juvenile court has jurisdiction over children between 16 and 18 who have been transferred from the jurisdiction of a town, city, police or borough court to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.
Delaware	Exclusive original.
District of Columbia	Exclusive original. But juvenile court has no jurisdiction of capital and other infamous offenses and those punishable by imprisonment in penitentiary.
Florida	Exclusive original, except as to children charged with crime, where jurisdiction is concurrent with court having jurisdiction over offense. No jurisdiction if offense is rape, murder, manslaughter, robbery, arson, burglary, or attempt to commit one of these.
Georgia	Exclusive original. But juvenile court may transfer child to a court having jurisdiction of the crime.
Hawaii	Exclusive original.
Idaho	Exclusive, except over children charged with felonies.
Illinois	Exclusive original. But court may allow criminal prosecution of delinquents.
Indiana	Exclusive except over children charged with offenses punishable by life imprisonment or death.
Iowa	Exclusive original except for offense within jurisdiction of district court, when jurisdiction is concurrent, except that juvenile court has no jurisdiction of offenses punishable by life imprisonment or death. Child under 18 convicted of offense not punishable by life imprisonment or death may be transferred by district court to juvenile court for commitment.
Kansas	Exclusive original.
Kentucky	Exclusive original. But court may remand case to court having jurisdiction of offense.
Louisiana	Exclusive original. In Orleans Parish court has no jurisdiction of capital offenses; elsewhere, court has no jurisdiction of capital offenses or assault with intent to commit rape.
Maine	Exclusive original.
Maryland	Exclusive. Case may be tried under regular criminal procedure if jury trial is demanded where circuit court has been designated.
Massachusetts	Exclusive original. But court has no jurisdiction of offenses punishable by life imprisonment or death. Court may remand for criminal trial for violation of any State law, city ordinance, or town bylaw.
Michigan	Exclusive original. Court may remand child over 15 accused of felony to court having jurisdiction of offense.
Minnesota	Exclusive original. Court may permit criminal proceedings against child over 12.
Mississippi	Concurrent. Court may remand for criminal trial in circuit court. When child under 18 is brought before any court charged with an offense, such court may transfer case to chancery court for delinquency hearing.
Missouri	Exclusive original. Court may dismiss petition and order criminal prosecution. Minors 17 or over who commit acts that would constitute delinquency if committed by minor under 17 may be tried as for

	misdemeanor in any court of record, (juvenile court is court of record).
Montana	Exclusive original. Court has no jurisdiction of offenses punishable by life imprisonment or death. Court may permit criminal proceedings where delinquency charged would otherwise constitute a felony.
Nebraska	Exclusive over children under 16; concurrent over children between 16 and 18.
Nevada	Exclusive original. But court may permit proceedings. District court may treat minor over 18 and under 21, charged with felony except capital offense or attempt to commit capital offense as delinquent with consent of such minor, after conviction in criminal court such minor may be treated as delinquent.
New Hampshire	Exclusive original. Court may remand to criminal court. Criminal laws not affected.
New Jersey	Exclusive original.
New Mexico	Exclusive original. Criminal proceedings may be held in juvenile court if child is incorrigible or charged with offense for which jury trial is guaranteed. District court has exclusive jurisdiction over girls under 18 who are immoral, incorrigible, or accused of any offense except murder.
New York	Exclusive original. If over 15 concurrent jurisdiction with criminal courts of offenses punishable by life imprisonment or death.
North Carolina	Exclusive original. Court may hold child between 14 and 16 charged with felony punishable by less than 10 years' imprisonment for trial in superior court under criminal procedure; court has no jurisdiction of felony punishable by 10 or more years imprisonment.
North Dakota	Exclusive original. Court may permit criminal proceedings.
Ohio	Exclusive original. Court may remand minor accused of felony to court of common pleas for criminal trial.
Oklahoma	Exclusive original. Court may remand to court of criminal jurisdiction.
Oregon	Exclusive original. Court may remand to court of criminal jurisdiction. Criminal court convicting child may certify conviction to juvenile court for commitment.
Pennsylvania	Exclusive original. Court has no jurisdiction of murder charges. Court may remand for criminal trial child over 14 accused of felony.
Rhode Island	Exclusive original. Court has no jurisdiction of murder or manslaughter. Court may dismiss petition so as to permit criminal proceedings.
South Carolina	Exclusive original. The court may transfer to the criminal courts any child it thinks should be transferred.
South Dakota	Exclusive original. Court may permit criminal proceedings.
Tennessee	Exclusive original. But in Hamilton and Knox Counties, Johnson City and Kingsport the criminal court has jurisdiction of child charged with indictable offense, although child arraigned or tried by criminal court may be transferred to juvenile court. Juvenile court has no jurisdiction of offenses punishable by life imprisonment or death in Knox County, Johnson City, and Kingsport; no jurisdiction of rape or murder elsewhere. Juvenile court may remand for criminal trial in Knox and Hamilton Counties, Johnson City and Kingsport; may so remand elsewhere if child proves incorrigible after commitment as delinquent. Child may be transferred on demand

to criminal court for trial in Knox County, Johnson City, and Kingsport.

Boys under 18 who have been convicted of an offense punishable by confinement in the penitentiary shall be sentenced to and confined in the State training school; provided that no boy under 12 shall be sentenced there unless convicted for a capital offense. Court may suspend sentence when it is in the best interest of the boy and society.

Texas	Exclusive original.
Utah	Exclusive original, except that juvenile court has concurrent jurisdiction with district court of children 14 years of age or older accused of felony.
Vermont	Exclusive original.
Virginia	Exclusive original. Court may permit criminal proceedings against minors 14 or over.
Washington	Exclusive original. Court may remand child charged with crime for criminal trial.
West Virginia	Exclusive original. Court may permit criminal proceedings except as to violations which if committed by an adult would be capital offenses.
Wisconsin	Exclusive original over children under 16; concurrent with criminal court over delinquents 16 or over.

(Taken from the March 1957 report of the Sub-committee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate.)

APPENDIX C

Various titles of courts throughout the United States handling juvenile cases:

Chancery Court
 Children's Court
 Circuit Court
 Circuit Court of Judicial District
 City Court
 County Court
 County Juvenile Court
 County Youth Court
 Court of Common Pleas
 Criminal Court
 District Court
 Division of Domestic Relations of Common Pleas Court
 Domestic Relations Court
 Domestic Relations Department of Circuit Court
 Family Court
 Inferior Court
 Intermediate Court
 Juvenile Court
 Juvenile Court for Judicial District
 Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
 Juvenile Division of District Court
 Juvenile Division of Probate Court
 Law and Equity Court
 Municipal Court
 People's Court for Juvenile Cases
 Probate Court
 Superior Court
 Superior Court of County
 Superior Court of Judicial District
 State Juvenile Court
 Surrogate's Court
 United States District Court

(Taken from the National Directory of Juvenile Court Judges, published by the National Juvenile Court Foundation, Inc.)