

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2005

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	1,773	62	57	22	1,694	1,360	28	28	72,897	57	21	1,610	49	28	8	-
FEDERAL	625	3	-	1	624	461	30	30	28,277	15	6	584	14	5	1	-
ARIZONA																
MARICOPA	4	1	-	-	4	3	30	30	178	-	-	3	1	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	2	-	-	8	8	30	30	391	-	-	5	3	-	-	-
CALIFORNIA																
ALAMEDA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	26	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
FRESNO	3	-	-	-	3	1	30	30	82	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES	102	-	11	-	91	26	30	30	3,135	2	-	88	12	-	-	-
ORANGE	32	-	-	1	31	-	30	-	851	-	-	32	-	-	-	-
PLACER	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	46	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	12	-	-	-	12	12	30	30	712	-	-	12	-	-	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	18	-	-	-	18	2	30	30	570	-	-	17	1	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	62	-	1	-	61	35	30	28	2,360	-	-	62	-	-	-	-
SANTA BARBARA	3	1	-	-	3	2	28	30	140	-	-	2	1	-	-	-
COLORADO																
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (DENVER)	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT (EL PASO)	11	-	3	-	8	2	27	30	251	-	-	10	1	-	-	-
CONNECTICUT																
NEW HAVEN	3	-	-	-	3	-	15	-	45	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
NEW LONDON	4	-	-	-	4	1	15	15	68	1	-	1	-	2	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	4	-	-	2	2	-	15	-	30	1	-	3	-	-	-	-
WATERBURY	1	-	-	-	1	1	15	15	28	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
FLORIDA																
4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (DUVAL)	17	1	-	-	17	11	30	30	676	-	-	17	-	-	-	-
5TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (LAKE/MARION)	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	18	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
9TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (ORANGE/OSCEOLA)	2	1	-	-	2	1	30	30	75	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (HILLSBOROUGH)	9	1	-	-	9	2	30	20	275	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (BROWARD)	8	-	-	-	8	5	30	30	324	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (SAINT LUCIE)	3	1	2	-	1	-	30	-	14	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	32	2	2	-	30	14	30	30	1,143	-	-	31	1	-	-	-
GEORGIA																
AUGUSTA	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	20	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
BIBB	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	76	1	-	2	-	-	-	-
FULTON	2	-	-	1	1	-	30	-	11	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
GWINNETT	7	-	-	-	7	-	30	-	118	-	-	6	1	-	-	-
HOUSTON	14	-	-	1	13	-	29	-	151	-	-	14	-	-	-	-

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2005 (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
ILLINOIS																
CLARK	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	29	1	-	-	-	-	-	
DUPAGE	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	43	-	-	-	1	-	-	
POPE	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	2	32	1	-	-	-	-	-	
MARYLAND																
BALTIMORE	5	-	-	-	5	2	30	30	130	-	-	4	-	1	-	
BALTIMORE CITY	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	39	1	-	1	-	-	-	
CECIL	10	-	-	-	10	2	30	30	256	-	-	10	-	-	-	
HARFORD	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	98	-	-	5	-	-	-	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	19	-	-	-	19	3	28	30	481	1	-	18	-	-	-	
MASSACHUSETTS																
HAMPSHIRE	1	-	-	-	1	-	15	-	15	-	-	1	-	-	-	
MIDDLESEX	10	-	-	-	10	9	15	15	249	2	1	7	-	-	-	
MINNESOTA																
HENNEPIN	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	58	-	-	2	-	-	-	
MISSISSIPPI																
FORREST	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	17	-	-	1	-	-	-	
HINDS	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	55	-	-	3	-	-	-	
LAMAR	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	40	-	-	2	-	-	-	
LEFLORE	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	17	-	-	1	-	-	-	
WASHINGTON	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	30	36	-	-	1	-	-	-	
NEVADA																
CLARK	2	-	-	-	2	-	16	-	20	-	-	1	1	-	-	
ELKO	1	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	
NEW JERSEY																
ATLANTIC	2	-	-	-	2	1	20	10	27	-	-	2	-	-	-	
BURLINGTON	4	-	-	2	2	-	20	-	2	1	-	3	-	-	-	
CAMDEN	4	-	-	1	3	1	30	30	87	-	-	3	-	1	-	
CAPE MAY	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	28	-	-	2	-	-	-	
ESSEX	5	-	3	-	2	-	26	-	31	-	-	2	-	3	-	
GLOUCESTER	1	-	-	1	-	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	
HUDSON	28	-	-	-	28	13	22	15	608	1	-	25	-	2	-	
MIDDLESEX	5	-	-	1	4	-	20	-	63	-	-	3	-	2	-	
MORRIS	29	-	1	-	28	19	20	11	692	1	-	28	-	-	-	
PASSAIC	16	-	-	-	16	4	19	28	273	-	-	16	-	-	-	
SALEM	1	-	-	-	1	1	20	10	30	-	-	1	-	-	-	
SOMERSET	20	-	-	-	20	28	20	13	483	1	-	19	-	-	-	
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	67	-	28	1	38	40	27	24	1,194	3	-	61	-	1	2	
UNION	34	10	-	-	34	16	24	24	1,014	-	-	29	-	-	5	
NEW YORK																
ALBANY	2	-	-	-	2	-	30	-	58	-	-	1	1	-	-	
DUTCHESS	3	-	-	-	3	3	30	30	172	-	-	3	-	-	-	
FRANKLIN	7	1	-	-	7	9	30	30	410	4	-	3	-	-	-	
JEFFERSON	1	-	-	1	-	-	30	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	
KINGS	3	-	-	-	3	10	29	29	374	-	-	3	-	-	-	
MONTGOMERY	5	-	-	1	4	-	30	-	39	-	-	5	-	-	-	
NASSAU	7	3	-	-	7	5	30	30	266	-	-	7	-	-	-	

Table 2
Intercept Orders Issued by Judges During Calendar Year 2005 (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 YORK (CONTINUED)																
NEW YORK	4	1	2	-	2	5	30	30	183	-	-	3	-	1	-	-
NY ORGANIZED CRIME TASK FORCE	9	3	-	-	9	36	30	30	1,109	-	-	4	5	-	-	-
NYC SPECIAL NARCOTICS BUREAU	148	7	-	5	143	89	30	30	5,461	6	-	138	-	4	-	-
ONEIDA	4	-	-	-	4	3	20	19	136	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
QUEENS	118	5	1	1	116	354	26	29	12,275	4	2	110	-	2	-	-
RICHMOND	4	-	-	-	4	1	30	30	58	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
ROCKLAND	10	-	-	-	10	6	30	30	380	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
SARATOGA	1	-	-	-	1	-	10	-	10	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SCHENECTADY	1	-	-	-	1	1	30	21	41	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	1	1	1	-	-	9	30	23	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SUFFOLK	41	11	-	-	41	29	30	30	1,551	1	10	30	-	-	-	-
WAYNE	2	-	-	-	2	1	27	30	71	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
WESTCHESTER	20	3	-	-	20	33	25	29	1,268	-	-	20	-	-	-	-
NORTH CAROLINA																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	8	-	-	-	8	4	30	15	245	-	-	8	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA																
GARFIELD	2	-	-	-	2	1	30	30	53	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
OKLAHOMA	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	149	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
OREGON																
LANE	1	-	-	-	1	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
MARION	3	-	-	-	3	-	30	-	45	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
MULTNOMAH	2	-	-	1	1	-	16	-	5	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
PENNSYLVANIA																
MCKEAN	1	-	-	-	1	-	30	-	6	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
MONTGOMERY	5	-	-	-	5	-	30	-	61	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	41	-	1	-	40	8	30	30	983	5	-	36	-	-	-	-
RHODE ISLAND																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	3	1	-	-	3	5	30	30	167	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
TENNESSEE																
DAVIDSON	20	-	-	1	19	18	30	30	914	-	-	19	-	1	-	-
SHELBY	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	15	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
TEXAS																
BURLESON	2	1	-	-	2	-	30	-	57	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
FORT BEND	1	1	-	-	1	-	30	-	23	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
STARR	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
WISCONSIN																
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL	5	-	-	-	5	-	22	-	40	4	-	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.