

BILL ANALYSIS

C.S.H.B. 2261
By: West, George "Buddy"
Redistricting
Committee Report (Substituted)

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

C.S.H.B. 2261 relates to the composition of the Eighth and Eleventh courts of appeals districts.

C.S.H.B. 2261 reduces the distance from major population centers to the appellate courthouse. The drive from Midland/Odessa to El Paso is approximately 50% greater than the drive from Midland/Odessa to Eastland.

C.S.H.B. 2261 reduces the population discrepancy between the districts. According to the 2000 census data, the population within the proposed Eighth Court of Appeals District would be 781,323. The population within the proposed Eleventh Court of Appeals District would be 683,759.

The five-year average caseload per judge in the Eleventh Court of Appeals District would increase from 66 to 107 cases per judge. The five-year average caseload per judge in the Eighth Court of Appeals District would decrease from 99 to 68 cases per judge; however, history and demographics suggest that the Eighth Court of Appeals District is growing faster than the Eleventh Court of Appeals District.

C.S.H.B. 2261 removes Ector, Gaines, Glasscock, Martin, and Midland counties from the Eighth Court of Appeals District and places them into the Eleventh Court of Appeals District.

RULEMAKING AUTHORITY

It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly grant any additional rulemaking authority to a state officer, department, agency, or institution.

ANALYSIS

C.S.H.B. 2261 amends Sections 22.201(i) and (l), Government Code. C.S.H.B. 2261 removes the counties of Ector, Gaines, Glasscock, Martin, and Midland from the Eighth Court of Appeals District. C.S.H.B. 2261 adds the counties of Ector, Gaines, Glasscock, Martin, and Midland to the Eleventh Court of Appeals District.

This Act does not affect the jurisdiction on appeal of any case from a county that is transferred by this Act to a different court of appeals district if the transcripts for the case were filed before the effective date of this Act in the appropriate court of appeals district.

EFFECTIVE DATE

September 1, 2003.

COMPARISON OF ORIGINAL TO SUBSTITUTE

The substitute differs from the original bill in that the original bill also included Andrews county.