

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2003

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions	Avg. Length (in Days)			Location Authorized in Original Application						
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed*		Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roving	None Specified
TOTAL	1,442	47	45	30	1,367	1,145	29	29	60,198	118	35	1,165	95	23	6	-
FEDERAL	578	5	-	2	576	392	30	30	24,889	18	12	503	36	8	1	-
ARIZONA																
MARICOPA	5	-	-	-	5	2	18	30	74	-	-	4	1	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	3	1	-	7	12	30	29	502	-	-	5	3	-	-	-
YUMA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA																
CONTRA COSTA	4	1	-	-	4	2	30	30	157	-	-	3	1	-	-	-
IMPERIAL	7	-	-	-	7	1	30	30	197	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
KERN	4	-	-	-	4	1	30	30	104	-	-	3	-	1	-	-
LOS ANGELES	118	-	12	-	106	30	30	30	3,653	4	-	94	17	3	-	-
MARIN	1	-	-	-	1	2	30	30	22	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
ORANGE	9	-	-	1	8	1	30	30	231	-	-	8	1	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	10	-	-	-	10	3	30	30	368	1	-	8	1	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	14	-	-	-	14	10	30	30	651	1	-	12	1	-	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	74	-	-	1	2	-	-	-
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1	1	-	-	1	6	30	30	203	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SANTA CLARA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	19	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHASTA	4	-	-	1	3	2	30	30	119	2	-	2	-	-	-	-
STANISLAUS	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	42	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
TEHAMA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
VENTURA	7	-	-	-	7	1	30	30	240	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
COLORADO																
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	44	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (WELD)	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
CONNECTICUT																
MIDDLESEX	1	-	-	-	1	-	15	-	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
NEW HAVEN	3	-	-	1	2	-	15	-	27	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
DELAWARE																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	26	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA																
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	1	-	-	-	1	-	10	-	10	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	3	-	-	-	3	4	30	30	189	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
6TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (PINELLAS)	3	-	2	-	1	1	30	30	30	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
7TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (VOLUSIA)	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	33	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	60	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DADE)	7	-	-	-	7	7	30	30	383	-	-	7	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2003 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions	Avg. Length (in Days)		Total Number of Days in Operation	Location Authorized in Original Application						
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed*		Original Authorization	Extensions		Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roving	None Specified
FLORIDA (CONTINUED)																
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	3	2	-	-	3	-	30	-	52	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
18TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BREVARD/SEMINOLE)	10	-	-	-	10	5	30	30	287	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	8	1	-	-	8	3	30	30	245	1	-	7	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	7	-	-	-	7	3	30	30	196	-	-	6	1	-	-	-
GEORGIA																
BIBB	4	-	-	-	4	-	30	-	99	1	-	3	-	-	-	-
IDAHO																
CANYON	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	18	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
ILLINOIS																
CALHOUN	1	-	1	-	-	1	30	30	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
COOK	5	-	-	-	5	2	30	30	175	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
EDGAR	1	-	-	-	1	-	7	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
FAYETTE	2	-	-	1	1	-	30	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
JO DAVIESS	5	-	-	2	3	-	24	-	4	1	-	2	-	2	-	-
MONROE	3	-	-	2	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
ROCK ISLAND	2	1	-	-	2	1	30	30	11	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
WAYNE	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
WHITE	2	-	-	1	1	-	30	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
MARYLAND																
BALTIMORE	6	1	-	-	6	-	30	-	116	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
BALTIMORE CITY	8	-	-	-	8	11	30	30	469	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
HARFORD	8	-	-	-	8	1	30	30	206	3	-	5	-	-	-	-
HOWARD	3	-	-	-	3	2	30	30	107	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
MASSACHUSETTS																
HAMPDEN	4	-	-	-	4	10	15	15	210	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
MIDDLESEX	10	-	-	-	10	19	15	15	377	-	-	9	-	1	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2	-	-	-	2	-	15	-	20	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
MISSISSIPPI																
HINDS	3	-	-	-	3	3	30	30	130	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
NEVADA																
CLARK	8	-	-	-	8	6	27	30	281	-	-	5	3	-	-	-
ELKO	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
WASHOE	3	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
NEW HAMPSHIRE																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	2	-	-	5	4	10	10	76	2	-	2	-	1	-	-
NEW JERSEY																
ATLANTIC	1	-	-	-	1	-	20	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
BERGEN	2	-	-	-	2	3	20	10	69	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
BURLINGTON	6	-	-	-	6	5	25	30	229	-	-	6	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2003 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions	Avg. Length (in Days)			Location Authorized in Original Application						
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed*		Original Authorization	Extensions	Total Number of Days in Operation	Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roving	None Specified
NEW JERSEY (CONTINUED)																
CAMDEN	5	-	-	-	5	1	26	30	107	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
GLOUCESTER	2	-	-	-	2	1	15	10	34	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
HUDSON	23	-	-	-	23	11	25	18	564	6	1	16	-	-	-	-
MIDDLESEX	3	-	1	-	2	1	20	10	36	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
MORRIS	9	-	-	-	9	-	26	-	186	2	-	7	-	-	-	-
PASSAIC	29	1	-	1	28	1	26	10	446	-	-	29	-	-	-	-
SALEM	7	-	-	1	6	2	20	10	76	-	-	6	1	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY																
GENERAL	14	-	12	-	2	8	28	23	102	2	-	9	-	-	3	-
UNION	16	-	-	-	16	5	28	30	381	-	1	15	-	-	-	-
NEW YORK																
ALBANY	4	-	-	-	4	-	30	-	115	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
DUTCHESS	1	1	1	-	-	8	30	29	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
FULTON	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	48	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
KINGS	24	1	-	1	23	48	29	30	1,732	6	10	8	-	-	-	-
MONROE	22	2	-	3	19	2	30	30	453	5	-	16	-	1	-	-
MONTGOMERY	1	1	1	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
NASSAU	4	2	-	-	4	2	30	30	129	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
NEW YORK	3	-	-	1	2	24	30	30	466	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
NY ORGANIZED CRIME																
TASK FORCE	12	6	-	-	12	106	30	30	3,115	-	-	6	6	-	-	-
NYC SPECIAL																
NARCOTICS BUREAU	112	1	-	7	105	74	30	30	3,964	3	-	109	-	-	-	-
ONEIDA	2	2	-	-	2	2	30	30	90	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
OTSEGO	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
QUEENS	88	3	-	-	88	217	29	30	8,195	5	5	78	-	-	-	-
RENSSELAER	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	29	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
ROCKLAND	5	-	-	-	5	3	30	30	174	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY																
GENERAL	3	-	-	-	3	9	30	30	283	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
SUFFOLK	29	1	1	5	23	15	30	30	847	12	2	15	-	-	-	-
WESTCHESTER	13	5	-	-	13	13	30	30	657	5	2	6	-	-	-	-
OHIO																
MONTGOMERY	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
WASHINGTON	1	-	-	-	1	-	9	-	9	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA																
BERKS	4	1	1	-	3	3	28	28	144	1	-	3	-	-	-	-
CUMBERLAND	3	1	-	-	3	3	25	25	144	2	-	1	-	-	-	-
LANCASTER	4	-	4	-	-	1	30	30	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
LYCOMING	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	56	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	11	-	1	-	10	2	30	30	244	1	-	9	-	1	-	-
PHILADELPHIA	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	39	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY																
GENERAL	26	1	5	-	21	4	30	30	560	7	-	18	1	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2003 (Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Number of Intercept Orders					Number of Extensions	Avg. Length (in Days)		Total Number of Days in Operation	Location Authorized in Original Application							
	Authorized	Amended	No Prosecutor's Report	Never Installed	Installed*		Original Authorization	Extensions		Personal Residence	Business	Portable Device	Combination**	Other	Roving	None Specified	
SOUTH CAROLINA																	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE																	
DAVIDSON	10	-	-	-	10	14	30	30	605	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-
TEXAS																	
BOWIE	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	25	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HARRIS	3	-	2	-	1	2	30	30	60	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-
UTAH																	
SALT LAKE	4	1	-	-	4	2	30	30	149	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN																	
MILWAUKEE	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	57	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-

* Based on the number of orders for which intercept devices were installed as reported by the prosecuting official.
 ** Combination refers to the number of authorized interceptions for which more than one location was reported.