eWarrant System Profile - Colorado

System Name: Colorado Electronic Warrants System

Owners: Colorado Bureau of Investigation, Colorado State Judicial,

                         Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (CICJIS)

Contact Information: Ted DeRosa, CBI 303-239-4299

                         Stacey Kirk, SCAO 720-625-5621

                         Christopher Wallner CICJIS 720-544-2220

Description:

Colorado's Electronic Warrants System uses a middleware architecture to link the state courts' ICON (Integrated Colorado On-line Network) case management system with the state department of public safety's (DPS) Warrants System (WS).   ICON is a statewide case management system used by all of the state's general jurisdiction courts (District) and limited jurisdiction courts (County). The ICON system is currently being replaced by a new case management system called JPOD, which will continue to provide this functionality. The wanted persons system is managed by the Colorado Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and hosted in the Colorado Crime Information Center (CCIC). CCIC is a statewide law enforcement records system that is modeled after the FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) and is used by all law enforcement agencies to access a variety of records including criminal histories, stolen vehicles and other property, as well as warrants. Both ICON and WS are legacy mainframe-style centralized databases.

The two legacy systems are linked together through the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (CICJIS), which is a middleware integration and messaging solution. CICJIS is responsible for performing all communications between ICON and WS, and also keeps track of the status of each warrant to ensure that warrants on both legacy systems are synchronized. This approach retains the traditional relationship between the authoritative source systems where each system is responsible for separate business operations related to the warrant process, as opposed to a single centralized warrant management system shared by all stakeholders.

Business Process:

As of April 2016 half the state is live on criminal e-filing and a request for warrant is received electronically from the district attorney's office in those locations.   The entire state will be live on e-filing from the district attorney by the end of 2016.   Locations that are not on e-filing yet, continue to receive their request for warrants in paper form. In addition, a law enforcement officer can bring a "walk

through" warrant directly to a court clerk for entry into the ICON system. This usually occurs only when they know where the suspect is and they can then go and arrest immediately. Colorado's Electronic Warrant System begins with the issuance of a warrant by the court. Warrants for all case classes, both criminal and civil, are issued electronically by the court. It manages all activities between the issuance and service/cancellation process for warrants that are active within the state. Warrants that will be entered into NCIC for purposes of interstate notification and execution require additional activities to meet NCIC standards. The local law enforcement agency managing the warrant must "pack" it (provide any additional identifying information for the offender from agency records), and forward the warrant to NCIC, thus taking full ownership of the record with the original CICJIS transferred warrant remaining in local records as a supporting document for the new NCIC entry. Once in NCIC, the warrant is subject to all of the management requirements of NCIC (hit confirmation, periodic validation, etc.)

CBI made significant changes to their warrant data and processing requirements for in-state only warrants issued by the courts (those not being entered into NCIC). Prior to implementation of the electronic warrants process, CBI applied all NCIC data entry and warrant management requirements to in-state warrants. This required a significant level of effort on the part of law enforcement to enter and manage warrants, and resulted in only the more serious warrants being entered. It was not uncommon for less serious warrants to never be entered into the WS and retained on paper only.

With the implementation of the electronic warrants system, all warrants issued by the district and county courts are automatically added to the state's WS. This created a large influx of new warrants that previously were never entered due to the resource requirements mentioned above. To accommodate this increase in volume and facilitate the automated creation of the warrant based solely on court-provided data, CBI "relaxed" some of the NCIC edit and content requirements. Courts could automatically add in-state only warrants without the packing and validation that had previously been performed by law enforcement. To align with other required processes and policies of CBI, the courts became the "owner" of the warrant, rather than the local law enforcement agency, thus relieving law enforcement from liability for the accuracy of the data. All court-generated warrants start as in-state only warrants, and the court retains "ownership" unless and until law enforcement forwards the warrant into NCIC. Only at this point in the process does law enforcement take "ownership" of the warrant and become liable for the accuracy of the data. Law enforcement no longer is responsible for the initial entry of warrants and relies exclusively on the courts to perform this task. (There is an "after-hours" exception to this process when the courts are not open for business and a warrant is needed immediately. In this situation, law enforcement follows the old approach of entering the paper warrant directly into WS.)

Reliance on court-entered warrant data also changed law enforcement procedures when executing a warrant. Following NCIC practices, the law enforcement agency serving the warrant would contact the agency managing the warrant to confirm the validity of the warrant and confirm the willingness of the managing agency to transport (retrieve) the offender. Since the courts are not 24 X 7 operations, they could not meet these requirements for warrant confirmation and validation. Under the electronic

warrant process, these practices and requirements were eliminated and the warrant provides notice that confirmation is not required. All court generated warrants include the following banner: `CICJIS COURT WARRANT -- NO CONFIRMATION REQUIRED`. Each issuing jurisdiction also determines the bond amount and type as well as the return appearance information. Each law enforcement agency sets their own transport information in the EXL screen in CCIC . This transport information is then automatically applied to every court warrant as it comes across from the court.   For example: `TRANSPORT INFORMATION: VALID METRO AREA ONLY IF BOND = $100 & UNDER. VALID STATEWIDE IF BOND = $101 & ABOVE. IF DEFT POSTS BOND OUTSIDE OF COUNTY BOND RETURNABLE 2 WEEKS FROM DATE OF POSTING ON WEDNESDAY AT 930AM IN DIV 11 AT 505 4TH AVE LONGMONT CO.`

When the wanted person is arrested by the same jurisdiction of the warrant, that agency cancels the warrant upon arrest. If the wanted person is arrested outside the jurisdiction of the warrant, a locate is sent to the wanting agency indicated on the warrant, and that agency places a detainer record in the system, indicating which jail the person is being housed in. If that person bonds from the jail, the record is cancelled with the bond information and return date. In all of these scenarios a message is sent back to the entering clerk and court record indicating the status of the warrant. The court does not actually cancel the warrant out of the ICON system until they receive either bond or the person appears. The court is aware if they receive a cancel for either of the reasons above and the person does not appear as directed, a new warrant must be issued to get the record back into CCIC/NCIC.

Strengths:

1. All warrants issued by the district and county courts are automatically entered into the state wanted person system, thus increasing law enforcement situational awareness.
2. Warrants remain synchronized between law enforcement and courts reducing the risk of false arrest.
3. The system enables each jurisdiction to establish its own transportation limits.
4. Serious warrants can rapidly be made available nationwide

Weaknesses:

1.
2. Municipal warrants must be handled by law enforcement or the municipal court for entry into CCIC (WS) without benefit of electronic entry as they are not part of the state level case management system.
3. Inconsistency between out-of-state agencies accepting warrants meeting Colorado statutory requirements as electronically signed documents.

Lessons Learned:

1. In-state warrants do not have to apply all NCIC requirements for data entry.

2. Courts learned about the practical issues affecting execution and transportation logistics and limits.
3. Law enforcement quickly recognized the reduced level of effort required to enter/maintain warrants.
4. Law enforcement recognized the improved situational awareness provided by having more warrants entered into the WS.

Architecture:

Middleware: X

Separate specialized application:

Integrated component of larger application:

Profile/Scope:

Business Process –

    Affidavit/Request: Y

    Order/Issuance: Y

    Execution/Service: Y

    Cancellation: Y

    Modification: Y

Case Types –

    Civil: Y

    Criminal:

        Felony: Y

        Serious Misdemeanor: Y

        Misdemeanor: Y

        Infraction/Status Offense: Partial

        Ordinance: N

    Juvenile: Y

Jurisdiction

    General Jurisdiction: Y

    Limited Jurisdiction: Y

    Specialty: N

    Municipal: N

    Justice of the Peace: N

Authorizing Authority: (Statute, Rule, Agreement): Decisions are made by a statutorily created executive board.