

MUNICIPAL COURT ADMINISTRATION

Establishment of Municipal Courts

Under Title 2B Chapter 12 of the New Jersey Statutes (N.J.S.2B:12-1), every municipality is authorized to establish a municipal court. The Statute permits two additional models besides the standard model in municipal court organization. Both models grant municipalities to share court services. According to state law, two or more municipalities may enter into an agreement establishing a single joint municipal court or they may agree to share facilities and agree to appoint judges and administrators without establishing a joint municipal court.

Joint Municipal Court

Under the first model (known as a “joint municipal court”), two municipalities form joint municipal courts thereby reorganizing into one single court. The Governor is authorized under joint courts to appoint judges. New Jersey currently has nineteen joint courts and most are in small communities. Under this model, funds are distributed by formula to one court and are dispersed to over fifty different accounts. Since the court serves two municipalities, fines and costs are distributed back to the municipality where the offense occurred.

List of Joint Municipal Courts

For the complete list of Joint Municipal Courts in New Jersey see the appendix section of this report. The list is broken up by Court Code, County, Municipality, Judge, Gubernatorial Appointment, and Date of Appointment.

Shared Municipal Courts

The second model of court sharing (known as the “share model”) occurs when two municipalities agree to share resources and each town keeps their own identity as it relates to their court system. In this model, each municipality operates functionally as two courts even though they might share computers, employees, or facilities. Some municipalities see this as a better option than the joint municipal court model since they can appoint their own judges. As of November 2008, there were 51 shared municipal courts in New Jersey.

List of Shared Municipal Courts

The list of New Jersey’s Shared Municipal Courts can be found in the appendix section of this report. The list is divided into Shared Code, Court Code, County, and Municipality.

Informal Sharing

Although there are only two models available for municipal courts to share services, many municipalities are informally sharing municipal judges as cost saving mechanisms. According to the New Jersey Administrative Office of the Courts, some municipal judges serve as many as ten municipalities. The Administrative Office of the Courts sites there

are about three hundred and fifty judges serving five hundred and thirty one municipal courts.

Case Study: Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority

The Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority (FMERPA) commissioned Jersey Professional Management (JPM) to conduct a case study on municipal court shared services. The observations, recommendations, and conclusions of the study are described in a report entitled, “Feasibility Study for Possible Shared Services.” JPM examined municipal courts in the Boroughs of Eatontown, Oceanport, and Tinton Falls and their analysis focused on municipal court personnel, facilities, security, workload, and administrative operations.

The Jersey Professional Management Study Team determined that the municipal courts in the Fort Monmouth area would be suited for a shared service agreement. JPM recommended that the Borough of Eatontown serve as the lead agency for an expanded shared service agreement to include Oceanport Borough. Under the recommendations of JPM, the Borough of Tinton Falls would remain independent while the Borough of Eatontown and Shrewsbury Township would share services and facilities with the Oceanport Borough. In the future, JPM recommended that neighboring municipalities consider sharing services to form a Joint Monmouth County Regional Court.

Administration of Justice -- Consolidation

BACKGROUND

Outlined in the Special Session Joint Legislative Committee Final Report, the Joint Committee examined the level of control municipalities have over the appointment of judges in the event that two municipalities choose to share a court. The Committee found that municipalities in some instances are so fearful of the potential loss of judicial appointment that it inhibited a merger that would otherwise have occurred.

Under Article VI, Section VI, paragraph 1 of the New Jersey Constitution, and associated implementing legislation, the Governor is granted the power to nominate and appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, the judges of any “inferior courts” with jurisdiction extending to more than one municipality. The Joint Committee concluded that since there was considerable interest expressed by municipalities in sharing court services, this obstacle should be removed. The Committee recommended that an alternative should be promoted that preserves the local appointment power.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Joint Committee recommended (Recommendation #11) an amendment to the State Constitution to remove the Governor’s power to appoint municipal court judges in the event that municipalities enter into an agreement to share court services, and to instead defer to that agreement determination of the judicial appointment. The Joint Committee also recommended that when implementing legislation for this constitutional change, the appointment method would be included within the inter-local agreement establishing the joint municipal court.

PUBLIC QUESTION #2 IN 2008 GENERAL ELECTION

On November 4th, voters had the opportunity to vote whether a constitutional amendment would provide that the method of selection and appointment of certain municipal court judges would be set by statute, rather than be provided for in the Constitution. The majority of voters decided not to amend the constitution (results are listed below).

COUNTY	YES COUNT	NO COUNT
	30,902	39,543
Atlantic	85,437	96,874
Bergen	61,376	73,664
Burlington	61,719	69,980
Camden	14,167	15,427
Cape May	13,018	16,018
Cumberland	43,736	43,773
Essex	37,394	53,325
Gloucester	23,999	30,538
Hudson	28,180	24,475
Hunterdon	44,440	50,235
Mercer	66,743	85,050
Middlesex	86,613	105,111
Monmouth	59,729	76,446
Morris	83,228	106,893
Ocean	35,660	41,596
Passaic	13,579	16,122
Salem	42,723	54,169
Somerset	32,229	35,170
Sussex	35,248	44,785
Union	17,216	21,437
Warren	917,336	1,100,631
TOTAL		

New Jersey

Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Planning Authority
Feasibility Study for Possible Shared Services For Emergency Services For FMERPA
July 2008

http://nj.gov/fmerpa/library/pdf/rfp_es_court.pdf

Addendum Alternate Municipal Court Shared Services
http://nj.gov/fmerpa/library/pdf/rfp_es_court_update.pdf

Other States

Office of the New York State Comptroller
Division of Local Government Services & Economic Development

Justice More Local: September 2008

http://www.nyslocalgov.org/pdf/Justice_Most_Local.pdf

Justice Courts Accountability and Internal Control Systems: May 2006

<http://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/audits/swr/2005mr10.pdf>

Opportunities for Town and Village Justice Court Consolidation: November 2003

<http://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/audits/swr/2003mr4.pdf>

State of New York Unified Court System

Action Plan for the Justice Courts: November 2006

<http://nycourts.gov/publications/pdfs/ActionPlan-JusticeCourts.pdf>

1993 Commission to Study the Orleans Parish Judicial System (*Landrieu Commission*), which reached the conclusion that the separate courts are not the dilemma. The dilemma is adequate funding for the courts. The Commission found that the merger of the civil and criminal courts would be ineffective, but did call for the merger of city courts and the abolishment of parochial offices, transferring those functions to the civil clerk.

<http://www.neworleansbar.org/CourtConsolidation.htm>

<http://www.neworleansbar.org/documents/LandrieuCommissionExecSummary1993.pdf>

Executive Summary: Report of the Independent Review Panel Concerning the Atlanta Municipal Court and the City Court of Atlanta

The Panel was charged to “advise the Mayor on the court systems of the City of Atlanta and whether the current systems could be revised in light of the goals of efficiency, avoidance of duplication, focus of essential services and cost savings.”

http://www.atlantaga.gov/client_resources/mayorsoffice/special%20reports/courtreviewpanel043003.pdf

TITLE 2B. COURT ORGANIZATION AND CIVIL CODE

CHAPTER 12. MUNICIPAL COURTS

N.J. Stat. § 2B:12-1 (2008)

§ 2B:12-1. Establishment of municipal courts

a. Every municipality shall establish a municipal court. If a municipality fails to maintain a municipal court or does not enter into an agreement pursuant to subsection b. or c. of this section, the Assignment Judge of the vicinage shall order violations occurring within its boundaries heard in any other municipal court in the county until such time as the municipality establishes and maintains a municipal court. The municipality without a municipal court shall be responsible for all administrative costs specified in the order of the Assignment Judge pending the establishment of its municipal court.

b. Two or more municipalities, by ordinance, may enter into an agreement establishing a single joint municipal court and providing for its administration. A copy of the agreement shall be filed with the Administrative Director of the Courts. As used in this act, "municipal court" includes a joint municipal court.

c. Two or more municipalities, by ordinance or resolution, may agree to provide jointly for courtrooms, chambers, equipment, supplies and employees for their municipal courts and agree to appoint judges and administrators without establishing a joint municipal court. Where municipal courts share facilities in this manner, the identities of the individual courts shall continue to be expressed in the captions of orders and process.

d. An agreement pursuant to subsection b. or c. of this section may be terminated as provided in the agreement. If the agreement makes no provision for termination, it may be terminated by any party with reasonable notices and terms as determined by the Assignment Judge of the vicinage.

e. Any county of the first class with a population of over 825,000 and a population density of less than 4,000 persons per square mile according to the latest federal decennial census, with a county police department and force established in accordance with *N.J.S.40A:14-106* or a county park police system established in accordance with P.L.1960, c.135 (*C.40:37-261 et seq.*), may establish, by ordinance, a central municipal court, which shall be an inferior court of limited jurisdiction, to adjudicate cases filed by agents of the county health department, members of the county police department and force or county park police system, or other cases within its jurisdiction referred by the vicinage Assignment Judge pursuant to the Rules of Court, and provide for its administration. A copy of that ordinance shall be filed with the Administrative Director of the Courts. As used in this act, "municipal court" includes a central municipal court.

HISTORY: L. 1993, c. 293, § 1; amended 1996, c. 95, § 1; 2008, c. 2, § 1, eff. Mar. 26, 2008.

NOTES:

Amendment Note:2008 amendment, by Chapter 2, in the first sentence of c., substituted "judges and administrators" for "the same persons as judges and administrators."

Cross References:

Definitions relative to municipal public defenders, see *2B:24-2*.

Fines, assessments, penalties, restitution; collection; disposition, see *2C:46-4*.

Violations of toll collection monitoring system regulations; penalties, see *27:23-34.3*.

Violations of toll collection monitoring system regulations; penalties, see *27:25A-21.3*.

Fines, penalties, forfeiture, disposition of; exceptions, see *39:5-41*.

CASE NOTES

1. Municipal court has no jurisdiction under *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-14* to assess a penalty for an alleged Consumer Fraud Act violation in connection with the sale of a used motor vehicle because § *56:8-14* only grants jurisdiction over penalty enforcement actions. *State v. Tri-Way Kars, Inc.*, 402 *N.J. Super. 215*, 953 *A.2d 766*, 2008 *N.J. Super. LEXIS 179 (App.Div. 2008)*.

2. Central Municipal Court of Bergen County, New Jersey had no jurisdiction under *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-14.1* to assess a penalty against a defendant in a Consumer Fraud Act case because that statute expressly limits jurisdiction over penalty assessment cases to municipalities "where the offense was committed or where the defendant may be found." The offense at issue was committed in South Hackensack where defendant conducted business and § *56:8-14.1* was held to trump the general power of the Assignment Judge to refer cases to the Central Municipal Court under *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(e)*. *State v. Tri-Way Kars, Inc.*, 402 *N.J. Super. 215*, 953 *A.2d 766*, 2008 *N.J. Super. LEXIS 179 (App.Div. 2008)*.

3. Municipal court has no jurisdiction under *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-14* to assess a penalty for an alleged Consumer Fraud Act violation in connection with the sale of a used motor vehicle because § *56:8-14* only grants jurisdiction over penalty enforcement actions. *State v. Tri-Way Kars, Inc.*, 402 *N.J. Super. 215*, 953 *A.2d 766*, 2008 *N.J. Super. LEXIS 179 (App.Div. 2008)*.

4. Central Municipal Court of Bergen County, New Jersey had no jurisdiction under *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 56:8-14.1* to assess a penalty against a defendant in a Consumer Fraud Act case because that statute expressly limits jurisdiction over penalty assessment cases to municipalities "where the offense was committed or where the defendant may be found." The offense at issue was committed in South Hackensack where defendant conducted business and § *56:8-14.1* was held to trump the general power of the Assignment Judge to refer cases to the Central Municipal Court under *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(e)*. *State v. Tri-Way Kars, Inc.*, 402 *N.J. Super. 215*, 953 *A.2d 766*, 2008 *N.J. Super. LEXIS 179 (App.Div. 2008)*.

5. Borough and town's interlocal services agreement to share municipal court administrative support services under the New Jersey Interlocal Services Act, *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 40:8A-1*, was not approved because a provision in the agreement that allowed them to appoint their own individual judges was not permitted by *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*. [2008 amendment changed § *2B:12-1(c)*]. *In re*

Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark, 390 N.J. Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

6. To the extent *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)* and *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)* conflict, the more specific terms of *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*, which does not allow municipalities choosing to share municipal court services to appoint their own individual judges, controls over the broader statement in *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)*. [2008 amendment changed § 2B:12-1(c)]. *In re Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark*, 390 N.J. Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

7. Police justice courts were constituted and established as municipal courts of their respective municipalities and designated as municipal courts under former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-2* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1 et seq.*); the transition from police court to municipal court was in name only. *State v. Celmer*, 157 N.J. Super. 242, 384 A.2d 894, 1978 N.J. Super. LEXIS 889 (App.Div. 1978), reversed by 80 N.J. 405, 404 A.2d 1, 1979 N.J. LEXIS 1240 (1979).

8. By authority of former *N.J. Stat. Ann. §§ 2:8A-13, 2:8A-17* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1*), every municipality in the state is given a choice of establishing a municipal court or of joining with one or more municipalities in creating a municipal court; it was not the intention of the state legislature, in authorizing two or more municipalities to establish a municipal court by the adoption of ordinances based on an intermunicipal agreement, to estop any of the parties to such an agreement from ever, at any time in the future, withdrawing from such agreement and setting up its own municipal court as provided by law, whenever in the judgment of the municipal authorities the public interest so demanded. *Upper Penns Neck Tp. v. Lower Penns Neck Tp.*, 20 N.J. Super. 280, 89 A.2d 727, 1952 N.J. Super. LEXIS 885 (Law Div. 1952).

9. Ordinance adopted by township A that withdrew from the intermunicipal agreement that had been entered into with township B and C and the ordinance that established a separate municipal court for township A pursuant to former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2:8A-13* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1*), were both within the power and authority of township A to enact, and were valid. *Upper Penns Neck Tp. v. Lower Penns Neck Tp.*, 20 N.J. Super. 280, 89 A.2d 727, 1952 N.J. Super. LEXIS 885 (Law Div. 1952).

10. Borough and town's interlocal services agreement to share municipal court administrative support services under the New Jersey Interlocal Services Act, *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 40:8A-1*, was not approved because a provision in the agreement that allowed them to appoint their own individual judges was not permitted by *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*. [2008 amendment changed § 2B:12-1(c)]. *In re Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark*, 390 N.J. Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

11. To the extent *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)* and *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)* conflict, the more specific terms of *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*, which does not allow municipalities choosing to share municipal court services to appoint their own individual judges, controls over the broader statement in *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)*. [2008 amendment changed § 2B:12-1(c)]. *In re Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark*, 390 N.J. Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

*** THIS SECTION IS CURRENT THROUGH NEW JERSEY 213TH LEGISLATURE ***

*** FIRST ANNUAL SESSION (P.L. 2008 CH. 102 & J.R. 4) AND NOVEMBER 2008 ELECTION ***

*** ANNOTATIONS CURRENT THROUGH NOVEMBER 10, 2008 ***

TITLE 2B. COURT ORGANIZATION AND CIVIL CODE

CHAPTER 12. MUNICIPAL COURTS

N.J. Stat. § 2B:12-4 (2008)

§ 2B:12-4. Judge of municipal court; term of office appointment

a. Each judge of a municipal court shall serve for a term of three years from the date of appointment and until a successor is appointed and qualified. Any appointment to fill a vacancy not caused by the expiration of term shall be made for the unexpired term only. However, if a county or municipality requires by ordinance that the judge of the municipal court devote full time to judicial duties or limit the practice of law to non-litigated matters, the first appointment after the establishment of that requirement shall be for a full term of three years.

b. In municipalities governed by a mayor-council form of government, the municipal court judge shall be appointed by the mayor with the advice and

consent of the council. Each judge of a joint municipal court shall be nominated and appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. In all other municipalities, the municipal judge shall be appointed by the governing body of the municipality.

c. In a county that has established a central municipal court, the judge of the central municipal court shall be nominated and appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. In those counties having a county executive, the county executive may submit the names of judicial candidates for judge of the central municipal court to the Governor. In all other counties, the governing body may submit the names of judicial candidates for judge of the central municipal court to the Governor.

HISTORY: L. 1993, c. 293, § 1; amended 1996, c. 95, § 3.

LexisNexis (R) Notes:

CASE NOTES

1. To the extent *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)* and *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)* conflict, the more specific terms of *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*, which does not allow municipalities choosing to share municipal court services to appoint their own individual judges, controls over the broader statement in *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)*. *In re Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark*, 390 N.J. Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

2. To the extent that *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)* and *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)* conflict, the more specific terms of *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*, which does not allow municipalities choosing to share municipal court services to appoint their own individual judges, controls over the broader statement in *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)*. *In re Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark*, 390 N.J. Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

3. Creation of local offices by ordinance, pursuant to former *N.J. Rev. Stat. § 40:48-1*, was not applicable to the position of magistrate when that position was mandated by the legislature as part of a state judicial system plan under former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*). *Krieger v. Jersey City*, 27 N.J. 535, 143 A.2d 564, 1958 N.J. LEXIS 219 (1958).

4. To the extent *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)* and *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)* conflict, the more specific terms of *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*, which does not allow municipalities choosing to share municipal court services to appoint their own individual judges, controls over the broader statement in *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)*. *In re Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark*, 390 N.J.

Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

5. To the extent that *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)* and *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)* conflict, the more specific terms of *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-1(c)*, which does not allow municipalities choosing to share municipal court services to appoint their own individual judges, controls over the broader statement in *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4(b)*. *In re Municipal Court of Borough of East Newark*, 390 N.J. Super. 513, 915 A.2d 1116, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 349 (Law Div. 2006).

6. Creation of local offices by ordinance, pursuant to former *N.J. Rev. Stat. § 40:48-1*, was not applicable to the position of magistrate when that position was mandated by the legislature as part of a state judicial system plan under former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*). *Krieger v. Jersey City*, 27 N.J. 535, 143 A.2d 564, 1958 N.J. LEXIS 219 (1958).

7. Board of commissioners, not the head of any one department, was the "governing body" of the city designated to act as statutory agent appointing a municipal court magistrate, in accordance with former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*), to exercise the power of the state court system. *Kagan v. Caroselli*, 30 N.J. 371, 153 A.2d 17, 1959 N.J. LEXIS 183 (1959).

8. Board of commissioners, not the head of any one department, was the "governing body" of the city designated to act as statutory agent under former *N.J. Stat. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*) appointing a municipal court magistrate to exercise the power of the state court system. *Kagan v. Caroselli*, 30 N.J. 371, 153 A.2d 17, 1959 N.J. LEXIS 183 (1959).

9. Appointment of a municipal judge was to be made by a municipal council and not by a mayor, because the municipality was not a mayor-council community provided by the Faulkner Act, former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 40:69A-139* et seq., as it was not "a mayor-council form" within the meaning of former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-5* (see now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*); the municipality could not have been a mayor-council community, because the mayor was also a council member. *In re Fairfield Township*, 240 *N.J. Super.* 83, 572 *A.2d* 660, 1990 *N.J. Super.* LEXIS 104 (*App.Div.* 1990).

10. Mayor's, city council's, and city's attempted term limitation of the municipal judge was improper under former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*), and subject to remedial action by the court; the municipal resolution was void, and sitting municipal judge was appointed by the court to the statutory three year term. *Levine v. Mayor of Passaic*, 233 *N.J. Super.* 559, 559 *A.2d* 485, 1988 *N.J. Super.* LEXIS 519 (*Law Div.* 1988).

11. Where former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*) was amended to provide that vacancies could be filled for an unexpired term only, plaintiff's appointment was against public policy, and should have been set it aside because the entire township committee did not ask for the resignation of plaintiff's predecessor, but only a lame-duck majority who wished to keep the post in the hands of one of their political faith. *Higgins v. Denver*, 85 *N.J. Super.* 277, 204 *A.2d* 597, 1964 *N.J. Super.* LEXIS 295 (*App.Div.* 1964).

12. Municipality's resolution to abolish the office was set aside, even though the office had been appointed by a prior

resolution of the municipality's governing body, and not by ordinance, and the resolution at issue had been adopted in the interest of the municipality's economy; former *N.J. Stat. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*) declared that an office holder was to serve a three-year term and did not impliedly grant to the municipal governing body the power to abolish the office during such three-year term. *Krieger v. Jersey City*, 48 *N.J. Super.* 280, 137 *A.2d* 437, 1958 *N.J. Super.* LEXIS 309 (*App.Div.* 1958), affirmed by 27 *N.J.* 535, 143 *A.2d* 564, 1958 *N.J. LEXIS* 219 (1958).

13. Mayor's, city council's, and city's attempted term limitation of the municipal judge was improper under former *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2A:8-5* (now *N.J. Stat. Ann. § 2B:12-4*), and subject to remedial action by the court; the municipal resolution was void, and sitting municipal judge was appointed by the court to the statutory three year term. *Levine v. Mayor of Passaic*, 233 *N.J. Super.* 559, 559 *A.2d* 485, 1988 *N.J. Super.* LEXIS 519 (*Law Div.* 1988).

LAW REVIEWS & JOURNALS

1. 51 *Rutgers L. Rev.* 637, NEW JERSEY DEVELOPMENT: "A Matter of Simple Justice": Enactment of New Jersey's Municipal Public Defender Act.

2. 53 *Rutgers L. Rev.* 1, ARTICLE: Reinforcing New Jersey's Bench: Power Tools for Remodeling Senatorial Courtesy and Refinishing Judicial Selection and Retention.

