



# Recommendation for New U.S. Circuit and District Court Judgeships by the Judicial Conference of the United States (117<sup>th</sup> Congress)

March 26, 2021

Congress determines, through legislative action, both the size and structure of the federal judiciary. Consequently, the creation of any new permanent or temporary U.S. circuit and district court judgeships must be authorized by Congress. Congress can authorize either permanent or temporary judgeships. A “permanent judgeship,” as the term suggests, permanently increases the number of judgeships for a court, whereas a “temporary judgeship” increases the number of judgeships for a specified amount of time (although Congress can later convert such a judgeship to a permanent one).

**Figure 1** shows, for the period 1891 (when Congress established nine courts of appeals, one for each judicial circuit at the time) through 2020, changes in the number of U.S. circuit and district court judgeships authorized by Congress. As the country’s population increased, its geographic boundaries expanded, and federal case law became more complex, the number of judgeships authorized by Congress increased regularly during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The number of permanent circuit court judgeships increased to 179 in 1990 during the 101<sup>st</sup> Congress and has remained at that number to the present day. This represents the longest period of time since 1891 that Congress has not authorized any new permanent circuit court judgeships.

The number of permanent district court judgeships increased to 663 in 2003 during the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress and has remained at that number to the present day. This represents the longest period of time since district courts were established in 1789 that Congress has not authorized any new permanent district court judgeships.

**Congressional Research Service**

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

IN11639

# Pocket Constitution




The Declaration of Independence  
The Constitution of the United States  
The Bill of Rights  
Amendments XI–XXVII  
Gettysburg Address



**TheCapitolNet**

TCNFPC.com

**Figure I. Number of U.S. Circuit and District Court Judgeships Authorized by Congress (1891-2020)**



Source: Congressional Research Service.

The [Judicial Conference of the United States](#), the policymaking body of the federal courts, makes a biennial recommendation to Congress that identifies any circuit and district courts that, according to the conference, require new judgeships to more effectively administer civil and criminal justice in the federal system.

### U.S. Circuit Court Judgeships


The conference's most recent recommendation, [released in March 2021](#) during the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress, requests the authorization of 2 new permanent circuit court judgeships for the [U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit](#) (comprised of California, eight other western states, and two U.S. territories). This would bring the number of authorized judgeships for the Ninth Circuit from 29 to 31. The Ninth Circuit is the country's most populous appellate circuit, with a population of approximately 66.9 million.

### U.S. District Court Judgeships

The conference also recommends that Congress authorize 86 new permanent U.S. district court judgeships across 26 judicial districts (with more than one new judge being recommended for some district courts). [Figure 2](#) shows the 26 judicial districts for which the conference has recommended new district court judgeships. Of the 26 districts, the conference recommends the creation of more than one new judgeship in 17, or 65%, of the districts.

The greatest number of new judgeships, 16, was recommended for the [U.S. District Court for the Central District of California](#) (which exercises jurisdiction over Los Angeles County and six other counties). This federal judicial district is the most populous district in the country, with an estimated population of 19.4 million.

**Figure 2. New Judgeships Recommended by the Judicial Conference**  
(March 2021)



**Source:** Congressional Research Service.

A total of 60 (or 70%) of the new judgeships are recommended for U.S. district courts located in the country’s four most populous states—California, Texas, Florida, and New York.

Of the 86 new permanent district court judgeships that the conference recommends be authorized by Congress, 9 (10%) are currently temporary judgeships—each of which was first authorized by Congress in either 1990 or 2002.

### *Weighted Filings*

The Judicial Conference’s recommendation as to which lower federal courts need new judgeships is based, in part, upon a comparison across courts of the complexity of different types of cases handled by judges, as well as the amount of time it takes for judges to dispense with such cases. For example, types of civil cases that are generally more complex or time-consuming for judges include environmental, patent, civil rights, antitrust, and Freedom of Information Act actions.

For district courts, the specific statistic used by the Judicial Conference to make its comparison across courts is the number of “[weighted filings](#)” per authorized judgeship in each district. The weighted filings statistic is a mathematical adjustment to the number of case filings for a district court that takes into account the relative complexity of cases and the expected amount of time required for disposition of a court’s cases. A similar statistic, not discussed in detail in this Insight, is used for U.S. circuit courts (it is referred to as “adjusted filings per three-judge panel”).

Nationally, [for the 12-month period ending September 30, 2020](#), there were on average 681 weighted filings per judgeship across all 91 U.S. district courts (excluding 3 territorial district courts). In contrast, the numbers of weighted filings per judgeship during the same period for several of the district courts recommended to receive new judgeships included 903 ([District of Delaware](#)), 880 ([Southern District of Indiana](#)), 860 ([District of New Jersey](#)), 830 ([Western District of Texas](#)), and 702 ([Central District of California](#)).

Although the number of weighted filings per judgeship is the primary factor in the Judicial Conference's evaluation of a district court's need for additional judgeships, the conference's recommendations for new judgeships are not based solely upon this particular statistic. Other factors that the conference might consider in making its recommendations include the number of judgeships requested by the district court itself; the availability of senior, visiting, and [magistrate judges](#) to assist in handling a district court's caseload; geographical factors; unusual caseload complexity for a court; and whether a court is experiencing temporary increases or decreases in its caseload.

## Author Information

Barry J. McMillion  
Analyst in American National Government

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

# Learn how Capitol Hill really works

**All of our programs and any combination of their topics can be tailored for custom training for your organization.**

For more than 40 years, TheCapitol.Net and its predecessor, Congressional Quarterly Executive Conferences, have been teaching professionals from government, military, business, and NGOs about the dynamics and operations of the legislative and executive branches and how to work with them.

Our training, on-site and online, and publications include congressional operations, legislative and budget process, communication and advocacy, media and public relations, research, testifying before Congress, legislative drafting, critical thinking and writing, and more.

- **Diverse Client Base**—We have tailored hundreds of custom on-site and online training programs for Congress, numerous agencies in all federal departments, the military, law firms, lobbying firms, unions, think tanks and NGOs, foreign delegations, associations and corporations, delivering exceptional insight into how Washington works.™
- **Experienced Program Design and Delivery**—We have designed and delivered hundreds of custom programs covering congressional/legislative operations, budget process, media training, writing skills, legislative drafting, advocacy, research, testifying before Congress, grassroots, and more.
- **Professional Materials**—We provide training materials and publications that show how Washington works. Our publications are designed both as course materials and as invaluable reference tools.
- **Large Team of Experienced Faculty**—More than 150 faculty members provide independent subject matter expertise. Each program is designed using the best faculty member for each session.
- **Non-Partisan**—TheCapitol.Net is non-partisan.
- **GSA Schedule**—TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training: GSA Contract GS02F0192X.

Please see our Capability Statement on our web site at [TCNCS.com](http://TCNCS.com).

Custom training programs are designed to meet your educational and training goals, each led by independent subject-matter experts best qualified to help you reach your educational objectives and align with your audience.

As part of your custom program, we can also provide online venue, classroom space, breaks and meals, receptions, tours, and online registration and individual attendee billing services.

For more information about custom on-site training for your organization, please see our web site: [TCNCustom.com](http://TCNCustom.com) or call us: 202-678-1600, ext 115.



## TheCapitol.Net

*Non-partisan training and publications that show how Washington works.™*

PO Box 25706, Alexandria, VA 22313-5706  
202-678-1600 • [www.thecapitol.net](http://www.thecapitol.net)



TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training.  
GSA Contract GS02F0192X

