

that cases shall be heard by a court of not more than three judges unless the court has provided for hearing in banc. This provision continues the tradition of a three-judge appellate court and makes the decision of a division, the decision of the court, unless rehearing in banc is ordered. It makes judges available for other assignments, and permits a rotation of judges in such manner as to give to each a maximum of time for the preparation of opinions.

Whether divisions should sit simultaneously at the same or different places in the circuit is a matter for each court to determine.

REFERENCES IN TEXT

Section 6 of Public Law 95-486 (92 Stat. 1633), referred to in subsec. (c), is section 6 of Pub. L. 95-486, Oct. 20, 1978, 92 Stat. 1633, which is set out as an Appeals Court Administrative Units note under section 41 of this title.

AMENDMENTS

1996—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 104-175, in last sentence, inserted “(1)” after “eligible” and “, or (2) to continue to participate in the decision of a case or controversy that was heard or reheard by the court in banc at a time when such judge was in regular active service” before period at end.

1982—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 97-164, §103(a), substituted “panels” for “divisions”.

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 97-164, §103(b), substituted “panels” for “divisions” wherever appearing and inserted provisions requiring that at least a majority of the panels of each circuit be judges of that court, unless such judges cannot sit because recused or disqualified, or unless the chief judge of that court certifies that there is an emergency including, but not limited to, the unavailability of a judge of the court because of illness, and that the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit determine by rule a procedure for the rotation of judges from panel to panel to ensure that all of the judges sit on a representative cross section of the cases heard and determine by rule the number of judges, not less than three, who constitute a panel.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 97-164, §§103(c), 205, inserted provision that the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit may sit in panels of more than three judges if its rules so provide and that, as an alternative to the requirement that a court in banc consist of all circuit judges in regular active service, such a court may consist of such number of judges as may be prescribed in accordance with section 6 of Public Law 95-486 (92 Stat. 1633), except that any senior circuit judge of the circuit shall be eligible to participate, at his election and upon designation and assignment pursuant to section 294(c) of this title and the rules of the circuit, as a member of an in banc court reviewing a decision of a panel of which such judge was a member.

Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 97-164, §103(d), substituted “panel” for “division”.

1978—Pub. L. 95-486, §5(b), substituted “panels” for “divisions” in section catchline.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 95-486, §5(a), substituted “panel” for “division” and struck out provision authorizing a retired circuit judge to sit as a judge of the court in banc in the rehearing of a case if he sat in the court or division in the original hearing of such case.

1963—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 88-176 inserted “regular” before “active service” wherever appearing, and provided that a retired circuit judge shall be competent to sit as a judge of the court in banc, in a rehearing if he sat in at the original hearing.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1982 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 97-164 effective Oct. 1, 1982, see section 402 of Pub. L. 97-164, set out as a note under section 171 of this title.

§ 47. Disqualification of trial judge to hear appeal

No judge shall hear or determine an appeal from the decision of a case or issue tried by him.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 872.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §216, and District of Columbia Code, 1940 ed., §11-205 (Feb. 9, 1893, ch. 74, §6, 27 Stat. 435; July 30, 1894, ch. 172, §2, 28 Stat. 161; Mar. 3, 1901, ch. 854, §225, 31 Stat. 1225; Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §120, 36 Stat. 1132).

The provision in section 11-205 of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 ed., that a justice of the district court while on the bench of the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia shall not sit in review of judgment, order, or decree rendered by him below, was consolidated with a similar provision of section 216 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed. The consolidation simplifies the language without change of substance.

References in said section 11-205 to the power to prescribe rules, requisites of record on appeal, forms of bills of exception, and procedure on appeal, were omitted as covered by Rules 73, 75, 76, of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and by Rule 51 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Said section 11-205 contained a provision that on a divided opinion by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia the decision of the lower court should stand affirmed. This was omitted as unnecessary as merely expressing a well-established rule of law.

Other provisions of said section 11-205 are incorporated in section 48 of this title.

The provision of section 216 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., with respect to the competency of justices and judges to sit, was omitted as covered by section 43 of this title.

Specific reference in said section 216 to the Chief Justice of the United States was likewise omitted inasmuch as he sits as a circuit justice.

The provision of said section 216 with respect to assignment of district judges was omitted as covered by section 291 et seq. of this title.

Provision of said section 216 relating to presiding judge was omitted as covered by section 44 of this title.

§ 48. Terms of court

(a) The courts of appeals shall hold regular sessions at the places listed below, and at such other places within the respective circuit as each court may designate by rule.

Circuits	Places
District of Columbia	Washington.
First	Boston.
Second	New York.
Third	Philadelphia.
Fourth	Richmond, Asheville.
Fifth	New Orleans, Fort Worth, Jackson.
Sixth	Cincinnati.
Seventh	Chicago.
Eighth	St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, St. Paul.
Ninth	San Francisco, Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle.
Tenth	Denver, Wichita, Oklahoma City.
Eleventh	Atlanta, Jacksonville, Montgomery.
Federal	District of Columbia, and in any other place listed above as the court by rule directs.

(b) Each court of appeals may hold special sessions at any place within its circuit as the nature of the business may require, and upon such

notice as the court orders. The court may transact any business at a special session which it might transact at a regular session.

(c) Any court of appeals may pretermitt any regular session of court at any place for insufficient business or other good cause.

(d) The times and places of the sessions of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall be prescribed with a view to securing reasonable opportunity to citizens to appear before the court with as little inconvenience and expense to citizens as is practicable.

(e) Each court of appeals may hold special sessions at any place within the United States outside the circuit as the nature of the business may require and upon such notice as the court orders, upon a finding by either the chief judge of the court of appeals (or, if the chief judge is unavailable, the most senior available active judge of the court of appeals) or the judicial council of the circuit that, because of emergency conditions, no location within the circuit is reasonably available where such special sessions could be held. The court may transact any business at a special session outside the circuit which it might transact at a regular session.

(f) If a court of appeals issues an order exercising its authority under subsection (e), the court—

(1) through the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall—

(A) send notice of such order, including the reasons for the issuance of such order, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(B) not later than 180 days after the expiration of such court order submit a brief report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives describing the impact of such order, including—

- (i) the reasons for the issuance of such order;
- (ii) the duration of such order;
- (iii) the impact of such order on litigants; and
- (iv) the costs to the judiciary resulting from such order; and

(2) shall provide reasonable notice to the United States Marshals Service before the commencement of any special session held pursuant to such order.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 872; Oct. 31, 1951, ch. 655, §36, 65 Stat. 723; Pub. L. 96-452, §4, Oct. 14, 1980, 94 Stat. 1994; Pub. L. 97-164, title I, §104, Apr. 2, 1982, 96 Stat. 26; Pub. L. 102-572, title V, §501, Oct. 29, 1992, 106 Stat. 4512; Pub. L. 109-63, §2(a), Sept. 9, 2005, 119 Stat. 1993.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §223 and §11-205 District of Columbia Code, 1940 ed. (Feb. 9, 1893, ch. 74, §6, 27 Stat. 435; July 30, 1894, ch. 172, §2, 28 Stat. 161; Mar. 3, 1901, ch. 854, §225, 31 Stat. 1225; Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, §126, 36 Stat. 1132; July 17, 1916, ch. 246, 39 Stat. 385; Jan. 8, 1925, ch. 57, 43 Stat. 729; July 3, 1926, ch. 735, 44 Stat. 809; Feb. 28, 1929, ch. 363, §3, 45 Stat. 1347; May 17, 1932, ch. 190, 47 Stat. 158).

This section consolidates section 223 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., with part of section 11-205 of the District of Columbia Code.

Reference to San Juan as a place for holding court in the First Circuit was omitted. The revised section will permit the holding of terms at San Juan when the public interest requires.

The phrase “and at such other places within the respective circuits as may be designated by rule of court” was added to enable each court of appeals to hold such additional regular terms as changing circumstances might require.

The provisions of such section 223, for furnishing suitable rooms and accommodation at Oakland City, were omitted as obsolete since the erection of a new Federal building there.

The provisions as to fixed times for holding court in the Fifth Circuit was omitted as inconsistent with the practice in the other circuits. Words “San Francisco, Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle” were substituted for “San Francisco and two other places designated by the court” to conform with the practice in the Ninth Circuit.

Changes were made in phraseology.

SENATE REVISION AMENDMENT

By Senate amendment, Jacksonville (Fla.) was added as a place for holding a regular session of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. See 80th Congress Senate Report No. 1559.

AMENDMENTS

2005—Subsecs. (e), (f). Pub. L. 109-63 added subsecs. (e) and (f).

1992—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 102-572 struck out “, with the consent of the Judicial Conference of the United States,” after “pretermitt”.

1982—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 97-164, §104(a), (b), designated introductory provisions and table of circuits as subsec. (a) and substituted provisions directing the courts of appeals to hold regular sessions at the places listed in the table and at such other places within the circuits as each court might designate by rule, for provisions which directed that terms or sessions of courts of appeals be held annually at the places listed in the table and at such other places as the courts might designate by rule and authorized each court of appeals to hold special terms at any place within its circuit, and added to the table an item for the Federal circuit, with sessions to be held in the District of Columbia and in any other place listed elsewhere in the table as the Federal circuit court might by rule direct.

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 97-164, §104(c), added subsec. (b).

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 97-164, §104(c), designated existing provisions following table of circuits as subsec. (c) and substituted “regular session” for “regular term or session”.

Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 97-164, §104(c), added subsec. (d).

1980—Pub. L. 96-452 substituted “New Orleans, Fort Worth, Jackson” for “New Orleans, Atlanta, Fort Worth, Jacksonville, Montgomery” in item relating to fifth circuit, and added item relating to eleventh circuit.

1951—Act Oct. 31, 1951, inserted last par.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1992 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 102-572 effective Jan. 1, 1993, see section 1101(a) of Pub. L. 102-572, set out as a note under section 905 of Title 2, The Congress.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1982 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 97-164 effective Oct. 1, 1982, see section 402 of Pub. L. 97-164, set out as a note under section 171 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1980 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 96-452 effective Oct. 1, 1981, see section 12 of Pub. L. 96-452, set out as a note under section 41 of this title.

SURVEY OF JUDICIAL BUSINESS IN ALASKA

Pub. L. 86-70, §23(a), June 25, 1959, 73 Stat. 147, provided that: “The Judicial Conference of the United

States, with the assistance of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall conduct a study, including a field survey, of the Federal judicial business arising in the State of Alaska with a view toward directing the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to hold such terms of court in Anchorage or such other Alaskan cities as may be necessary for the prompt and efficient administration of justice."

§ 49. Assignment of judges to division to appoint independent counsels

(a) Beginning with the two-year period commencing on the date of the enactment of this section, three judges or justices shall be assigned for each successive two-year period to a division of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to be the division of the court for the purpose of appointing independent counsels. The Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall serve as the clerk of such division of the court and shall provide such services as are needed by such division of the court.

(b) Except as provided under subsection (f) of this section, assignment to such division of the court shall not be a bar to other judicial assignments during the term of such division.

(c) In assigning judges or justices to sit on such division of the court, priority shall be given to senior circuit judges and retired justices.

(d) The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate and assign three circuit court judges or justices, one of whom shall be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, to such division of the court. Not more than one judge or justice or senior or retired judge or justice may be named to such division from a particular court.

(e) Any vacancy in such division of the court shall be filled only for the remainder of the two-year period in which such vacancy occurs and in the same manner as initial assignments to such division were made.

(f) Except as otherwise provided in chapter 40 of this title, no member of such division of the court who participated in a function conferred on the division under chapter 40 of this title involving an independent counsel shall be eligible to participate in any judicial proceeding concerning a matter which involves such independent counsel while such independent counsel is serving in that office or which involves the exercise of such independent counsel's official duties, regardless of whether such independent counsel is still serving in that office.

(Added Pub. L. 95-521, title VI, §602(a), Oct. 26, 1978, 92 Stat. 1873; amended Pub. L. 97-409, §2(b)(1), Jan. 3, 1983, 96 Stat. 2039; Pub. L. 99-554, title I, §144(g)(3), Oct. 27, 1986, 100 Stat. 3097; Pub. L. 100-191, §§4, 5(a), Dec. 15, 1987, 101 Stat. 1307.)

REFERENCES IN TEXT

The date of enactment of this section, referred to in subsec. (a), is Oct. 26, 1978.

AMENDMENTS

1987—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 100-191, §4, inserted at end: "The Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall serve as the clerk of such division of the court and shall provide

such services as are needed by such division of the court."

Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 100-191, §5(a), substituted "involving an independent counsel" for "involving a independent counsel".

1986—Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 99-554 substituted "chapter 40" for "chapter 39" in two places.

1983—Pub. L. 97-409, §2(b)(1)(B), substituted "independent counsels" for "special prosecutors" in section catchline.

Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 97-409, §2(b)(1)(B), substituted "independent counsels" for "special prosecutors".

Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 97-409, §2(b)(1)(A), (C), substituted "independent counsel" for "special prosecutor" wherever appearing and "independent counsel's" for "special prosecutor's".

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1986 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 99-554 effective 30 days after Oct. 27, 1986, see section 302(a) of Pub. L. 99-554, set out as a note under section 581 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section effective Oct. 26, 1978, see section 604 of Pub. L. 95-521, set out as a note under section 591 of this title.

CHAPTER 5—DISTRICT COURTS

Sec.	
81.	Alabama.
81A.	Alaska.
82.	Arizona.
83.	Arkansas.
84.	California.
85.	Colorado.
86.	Connecticut.
87.	Delaware.
88.	District of Columbia.
89.	Florida.
90.	Georgia.
91.	Hawaii.
92.	Idaho.
93.	Illinois.
94.	Indiana.
95.	Iowa.
96.	Kansas.
97.	Kentucky.
98.	Louisiana.
99.	Maine.
100.	Maryland.
101.	Massachusetts.
102.	Michigan.
103.	Minnesota.
104.	Mississippi.
105.	Missouri.
106.	Montana.
107.	Nebraska.
108.	Nevada.
109.	New Hampshire.
110.	New Jersey.
111.	New Mexico.
112.	New York.
113.	North Carolina.
114.	North Dakota.
115.	Ohio.
116.	Oklahoma.
117.	Oregon.
118.	Pennsylvania.
119.	Puerto Rico.
120.	Rhode Island.
121.	South Carolina.
122.	South Dakota.
123.	Tennessee.
124.	Texas.
125.	Utah.
126.	Vermont.
127.	Virginia.
128.	Washington.
129.	West Virginia.