



CRIMINAL
JUSTICE
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

2025 ANNUAL REPORT

PREPARED BY

Aerielle Reynolds, MSCJA, Samuel Choi, PhD, and
Erin Harbinson, PhD



BACKGROUND

This report is respectfully prepared pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statutes (HRS) § 614, which requests an annual report from the Criminal Justice Research Institute. The Criminal Justice Research Institute (CJRI) was established with the passage of Act 179 (2019) for the purposes of collecting and analyzing criminal pretrial system data and conducting research for the state to support the criminal justice system. Due to the complexity of the criminal pretrial process and data in the state, HRS § 614-3 acknowledges there were several steps needed before establishing a pretrial database and reporting system, and disseminating pretrial metrics regularly. The law states:

“(b) In establishing the system, the institute shall take all necessary and appropriate steps, including: (1) Identifying all current databases utilized by various state agencies to track criminal pretrial information; (2) Determining the administrative and technological feasibility of aggregating and sharing current data; and (3) Identifying critical gaps in data and information collection that are required for a robust assessment of criminal pretrial justice matters.”

This annual report presents the culmination of work to develop and establish the “centralized statewide criminal pretrial justice data reporting and collection system,” hereinafter referred to as the *pretrial database and reporting system*. The analysis and findings of pretrial metrics are provided in this report from the newly developed centralized data source. The report reviews steps necessary to provide ongoing maintenance of the data system and recommendations for improvement.

CJRI is authorized to study all areas of the criminal justice system



in order to provide a more comprehensive approach to helping the state protect the rights of individuals, increase system efficiencies, and apply cost controls. HRS § 614-2(b) reviews the scope of CJRI's work, including monitoring data and evidence-based practices of the criminal pretrial system, conducting cost-benefit analysis, monitoring national trends, and issuing reports to the public about the criminal justice system. CJRI engages with several agencies to further this effort by supporting them with research on issues across the criminal justice system. This report includes updates on activities to support these goals as well.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Addressing Our Responsibilities in HRS § 614	page 5
Accomplishments at a Glance	page 8
Reviewing Activities from 2025	page 12
Pretrial Performance Measures	page 20
Research Takeaways	page 88
Pretrial Database and Reporting System Continued Development	page 92
Strategic Plan	page 99
Mission, Vision, and Values Statement	page 100
Our Organization	page 102
APPENDIX A: <i>List of Figures</i>	page 109



ADDRESSING OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN HRS § 614

Before reviewing CJRI activities from the past year, we provide some context for the criminal pretrial system and existing landscape of data that directly impacts our work. The Institute's main priority is to establish and maintain a "centralized statewide criminal pretrial justice data reporting and collection system" (HRS § 614-3). Without a centralized system, criminal pretrial data is disconnected and scattered across agencies. Siloed data is one of the barriers to studying a system of pretrial decisions and impacts. The creation of a centralized source of data has provided CJRI with capacity to report out on the pretrial system.

A contract was executed with technology and software partners to initiate the work of the pretrial database and reporting system in Fall 2023 with funds from Act 147 (SLH 2023). The main foundational work to create this was finished in the second fiscal year of the appropriation, spring 2025. Additional work to test and refine the pretrial database and reporting system has continued to ensure data is accurate for reporting. This project would not have been successful without several staff members at the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (DCR), the Hawai'i Criminal Justice Data Center (HCJDC), Department of the Attorney General, and the Judiciary. All three agencies have been collaborative throughout the project and continue to support the ongoing work by sharing their data and expertise with CJRI research staff. This year, CJRI will report out on pretrial metrics that were analyzed using the pretrial database and reporting system.

In addition to creating the pretrial database and reporting system, the



law describes other activities for CJRI to assist the State with research and data (HRS 614-2). The scope of CJRI's research support for the state is summarized in the graphic on the following page. CJRI undertakes many research and data activities that inform criminal justice policy discussions across all three branches of government and at the local level. While CJRI staff prioritize activities that advance the pretrial database and reporting system, additional projects have helped CJRI identify the strengths and barriers of the existing criminal justice data landscape. This also provides CJRI with the opportunity to break down siloes in criminal justice policy conversations as work is conducted to integrate data.


The 2025 annual report summarizes the progress toward creating the pretrial database and reporting system, in addition to providing an overview of accomplishments to bring data and research to criminal justice policy discussions. Full length research reports, presentations, and other materials are available on our website at cjrihawaii.com.



Scope of CJRI in HRS § 614-2



Collecting data to monitor the overall functioning of the criminal justice system



Monitoring evidence-based practices and reporting out on the effectiveness of practices and policies implemented as a result of the recommendations of the criminal pretrial task force



Conducting cost-benefit analysis on various areas of operation



Monitoring national trends in criminal justice



Issuing public reports to inform all criminal justice stakeholders and the public about the functioning of the criminal justice system



ACCOMPLISHMENTS AT A GLANCE



CJRI was established by Act 179 in 2019, followed by the appointment of board members and the hiring of the first staff member in November 2020, the second staff member in October 2021, and the third and fourth staff members in September and October 2023, respectively. In CJRI's fifth year, the Institute has accomplished the following:

- Established a centralized source of pretrial data in a data warehouse using software that maps data pipelines for efficient and reliable data ingestion from three statewide agencies:
 - Conducted quality assurance reviews of unified datasets to ensure proper data ingestion, data cleaning, and linking and merging of records across agencies.
 - Reviewed reliability and validity of unified dataset to produce accurate metrics.
 - Collaborated with data science intern to assess the quality of data linkage and developed recommendations for future improvements.
 - Developed pretrial metrics to be reported in CJRI annual reports, including quality assurance reviews of metric coding logic.
- Attended the Judiciary's 2025 Committee on Equality and Access to the Courts (CEAC) Equitable & Sustainable Futures Speaker Series and participated as a panelist in the *Assessing Hawai'i's Justice System: Addressing Over-Incarceration, Disparities, and Pathways Forward* session.



- Toured the O`ahu Community Correctional Center with the oversight coordinator and staff from the Hawai`i Correctional System Oversight Commission (HCSOC) to learn more about how jail practices and activities impact pretrial data.
- Participation in the Justice Research Group, a regular gathering for research staff in the State's criminal justice system along with local universities to share current research projects and findings, discuss peer-reviewed journal articles, and hear from guest speakers.
 - Provided members with a presentation on the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) model of rehabilitation.
- Provided administrative and research support for the Probation Subcommittee for the Model Penal Code Review by providing research and policy resources on probation and serving as the committee's reporter.
- Continued participation on the *Committee on Artificial Intelligence and the Courts* to address the evolving impact of A.I. on the Judiciary.
- Continued providing data collection technical assistance to DCR's Intake Services Centers Division (ISC) to collect pilot data on the ORAS-CST.
- Continued partnership and technical assistance to the Maui County Department of the Prosecuting Attorney to support their work in the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Prosecutor-Led Diversion Project, including research supervision of graduate assistant.
- Continued participation with First Circuit Post-Booking Jail Diversion Program (JDP) working group to develop a data collection and evaluation plan.
- Participated in train-the-trainer sessions on the Ohio Risk Assessment System - Community Supervision tool (ORAS-CST) and received in-depth knowledge on application of the assessment tools.
- Participated in end-user training on the Ohio Risk Assessment System - Community Supervision Tool (ORAS-CST) and received certification.
- Participated in continuous quality improvement training on assessing assessment fidelity.



- Continued participation in monthly meetings on competency to stand trial and other diversion issues led by the Senior Advisor to Mental Health in the Governor’s Office.
- Conducted site visit to the County of Maui Office of the Prosecuting Attorney to learn about their data and records management system and explore its use in research for diversion policy.
- Attended the Hawai‘i Data and A.I. Summit to continue learning about the use of artificial intelligence in data governance, management, and usage.
- Conducted strategic planning sessions for 2026-2030 to help steer the Institute’s next phase of work following the establishment of the pretrial database and reporting system.
- Participated in the *Reentry Simulation: Addressing Barriers to Life After Incarceration*, an experiential learning opportunity designed to improve reentry outcomes through stakeholder collaboration.
- Conducted site visits to observe pretrial hearings in District Court in the First Circuit and Third Circuit.
- Toured the Women’s Community Correctional Center with CJRI board member and Judiciary staff to learn about how the facility has shifted to house both jail and prison populations for women.
- Attended the National Association of Pretrial Service Agencies annual conference to learn about evidence-based practices and the national policy landscape on pretrial issues.
- Participated in the Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab’s *Data to Decisions: Analyzing Pretrial Data for Better Outcomes* training series to better leverage pretrial data for policy recommendations.
- Provided technical assistance to ISC on establishing assessment policies that align with evidence-based practices, and developed a research and data collection plan to validate them.
- Attended the Maui Criminal Justice and Mental Health Diversion Summit, a two-day planning session with Maui stakeholders.



- Provided input on the survey design for post-graduation for Women's Court.
- Participated in regular National Association of Sentencing Commission (NASC) director calls to learn about current sentencing policy topics occurring across the country.
- Hosted and supervised undergraduate interns majoring in data science, analytics, and visualization from Chaminade University of Honolulu.
- Held quarterly board meetings as required in HRS § 614-2.
- Set-up peer connections with state and local level criminal justice agencies across the country.



REVIEWING ACTIVITIES FROM 2025

Engaging with Policymakers and the Community



Creating Opportunities to Disseminate and Learn About Criminal Justice Research

CJRI receives many requests for information on national trends, insight from studies in scholarly and peer-reviewed literature, and data on local practices. CJRI provides training and presentations, and authors summaries on policy issues. The CJRI director and board consider all requests, but prioritize those that align with the scope of research outlined in HRS § 614 and with the resources available at the time of the request. Staff also attend national and local convenings on criminal justice topics to keep up-to-date on the latest research and develop a peer network for the State. The list below expands on some of the community engagement CJRI staff participated in over the past year. It is not an exhaustive list but highlights some areas important to many stakeholders in the state.



Presentations and Panels

- Dr. Harbinson was a speaker in the Judiciary’s Committee on Equality and Access to the Courts (CEAC) and the King Kamehameha V Judiciary History Center’s (JHC) Equitable and Sustainable Future’s Speakers Series, a follow-up to the 2021 Racial Equity Speaker Series. Dr. Harbinson served as a panelist in the *Assessing Hawai‘i’s Justice System: Addressing Over-Incarceration, Disparities, and Pathways Forward* session, along with panelists from the Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation, American Civil Liberties Union of Hawai‘i, and `Ekolu Mea Nui. The session featured discussions on creating a more equitable correctional and legal system in the State. Some of the topics that were discussed relate to the ongoing efforts for system improvements and interagency cooperation, identifying available data, reviewing recent law and policy updates, and sharing personal experiences.

Conferences

- Dr. Choi attended the National Association of Pretrial Service Agencies (NAPSA) Annual Conference in Atlanta, Georgia. This is a meeting of legal practitioners and researchers who discuss the latest innovations in pretrial services from their respective jurisdictions. There, Dr. Choi attended talks specific to how pretrial metrics were reported in other states. Specifically, he learned about the approaches other states took to clean their data, create visuals, look for trends, and communicate data to stakeholders. These talks helped inform the development of data and visuals for the Hawai‘i’s own pretrial metrics in CJRI’s annual report.
- Dr. Harbinson attended the Maui Criminal Justice and Mental Health Diversion Summit, hosted by the Maui County Office of the Prosecuting Attorney. This summit was facilitated by The Leifman Group and brought stakeholders together to assess behavioral health and justice system challenges within the county. The summit was attended by several representatives from across Maui County and the State. Participants at the summit worked together to begin developing a response plan and collaboration framework to address mental health



issues in and outside of the criminal justice system tailored to Maui's cultural landscape, community needs, and system resources.

Trainings and Workshops

- Dr. Choi and Ms. Reynolds attended training sessions on the Ohio Risk Assessment System - Community Supervision Tool provided by the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute and facilitated by the DCR's Intake Service Centers Division. The ORAS - CST is used by correctional staff to assess risk to reoffend and identify criminogenic needs for offenders in the criminal justice system. Dr. Choi participated in the train-the-trainer session, which is an in-depth review of the tool and instructs local staff on the curriculum to train their staff in using the risk assessment tool. Ms. Reynolds participated in the end-user training, which prepares staff to administer the ORAS, earning certification after passing the final examination. This tool is important for DCR's work in corrections including diversion, which CJRI supports through research and data.
- Dr. Choi participated in the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS) Continuous Quality Improvement training provided by the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute and facilitated by the DCR's ISC division. This training focused on assisting criminal justice practitioners, who were certified in administering the ORAS - CST, in maintaining fidelity in the use of this risk assessment tool over time. Dr. Choi was previously trained to administer the ORAS - CST, which allowed him to understand the blueprint of the tool and how it was used in practice. The CQI training served as a refresher on the ORAS - CST for Dr. Choi. In addition, the training course provided details of the process and effort it takes to maintain consistent and accurate use of the ORAS tool. The information from this course provided him with much needed context in his ongoing work to validate the tool's use in Hawai'i.
- Ms. McCaskill participated in and Dr. Choi attended the *Reentry Simulation: Addressing Barriers to Life After Incarceration*, which was sponsored by Penn State's Restorative Justice Institute, the Judiciary's



CEAC and JHC, the Hawai'i Friends of Restorative Justice, and the Hawai'i State Bar Association Civic Education Committee. The purpose of the simulation was to demonstrate to attendees the barriers faced by formerly incarcerated individuals reentering the community, and how these barriers impact the recidivism rate when certain supervision conditions are not met. The simulation provided examples of the steps necessary to adhere to typical conditions of supervision such as those that require the person to acquire and maintain employment, housing, and transportation to and from probation or parole visits, and attend service providers. By demonstrating the steps necessary to adhere to these requirements, participants learned how these conditions could be barriers to succeeding on supervision.

- Ms. Reynolds participated in the *Data to Decisions: Analyzing Pretrial Data for Better Outcomes* training series provided by the Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab (GPL) and NAPSA, along with staff from the DCR and the Judiciary. This training provided participants with a series of workshops designed to leverage pretrial data to make data driven decisions and address challenges within pretrial systems. Topics in this training series included understanding data quality, prioritizing metrics, data visualization, communicating findings with stakeholders, and making real-time decisions using data.

Collaborating with Criminal Justice Agencies

CJRI has been collaborating with several agencies across the state to develop and implement the pretrial database and reporting system. Pretrial data and operations are housed across different agencies, and within two separate branches of government. In order to ensure CJRI conducts this work in an informed and collaborative way, CJRI staff meet frequently with a range of leadership, administrators, researchers, information technology staff, and others across different statewide criminal justice agencies. The primary partners in this project include the Judiciary, DCR, and HCJDC. In addition, CJRI collaborates with several other state and local criminal justice agencies to inform their work and help Hawai'i's criminal justice system use research to improve the system.



Siloed data is not unique to the pretrial system, as such, CJRI staff addresses these issues in other criminal justice research too. CJRI staff participate in a variety of criminal justice-related committees and working groups to improve coordination and reduce the disconnect of data and research that exists across the State's criminal justice system. Some examples of these collaborations are provided below.

O`ahu Post-Booking Jail Diversion: Several stakeholders in the First Circuit have partnered to offer the Post-Booking Jail Diversion Program (JDP) that is modeled after a program in Miami-Dade County, Florida [1]. This diversion approach focuses on people who have serious mental illness (SMI) and who frequently require local resources such as emergency services and the courts. CJRI drafted data collection recommendations about the type of data each agency could collect to understand the program's operations. Additionally, CJRI has outlined a research plan to evaluate the impact of the program on recidivism. While this outcome evaluation is important for understanding the effectiveness of the program locally, it is a long-term goal since it will take time to allow for an adequate follow-up period and collect enough data to evaluate recidivism.

Maui County Prosecutor-Led Diversion: The Maui County Prosecutor's Office is developing a prosecutor-led diversion program. They are focusing on a data-driven approach that is based on the needs of their population and the availability of local resources. Last year, they received an Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant to carry out this important effort. CJRI is partnering with their office by supervising a graduate research assistant assigned to this grant who is collecting data and conducting analysis from local data sources. CJRI staff will contribute to this project further by reporting on data from the Second Circuit where feasible to help Maui understand trends on criminal pretrial cases. The data will provide information on criminal cases before conviction and will be used to develop recommendations for Maui County to inform the creation of a prosecutor-led diversion program.

Committee on Artificial Intelligence and the Courts: CJRI staff are one of the



members appointed to the Committee on Artificial Intelligence and the Courts, which was established by Chief Justice Recktenwald to address the evolving use of artificial intelligence (A.I.) and its use in court proceedings and other sectors of the judicial branch. As committee members, CJRI staff are focusing, in particular, on the role of A.I. in improving the Judiciary's capacity to conduct more in-depth research and analysis using court administrative data and electronic files of documents (PDFs). A.I. technology could be used by the courts to assist in answering policy questions that are important to stakeholders across the criminal justice system in a more timely and accurate manner, which would have previously required extensive manual data collection by staff (e.g., reading court filings and inputting information into a spreadsheet). The committee concluded its work at the end of this year, which culminated in authoring a report on recommendations related to the use of A.I.

Penal Code Review - Probation Subcommittee: Act 245 (2024) established a process to review the penal code through an advisory council [2]. The advisory council includes representatives across the justice system. The council established sub-committees to review sections of criminal code and target specific topics. CJRI staff supported the Probation Subcommittee with administrative support as well as resources on probation research to inform the committee members of the evidence based on probation policies.

Assessment Validation Studies for Intake Services Division: An important part of pretrial services is provided by ISC through their process to assess defendants at intake. They must conduct a pretrial risk assessment to assess risk of new crimes and failure to appear during pretrial (using the Ohio Risk Assessment System - Pretrial Assessment Tool (ORAS-PAT)) for defendants entering community correctional centers and report them to the courts when ordered (HRS § 353-10). As part of efforts to contribute to diversion across the state, ISC has implemented other assessments to improve the types of information that staff have when defendants are brought into jail. This includes piloting the ORAS - Community Supervision Tool (ORAS - CST), the ORAS - Misdemeanor Assessment Tool (ORAS -



MAT), and other tools for information on mental health and substance use needs. These assessment tools can aid ISC in implementing evidence-based practices in pretrial services by collecting information on defendants for more individualized supervision and referrals while defendants await trial [3]. Since these assessments are important to CJRI's efforts to collect data for pretrial reporting and they are a critical tool in improving pretrial supervision in Hawai'i, CJRI is partnering with ISC to collect data and validate these tools. One validation study will meet the requirement under HRS § 353-10 to validate the pretrial risk assessment every five years, and the other study will analyze data on the piloted assessments to examine their ability to predict risk to reoffend in the community for defendants pretrial in Hawai'i and in improving the effectiveness of diversion programs.

Strategic Planning for 2026-2030: Over the course of several months, CJRI staff engaged in strategic planning sessions for 2026 - 2030, which were facilitated by Dayna Miyasaki. Ms. Miyasaki has completed strategic planning training to assist departments across the Judiciary with developing plans for achieving organizational success. During these sessions, CJRI staff developed a vision statement to guide the Institute's work over the next five years, adapted strategic plans goals for the organization in light of the establishment of the pretrial database and reporting system, and refined objectives which will enable CJRI to achieve these goals. See CJRI's vision statement [here](#) and CJRI's strategic plan goals for 2026 - 2030 [here](#).

Facility Tours - O`ahu Community Correctional Center and Women's Community Correctional Center: This year, CJRI staff attended facility tours of the O`ahu Community Correctional Center (OCCC) and the Women's Community Correctional Center (WCCC). The tour of OCCC, which was facilitated by the HCSOC oversight coordinator and staff, allowed CJRI staff to gain a better understanding of the intake process for newly admitted individuals and how pretrial detainees are housed throughout the facility. The tour of WCCC, which was facilitated by one of CJRI's board members who works at the facility, provided CJRI staff with the



opportunity to see how the facility has constructed infrastructure and operations to house both pretrial and post-conviction women. The tour explained how the new facility promotes prosocial change for women through innovations in educational programs, vocational opportunities, and recreational activities.

Justice Research Group: Earlier this year, the CJRI Director and the Judiciary's Planning and Program Evaluation Division Administrator formed the Justice Research Group (JRG), an interagency gathering of research staff in Hawai'i. The JRG includes research staff from CJRI, the Judiciary, DCR, the Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division of the Department of the Attorney General, and faculty from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa and Chaminade University of Honolulu. Members of the group have the opportunity to share research at any stage from study design to findings, lead journal club discussions, and hear from guest speakers.

CJRI staff work collaboratively with other agencies and organizations addressing criminal justice topics to ensure that research and data improve the system as a whole.



PRETRIAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Hawai'i Legislature tasked CJRI with establishing and maintaining a “centralized statewide criminal pretrial justice data reporting and collection system” (HRS § 614-3). Following an appropriation through Act 147 (2023), CJRI has spent the past two years working with information technology partners to establish the pretrial database and reporting system. This new data warehouse centralizes three sources of data: 1) **arrest data** from the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS), Hawai'i Criminal Justice Data Center (HCJDC), Department of the Attorney General; 2) **criminal pretrial court data** from the Judiciary Information Management System (JIMS), Judiciary, and 3) **jail data** from OffenderTrak, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

The pretrial database was established to centralize data, which creates capacity for CJRI to fulfill pretrial reporting requirements. One important outcome from this project was the creation of a case-level unified dataset that links and merges records across all three data sources. This is the primary data source to answer research questions about the pretrial system and report out on pretrial performance measures. CJRI's 2025 annual report includes eight pretrial metrics developed using this unified dataset. Some metrics will be reported at a later date or cannot be reported unless there are key changes made to data collection. Additional details related to the ongoing work are provided on [page 80](#).

Presented in the next section are pretrial metrics outlined under law (HRS § 614-3) for pretrial reporting. The data is analyzed for cases filed in Fiscal Year 2025 (July 1, 2024 -



June 30, 2025) for process metrics and in Fiscal Year 2023 (July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023) for outcome metrics. The fiscal year timeframe is reported to provide the most recent calculations on process metrics.

It is important to note that this is the first year that CJRI has had the capacity to report out on pretrial metrics, and that the findings shared this year serve as a baseline for the performance of the pretrial system in Hawai'i. In 2026, CJRI staff will continue to analyze these metrics by updating the calculations with data from the more recent year. Additionally, data will be analyzed for prior years in order to establish historical trends in the metrics that will allow readers to understand them in more context. These analyses will be provided in CJRI's 2026 annual report, and will be posted to the [CJRI website](#) as they become available.

For a summary of the findings presented in this section, please see the Research Takeaways section on [page 88](#).

Please see [page 86](#) for a list of key terms and acronyms in this section and their definitions.

For more information about Hawai'i's pretrial system, please see <https://cjrihawaii.com/pretrial-database/>.





PROCESS METRICS

Process metrics measure activities or operations within a pretrial system, often through frequencies and/or percentages [4]. They provide stakeholders with an understanding of what has occurred within their pretrial system, such as the movement of individuals throughout various decision points. Additionally, process metrics can provide insight into why goals for the system are succeeding or failing.

FY 2025 (July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025) was used for reporting for all process metrics.

Annual arrests

page 23

Annual case filings

page 30

Release status - first pretrial hearing

page 38

Bail amount - first pretrial hearing

page 45

Change in release status - after three months

page 52




Annual arrests

This metric calculates the frequency of **arrests**, operationalized as an event where a person is taken into legal custody for at least one charge on a specific date in a fiscal year. While many arrests are made by county police departments, some arrests analyzed include those conducted by the Department of Law Enforcement.

Statewide

There were 26,184 arrests statewide in FY 2025. There were an average of 2,182 arrests per month. The most serious offense in an arrest was most frequently misdemeanors (42%), followed by petty misdemeanors (30%), class C felonies (21%), class B felonies (5%), and class A felonies (2%).

Figure 1



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 28](#).




Annual arrests (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu

There were 14,979 arrests in the First Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 1,248 arrests per month. The most serious offense in an arrest was most frequently misdemeanors (46%), followed by petty misdemeanors (30%), class C felonies (18%), class B felonies (4%), and class A felonies (2%).

Figure 2



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 28](#).




Annual arrests (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County

There were 3,941 arrests in the Second Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 328 arrests per month. The most serious offense in an arrest was most frequently misdemeanors (37%), followed by class C felonies (29%), petty misdemeanors (22%), class B felonies (9%), and class A felonies (3%).

Figure 3



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 28](#).




Annual arrests (cont.)

Third Circuit - Hawai'i County

There were 5,474 arrests in the Third Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 456 arrests per month. The most serious offense in an arrest was most frequently petty misdemeanors (33%), followed by misdemeanors (32%), class C felonies (23%), class B felonies (10%), and class A felonies (2%).

Figure 4

Counts of Third Circuit Arrests in FY 2025 by the Most Serious Offense Classification (Total n = 5,474)



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 28](#).




Annual arrests (cont.)

Fifth Circuit - Kaua'i County

There were 1,790 arrests in the Fifth Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 149 arrests per month. The most serious offense in an arrest was most frequently misdemeanors (41%), followed by petty misdemeanors (32%), class C felonies (21%), class B felonies (5%), and class A felonies (1%).

Figure 5



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 28](#).



Annual arrests (cont.)

Takeaways

- There were 26,184 arrests statewide in FY 2025, averaging 2,182 arrests per month.
- The First Circuit had the highest count of arrests, followed by the Third Circuit, Second Circuit, and Fifth Circuit.
- Most arrests were for both misdemeanor levels and felony C. Statewide and in the First Circuit and Fifth Circuit, the most serious offense charge for the largest portion of arrests were misdemeanors, followed by petty misdemeanors, and class C felonies.
 - In the Second Circuit, the most serious offense charge for the largest portion of arrests were misdemeanors, followed by class C felonies, and petty misdemeanors.
 - In the Third Circuit, the most serious offense charge for the largest portion of arrests were petty misdemeanors, followed by misdemeanors, and class C felonies.

Notes

- This measure focuses on analyzing arrests by most serious offense. Arrests can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).
- This measure is based on data from CJIS and does not include criminal citations, which are filed directly with the courts.
- Circuit level statistics include the following agencies:
 - First Circuit: Honolulu Police Department, Department of Law Enforcement - O`ahu, Honolulu Prosecutors, Department of the Attorney General
 - Second Circuit: Maui Police Department, Department of Law Enforcement - Maui
 - Third Circuit: Hawai`i Police Department, Department of Law Enforcement - Hawai`i Island
 - Fifth Circuit: Kaua`i Police Department, Department of Law Enforcement - Kaua`i



Annual arrests (cont.)

Limitations

- This measure may not be reflective of the actual number of arrests within a calendar year, as it does not account for a person being arrested more than once on any given day, such as someone being arrested and booked in the morning, being released from police custody, and arrested and booked again in the evening on the same day.



Annual case filings

This metric calculates the frequency of **criminal cases filed** with the Hawai'i Judiciary in a fiscal year. This metric includes Circuit Court Criminal (PC), Family Court Criminal (FC), and District Criminal Complaint Written (CW) cases. These cases include many of the cases filed when someone is charged for felony, misdemeanor, or petty misdemeanor offenses, but does not include all such as traffic and citations. The data is analyzed by the most serious offense level in a case, since many people are charged with more than one offense.

The statistics presented for this metric include Circuit Court Criminal (PC), Family Court Criminal (FC), and District Criminal Complaint Written (CW) cases statewide and by circuit. Statistics do not include District Criminal Citation (CC) and Traffic Crime (TC) cases due to data limitations.

Note about misdemeanors and petty misdemeanors: Cases filed in CW cases involve misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor charges that stem from an arrest and booking by law enforcement officers. CW cases encompass many, but not all misdemeanor charges that are filed in court. CC cases also involve misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor charges, and result from the issuance of a criminal citation by a law enforcement officer. The decision to arrest or cite someone for misdemeanor or petty misdemeanor charges is decided by law enforcement. *The frequency of criminal case filings provided here for misdemeanors and petty misdemeanors should not be used to generalize to all misdemeanor cases.*




Annual case filings (cont).

Statewide

There were 14,518 criminal case filings statewide in FY 2025. There were an average of 1,210 case filings per month. The most serious offense in a case was most frequently petty misdemeanors (39%), followed by misdemeanors (28%), class C felonies (21%), class B felonies (9%), and class A felonies (3%).

Figure 6



For notes regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 36](#).




Annual case filings (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu

There were 7,019 criminal case filings in the First Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 585 case filings per month. The most serious offense in a case was most frequently petty misdemeanors (43%), followed by misdemeanors (33%), class C felonies (17%), class B felonies (4%), and class A felonies (3%).

Figure 7



For notes regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 36](#).




Annual case filings (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County

There were 1,984 criminal case filings in the Second Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 165 case filings per month. The most serious offense in a case was most frequently misdemeanors (30%), followed by class C felonies (29%), petty misdemeanors (27%), class B felonies (11%), and class A felonies (3%).

Figure 8



For notes regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 36](#).




Annual case filings (cont.)

Third Circuit - Hawai'i County

There were 4,124 criminal case filings in the Third Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 344 case filings per month. The most serious offense in a case was most frequently petty misdemeanors (34%), followed by class C felonies (24%), misdemeanors (20%), class B felonies (19%), and class A felonies (3%).

Figure 9

Counts of Third Circuit FY 2025 Court Case Filings by the Most Serious Offense Classification (Total n = 4,124)



For notes regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 36](#).




Annual case filings (cont.)

Fifth Circuit - Kaua'i County

There were 1,391 criminal case filings in the Fifth Circuit in FY 2025. There were an average of 116 case filings per month. The most serious offense in a case was most frequently petty misdemeanors (45%), followed by misdemeanors (29%), class C felonies (19%), class B felonies (6%), and class A felonies (1%).

Figure 10



For notes regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 36](#).



Annual case filings (cont.)

Takeaways

- There were 14,518 case filings statewide in FY 2025, averaging 1,210 case filings a month.
- The First Circuit had the highest count of case filings, followed by the Third Circuit, Second Circuit, and Fifth Circuit. This trend for case volume was similar to the trend in arrest volume by county.
- Felony A was the least frequent most serious offense charge in case filings across all circuits. Statewide and in the First Circuit and Fifth Circuit, the most serious offense charge for the largest portion of cases filed were petty misdemeanors, followed by misdemeanors, and class C felonies.
 - In the Second Circuit, the most serious offense charge for the largest portion of cases filed were misdemeanors, followed class C felonies, and petty misdemeanors.
 - In the Third Circuit, the most serious offense charge for the largest portion of cases filed were petty misdemeanors, followed by class C felonies, and misdemeanors.

Notes

- This measure focuses on analyzing case filings by most serious offense. Cases can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).
- This metric does not include Criminal Citation (CC) cases because of data limitations. CC cases result from the issuance of a criminal citation, rather than an arrest and booking, for misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor charges.
- This metric does not include Traffic Crime (TC) cases because of data limitations. TC cases involve offenses like operating a vehicle under the influence of an intoxicant (OVUI), driving without a license, and driving without insurance.
- There are many instances in which felony level charges, as indicated by the same arrest number(s), have cases filed in both District and Circuit



Annual case filings (cont.)

Court, due to the process for establishing probable cause. This metric captures both the District Court and Circuit Court cases.

- There are some instances in which misdemeanor level charges, as indicated by the same arrest or citation number(s), have cases filed in both District and Circuit Court, due to a defendant requesting a jury trial, prompting charges to be committed to Circuit Court. This metric captures both the District and Circuit Court cases.
- Case filings do not equate to people. Individuals may be counted in this measure more than once if they had more than one case filed in FY 2025.
- The difference in frequencies between arrests and case filings is expected due to:
 - Not all arrests result in the filing of a criminal case with the courts due to differing burdens of proof.
 - An arrest and a case filing related to the same charges (same arrest numbers) can occur within different fiscal years.



Release status - first pretrial hearing

This metric calculates the percentage of defendants who were **released at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing** by type of release status in Circuit or Family Court. For those released, their status may include release on recognizance, supervised release, or monetary bail. For defendants in custody, this can refer to those who were held with DCR or the Department of Health (DOH). A defendant can be in custody because they were detained without bail or because bail was unpaid at the conclusion of the first hearing. This measure also includes defendants who were out of custody (pending bench warrant, bail forfeiture, or discharge of sureties) at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing. This measure is one approach to understand how often people are released or detained while they await trial. Another approach to assessing release status is provided with the *change in release status -after three months* metric.

This metric is not presented statewide due to data limitations. Instead, data is presented for only two case types in the Circuit and Family Courts of the First Circuit and Second Circuit. These case types are described below:

Note about misdemeanors in Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases: Cases filed in Circuit Court largely involve felony level charges. When misdemeanor charges are included in PC cases, it is often due to (1) defendants in District Court requesting a jury trial, resulting in their charges being committed to Circuit Court, or (2) felony level charges that are reduced to a misdemeanor as part of a plea agreement. The majority of misdemeanor cases are adjudicated in District Court. *The release statuses provided here for misdemeanors should not be used to generalize to all misdemeanor cases.*

Note about charges in Family Court Criminal (FC) cases: Criminal cases filed in Family Court involve abuse of a family or household member charges and felony level charges involving offenses against household members. *The release statuses provided here should not be used to generalize other case types.*



Release status - first pretrial hearing (cont).

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu


Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases

For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit in FY 2025, **33% of defendants were released** at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing, 66% of defendants were in custody, and 1% were out of custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 41.8% of defendants were released on recognizance.
- class C felony, 69.4% of defendants were in custody.
- class B felony, 68.7% of defendants were in custody.
- class A felony, 80.0% of defendants were in custody.

Figure 11



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 43](#).



Release status - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County


Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases

For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2025, **32% of defendants were released** at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing, 52% were in custody, and 16% were out of custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 57.1% of defendants were in custody.*
- class C felony, 54.0% of defendants were in custody.
- class B felony, 46.8% of defendants were in custody.
- class A felony, 51.2% of defendants were in custody.

Figure 12



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 43](#).



Release status - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu


Family Court Criminal (FC) cases

For cases filed in the Family Court of the First Circuit in FY 2025, **73% of defendants were released** at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing, 22% were in custody, and 5% were out of custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 63.1% of defendants were released on recognizance.
- misdemeanor, 58.4% of defendants were released on recognizance.
- class C felony, 47.4% of defendants were in custody.*
- class A felony, 93.8% of defendants were in custody.*

Figure 13



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 43](#).



Release status - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County


Family Court Criminal (FC) cases

For cases filed in the Family Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2025, **54% of defendants were released** at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing, 39% were in custody, and 7% were out of custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 43.5% of defendants were released on monetary bail.*
- misdemeanor, 43.9% of defendants were released on monetary bail.
- class C felony, 40.4% of defendants were released on monetary bail.
- class A felony, 66.7% of defendants were out of custody.*
 - Note the small sample size, two out of the three cases total.

Figure 14



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 43](#).



Release status - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

Takeaways

- Overall, *in custody* was the most common release status for cases with a felony offense as their most serious charge. One exception was for felony cases in the Family Court of the Second Circuit.
- About a third of defendants were released into the community at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing by the Circuit Court of the First Circuit (33%) and the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit (32%).
- Of those released in the Circuit Courts of the First Circuit and Second Circuit, *monetary bail* was the most common release type for cases where a felony offense was the most serious charge, followed by *supervised release*, and *release on recognizance*. The only exception was for Circuit Court felony C cases of the Second Circuit, in which release on recognizance was slightly more frequent than supervised release.
- Family Courts released a greater percentage of defendants than Circuit Courts. A majority of defendants were released at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing in the Family Court of the First Circuit (73%) and the Family Court of the Second Circuit (54%).
- Most cases with a misdemeanor as the most serious offense are heard in District Court, though some are heard in other courts and therefore analyzed in this data. While *monetary bail* was the most common release type for cases with a felony offense as the most serious charge, a greater percentage of cases were *released on recognizance* for those with a misdemeanor offense as the most serious charge. This applied to both Circuit Courts and the Family Court of the First Circuit, but not for the Family Court of the Second Circuit. There, *monetary bail* was more common.

Notes

- This measure focuses on analyzing release status at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing in a case by most serious offense. Cases can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).



Release status - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

- First pretrial hearing is defined as the defendant's first court hearing in which a judge makes a pretrial release decision - the initial appearance hearing at District Court and the arraignment and plea hearing at Circuit and Family Court. Defendants whose first hearing in a case that were calendared as another hearing type were excluded from this measure.
- This measure includes individuals who were released prior to their first pretrial hearing, such as those who were released on their own recognizance or who posted monetary bail at the police station, and lawfully remained in the community at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing.
- The out of custody category refers to persons whose release status at the date of their first scheduled pretrial hearing was either bench warrant issued, discharge of sureties, or bail forfeiture. These persons are not in the community on court approved release and are pending return to custody.
- Individuals may be counted in this measure more than once if they had more than one case filed in FY 2025.
- Due to slight rounding errors, some percentage totals do not add up to 100% (+/-0.1%).

Limitations

- Due to data limitations, this metric is only available for Circuit Court Criminal (PC) and Family Court Criminal (FC) cases in the First and Second Circuits. PC cases encompass criminal felony cases, and misdemeanor cases in which a jury trial was demanded. FC cases encompass abuse of family and household member charges and felony charges involving offenses against household members. Additionally, release status at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing is unavailable for District Court cases, which encompass the vast majority of the State's misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor level cases, due to data limitations.



Bail amount - first pretrial hearing

This metric calculates the **monetary bail amounts assigned at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing** in Circuit or Family Court, by providing the median and the percentage of cases within ranges for bail amounts. If a defendant has monetary bail set, they must pay the amount in order to be released while their case is pending trial. For defendants released on bail, the money they post is meant to ensure court appearance and prevent new crimes. Bail amounts are summarized with the median, which represents the value that is in the middle of a distribution. The average is not provided for bail because the data is skewed, which means the average is not representative.

This metric is not presented statewide due to data limitations. Instead, data is presented for only two case types in the Circuit and Family Courts of the First Circuit and Second Circuit. These case types are described below:

Note about misdemeanors in Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases: Cases filed in Circuit Court largely involve felony level charges. When misdemeanor charges are included in PC cases, it is often due to (1) defendants in District Court requesting a jury trial, resulting in their charges being committed to Circuit Court, or (2) felony level charges that are reduced to a misdemeanor as part of a plea agreement. The majority of misdemeanor cases are adjudicated in District Court. *The bail amounts provided here for misdemeanors should not be used to generalize to all misdemeanor cases.*

Note about charges in Family Court Criminal (FC) cases: Criminal cases filed in Family Court involve abuse of a family or household member charges and felony level charges involving offenses against household members. *The bail amounts provided here should not be used to generalize to other case types.*



Bail amount - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu

Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases


The median bail amount at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing for cases in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit for cases filed in FY 2025 was \$11,000. Bail amount ranged from \$10 to \$1,000,000. In 51% of cases, bail was between \$10,001 and \$50,000.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 87.5% of cases had bail between \$1 and \$1,000.
- class C felony, 50.7% of cases had bail between \$10,001 and \$50,000.
- class B felony, 70.4% of cases had bail between \$10,001 and \$50,000.
- class A felony, 73.8% of cases had bail over \$50,000.

Figure 15

Percentage of First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases within a Certain Bail Amount Range by the Most Serious Offense (Total n = 1,163)



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 50](#).



Bail amount - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County


Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases

The median bail amount at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing for cases in the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit for cases filed in FY 2025 was \$5,000. Bail amount ranged from \$1 to \$1,500,000. In 55% of cases bail was between \$1,001 and \$10,000.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 87.5% of cases had bail between \$1 and \$1,000.*
- class C felony, 66.7% of cases had bail between \$1,001 and \$50,000.
- class B felony, 54.3% of cases had bail between \$1,001 and \$10,000.
- class A felony, 71.4% of cases had bail over \$50,000.*

Figure 16



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 50](#).



Bail amount - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu


Family Court Criminal (FC) cases

The median bail amount at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing for cases in the Family Court of the First Circuit for cases filed in FY 2025 was \$2,000. Bail amount ranged from \$10 to \$1,000,000. In 53% of cases, bail was between \$1,001 and \$5,000.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 55.8% of cases had bail between \$501 and \$1,000.
- misdemeanor, 65.2% of cases had bail between \$1,001 and \$5,000.
- class C felony, 93.8% of cases had bail over \$5,000.*
- class A felony, 100% of cases had bail over \$5,000.*

Figure 17



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 50](#).



Bail amount - first pretrial hearing (cont.)


Second Circuit - Maui County Family Court Criminal (PC) cases

The median bail amount at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing for cases in the Family Court of the Second Circuit for cases filed in FY 2025 was \$1,000. Bail amount ranged from \$1,000 to \$210,000. In 61% of cases, bail was between \$501 and \$1,000.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 81.2% of cases had bail between \$501 and \$1,000.*
- misdemeanor, 73.3% of cases had bail between \$501 and \$1,000.
- class C felony, 54.3% of cases had bail between \$1,001 and \$5,000.
- class A felony, 100% of cases had bail between \$501 and \$1,000.*

Figure 18



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 50](#).



Bail amount - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

Takeaways

- The amount of monetary bail assigned to a defendant after the first hearing varied with offense severity, to some degree, in data analyzed in the First Circuit and Second Circuit. For Circuit Court cases, the lowest offense level (misdemeanor) had the greatest percentage of defendants within the lowest bail amount range (\$1-1,000). For the most serious offense level, felony A, the largest percentage of defendants fell within the highest bail amount range (over \$50,000). Within those offense levels, a pattern emerges where bail amount appears to increase with each offense level. This trend occurred within each circuit.
- Though statewide data was not available at this time and circuit trends cannot be established, there were differences in the median bail amounts between the two analyzed. The median bail amounts were higher in the First Circuit: \$11,000 (Circuit Court) and \$2,000 (Family Court). In the Second Circuit, \$5,000 was the median bail amount for Circuit Court and \$1,000 was the median bail amount for Family Court.
- The data on median bail amounts demonstrates that Circuit Court sets higher bail amounts than Family Court. However, this could be expected. Each Circuit Court has a greater number of cases with more serious offense levels as their most serious charge and cases are different between the two different types of courts.

Notes

- This measure focuses on analyzing bail amount at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing in a case by most serious offense. Cases can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).
- First pretrial hearing is defined as the defendant's first court hearing in which a judge makes a pretrial release decision - the initial appearance hearing at District Court and the arraignment and plea hearing at Circuit and Family Court. Defendants whose first hearing in a case that



Bail amount - first pretrial hearing (cont.)

were calendared as another hearing type were excluded from this measure.

- This measure includes bail amounts that were assigned at the police station for misdemeanors or by an on-call judge for felonies prior to the first hearing, in which the defendant paid their bail and was released from custody prior to their first pretrial hearing.
- This measure excludes individuals who were released on recognizance or on supervised release, who were committed without bail, those who were in the custody of DOH, those who were committed without bail, and those who were out of custody at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing.
- Individuals may be counted in this measure more than once if they had more than one case filed in FY 2025.
 - In some cases, a defendant might receive “nominal bail” for a case if they already have a pending case pretrial. This is often set at a lower amount (e.g., \$10) and ensures the defendant receives credit for time served on their new case.
- Due to slight rounding errors, some percentage totals do not add up to 100% (+/-0.1%).

Limitations

- Due to data limitations, this metric is only available for Circuit Court Criminal (PC) and Family Court Criminal (FC) cases in the First and Second Circuits. PC cases encompass criminal felony cases, and misdemeanor cases in which a jury trial was demanded. FC cases encompass abuse of family and household member charges and felony charges involving offenses against household members. Additionally, bail amount at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing is unavailable for District Court cases, which encompass the vast majority of the State’s misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor level cases, due to data limitations.



Change in release status - after three months

This metric calculates the percentage of defendants who had their **release status change within three months (90 days) of their first pretrial hearing**. This metric captures the first change in release status. This measure helps understand the dynamic nature of pretrial release, where someone's status can change over time while they await trial. For example, some individuals who have monetary bail set at the conclusion of their first hearing may not post bail until a later date.

This metric is not presented statewide due to data limitations. Instead, data is presented for only two case types in the Circuit and Family Courts of the First Circuit and Second Circuit. These case types are described below:

Note about misdemeanors in Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases: Cases filed in Circuit Court largely involve felony level charges. When misdemeanor charges are included in PC cases, it is often due to (1) defendants in District Court requesting a jury trial, resulting in their charges being committed to Circuit Court, or (2) felony level charges that are reduced to a misdemeanor as part of a plea agreement. The majority of misdemeanor cases are adjudicated in District Court. *The change in release status after three months provided here for misdemeanors should not be used to generalize to all misdemeanor cases.*

Note about charges in Family Court Criminal (FC) cases: Criminal cases filed in Family Court involve abuse of a family or household member charges and felony level charges involving offenses against household members. *The change in release status after three months provided here should not be used to generalize to other case types.*



Change in release status - after three months (cont).

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu

Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases


For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit in FY 2025, 45% of defendants remained in custody 90 days after their first pretrial hearing, 29% remained on release, 23% went from custody to release, and 3% went from release to custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 72.3% of defendants remained on release.
- class C felony, 44.9% of defendants remained in custody.
- class B felony, 47.2% of defendants remained in custody.
- class A felony, 68.3% of defendants remained in custody.

Figure 19

Percentage of Defendants Whose Release Status Changed 3 Months after the First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases (Total n = 1,281)



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 57](#).



Change in release status - after three months (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County

Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases


For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2025, 38% of defendants remained in custody 90 days after their first pretrial hearing, 32% remained on release, 26% went from custody to release, and 4% went from release to custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 44.4% of defendants remained in custody.*
- class C felony, 37.8% of defendants remained in custody.
- class B felony, 38.3% of defendants remained in custody.
- class A felony, 41.4% of defendants remained on release.*

Figure 20

Percentage of Defendants Whose Release Status Changed 3 Months after the First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for Second Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases (Total n = 337)



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 57](#).



Change in release status - after three months (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu

Family Court Criminal (FC) cases


For cases filed in the Family Court of the First Circuit in FY 2025, 67% of defendants remained on release 90 days after their first pretrial hearing, 16% went from custody to release, 9% went from release to custody, and 8% remained in custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 83.0% of defendants remained on release.
- misdemeanor, 64.2% of defendants remained on release.
- class C felony, 52.6% of defendants remained on release.*
- class A felony, 81.2% of defendants remained in custody.*

Figure 21

Percentage of Defendants Whose Release Status Changed 3 Months after the First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Family Court Cases (Total n = 892)



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 57](#).



Change in release status - after three months (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County


Family Court Criminal (FC) cases

For cases filed in the Family Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2025, 56% of defendants remained on release 90 days after their first pretrial hearing, 23% remained in custody, 16% went from custody to release, and 5% went from release to custody.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 57.9% of defendants remained on release.*
- misdemeanor, 52.6% of defendants remained on release.
- class C felony, 62.9% of defendants remained on release.
- class A felony, 100% of defendants remained on release.*

Figure 22



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 57](#).



Change in release status - after three months (cont.)

Takeaways

- Many cases in the Circuit Courts did not have a change in release status within three months of their first pretrial hearing. For all cases with a felony offense level as a most serious charge in both First Circuit and Second Circuit, more than half of the cases were *no change* (either remained in custody or remained released).
- For cases with a felony B and felony C as their most serious charge in a case in the Circuit Courts, approximately a fifth to a quarter of defendants had a change in status from *custody to release* within 90 days of their first hearing.
- Regardless of circuit, a majority of cases in the Family Courts maintained a release status. One exception to this trend was for felony A cases in the First Circuit, where more defendants remained in custody (though this sample size was small).
- A large proportion of cases with a misdemeanor or petty misdemeanor offense level as their most serious charge did not have a change in status. However, those heard in Family Court and Circuit Court may not represent the typical case for those lower offense levels.

Notes

- This measure focuses on change in release status three months after the first pretrial hearing in a case by most serious offense. Cases can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).
- This metric captures the first change in an individual's release status following their first pretrial hearing and within three months (custody → release OR release → custody). This was done in order to demonstrate how frequently persons who were in custody at the conclusion of the first pretrial hearing are able to later secure their release, as well as how frequently persons who were released at the conclusion of their first hearing are returned to custody during pretrial.



Change in release status - after three months (cont.)

- This metric measures the *change* in status, and does not translate to where an individual is located (in the community on pretrial release or in custody) at the conclusion of the 90 day period following their first pretrial hearing. Rather, it gives an indication of the *first change in status* during the three-month follow up period from the first pretrial hearing. For example, an individual could have been in custody at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing, be released from custody (which would be captured by this metric), and then return to custody (which would not be captured by this metric) within the 90 days following their first pretrial hearing.
- Individuals may be counted in this measure more than once if they had more than one case filed in FY 2025.
- Due to slight rounding errors, some percentage totals do not add up to 100% (+/-0.1%).

Limitations

- Due to data limitations, this metric is only available for Circuit Court Criminal (PC) and Family Court Criminal (FC) cases in the First and Second Circuits. PC cases encompass criminal felony cases, and misdemeanor cases in which a jury trial was demanded. FC cases encompass abuse of family and household member charges and felony charges involving offenses against household members. Additionally, change in release status within three months is unavailable for District Court cases, which encompass the vast majority of the State's misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor level cases, due to data limitations.



OUTCOME METRICS

Outcome metrics measure goals or results within a pretrial system [5]. They provide stakeholders with an understanding of the system’s effectiveness at meeting desired objectives.

All outcome metrics reported by CJRI are calculated using adjudicated cases. This was done in order to say for certain whether an outcome occurred or not during the pretrial period of a case. As a result, these metrics are calculated using data from an earlier year than the process metrics to ensure that a large enough percentage of cases are adjudicated. It is important that a large sample of cases be adjudicated to calculate these metrics to ensure that statistics are representative of most cases.

FY 2023 (July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023) was used for reporting for all process metrics. Additionally, cases included in outcome metrics were adjudicated by November 30, 2025.

Length of the pretrial period

page 60

Release ever

page 68

New charges

page 75



Length of the pretrial period

This metric calculates the **length of the pretrial period** by providing the median and the percentage of cases within ranges for days a case was pending adjudication. The length of time is measured from case filing through the date of adjudication (sentencing, acquittal, granting of a deferred prosecution agreement, or dismissal). The length of the pretrial period is important because cases should be adjudicated efficiently to ensure defendant's rights, create resolution for victims and the public, and use system resources efficiently [6].

The statistics presented for this metric include Circuit Court Criminal (PC), Family Court Criminal (FC), and District Criminal Complaint Written (CW) cases statewide and by circuit. Statistics do not include District Criminal Citation (CC) and Traffic Crime (TC) cases due to data limitations.

Note about misdemeanors and petty misdemeanors: Cases filed in CW cases involve misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor charges that stem from an arrest and booking by law enforcement officers. CW cases encompass many, but not all misdemeanor charges that are filed in court. CC cases also involve misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor charges, and result from the issuance of a criminal citation by a law enforcement officer. The decision to arrest or cite someone for misdemeanor or petty misdemeanor charges is decided by law enforcement. *The length of the pretrial period provided here for misdemeanors should not be used to generalize to all misdemeanor cases.*



Length of the pretrial period (cont.)

Statewide


For cases filed statewide in FY 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025, the median length of the pretrial period was 95 days. The pretrial period ranged from the date of case filing to 935 days. The pretrial period for the largest portion of cases was between the date of case filing and 90 days (49%).

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 67.8% of cases.
- misdemeanor, the pretrial period was between within 90 days for 43.7% of cases.
- class C felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 41.0% of cases.
- class B felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 37.6% of cases.
- class A felony, the pretrial period was over 365 days for 53.2% of cases.

Figure 23

Percentage of Statewide FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense (Total n = 9,611)



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 66](#).



Length of the pretrial period (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu


For cases filed in the First Circuit in FY 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025, the median length of the pretrial period was 64 days. The pretrial period ranged from the date of case filing to 895 days. The pretrial period for the majority of cases was between the date of case filing and 90 days (55%).

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 76.9% of cases.
- misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 49.9% of cases.
- class C felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 48.8% of cases.
- class B felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 43.6% of cases.
- class A felony, the pretrial period was over 365 days for 64.9% of cases.

Figure 24

Percentage of First Circuit FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense (Total n = 4,782)



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 66](#).



Length of the pretrial period (cont.)


Second Circuit - Maui County

For cases filed in the Second Circuit in FY 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025, the median length of the pretrial period was 102 days. The pretrial period ranged from the date of case filing to 890 days. The pretrial period for the majority of cases was between the date of case filing and 90 days (48%).

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 78.3% of cases.
- misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 51.2% of cases.
- class C felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 45.3% of cases.
- class B felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 42.3% of cases.
- class A felony, the pretrial period was over 365 days for 68.5% of cases.

Figure 25



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 66](#).



Length of the pretrial period (cont.)

Third Circuit - Hawai'i County


For cases filed in the Third Circuit in FY 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025, the median length of the pretrial period was 115 days. The pretrial period ranged from the date of case filing to 935 days. The pretrial period for the largest portion of cases was between the date of case filing and 90 days (42%).

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 54.0% of cases.
- misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 28.7% of cases.
- class C felony, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 26.8% of cases and between 181 and 365 days for 26.8% of cases.
- class B felony, the pretrial period was between 91 and 180 days for 31.9% of cases.
- class A felony, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 28.6% of cases.

Figure 26

Percentage of Third Circuit FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense (Total n = 3,002)



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 66](#).



Length of the pretrial period (cont.)


Fifth Circuit - Kaua'i County

For cases filed in the Fifth Circuit in FY 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025, the median length of the pretrial period was 153 days. The pretrial period ranged from the date of case filing to 881 days. The pretrial period for the largest portion of cases was between the date of case filing and 90 days (37%).

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 50.0% of cases.
- misdemeanor, the pretrial period was within 90 days for 32.6% of cases.
- class C felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 46.6% of cases.
- class B felony, the pretrial period was over 365 days for 41.7% of cases.*
- class A felony, the pretrial period was between 181 and 365 days for 100% of cases.*

Figure 27



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 66](#).



Length of the pretrial period (cont.)

Takeaways

- To some extent, the length of the pretrial period appears to vary with offense seriousness. Statewide, cases filed with petty misdemeanor as the most serious offense were adjudicated most quickly. Almost 68% of these cases were pretrial for *90 days or less*, and 94% of cases were adjudicated within a year. Cases where misdemeanor was the most serious offense were adjudicated second most quickly. Close to half (44%) of misdemeanor cases were in pretrial *less than 90 days*, and 13% took *more than a year* to adjudicate.
- Though cases where a felony offense was the most serious charge took longer to adjudicate than petty misdemeanors and misdemeanors, the trends were not as clearly linked within felony offense levels. At the state level, felony C and felony B had a similar distribution of days pretrial for each range.
- While the First Circuit and Second Circuit had similar trends in pretrial length, Third Circuit differed. With the exception of petty misdemeanors, cases had similar proportions by each offense level for the three pretrial lengths of *90 days or less*, *91-180 days*, and *181-365 days* in the Third Circuit. The Fifth Circuit is smaller and therefore more difficult to interpret, though the trends are somewhat similar to the First Circuit and Second Circuit.

Notes

- This measure focuses on the length of the pretrial period in a case by most serious offense. Cases can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).
- This metric requires cases to be adjudicated in order to analyze the length of the pretrial period.
 - For cases filed in FY 2023, this includes cases filed between July 1, 2022 and June 30, 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025.
- Due to slight rounding errors, some percentage totals do not add up to 100% (+/-0.1%).



Length of the pretrial period (cont.)

Limitations

- Due to data limitations, this metric undercounts the number of adjudicated cases in any given year due to cases missing coding markers which are used to indicate adjudication. While this undercounting is expected, it is slight and does not significantly impact the findings and takeaways presented above.



Release ever during the pretrial period

This metric calculates the percentage of **defendants released to the community** at least once during the pretrial period. Pretrial release must balance due process considerations for those accused of crimes while protecting the public and ensuring court appearance [7]. In other words, pretrial detention is not a punishment, but a tool used by the courts when they determine a defendant is a danger to the community, a threat to witnesses, and/or unlikely to appear at court. Release to the community refers to release on monetary bail, supervised release, or release on recognizance.

This metric is not presented statewide due to data limitations. Instead, data is presented for only two case types in the Circuit and Family Courts of the First Circuit and Second Circuit. These case types are described below:

Note about misdemeanors in Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases: Cases filed in Circuit Court largely involve felony level charges. When misdemeanor charges are included in PC cases, it is often due to (1) defendants in District Court requesting a jury trial, resulting in their charges being committed to Circuit Court, or (2) felony level charges that are reduced to a misdemeanor as part of a plea agreement. The majority of misdemeanor cases are adjudicated in District Court. *The percentage of defendants released ever during the pretrial period provided here for misdemeanors should not be used to generalize all misdemeanor cases.*

Note about charges in Family Court Criminal (FC) cases: Criminal cases filed in Family Court involve abuse of a family or household member charges and felony level charges involving offenses against household members. *The percentage of defendants released ever during the pretrial period provided here should not be used to generalize other case types.*



Release ever during the pretrial period (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu

Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases


For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit in FY 2023, 57% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period of their case and 43% were never released.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 59.3% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- class C felony, 57.6% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- class B felony, 65.6% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- class A felony, 68.6% of defendants were never released during the pretrial period.

Figure 28

Percentage of Defendants Who Were Ever Released During the Pretrial Period by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2023 Circuit Court Cases (Total n = 1,009)



For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 73](#).



Release ever during the pretrial period (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County

Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases


For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2023, 66% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period of their case and 34% were never released.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 90.5% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.*
- class C felony, 70.1% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- class B felony, 62.2% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- class A felony, 52.8% of defendants were never released during the pretrial period.

Figure 29

Percentage of Defendants Who Were Ever Released During the Pretrial Period by the Most Serious Offense for Second Circuit FY 2023 Circuit Court Cases (Total n = 373)



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 73](#).



Release ever during the pretrial period (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu


Family Court Criminal (FC) cases

For cases filed in the Family Court of the First Circuit in FY 2023, 91% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period of their case and 9% were never released.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 97.0% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- misdemeanor, 86.4% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- class C felony, 100% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.*
- class A felony, 100% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.*

Figure 30



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 73](#).



Release ever during the pretrial period (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County


Family Court Criminal (FC) cases

For cases filed in the Family Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2023, 83% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period of their case and 17% were never released.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 95.6% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- misdemeanor, 80.2% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.
- class C felony, 76.9% of defendants were released at least once during the pretrial period.*
- class A felony, 100% of defendants were never released during the pretrial period.*

Figure 31



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 73](#).



Release ever during the pretrial period (cont.)

Takeaways

- There was a slight difference between Circuit Court cases in the First Circuit and the Second Circuit for this metric. At the aggregate level, a little over half of the defendants in First Circuit were released at least once during pretrial, while about two thirds of defendants in Second Circuit were released pretrial.
- More defendants were released at some point during the pretrial period in cases from the Family Courts. A majority of defendants (91%) were released at least once in the First Circuit and a majority of defendants (83%) were released at least once in the Second Circuit.
- Since most cases where the most serious charge was petty misdemeanor and misdemeanor offenses were not heard in Family Court or Circuit Court, this data might not reflect their overall trends since it represents a small proportion of them in the state.

Notes

- This measure focuses on the release ever during the period in a case by most serious offense. Cases can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).
- This metric requires cases to be adjudicated in order to analyze the length of the pretrial period.
 - For cases filed in FY 2023, this includes cases filed between July 1, 2022 and June 30, 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025.
- Due to slight rounding errors, some percentage totals do not add up to 100% (+/-0.1%).

Limitations

Due to data limitations, this metric is only available for Circuit Court Criminal (PC) and Family Court Criminal (FC) cases in the First and Second Circuits. PC cases encompass criminal felony cases, and misdemeanor cases in which a jury trial was demanded. FC cases encompass abuse of family and household member charges and felony charges involving



Release ever during the pretrial period (cont.)

offenses against household members. Additionally, release ever during the pretrial period is unavailable for District Court cases, which encompass the vast majority of the State's misdemeanor and petty misdemeanor level cases, due to data limitations.



New charges

This metric calculates the percentage of defendants **charged with a new offense** during the pretrial period. New charges are operationalized as the filing of a new criminal case with the courts, in which the charges stem from an arrest and booking (rather than a criminal citation). The only charges that are counted are those that have an arrest date and filing date that occurred within the pretrial period of an existing case. The new charges measure is reflective of alleged criminal activity only, not a conviction. This measure helps evaluate new criminal activity among people who are released pretrial, and is used to assess public safety considerations of pretrial decisions.

This metric is not presented statewide due to data limitations. Instead, data is presented for only two case types in the Circuit and Family Courts of the First Circuit and Second Circuit. These case types are described below:

Note about misdemeanors in Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases: Cases filed in Circuit Court largely involve felony level charges. When misdemeanor charges are included in PC cases, it is often due to (1) defendants in District Court requesting a jury trial, resulting in their charges being committed to Circuit Court, or (2) felony level charges that are reduced to a misdemeanor as part of a plea agreement. The majority of misdemeanor cases are adjudicated in District Court. *The percentage of new charges provided here for misdemeanors should not be used to generalize all misdemeanor cases.*

Note about charges in Family Court Criminal (FC) cases: Criminal cases filed in Family Court involve abuse of a family or household member charges and felony level charges involving offenses against household members. *The percentage of new charges provided here should not be used to generalize other case types.*



New charges (cont.)


First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases

For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit in FY 2023, 12% of defendants were charged with a new criminal case stemming from an arrest during the pretrial period and 88% of defendants were not.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 21.4% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*
- class C felony, 13.0% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.
- class B felony, 6.0% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.
- class A felony, 0% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*

Figure 32



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 80](#).



New charges (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County


Circuit Court Criminal (PC) cases

For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2023, 4% of defendants were charged with a new criminal case stemming from an arrest during the pretrial period and 96% of defendants were not.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- misdemeanor, 0% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*
- class C felony, 4.5% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*
- class B felony, 0% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*
- class A felony, 14.3% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*

Figure 33



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 80](#).



New charges (cont.)

First Circuit - City and County of Honolulu


Family Court Criminal (FC) cases

For cases filed in the Family Court of the First Circuit in FY 2023, 10% of defendants were charged with a new criminal case stemming from an arrest during the pretrial period and 90% of defendants were not.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 4.2% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.
- misdemeanor, 14.5% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.
- class C felony, 0% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*
- class A felony, 50% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*

Figure 34



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 80](#).



New charges (cont.)

Second Circuit - Maui County

Family Court Criminal (FC) cases


For cases filed in the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit in FY 2023, 9% of defendants were charged with a new criminal case stemming from an arrest during the pretrial period and 91% of defendants were not.

For cases in which the most serious offense was a:

- petty misdemeanor, 4.9% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.
- misdemeanor, 10.1% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.
- class C felony, 50% of defendants had new charges filed during the pretrial period.*

Figure 35

Percentage of Second Circuit FY 2023 Family Court Cases involving a New Charge Stemming from an Arrest by the Most Serious Offense (Total n = 112)



*Indicates small sample size (n < 30).

For notes and limitations regarding how this metric was calculated, please see [page 80](#).



New charges (cont.)

Takeaways

- Most defendants released during pretrial did not get charged for new crimes.
- The sample size was small for most offense levels in this analysis, but the sample size was the largest for people who had a felony B or C as their most serious offense charge in their initial case in the First Circuit. The new charge rate for people initially charged with felony C offenses as their most serious offense was 13% and it was 6% for those charged for a felony B offense.
- In Family Court, sample sizes were small for felonies in both circuits. For defendants charged with a misdemeanor offense as their most serious charge in their initial case, less than 15% of defendants were charged for new crimes during pretrial release in both circuits. However, these misdemeanors may not generalize to all cases since they are specific to ones processed in Family Court or Circuit Court.

Notes

- Several charges were excluded from analysis when they were the only charge in a case (representing a new charge), as they do not constitute the commission of a new criminal act while on pretrial release. Rather, these charges relate to technical violations for past criminal behaviors, supervision violations for pretrial or post-conviction (probation or parole) supervision, and other violations. These charges include:
 - HRS § 803-6(a)(b) Arrest, how made.
 - HRS § 710-1077(g) Criminal contempt of court.
 - HRS § 804-7.1 Conditions of release on bail, recognizance, or supervised release.
 - HRS § 804-7.2 Violations of conditions of release on bail, recognizance, or supervised release.
 - HRS § 804-7.3 Sanctions for violation of conditions of release on bail, recognizance, or supervised release.
 - HRS § 804-14 Discharge of sureties.
 - HRS § 804-41 Discharge of surety.



New charges (cont.)

- HRS § 804-51 Procedure (for forfeiture).
- HRS § 710-1024 Bail jumping in the first degree.
- HRS § 710-1025 Bail jumping in the second degree.
- HRS § 704-413 Conditional release; application for modification or discharge; termination of conditional release and commitment.
- HRS § 853-3 Violation of terms and conditions during deferment.
- HRS § 706-624 Conditions of probation.
- HRS § 706-625 Revocation, modification of probation conditions.
- HRS § 706-626 Summons or arrest of defendant on probation.
- HRS § 353-65 Paroles; rules.
- HRS § 353-66 Terms and conditions of parole; suspension and revocation.
- HRS § 844D-111 Refusal or failure to provide specimen for forensic identification.
- This measure focuses on the new charges in a case by most serious offense. Cases can include multiple charges, and each charge can be a different offense level (one charge is a class C felony and another charge is a misdemeanor).
- Persons who are detained for the entirety of the pretrial period for the case of interest were excluded from new charges analysis. This was done in order to avoid the capture of new charges that were filed as the result of misconduct while an individual was in jail. While misconduct in jail that rises to the level of criminal charges being filed is a serious occurrence, this metric intends to focus on new charges while an individual is in the community on pretrial release.
- This metric requires cases to be adjudicated before analyzing whether new charges were filed during the pretrial period.
 - For cases filed in FY 2023, this includes cases filed between July 1, 2022 and June 30, 2023 and adjudicated by November 30, 2025.
- Prior pending cases for the preceding two fiscal years prompted exclusion from the sample. For example, if an individual had a prior case from FY 2021 or 2022 that was pending during the time their case was filed in FY 2023, the FY 2023 case was excluded from the sample. This type of FY 2023 case was excluded from analysis because it would count as a new charge for the prior pending case from FY 2021 or FY



New charges (cont.)

2022, which would disqualify it from being a reference case for new charges.

- Due to slight rounding errors, some percentage totals do not add up to 100% (+/-0.1%).

Limitations

- Not all case types are analyzed as cases of interest due to data limitations with District Complaint Written (CW) cases and Circuit Court Criminal (PC) and Family Court Criminal (FC) cases in the Third and Fifth Circuits.
- It is not uncommon for defendants to cycle between detainment and release during the pretrial period. While this metric excludes cases in which the defendant was never released as cases of interest in an effort to avoid the capture of new charges while the defendant was detained, due to data limitations, this metric is unable to exclude new charges that were committed while a defendant was detained after they were released. To illustrate, some defendants might commit serious crimes while they are in jail. However, it is unlikely that many defendants who are both released then brought into custody commit serious crimes in jail (at least to a degree that statistics would be skewed).
- Due to limitations in record matching and linking across different data sources required to produce this metric, the new charges measure is limited to cases (both the case of interest and new charges cases) which stemmed from an arrest. Generally, these case types include Circuit Court Criminal (PC), Family Court Criminal (FC), and District Complaint Written (CW) cases. For the most part, these cases stem from an arrest and booking (rather than a criminal citation), and involve an SID number - a unique individual identifier, which is critical to linking different cases to the same person.
 - Any cases that did not have an SID present, or those which stemmed from a criminal citation, were excluded as reference cases.



Ongoing Work: Barriers to Reporting and Data Limitations

The pretrial database and reporting system has capacity to report out on many pretrial metrics. Several metrics are not in this year's report while the logic to calculate them must be refined, but they will be available in the 2026 report. However, some cannot be developed until data limitations in the source data are addressed. Provided below is more detail on the work that will continue for the next year and the data limitations across the three data sources.

- *Coding logic is still under development:* CJRI has identified several additional metrics that can be produced over the next year with the data elements that are currently available in the pretrial database. For example, this includes examining the frequency of citations and case adjudications by type. Due to time and resource constraints this year, the coding logic could not be finalized in time for this year's annual report. CJRI research staff will continue to develop the coding logic for these metrics in 2026, including conducting quality assurance reviews of these metrics prior to their publication. The additional metrics will be included in the 2026 annual report.
- *Data quality issues:* Across several metrics, CJRI has identified data quality issues, including information that is entered incorrectly or missing, in key data elements that preclude these metrics from being produced at this time. To illustrate, sometimes information is entered in an open text field rather than a structured field (such as a dropdown). In such cases, the information is present, but not in a form in which it can readily be leveraged for research purposes. CJRI will share documentation regarding these issues with each agency and where appropriate, make recommendations that could improve data quality. This may include suggestions like definitions and guidelines for data entry or quality assurance procedures. These issues could take time to address since they may require agency-wide training or changes to the operational databases that agencies use to enter data.
- *Not all data is entered in structured fields in operational databases:* Metrics are calculated more efficiently when the information is entered in structured fields. Additionally, structured fields promote more



reliable and valid data for research. However, many case management systems have unstructured fields where staff use this information to make decisions critical to their jobs. For example, court records contain a wealth of information on pretrial such as information about charges, bail, and release decisions over the course of multiple pretrial hearings. Yet this information is often stored in unstructured text fields, such as court hearing minutes, that require more intensive processing to transform into data elements (i.e., natural language processing). Other information is stored within PDFs, such as complaint documents, bench warrants, and judgments. To use the information stored within PDFs for research purposes, a document reading tool or other artificial intelligence needs to be used in order to extract and transform key pieces of information from these documents into data elements at scale. And even when technology is used to address this, it cannot solve issues that relate to accuracy of data (i.e., inconsistent definitions cannot be aggregated).

- *Critical data elements for records matching are not always reliable:* Agency case and records management systems are designed to focus on collecting information most important for that agency's operations and do not always prioritize other criminal justice data. For example, corrections agencies prioritize personal-level identifiers while courts prioritize case-level identifiers. Because these identifiers use different units of analysis, they do not link on a one-to-one basis. As a result, other solutions must be examined to link records. At this time, CJRI is exploring options that could be pursued such as partnering with a data science intern or utilizing a software that specifically addresses records matching.
- *Upcoming implementation of a new case management system:* Developing a data warehouse from different case management systems involves extensive mapping of data pipelines. This mapping is based on merging and transforming fields from source agency databases. Since DCR will be implementing a new case management system to replace OffenderTrak over the next few years, only basic, foundational pipelines were mapped to ingest jail data into the pretrial database. Because the



new case management system may change the content and structure of many fields, CJRI did not expend resources on mapping pipelines that would likely change. Relatedly, CJRI did not map pipelines from a separate database that the Intake Service Centers Division (ISC) uses for some pretrial information. When DCR implements their new system, they will incorporate the data collected from ISC into one database moving forward. Following the implementation of DCR's new database, CJRI will map data pipelines for DCR's jail and pretrial data, and develop additional pretrial metrics.

For more detail about the steps CJRI is taking to address these issues and improve pretrial data for increased pretrial reporting, please see [page 96](#).



Key Terms

- *Pretrial period*: The period of time between the date of a criminal case filing with the courts and the date of adjudication.
- *Adjudication date*: The date of sentencing, granting of a deferral agreement, acquittal, or dismissal.
- *Adjudicated case*: A case in which all charges have been terminally disposed and the case has resulted in conviction and sentencing, granting of a deferral agreement, acquittal, or dismissal.
- **Case Types**
 - *Circuit Court Criminal cases (PC)*: Cases which involve felony level charges, as well as misdemeanor level charges which have been transferred from District court in which a jury trial was requested.
 - *Family Court Criminal cases (FC)*: Cases which involve abuse of a family or household member charges and felony level charges involving offenses against household members.
 - *District Court Criminal Complaint Written cases (CW)*: Cases which involve misdemeanor level charges and lower, or offenses punishable by up to one year of incarceration, stemming from an arrest and booking.
- **Circuits**
 - *First Circuit*: City and County of Honolulu (O`ahu)
 - *Second Circuit*: Maui County
 - *Third Circuit*: Hawai`i County
 - *Fifth Circuit*: Kaua`i County
- **Offense Severity Levels**
 - *Class A felony (FA)*: Offenses which are punishable by up to 20 years of incarceration (prison), as well as second degree murder, which is punishable by life in prison with the possibility of parole, and first degree murder, which is punishable by life in prison without the possibility of parole.
 - *Class B felony (FB)*: Offenses which are punishable by up to 10 years of incarceration (prison).
 - *Class C felony (FC)*: Offenses which are punishable by up to five years of incarceration (prison).



- *Misdemeanor (MD)*: Offenses which are punishable by up to one year of incarceration (jail).
- *Petty misdemeanor (PM)*: Offenses which are punishable by up to 30 days of incarceration (jail).
- **Release Statuses**
 - *In custody*: Includes persons in DCR custody, covering persons committed without bail, persons with unpaid monetary bail, or persons in DOH custody.
 - *Release on monetary bail*: Includes persons who were assigned monetary bail (financial conditions of pretrial release) and who paid their bail, either through cash or professional surety bond, thereby securing their release from pretrial detention.
 - *Supervised release*: Includes persons who are subject to court ordered supervision by ISC staff and compliance with court ordered conditions of release.
 - *Release on recognizance*: Includes persons who are released on a written promise to appear for all future court hearings and who are not subject to financial conditions of pretrial release.
 - *Out of custody*: Includes persons who have a pending bench warrant or are subject to discharge of sureties or bail forfeiture. These individuals are neither in the custody of DCR or DOH or in the community on a form of court approved release (release on monetary bail, supervised release, release on recognizance).



RESEARCH TAKEAWAYS

This section summarizes findings across research projects that CJRI supports throughout the year. The focus of the section this year is to summarize the pretrial metrics analyzed from the pretrial database and reporting system. Other data projects are currently underway, and will be summarized at a later date. Where appropriate, recommendations to bridge data, policy, and practice are made in addition to the key takeaways from data analysis. Final reports and presentations can be found on cjrihawaii.com.

Pretrial Reporting (HRS § 614)

This report includes analyses and findings of pretrial metrics for the first time, which is possible because of the pretrial database and reporting system established this year. Since this is the first year of reporting, these measures present baseline metrics and an initial introduction to understanding Hawai'i's criminal pretrial system. These metrics will continue to be updated and expanded over time. Some pretrial metrics require more complex logic to calculate from records, while others may need additional work in data systems to address data quality issues. Additionally, CJRI will analyze data from prior years to situate these numbers within historical trends. This information will be updated as it becomes available and provided in future annual reports and/or on the CJRI website. The findings reviewed below are not exhaustive of all data that were analyzed, but a summary of findings to help stakeholders identify a few takeaways that CJRI research staff found compelling.

Process metrics on the pretrial system were analyzed using cases filed in FY 2025 (July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025). These metrics help describe main decision points within the criminal pretrial system starting from arrest to adjudication. There are some metrics that summarize events (i.e., arrests or case filings), while others summarize decisions that impact



defendants (i.e., people who were charged for crimes, but have not been convicted). Key findings are presented below:

- **The volume of arrests and new court cases filed in FY 2025 reflect the population numbers to some extent.** The First Circuit (City and County of Honolulu), with the largest population, was associated with the most arrests and most cases filed in the courts, followed by the Third (Hawai'i County), Second (Maui County), and Fifth (Kaua'i County) Circuits. As policymakers consider different pretrial efforts, it is important to remember that county level initiatives might impact state numbers and resources to varying degrees.
- **Most of the reported crime in Hawai'i is from petty misdemeanor and misdemeanor level offenses.** Approximately 70 percent of arrests and new case filings were for misdemeanor or petty misdemeanor as their most serious offense. This suggests that pretrial policies targeting lower level offenses could make a meaningful reduction in the use of resources, especially as it relates to bringing new cases into the system. For example, pre-arrest or pre-charge diversion programs targeting people who have a petty misdemeanor or misdemeanor offense as their most serious charge could reduce case volume in the courts. Other alternatives in the community could be offered that redirect people to services that will reduce their likelihood of committing crime, while also reducing resources used by the courts, prosecutors, and public defenders in traditional case processing [8].
- **Pretrial release can be a dynamic process for a defendant.** About a third of defendants were released at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing in the Circuit Courts of the First and Second Circuits. However, this statistic is not static and pretrial release can change over time. For those same cases, approximately a quarter of defendants who were in custody at the conclusion of their first pretrial hearing were eventually released within 90 days. For some defendants, their status may change as they post bail or they could be released after pretrial motions are filed and change in status is ordered by the courts. Future research will need to examine the intricacies of pretrial release in greater depth. On the one hand, some defendants might be



held to protect the community and ensure court appearance. On the other hand, where appropriate, the goal should be to release defendants who have not been convicted to allow them adequate opportunity to prepare their defense and avoid unintended consequences of detention like losing a job.

- **Bail amounts varied by offense level and circuit.** Though it is not a clearly defined relationship, defendants generally had higher bail amounts as the degree of their most serious offense increased. This trend held true even as offense seriousness increased within felonies (from C, to B, to A). Besides offense level, there were differences between the two circuits analyzed. The median bail amount was \$11,000 for cases filed in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit and \$5,000 for cases filed in the Circuit Court of the Second Circuit. Data limitations will need to be addressed to understand bail trends better especially since there is less information available for misdemeanor offenses or for other circuits.

Outcome metrics on the pretrial system were analyzed using data on criminal cases that were filed in FY 2023 (July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023) and had been adjudicated by November 30, 2025. These metrics describe how the pretrial system is achieving its goals. Data was analyzed differently for these cases because it is important to calculate these metrics after a long enough time has passed for the follow up period to occur and because the sample must have a high percentage of cases that have been adjudicated.

- **The length of the pretrial period varies with the seriousness of the offense statewide, but not at the county level.** Statewide, over three quarters of petty misdemeanors were adjudicated within 180 days, and over three quarters of misdemeanors were adjudicated within 6 months or less. When data is examined by circuit, this trend does not hold. In the Third Circuit, a majority of the offense levels were adjudicated within 180 days or less demonstrating that pretrial length did not vary by offense level. However, the Third Circuit had higher proportions of more serious offenses than other circuits within their cases, which could explain this. In other words, a high case volume of serious



offenses within a circuit could impact the time it takes for all cases to adjudicate. It is expected that more serious offenses would take longer to adjudicate since they are more likely to go to trial and very serious offenses likely require more preparation for trial.

- **Nationwide statistics demonstrate that most people who are released pretrial are not charged for new crimes while awaiting trial [9], and the local data suggests a similar finding.** When examining aggregate new charge rates for all cases filed with a felony offense as the most serious offense, 11% or less of defendants were charged for new crimes (based on available First Circuit and Second Circuit data). Data limitations will need to be addressed for petty misdemeanor and misdemeanor offense levels to provide a more comprehensive picture for this outcome measure.

This is the first year that the annual report includes pretrial metrics and therefore these numbers establish baseline information about how the system is working and what outcomes it is achieving. In some cases, findings are limited to certain case types or circuits as CJRI continues to work with agencies to address data limitations. In this section, there was less focus on trends related to petty misdemeanor and misdemeanor offenses where there was limited statewide data. As pretrial reporting develops, CJRI will continue to add more metrics and examine them in more depth. For now, these initial findings establish a starting point and provide direction to conduct further analysis.



PRETRIAL DATABASE AND REPORTING SYSTEM CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT

Background

Under HRS § 614, CJRI was tasked with assessing the feasibility of and establishing a “centralized statewide criminal pretrial justice data reporting and collection system.” There is no one way to create a database, and several factors must be considered such as the structure of data files, methods for data sharing, costs, and others. As a result, CJRI created a conceptual framework that provided three different approaches to fulfilling the database requirements under law. First, technology could be used to create a centralized platform by linking other databases or datasets. After speaking with other states engaged in similar projects, CJRI learned that some organizations were using data warehouses or other technology solutions to link siloed data sources into one centralized platform. The second option was to purchase a new database for staff to enter criminal pretrial data that would be separate and additional to operational databases. The third solution did not require new technology or an additional system, and instead relied on a process where staff from each agency would send spreadsheets that CJRI research staff would clean and merge in statistical software. These three options were presented to the CJRI board and shared with stakeholders.

Figure 36. Overview of strengths and weaknesses for conceptual framework to create a statewide pretrial database and reporting system

<h3>Comparing Options to Create Centralized Statewide Criminal Pretrial Data Reporting System</h3> <p>Different Options Can Be Used to Merge, Link, and Analyze Data Across the System</p>			
Capabilities & Features	Centralized Platform	New Database	Manual Extractions
Up front and long-term costs	●●●●○	●●●●●	○●●●●
No increase in line staff and data entry workload	✓		✓
Potential to improve processes and operations	✓		
Centralized source for data	✓	✓	
Timeliness of data sharing and reporting of metrics	●●●●●	●●●●○	●●●●○

While considering these options, CJRI staff met with criminal pretrial agencies to understand how these different options might impact them as they fulfilled their obligation to share data. The intent was to identify an approach that would limit the use of additional resources and workloads within agencies. After careful consideration, CJRI received board approval to pursue an approach that would use technology to link and merge existing data into one platform. This approach was viewed as the best option to meet the law’s requirements because it would centralize data and create a system that would allow CJRI research staff to respond to Legislative questions more efficiently. Manual extractions and sending spreadsheets would not centralize data (the third approach), and a new database would silo more data, require duplicate data entry, and likely cost more money (the second approach). CJRI made an appropriation request to the Legislature in 2023 that would provide funds to develop a data warehouse, a software subscription to create data pipelines for the data warehouse, and another software to collect additional data from electronic forms and build dashboards. This technical endeavor was projected to last



three years to create the system since the new tools would have to be installed and built specific to local data. For the appropriation and moving forward, some funds are required for ongoing maintenance (i.e., data storage and maintaining data pipelines) on an annual basis. Both staff and the CJRI board were grateful for receiving the appropriation from the Legislature in 2023.

Pretrial Database and Reporting System Established

The pretrial database and reporting system was established within the project timeline in April 2025, almost two years after the appropriation was provided to CJRI. Following this, CJRI conducted several activities to validate the work and conduct quality assurance to ensure the system was built accurately. The most important part of this project is the *centralization of criminal pretrial data into one location*, and in particular, the creation of a unified dataset of pretrial data from three agency data sources. This dataset creates the capacity to report out on metrics and conduct pretrial research efficiently. More detail on the technology is provided below.

The pretrial database and reporting system consists of a few technology tools that were built to fit local pretrial data and meet CJRI's reporting needs. First, a *data warehouse* was established. The data warehouse is a centralized cloud-based platform to ingest and store data from all three agencies. Data is ingested into the data warehouse on a monthly basis at this time. The second and most complicated component of this project is the software that maps data to create a repeatable and automated process to ingest and restructure data for research purposes. An *Extract, Transfer, and Load (ETL) software tool* was implemented to map data pipelines to make data merging and linking more efficient in the data warehouse. These data pipelines are designed to extract data from three data sources (arrests from HCJDC, court data from the Judiciary, and jail data from DCR). The ETL tool has several steps of data mapping: data ingestion from all three agencies, cleansing of data sources at the agency level, and the linking and merging of data into a unified dataset for research. For example, court data must be extracted from several tables in



the underlying information system for criminal cases. During this process, multiple tables must be restructured such as multiple rows of information for one court case that have to be restructured as one row and multiple columns for a court case. At the aggregate level, data from all three agencies must be linked by an identifier. This is difficult when each agency uses different units of analysis (arrests, cases, and jail bookings). The data pipelines were built specific to pretrial data sources and improve the efficiency of the data restructuring and merging, and they are maintained through the ongoing subscription of the ETL tool.

There was one change in technology tools since the start of the project in 2023. An additional software tool was originally selected to create dashboards from the data and fill in gaps of information through electronic forms. As the work proceeded, CJRI discovered that significant work went into transforming data for dashboards into this platform. At the same time, research staff learned there was a more cost-effective approach in the data warehouse that could be pursued for dashboard development. While this software was helpful for addressing gaps in data, CJRI decided not to use this software in the future for this project.

The unified dataset of criminal pretrial data was used to report out on metrics in this year's annual report, and will be used moving forward. Because of this dataset, CJRI can update the metrics more frequently to provide policymakers with more timely data. Metrics will be updated regularly and posted online. In some cases, it might be quarterly where more recent numbers are relevant (i.e., process metrics), while others might be less frequent. This dataset also provides research staff with the ability to respond to research questions more quickly, yet some may take time depending on the complexity of the data or question. The foundational work is complete for the pretrial database and reporting system, and fulfills requirements under law. However, due to data limitations and complex information systems, there are some steps that must be taken to increase reporting on metrics or capabilities such as features like public dashboards.



The Future of the Pretrial Database and Reporting System

Data warehouse projects are not considered finite projects. They are complex, and require iterative work and they require maintenance over the long-term. While there is a centralized source of criminal pretrial data that is available for reporting, there are areas that can be improved for more efficiency as well as expanded to accomplish more research.

Ongoing Maintenance

While software partners had to conduct work in the beginning of the project to develop data pipelines, the annual subscription to the ETL software tool preserves these pipelines. Changes in the future might require additional resources or they might be conducted by the CJRI IT research specialist depending on the need and complexity. The cost of storing data in the data warehouse is based on monthly data ingestion. As a result, CJRI will request these funds in their operational budget each biennium.

Challenges During Development

While the pretrial database and reporting system can fulfill main requirements outlined in law, the scale of the project was refined during the course of the project as CJRI and research partners encountered some barriers in the data and information systems they relied on. For example, a significant amount of time was spent understanding the underlying data architecture of the Judiciary's case management system. This step could not be ignored since a majority of pretrial metrics require case information from the courts, therefore other aspects of the project that were not required to meet the statute's objectives were de-prioritized. Another challenge in this project was working through the complex hierarchy of matching records to create the unified dataset of pretrial data. First, not all records are the same unit of analysis (i.e., people or cases). And, even when they are, records cannot be linked or aggregated without accounting for date or some other identifier (e.g., the date of an arrest might matter if the metric is the rate of new charges during pretrial). Finally, another consideration was the upcoming change from OffenderTrak to a new case management system with DCR. CJRI scaled back some features of the



project to ensure that the main goals were accomplished within budget and on time to fulfill the intent of the law.

Areas to Enhance Data Sources and Reporting

The unified dataset meets the requirements for pretrial reporting under law, but there are several ways in which this new system could be improved to increase efficiencies and expand reporting. Some of this work might be accomplished over time with existing resources, while other work may require additional funds or partnerships to complete.

- *Dashboards:* Originally, a software tool was selected to build dashboards because CJRI research staff could build out the dashboards themselves once the data was ingested into the platform. As the software partners began to prepare data for the data warehouse, it became clear that the underlying architecture of the data was too complex to merge into a software platform without significant effort to restructure the data first. Specifically, this meant that several data pipelines had to be developed to restructure and transform the data into several “curated” datasets specific to dashboards. This resulted in choosing a different tool that integrated with the data warehouse more efficiently, and resulted in a delay in dashboard development. More importantly, the unified dataset for research had to be prioritized since this is the centralized source of data for pretrial reporting.
- *Create another unified dataset:* The main research dataset is structured to study cases. This was prioritized because most pretrial metrics require an understanding of a court case filing (i.e., pretrial starts when a case is filed for a defendant), and in many instances it is possible to restructure a file to a person level dataset even when it is at a case level. However, this restructuring takes significant amounts of time, therefore CJRI recommends that a person level dataset be created in the future to make it more efficient for studying people as they move through the criminal pretrial system. For example, a person level dataset would be more helpful for answering a question such as “how often does someone enter and exit jail while they are awaiting trial?”



- *Develop a set of curated datasets:* Currently there is one unified dataset of all three data sources, but there are still several steps for data cleaning that must occur to calculate metrics. There are two major reasons that data cleaning takes significant time for researchers. First, files are restructured into rows and columns a certain way depending on the unit of analysis. The unified dataset of pretrial data addresses this issue for a case level unit of analysis. Second, transformations are conducted to create variables. For instance, a date of birth column could be used to create an age variable. While the unified dataset reduces data cleaning time significantly, CJRI research staff must develop several lines of code to produce one metric. Some steps of this code are repeatable across several metrics. Additional curated datasets could improve data analysis by 1) automating the process and 2) increasing reliability to ensure that pretrial metrics can be produced consistently over time. Curated datasets could focus on identifying and standardizing variable transformations that occur regularly in pretrial research.

Systemic Barriers


There are some challenges in the original source data that create significant barriers for research, and even with the best warehouse technology, they cannot be addressed without additional solutions. Agencies must enter all data or information in their systems consistently. If there is too much missing data, a reliable and valid statistic cannot be reported. If different definitions of a concept are used, sometimes they cannot be aggregated. Another challenge relates to how information is stored such as information that is located in court documents or reports like a PDF. There are tools that can scan these documents to generate data, but they can be time-consuming to implement and resource intensive to develop. Ultimately, some changes may need to be addressed at the agency level. Some examples of these issues are described in the section of data limitations on [page 83](#).



STRATEGIC PLAN

Presented below are the three primary goals of CJRI, which were developed to reflect the priorities authorized under statute (HRS § 614). These goals were identified to ensure staff focused on meeting the State's needs with research and data that would provide the Legislature with information to improve the criminal justice system. A strategic plan was developed around these goals and guides the work of CJRI. These goals help the CJRI board and staff prioritize requests for assistance from individuals in all three branches and the community. All staff at CJRI have worked together to develop a path for the next five years to accomplish these goals, and follow a shared mission and vision when carrying out their duties.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS



Goal 1: Establish centralized statewide criminal pretrial justice data reporting and collection system mandated by HRS § 614.



Goal 2: Identify research priorities, in addition to pretrial, that will improve the criminal justice system's capacity to carry out justice and improve public safety.



Goal 3: Disseminate research and share data on criminal justice topics in a wide range of formats to assist policymakers and the public in making informed decisions.



MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES STATEMENT

MISSION

The Criminal Justice Research Institute mission statement reflects HRS § 614-2, which establishes CJRI and outlines its' responsibilities for the state of Hawai'i. Our mission is *to examine all aspects of the criminal justice system for the purpose of assisting the state with a comprehensive approach to using data and research to improve outcomes related to safety, justice, and equity in the state of Hawai'i.*

HRS § 614-2

"a) There is established within the office of the chief justice a criminal justice research institute dedicated to examining all aspects of the criminal justice system, for the purpose of assisting the State in understanding the system in a more comprehensive way and ensuring the protection of individual rights, increasing efficiencies, and controlling costs. The institute shall have the authority to examine all areas of the criminal justice system, including police, prosecutors, defense counsel, courts, pretrial services, probation and parole, jails, and prisons, as well as examine the manner in which related areas, including mental health services and drug treatment services, intersect with the criminal justice system."



VISION

The Criminal Justice Research Institute CJRI is Hawai'i's trusted steward of criminal justice data. We conduct rigorous and transparent research that informs policy to shape a fairer and more equitable system. Through listening to different perspectives and fostering collaborative partnerships, our research promotes community safety and drives positive change.



VALUES

The Criminal Justice Research Institute staff adhere to values integral to conducting responsible and ethical research that is dedicated to analyzing data to improve the criminal justice system for the State of Hawai'i. CJRI staff will conduct research and serve the State by pursuing:

- **Independent and neutral** analyses that will improve the criminal justice system as a whole, and not favor one agency or perspective.
- **Fairness and equity** in establishing a research agenda.
- **Transparent communication** in the methods, goals, and limitations of the research undertaken.
- **Collaborative partnerships** with agencies, stakeholders, and communities to ensure broad perspectives are included.
- **Impactful work** providing policymakers, decision-makers, and the public with information to enact meaningful change.
- **Ethical and respectful methods** to study individuals involved or working in the criminal justice system.
- **Responsible and trustworthy** stewardship of public resources and data provided by agencies and organizations.



OUR ORGANIZATION

CJRI STAFF

Erin E. Harbinson, PhD
Director

Aerielle Reynolds, MSCJA
Research Analyst

Samuel Choi, PhD
Research Analyst

Mariah A. McCaskill
Secretary

Wilneris Colon
Undergraduate Research
Intern

Elora Tonaki
Undergraduate Research
Intern

Larchelle Tuifao
Undergraduate Research
Intern

The staff at CJRI are proud to announce several staffing updates for our organization from 2025. Through a partnership with Chaminade University of Honolulu, CJRI has been hosting several undergraduate research interns throughout the year. Learn more about the new staff of CJRI, who are dedicated to conducting research to support and improve the criminal justice system in Hawai'i.



WILNERIS COLON, UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH INTERN

Wilneris Colon is a senior at Chaminade University of Honolulu, majoring in Chaminade's data science and computer science bachelor of science undergraduate programs. Alongside her double major, she is completing a minor in criminology and criminal justice. At Chaminade University, she is a member of the Social Sciences Research Club.

Before interning for CJRI, Wilneris's research analyst experience includes her internship with the state of Hawai'i's Department of the Attorney General's Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division (Research and Statistics Branch). Her internship and project experiences have been interdisciplinary across criminal justice, data science, and computer science. She has contributed to projects involving remote sensing, predictive modeling, machine learning, criminology, public policy, and social justice.

ELORA TONAKI, UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH INTERN

Elora Tonaki is a senior at Chaminade University of Honolulu, majoring in Chaminade's data science bachelor of science undergraduate program. She is also minoring in their computer science program and fulfilling their computer science certificate. Before interning at CJRI, Elora gained research analytical experience through internships with Chaminade University, including as *Supporting Pacific Indigenous Computing Excellence* (SPICE), a Data Science Summer Institute held in partnership with the Texas Advanced Computing Center (TACC), Research Assistant Traineeship, and the *Advanced Computing Student Collaborative* (ACSC), presented by the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) Leadership-Class Computing Facility (LCCF).

She has worked on projects which include using Machine Learning models to predict the presence of behavioral/mental disorders from sensor data and Deep Learning models using Convolutional Neural Networks to detect early signs of dementia from structural MRI scans.



LARCHELLE TUIFAO, UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH INTERN

Larchelle Tuifao is a senior at Chaminade University of Honolulu, majoring in Chaminade's computer science undergraduate program while also fulfilling their computer science certificate. Before interning at CJRI, Larchelle's analytical and research experience includes her time as a research fellow at Texas Advanced Computing Center's SPICE summer institute, the Research Assistant Traineeship program, and the U.S. National Science Foundation Leadership-Class Computing Facility's ACSC program.

She has worked on projects which include using Machine Learning models to predict the gestures that were performed when there was a presence of behavioral/mental disorders from sensor data, to predict the severity of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in males and females as well as the most influential factors that went into the prediction, and to predict in which stage (stage I - stage IV) of pancreatic cancer a patient was in using clinical data. She also used Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) to detect early stages of pancreatic cancer from CAT scans of pancreas.

I ka nānā no a 'ike.

By observing, one learns.

-`Ōlelo no`eau

Through observing, or researching, Hawai'i's criminal justice system, CJRI is dedicated to helping stakeholders, lawmakers, and the public learn more about Hawai'i's criminal justice system.



BOARD MEMBERS

Judge Matthew J. Viola

CJRI Board Chair

Judge, First Circuit Criminal Division

Judiciary

Nicole C. Fernandez

Offender Services Section

Administrator, WCCC

Department of Corrections and

Rehabilitation

Governor's Office

Rep. Mahina Poepoe

District 13

Hawai'i House of Representatives

Francis Young

Corrections Program Services

Division Administrator

Department of Corrections and

Rehabilitation

Vacant

Hawai'i Senate

The staff at CJRI could not accomplish their work successfully without the expertise of the board. Each of the board members brings valuable knowledge from their respective roles and experience across the criminal justice system and the policymaking realm. The criminal justice system is wide-ranging, and the board is essential in helping prioritize projects and providing feedback on ways to communicate research. Their collective experience has improved the work of CJRI in several ways. The CJRI staff thank the board members for their ongoing work and support.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful for the input from many individuals across the criminal justice system, and would like to recognize staff that have spent a considerable amount of time sharing their knowledge with us this past year:

Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation: George King, Kelcie Makaike, Judy Yamada, Frank Young

Department of the Attorney General: Wendy Char, Philip Higdon, Paul Perrone

Hawai'i Correctional System Oversight Commission: Christin M. Johnson
Judiciary: Jaye M. Atiburcio, Jennifer Awong, Adam Cohen, Daylin-Rose Heather, Brandon Kimura, Terrence Lee, Ariel Maeda, Dayna Miyasaki, Dana Nakasato, Mai NguyenVan, Ginger L.M. Pana, Sanghoon Yun

We would like to extend our thanks to Chief Justice Mark Recktenwald, who provided critical support to establishing this new organization and bringing statewide data to criminal pretrial reform.






ENDNOTES

1. Eleventh Judicial Circuit (2021). Eleventh Judicial Circuit Criminal Mental Health Project. Retrieved from:
<https://www.jud11.flcourts.org/docs/CMHP%20Program.pdf>
2. H.B. 1953, H.D. 1, S.D. 2, C.D. 1, Thirty-Second Legislature, 2024 Regular Session. (Hawai'i 2024).
https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessions/session2024/bills/HB1953_CD1_.pdf
3. Blair, T. B., Kennedy, S., & Wosje, R. (2022). *Incorporating services and support into pretrial supervision: Is there a best model?* (D. Ledbetter, Ed.; 21CS05GLJ6). National Institute of Corrections.
<https://napsa.memberclicks.net/assets/NIC%20Incorporating%20Services%20and%20Support%20into%20Pretrial%20Supervision.pdf>
4. *Guide to Pretrial Performance Measures - Advancing Pretrial Policy & Research* (APPR). (2025). Advancing Pretrial Policy & Research (APPR).
<https://www.advancingpretrial.org/resource/guide-to-pretrial-performance-measures/>
5. APPR, 2025.
6. Van Duizend, R., Steelman, D. C., & Suskin, L. (2011). *Model time standards for state courts*. National Center for State Courts.
<https://www.azcourts.gov/Portals/0/27/Model%20Time%20Standards%20for%20State%20Trial%20Courts%20-%20Court%20Management%20-%20National%20Center%20for%20State%20Courts%202011.pdf>
7. American Bar Association Criminal Justice Standards Committee. (2007). *ABA Standards for Criminal Justice, Pretrial Release* (Third). American Bar Association.
https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/criminal_justice_standards/pretrial_release.authcheckdam.pdf
8. Widgery, A. (2023). *The legislative primer series for front-end justice: Deflection and diversion*. National Conference of State Legislatures.
<https://documents.ncsl.org/wwwncsl/Criminal-Justice/Deflection-Diversion-f02.pdf>
9. Inkpen, C., Silver, I. A., Bechtel, K., & DeMichele, M. (2024). Examining the patterns of pretrial rearrest in a large Southeastern County. *Federal Probation*, 88, 43.
https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/document/88_2_6.pdf



CONTACT INFORMATION



Criminal Justice Research Institute
The Judiciary - State of Hawai'i
417 South King Street
Honolulu, HI
96813-2943



808 - 539 - 4881



CJRI@courts.hawaii.gov



<https://cjrihawaii.com/>

<https://www.courts.state.hi.us/criminal-justice-research-institute-cjri>



List of Figures

Figure 1. Counts of Statewide Arrests in FY 2025 by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 23

Figure 2. Counts of First Circuit Arrests in FY 2025 by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 24

Figure 3. Counts of Second Circuit Arrests in FY 2025 by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 25

Figure 4. Counts of Third Circuit Arrests in FY 2025 by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 26

Figure 5. Counts of Fifth Circuit Arrests in FY 2025 by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 27

Figure 6. Counts of Statewide FY 2025 Court Case Filings by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 31

Figure 7. Counts of First Circuit FY 2025 Court Case Filings by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 32

Figure 8. Counts of Second Circuit FY 2025 Court Case Filings by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 33

Figure 9. Counts of Third Circuit FY 2025 Court Case Filings by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 34

Figure 10. Counts of Fifth Circuit FY 2025 Court Case Filings by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 35

Figure 11. Percentage of Defendants Who Were Released at Their First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases.....page 39

Figure 12. Percentage of Defendants Who Were Released at Their First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for Second Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases.....page 40

Figure 13. Percentage of Defendants Who Were Released at Their First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Family Court Cases.....page 41

Figure 14. Percentage of Second Circuit FY 2025 Family Court Cases within a Certain Bail Amount Range by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 42

Figure 15. Percentage of First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases within a Certain Bail Amount Range by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 46

Figure 16. Percentage of Second Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases within a Certain Bail Amount Range by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 47

Figure 17. Percentage of First Circuit FY 2025 Family Court Cases within a Certain Bail Amount Range by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 48

Figure 18. Percentage of Second Circuit FY 2025 Family Court Cases within a Certain Bail Amount Range by the Most Serious Offense Classification.....page 49

Figure 19. Percentage of Defendants Whose Release Status Changed 3 Months after the First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases.....page 53

Figure 20. Percentage of Defendants Whose Release Status Changed 3 Months after the First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases.....page 54



Figure 21. Percentage of Defendants Whose Release Status Changed 3 Months after the First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases.....page 55

Figure 22. Percentage of Defendants Whose Release Status Changed 3 Months after the First Hearing by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2025 Circuit Court Cases.....page 56

Figure 23. Percentage of Statewide FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense.....page 61

Figure 24. Percentage of First Circuit FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense.....page 62

Figure 25. Percentage of Second Circuit FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense.....page 63

Figure 26. Percentage of Third Circuit FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense.....page 64

Figure 27. Percentage of Fifth Circuit FY 2023 Court Cases within a Certain Pretrial Period Range in Days by the Most Serious Offense.....page 65

Figure 28. Percentage of Defendants Who Were Ever Released During the Pretrial Period by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2023 Circuit Court Cases.....page 69

Figure 29. Percentage of Defendants Who Were Ever Released During the Pretrial Period by the Most Serious Offense for Second Circuit FY 2023 Circuit Court Cases.....page 70

Figure 30. Percentage of Defendants Who Were Ever Released During the Pretrial Period by the Most Serious Offense for First Circuit FY 2023 Family Court Cases.....page 71

Figure 31. Percentage of Defendants Who Were Ever Released During the Pretrial Period by the Most Serious Offense for Second Circuit FY 2023 Circuit Court Cases.....page 72

Figure 32. Percentage of First Circuit FY 2023 Circuit Court Cases involving a New Charge Stemming from an Arrest by the Most Serious Offense.....page 76

Figure 33. Percentage of Second Circuit FY 2023 Circuit Court Cases involving a New Charge Stemming from an Arrest by the Most Serious Offense.....page 77

Figure 34. Percentage of First Circuit FY 2023 Family Court Cases involving a New Charge Stemming from an Arrest by the Most Serious Offense.....page 78

Figure 35. Percentage of Second Circuit FY 2023 Family Court Cases involving a New Charge Stemming from an Arrest by the Most Serious Offense.....page 79

Figure 36. Overview of strengths and weaknesses for conceptual framework to create a statewide pretrial database and reporting system.....page 93