

ent and plant variety protection cases among the district judges of the district courts so designated;

“(B) an analysis of the extent to which the program has improved the efficiency of the courts involved by reason of such expertise;

“(C) with respect to patent cases handled by the judges designated pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) and judges not so designated, a comparison between the 2 groups of judges with respect to—

“(i) the rate of reversal by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, of such cases on the issues of claim construction and substantive patent law; and

“(ii) the period of time elapsed from the date on which a case is filed to the date on which trial begins or summary judgment is entered;

“(D) a discussion of any evidence indicating that litigants select certain of the judicial districts designated under subsection (b) in an attempt to ensure a given outcome; and

“(E) an analysis of whether the pilot program should be extended to other district courts, or should be made permanent and apply to all district courts.

“(2) TIMETABLE FOR REPORTS.—The times referred to in paragraph (1) are—

“(A) not later than the date that is 5 years and 3 months after the end of the 6-month period described in subsection (b); and

“(B) not later than 5 years after the date described in subparagraph (A).

“(3) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the chief judge of each of the district courts designated under subsection (b) and the Director of the Federal Judicial Center, shall keep the committees referred to in paragraph (1) informed, on a periodic basis while the pilot program is in effect, with respect to the matters referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1).”

§ 138. Terms abolished

The district court shall not hold formal terms. (June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 897; Pub. L. 88–139, § 1, Oct. 16, 1963, 77 Stat. 248.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

This section was substituted for a number of special provisions fixing stated times for holding terms of court in the several districts, in order to vest in the courts wider discretion and promote greater efficiency in the administration of the business of such courts.

Editorial Notes

AMENDMENTS

1963—Pub. L. 88–139 substituted “The district court shall not hold formal terms” for “The times for holding regular terms of court at the places fixed by this chapter shall be determined by rule of the district court” in text, and “Terms abolished” for “Times for holding regular terms” in section catchline.

§ 139. Times for holding regular sessions

The times for commencing regular sessions of the district court for transacting judicial business at the places fixed by this chapter shall be determined by the rules or orders of the court. Such rules or orders may provide that at one or more of such places the court shall be in continuous session for such purposes on all business days throughout the year. At other places a session of the court shall continue for such purposes until terminated by order of final adjournment or by commencement of the next regular session at the same place.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 897; Pub. L. 88–139, § 1, Oct. 16, 1963, 77 Stat. 248.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

The purpose of this section is to remove all doubt as to whether the mere beginning of a new term at one place ends a prior term begun at another place. As revised, it conforms to a uniform course of judicial decisions. See *U.S. v. Perlstein*, 39 F.Supp. 965, 968 (D.C.N.J. 1941), and cases cited.

Editorial Notes

AMENDMENTS

1963—Pub. L. 88–139 substituted provisions requiring the times for commencing regular sessions of the district court to be determined by the rules or orders of the court, authorizing such rules or orders to provide that at one or more of the places fixed by this chapter, the court shall be in continuous session on all business days throughout the year, and that at other places, a session continues until terminated by order of final adjournment or by commencement of the next regular session at the same place, for provisions that a term continues until terminated by order of final adjournment or by commencement of the next term at the same place, in the text, and “Times for holding regular sessions” for “Term continued until terminated” in section catchline.

§ 140. Adjournment

(a) Any district court may, by order made anywhere within its district, adjourn or, with the consent of the judicial council of the circuit, pretermitt any regular session of court for insufficient business or other good cause.

(b) If the judge of a district court is unable to attend and unable to make an order of adjournment, the clerk may adjourn the court to the next regular session or to any earlier day which he may determine.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 897; Pub. L. 88–139, § 1, Oct. 16, 1963, 77 Stat. 248.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §§ 16, 146, 182 (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §§ 12, 73, 101, 36 Stat. 1088, 1108, 1122; June 12, 1916, ch. 143, 39 Stat. 225; Feb. 20, 1917, ch. 102, 39 Stat. 927; June 13, 1918, ch. 98, 40 Stat. 604; Feb. 26, 1919, ch. 54, 40 Stat. 1184; May 29, 1924, ch. 209, 43 Stat. 243; June 5, 1924, ch. 259, 43 Stat. 387; Jan. 10, 1925, chs. 68, 69, 43 Stat. 730, 731; Feb. 16, 1925, ch. 233, § 1, 43 Stat. 945; May 7, 1926, ch. 255, 44 Stat. 408; Apr. 21, 1928, ch. 395, 45 Stat. 440; Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 539, 45 Stat. 1518; June 28, 1930, ch. 714, 46 Stat. 829; May 13, 1936, ch. 386, 49 Stat. 1271; Aug. 12, 1937, ch. 595, 50 Stat. 625).

Section consolidates section 16 with the third sentence of section 146, and the final proviso in the third paragraph of section 182, all of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed.

Said section 16 of title 28 provided for adjournment by the marshal, or clerk, on written order of the judge, in case of inability of the district judge to attend at the commencement of any regular, adjourned or special term, or any time during such term. Said sections 146 and 182 thereof, related to the district courts of Colorado and Oklahoma, only, and contained special provisions for adjournment. Subsection (b) omits the requirement of written order where the judge is unable to make such order.

The revised section broadens these provisions, and vests discretionary power in the court, by order made anywhere within the district, to adjourn any term of court “for insufficient business or other good cause.” To establish uniformity, the special provisions relating to Colorado and Oklahoma were omitted.

Other provisions of said sections 146 and 182 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., are incorporated in sections 85 and 116 of this title.