

John Peter Suarez

**An Analysis of His Record By
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY
(PEER)**

March 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I Executive Summary
- II How Does the Suarez Record Compare – A Snapshot
- III Summary of the Suarez Prosecutorial Record 1992-1998
- IV Breakdown — Year-by-Year, Case-by-Case
- V Impact Comparison — Convictions, Length of Prison Sentence & Probation Sentences
- VI Efficiency Comparison — Caseload Management

Note: All material cited in this report was obtained from the Executive Office for US Attorneys of the Department of Justice, through Freedom of Information Act requests made by the University of Syracuse Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC) and compiled in its database. See: <http://trac.syr.edu>

I EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) opposes the nomination of John Peter Suarez to serve as the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Assistant Administrator for Enforcement & Compliance Assurance (OECA) on the grounds that Mr. Suarez is not qualified for the post.

Although he has been nominated to serve as the nation's top environmental enforcement administrator, Mr. Suarez has no demonstrated knowledge of, professional familiarity, or even personal experience with a single pollution-related law, regulation or subject matter.

Further, other than his recent posting as the Director of the New Jersey Division of Gaming Enforcement, Mr. Suarez has no experience in civil enforcement. While some may suggest that complex corporate environmental litigation resembles a game of chance, there is no relevant common set of skills that Mr. Suarez would bring to OECA from his short-lived casino regulatory experience. Nothing in Mr. Suarez's background prepares him to oversee the complicated array of multi-state and multi-media environmental regulatory litigation waged against a wide-range of pollution dischargers, emitters and generators, as would be required in the OECA position.

Mr. Suarez's principal qualification appears to be the seven years that he served as an Assistant US Attorney (AUSA) in the District of New Jersey. A closer look at his record as a prosecutor, however, gives scant comfort. During those seven years, according to an examination of detailed Justice Department data Mr. Suarez —

- Had only four jury trials, winning a conviction in only one of those trials;
- Carried a much smaller caseload than the average AUSA in the New Jersey District. Despite his small caseload, Mr. Suarez declined almost as many cases as he filed. In his last five years (1994-98), for example, Mr. Suarez filed only 17 prosecutions while declining to file 12 other cases, listing "lack of prosecution resources" as the reason;
- Obtained shorter prison sentences. His convictions carried an average length of prison time (primarily from plea agreements) well below the average sentence for both his District and the nation. Not one of Mr. Suarez's "organized crime" cases resulted in a prison term longer than five years.

Further, Mr. Suarez only handled one case considered a national priority in his entire career as an AUSA. He dismissed that case citing lack of prosecutorial resources.

In short, little in Mr. Suarez's record as a prosecutor distinguishes him. If Mr. Suarez is qualified for the OECA post on the basis of his prosecutorial experience, then virtually every lawyer who has served as an AUSA is similarly qualified.

The only apparent reason Mr. Suarez has been named to the OECA post is his past service to the office of then-Governor Christine Todd Whitman. While such service may be the basis of a new political appointment, it hardly qualifies a person for the top enforcement position at EPA.

Given the recent resignation of Eric V. Schaefer as OECA's Director of the Office of Regulatory Enforcement and controversies swirling around the current Administration's commitment to enforcement, an experienced and credible nominee for Assistant Administrator for Enforcement & Compliance Assurance is needed to reassure an uncertain public and regulatory community. Such a move would also restore flagging OECA staff morale.

The OECA nominee must have relevant experience and show how his accomplishments would best serve to help enforce our country's environmental laws. By any reasonable standard John Suarez does not appear to be even minimally qualified to serve in this position.

II How Does the Suarez Record Compare?

A Snapshot

To provide some perspective on the record of John Peter Suarez as a prosecutor, PEER has displayed three measures of comparison between the performance of Mr. Suarez and all other Assistant US Attorneys both in the New Jersey District and nationally:

- **Workload.** The measure used here is the number of prosecutions Suarez completed in a year compared with the average number of prosecutions completed by other AUSAs in New Jersey (total number of prosecutions in the state divided by the total number of NJ AUSAs for that year) and nation-wide (total number of prosecutions in the US divided by the number of AUSAs for that year);
- **Impact.** The measure used here is the average number of months of prison sentences resulting from the convictions obtained; and
- **Efficiency.** The measure used here is the average number of days between the initial referral (assignment) of a case to a prosecutor and the ultimate disposition of that case.

This examination of John Suarez's overall prosecutorial record shows that he is slower to act, handles fewer cases than other AUSA's in his district and the nation, and that his cases result in fewer convictions.

1998	Suarez	New Jersey (average)	US (average)
Prosecutions Completed	5	7	15
Average Prison Sentence (months)	11	36	41
Average Days from Referral to Disposition	611	488	373

1997	Suarez	New Jersey (average)	US (average)
Prosecutions Completed	3	9	14
Average Prison Sentence (months)	7	44	47
Average Days from Referral to Disposition	1,802	404	380

1996	Suarez	New Jersey (average)	US (average)
Prosecutions Completed	4	9	14
Average Prison Sentence (months)	0	32	48
Average Days from Referral to Disposition	2,015	478	400

1995	Suarez	New Jersey (average)	US (average)
Prosecutions Completed	3	10	14
Average Prison Sentence (months)	0	38	51
Average Days from Referral to Disposition	1,429	395	396
1994	Suarez	New Jersey (average)	US
Prosecutions Completed	4	11	16
Average Prison Sentence (months)	17	35	53
Average Days from Referral to Disposition	1,237	408	365

1993	Suarez	New Jersey (average)	US (average)
Prosecutions Completed	8	11	17
Average Prison Sentence (months)	0	31	52
Average Days from Referral to Disposition	822	461	339

1992	Suarez	New Jersey (average)	US (average)
Prosecutions Completed	22	11	16
Average Prison Sentence (months)	29	31	52
Average Days from Referral to Disposition	584	388	327

Note on data method:

New Jersey Prosecutions = total number of prosecutions in the state divided by the total number of NJ AUSAs for that year

US Prosecutions = total number of prosecutions in the US divided by the total number of AUSAs for that year

III Summary of the Prosecutorial Record of John Peter Suarez, 1992-1998

The following is a narrative description of Mr. Suarez's prosecutorial record. A detailed, case-by-case analysis begins on page 7.

1998: Six cases were referred to Mr. Suarez. He declined one for lack of prosecutorial resources (racketeering lead charge).

Five prosecutions were filed – four plead guilty and one went to jury trial. As a result, four prison sentences and one probationary sentence were meted out. Only one prison sentence was longer than 6 months.

1997: Three cases (with the identical lead charge on importation and storage of explosives) were referred to Mr. Suarez; all filed, all plead guilty, only one conviction resulted in a prison sentence, the other two received probation.

1996: Eight cases were referred to Mr. Suarez. He declined three for lack of prosecutorial resources, one was resolved by pre-trial diversion. One case was transferred to another judge.

Three prosecutions were filed, two plead guilty but received no prison terms and in the remaining case, the defendant died before trial.

1995: Five cases were referred to Mr. Suarez. He declined two for lack of prosecutorial resources and one was dismissed. One case Mr. Suarez declined was the only case relating to a conspiracy to deny civil rights referred to him.

Of the two cases filed for prosecution, one resulted in a guilty plea to racketeering, but no prison term, the other was joined with another case.

1994: Fourteen cases were referred to Mr. Suarez. He declined six for lack of prosecutorial resources, four more were withdrawn at agency request,

Only four of the 14 cases were filed for prosecution; one was dismissed at government request, the remaining three plead guilty. Two cases resulted in prison terms longer than 6 months.

1993: Nine cases were referred to Mr. Suarez; one was administratively diverted and the government withdrew two others.

Six cases were filed for prosecution. The government dismissed four of those cases, including one for lack of DOJ authorization, and the two others plead guilty. Not one of those cases resulted in prison terms.

1992: Twenty-six cases were referred to Mr. Suarez. He declined four of those cases: one for lack of prosecutorial resources, one for staleness and two for lack of a federal interest.

The remaining 22 cases were filed for prosecution, of which three jury trials resulted in no convictions and one case was dismissed upon motion by the defense. The remaining 18 cases resulted in guilty pleas, but only five resulted in prison terms and one resulted in probation.

IV Breakdown — Year-by-Year, Case-by-Case

The following breakdown of cases referred to Mr. Suarez details what violation occurred, the investigative agency the case originated from, the priority the Department of Justice assigned to the case, the date the prosecution was filed (if at all), the date the case was disposed of, the disposition type (was the case declined, how the accused pled, etc.), the disposition reason, the court type, what judge presided, and the prison sentence or probation period resulting from the case. A detailed explanation of the codes used begins on page 10.

FY 1998

Lead Charge	Program Category	Investigative Agency	Priority	Referral Received	Prosecution Filed	Referral Disposed Of	Disposition Type	Disposition Reason	Court Type	Judge	Prison Sentence	Probation
18:1512	20	JUFB	X	950203	970923	980730	GT	JTRD	DC	AJL	045M	
18:1344	36	JUFB	X	960528	971209	980528	GT	PLED	DC	DD	005M	
18:1962	20	JUFB	X	970327	980504	980901	GT	PLED	DC	GEB		003Y
18:1962	20	JUFB	X	970327		971024	DE	LKPR	NC			
18:1951	20	JUFB	X	970926	970930	980617	GT	PLED	DC	AET	002M	
18:1951	20	JUFB	X	970926	970930	980617	GT	PLED	DC	AET	002M	

FY 1997

Lead Charge	Program Category	Investigative Agency	Priority	Referral Received	Prosecution Filed	Referral Disposed Of	Disposition Type	Disposition Reason	Court Type	Judge	Prison Sentence	Probation
18:0844	34	TRAT	X	910722	940510	961007	GT	PLED	DC	JBS		036M
18:0844	34	TRAT	X	910722	940614	951207	GT	PLED	DC	JBS		060M
18:0844	34	TRAT	X	910722	940510	961007	GT	PLED	DC	JBS	021M	

FY 1996

Lead Charge	Program Category	Investigative Agency	Priority	Referral Received	Prosecution Filed	Referral Disposed Of	Disposition Type	Disposition Reason	Court Type	Judge	Prison Sentence	Probation
18:2314	90	JUFB	X	870515		960325	TR	RUFO	MG	HLS		
18:0215	36	JUFB	X	901005		960209	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:1003	39	HHS	X	901231		950920	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:0844	34	TRAT	X	910722	940510	951207	GT	PLED	DC	JBS		
18:0656	03Z	JUFB	X	910725		960214	DE	PTDR	NC			
18:1961	20	TRCB	X	921109	940810	960301	DM	DETH	DC	AJL		
18:2320	90	TRCB	X	940214		960325	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:0371	20	JUFB	X	960530	960410	960410	GT	PLED	DC	AMW		

FY 1995

Lead Charge	Program Category	Investigative Agency	Priority	Referral Received	Prosecution Filed	Referral Disposed Of	Disposition Type	Disposition Reason	Court Type	Judge	Prison Sentence	Probation
18:0241	50	JUFB	X	880203		950920	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:2113B	83	JUFB	X	900702		950703	DM	GWOM	MG	SRC		
18:0664	20	LABO	X	901113	931217	950221	TR	RTWD	DC	AMW		
21:0846	47	JUFB	X	910325		950630	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:1961	20	TRCB	X	921109	940810	950427	GT	PLED	DC	AJL		

FY 1994

Lead Charge	Program Category	Investigative Agency	Priority	Referral Received	Prosecution Filed	Referral Disposed Of	Disposition Type	Disposition Reason	Court Type	Judge	Prison Sentence	Probation
18:0656	36	JUFB	N	891005		931207	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:1344	36	JUFB	X	900312		940615	DE	AGRE	NC			
29:0501C	08A	LABO	X	900517	930910	940114	GT	PLED	DC	JBS		036M
18:0641	82	HHS	X	900618		931207	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:1344	36	TRSS	X	900807	930528	940112	GT	PLED	DC	AMW		014M
18:2113	83	JUFB	X	901009		931206	DE	LIPR	NC			
21:0846	40	JUDE	X	901009	911018	940411	DM	GWDD	DC	NHP		
18:1365	90	JUFB	X	901231		931102	DE	LIPR	NC			
18:0111	84	PSUS	X	910301	930521	940207	GT	PLED	DC	HLS		036M
21:0846	40	JUDE	X	910722		940608	DE	LIPR	NC			
21:0952	47	TRCB	X	911021		931207	DE	LIPR	NC			
21:0846	40	TRCB	X	920310		940202	DE	AGRE	NC			
21:0846	47	JUDE	X	920720		940202	DE	AGRE	NC			
18:0922G	20	JUFB	X	920817		940202	TR	RUFO	NC			

FY 1993

Lead Charge	Program Category	Investigative Agency	Priority	Referral Received	Prosecution Filed	Referral Disposed Of	Disposition Type	Disposition Reason	Court Type	Judge	Prison Sentence	Probation
18:0641	32	HHS	X	930127		930720	GT	PLED	MG	RJH		
18:1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	930527	DM	GWOD	DC	AET		
18:1003	32	HHSS	X	900416		921013	DE	CADA	NC			
18:0641	82	HHS	X	900618	930621	930621	GT	PLED	DC	NHP		
18:1344	36	TRSS	X	900807	930528	930909	GT	PLED	DC	AMW		
18:0659	75	JUFB	X	901009	900920	930709	DM	GWDD	DC	GEB		
18:0659	75	JUFB	X	901009	900920	930709	DM	GWDD	DC	AMW		
18:0659	75	JUFB	X	901009	900920	930709	DM	GWDD	DC	AMW		
18:3184	90	JUMS	X	930212		930303	DM	GWDM	MG	JAP		

FY 1992

Lead Charge	Program Category	Investigative Agency	Priority	Referral Received	Prosecution Filed	Referral Disposed Of	Disposition Type	Disposition Reason	Court Type	Prison Judge	Sentence	Probation
29 :0501C	08A	LABO	X	861101		910930	DE	MFIN	NC			
18 :0912	90	JUFB	X	880915	910306	910716	GT	PLED	DC	RJH	027M	
18 :0641	03Z	HHS	X	890522		910930	DE	STAL	NC			
18 :0549	62	TRCB	X	891220		910930	DE	MFIN	NC			
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920511	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920511	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920504	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920511	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920504	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920710	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	920513	920527	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	920625	920911	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	920504	920504	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920911	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920911	GT	PLED	DC	AET		
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	900409	911211	920506	DM	DEMD	DC	AET		
18 :1003	32	HHSS	X	900416		920417	DE	LIPR	NC			
21 :0846	40	JUDE	X	900919	900920	901217	GT	PLED	DC	HLS	018M	
21 :0846	40	JUDE	X	900919	900920	901217	GT	PLED	DC	HLS	036M	
21 :0846	40	JUDE	X	901009	911018	920612	GT	PLED	DC	NHP		
21 :0846	40	JUDE	X	901031	901101	911007	NG	JTRD	DC	HAA		
21 :0846	40	JUDE	X	901031	901101	911007	NG	JTRD	DC	HAA		
21 :0846	40	JUDE	X	901031	901101	911007	NG	JTRD	DC	HAA		
21 :0846	40	JUDE	X	910313	910423	910814	GT	PLED	DC	JFG	005Y	
18 :1341	33	IRS	X	910606	920312	920312	GT	PLED	DC	JWB	002M	036M
18 :1343	32	HHS	X	920504	920504	920504	GT	PLED	DC	GEB		

Definition of Codes

Lead Charge

Note: code 18:0215 and 18:0664 may have been mis -typed into the database.

18 USC 0111	assaulting/intimidating government employee
18 USC 0241	conspiracy against civil rights
18 USC 0371	conspiracy to defraud the US
18 USC 0549	removing goods from customs custody; breaking seals
18 USC 0641	embezzlement/theft of federal property
18 USC 0656	theft/embezzlement by bank officer/employee
18 USC 0659	embezzlement/theft-interstate commerce
18 USC 0844	explosives-illegal actions-penalties
18 USC 0846	explosives-importation/distribution
18 USC 0912	false impersonation of US official
18 USC 0922	firearms-illegal procedures
18 USC 0952	crimes-diplomatic codes/correspondence
18 USC 1003	fraudulent demands against the United States
18 USC 1341	mail fraud
18 USC 1343	mail fraud-wire/radio/TV
18 USC 1344	bank fraud
18 USC 1365	tampering with consumer products
18 USC 1512	obstruction of justice
18 USC 1961	racketeering-definitions
18 USC 1962	racketeering-prohibited acts
18 USC 2113	bank robbery
18 USC 2314	transportation of stolen goods-securities
18 USC 2320	trafficking in counterfeit goods or services
18 USC 3184	extradition of fugitives from foreign country to US
21 USC 0846	drugs-attempt/conspiracy
29 USC 0501c	fiduciary responsibility of officers of labor organizations - embezzlement

Program Category

03Z	<p><u>Other White Collar Crime/Fraud</u> Use 03Z ONLY if one of the specific codes does not apply.</p>
08A	<p><u>Union Official Corruptions - Pension Benefit Funds</u> Embezzlement, conversion and other misuse of union pension, welfare, and other benefit funds (may involve violations of 18 USC. 664, 1954 and 1962, 29 USC. 186, 501c and related statutes). (All such cases involving \$25,000 or more in the aggregate are national priorities (N).)</p>
020	<p><u>Organized Crime - Traditional Organizations</u> Violations of statutes relating to gambling, extortion, alcoholic beverages, infiltration of legitimate business by organized criminal elements, and related offenses involving organized crime (may involve violations of 18 USC. 371, 664, 1084, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1955, 1962 and similar statutes).</p>
033	<p><u>Tax Fraud</u> Fraud against the government involving tax evasion, non-reporting of income, etc. (may involve violations of 26 USC. 7201, 7203, 7206 and related statutes). All such cases authorized for prosecution by the Tax Division, USDOJ, are national priorities (N).</p>
034	<p><u>Arson for Profit</u> Fraud against insurance companies and others involving the willful destruction of property by fire, explosives or incendiary devices (may involve violations of 18 USC. 81, 1341, 1343, 1962 and related statutes). (All such cases involving \$250,000 or more in aggregate losses or two or more incidents perpetrated by the same person or persons are national priorities (N).) (Discontinued 9/95)</p>
036	<p><u>Financial Institution Fraud</u> Fraud and embezzlement, including through the use of credit cards and credit card information, in which banks, savings and loan associations credit unions and similar financial institutions are the victims (see 039 for other kinds of credit card fraud) (may involve violations of 18 USC. 371, 656, 657, 1005, 1006, 1029, 1341, 1343, and 1344).</p>
039	<p><u>Other Fraud Against Businesses</u> Fraud against business institutions not described in program categories 034, 035, 036, 037 or 038 (may involve violations of 18 USC. 1341, 1343, 1962 and related statutes). (All such cases involving \$100,000 or more in aggregate losses are national priorities (N).)</p>
047	<p><u>OCDETF</u> Cases assigned exclusively to the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (formerly Narcotics Task Force). (National Priority (N).)</p>
075	<p><u>Theft of Property</u> In interstate transportation (18 USC. 659, 2117) or interstate transportation of stolen property (19 USC. 2314, etc.) excluding motor vehicles.</p>
082	<p><u>Violations Relating to the Postal Service</u> Including theft of mail (18 USC. 1691 et seq.). Does not include mail fraud under 18 USC. 1341; public corruption under program categories 011-014; or pornography/obscenity under program categories 087 or 089.</p>
083	<p>May Involve Violations of 18 USC. 2113. (Bank robberies)</p>

084	<u>Violations of State Laws Adopted for an Area within Special Federal Jurisdiction</u> (Such as some military posts.) (See 18 USC. 0007, 0013; does not include Native American Offenses assimilated under 18 USC. 1152-1153 (065).) Also violations of federal crimes which are the equivalent of state crimes but are enacted for the "special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States" (e.g., 18 USC. 0661).
090	Include in this category everything which does not fall into one of the above categories.

Investigative Agency

Health and Human Service	
HHSS	Social Security Admin.
HHS	All Other Health & Human Service
Justice	
JUDE	Drug Enforcement Admin.
JUFB	Federal Bureau of Investigation
Labor	
LABO	All Other Labor
Postal Service	
PSUS	US Postal Service
Treasury	
IRS	All Internal Revenue
TRAT	Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms

Priority

N	<u>National Priority</u> Case/matter qualifies as a national priority; see priority descriptions associated with specific types of offenses listed under Criminal Program Category Codes.
D	<u>District Priority Only</u> Case/matter qualifies as a district priority, as determined by the US Attorney for the relevant federal district, but not as a national priority; use this only when district priorities are different from established national priorities. (Not all districts will have district priorities.)
B	<u>Both a National Priority and a District Priority</u> Case/matter is both a national priority and a district priority, as determined by the US Attorney. (Not all districts will have district priorities.)
X	<u>Neither a National Nor a District Priority</u> Case/matter does not meet specifications for a national or district priority.
U	<u>Undetermined</u> This code is to be used when the priority is unknown at the time the case/matter is opened.

Disposition Type

DE	Declination
DM	Dismissed without prejudice
GT	Guilty
NG	Not guilty
TR	Transfer

Disposition Reason Criminal Immediate Declination

AGRE	Agency request
CADA	Civil, administrative, or other disciplinary alternatives
LIPR	Lack of investigative or prosecutive resources (<i>Discontinued by September 1995</i>)
LKPR	Lack of prosecutive resources
MFIN	Minimal federal interest or no deterrent value

Criminal Other Than Declinations

DEMD	By defense motion (District Court)
DETH	Death of Defendant
GWDD	By government from District Court w/ DOJ authorization
GWDM	By government from Magistrate Court w/ DOJ authorization
GWOD	By government from District Court no DOJ authorization
GWOM	By government from Magistrate Court no DOJ authorization
JTRD	Jury Trial Verdict (District Court)
PLED	Plea (District Court)
PTDR	Pretrial Diversion Completed
RTWD	Rule 20 (District Court) (was joined with another case)
RUFO	Rule 40 (transferred to another Judge)

V Impact Comparison — Length of Prison Sentence & Probation

This comparison shows that Mr. Suarez's cases resulted in fewer convictions compared to the total number of convictions in the NJ AUSA district and the US overall. The few convictions attained by Mr. Suarez resulted in fewer months served in prison or on probation than convictions attained by other AUSA's in his district and the US overall.

1998

	JPS	District (total)	US (total)
# convicted	5	612	59,540
average prison sentence (months)	11	36	41
average probation sentence (months)	7	12	9

1997

	JPS	District (total)	US (total)
# convicted	3	912	50,142
average prison sentence (months)	7	44	47
average probation sentence (months)	32	11	15

1996

	JPS	District (total)	US (total)
# convicted	2	805	48,380
average prison sentence (months)	0	32	48
average probation sentence (months)	0	12	17

1995

	JPS	District (total)	US (total)
# convicted	1	779	46,570
average prison sentence (months)	0	38	51
average probation sentence (months)	0-	15	16

1994

	JPS	District (total)	US (total)
# convicted	3	791	48,086
average prison sentence (months)	17	35	53
average probation sentence (months)	12	16	17

1993

	JPS	District (total)	US (total)
# convicted	3	864	53,536
average prison sentence (months)	0	31	52
average probation sentence (months)	0	17	18

1992

	JPS	District (total)	US (total)
# convicted	18	894	49,677
average prison sentence (months)	29	21	48
average probation sentence (months)	7	19	18

VI Efficiency Comparison — Caseload Management

Mr. Suarez took` significantly more time to file and decline cases than his colleagues. This analysis provides a direct comparison with the NJ district average and the US overall average.

FY 1998

	JPS	District	US
average time before court filing (days)	243	203	111
average time before declined (days)	211	183	393
average days court filing to disposition	224	311	295
average days referral to disposition	611	488	373

FY 1997

	JPS	District	US
average time before court filing (days)	963	234	168
average time before declined (days)	-	240	340
average days court filing to disposition	768	236	267
average days referral to disposition	1,802	404	380

FY 1996

	JPS	District	US
average time before court filing (days)	-	229	161
average time before declined (days)	1,528	757	340
average days court filing to disposition	382	229	271
average days referral to disposition	2,015	478	400

FY 1995

	JPS	District	US
average time before court filing (days)	676	226	175
average time before declined (days)	2,172	304	314
average days court filing to disposition	346	178	278
average days referral to disposition	1,429	395	396

FY 1994

	JPS	District	US
average time before court filing (days)	899	259	175
average time before declined (days)	1,016	136	283
average days court filing to disposition	381	201	258
average days referral to disposition	1,237	408	365

FY 1993

	JPS	District	US
average time before court filing (days)	914	244	162
average time before declined (days)	911	120	251
average time before court filing (days)	914	244	162
average time before declined (days)	911	120	251

FY 1992

	JPS	District	US
average time before court filing (days)	554	208	151
average time before declined (days)	1,009	137	279
average days court filing to disposition	156	249	240
average days referral to disposition	584	388	327

For questions about this report, please call PEER at: 202-265-7337