

southern district of California. All other district judges for the southern district of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section shall, on and after such date, be district judges for the central district of California.

“(d) Nothing in this Act [amending this section and sections 44 and 133 of this title and enacting provisions set out as notes under this section and sections 44 and 133 of this title] shall in any manner affect the tenure of office of the United States attorney and the United States marshal for the northern district of California who are in office on the effective date of this section [see Effective Date of 1966 Amendment note above], and who shall be during the remainder of their present terms of office the United States attorney and marshal for such district as constituted by this Act.

“(e) Nothing in this Act [amending this section and sections 44 and 133 of this title and enacting provisions set out as notes under this section and sections 44 and 133 of this title] shall in any manner affect the tenure of office of the United States attorney and the United States marshal for the southern district of California who are in office on the effective date of this section, and who shall be during the remainder of their present terms of office the United States attorney and marshal for the central district of California.

“(f) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney and a United States marshal for the southern district of California.

“(g) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney and a United States marshal for the eastern district of California.”

### § 85. Colorado

Colorado constitutes one judicial district.

Court shall be held at Boulder, Colorado Springs, Denver, Durango, Grand Junction, Montrose, Pueblo, and Sterling.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 875; Pub. L. 98-620, title IV, § 409, Nov. 8, 1984, 98 Stat. 3362; Pub. L. 108-455, § 5, Dec. 10, 2004, 118 Stat. 3629; Pub. L. 108-482, title III, § 301, Dec. 23, 2004, 118 Stat. 3918.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 146 (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, § 73, 36 Stat. 1108; June 12, 1916, ch. 143, 39 Stat. 225; May 29, 1924, ch. 209, 43 Stat. 243).

A provision for furnishing rooms and accommodations at Sterling was omitted as obsolete upon advice from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts that Federal accommodations are now available.

A provision authorizing adjournment at Denver when there is not business for terms at other places, is incorporated in section 138 of this title.

Provisions as to clerk's and marshal's deputies and maintenance of offices were deleted as covered by sections 541 [see 561], 542 [see 561], and 751 of this title.

Changes in arrangement and phraseology were made.

#### AMENDMENTS

2004—Pub. L. 108-455 and 108-482 amended section identically, inserting “Colorado Springs,” after “Boulder.”

1984—Pub. L. 98-620 provided for holding court at Boulder.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1984 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 98-620, title IV, § 411, Nov. 8, 1984, 98 Stat. 3362, provided that:

“(a) The amendments made by this subtitle [subtitle B (§§ 404-411) of title IV of Pub. L. 98-620, amending this section and sections 90, 93, 112, 124, and 126 of this title and enacting provisions set out as notes under sections

1, 90, 93, and 124 of this title] shall take effect on January 1, 1985.

“(b) The amendments made by this subtitle shall not affect the composition, or preclude the service, of any grand or petit jury summoned, impaneled, or actually serving on the effective date of this subtitle [Jan. 1, 1985].”

### § 86. Connecticut

Connecticut constitutes one judicial district.

Court shall be held at Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, New London, and Waterbury.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 875; Pub. L. 87-36, § 3(b), May 19, 1961, 75 Stat. 83; Pub. L. 89-558, Sept. 7, 1966, 80 Stat. 705.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 147 (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, § 74, 36 Stat. 1108; Feb. 27, 1921, ch. 74, 41 Stat. 1146; June 15, 1933, ch. 80, 48 Stat. 148; Dec. 28, 1945, ch. 599, 59 Stat. 663).

Changes in arrangement and phraseology were made.

#### AMENDMENTS

1966—Pub. L. 89-558 provided for holding court at New London.

1961—Pub. L. 87-36 provided for holding court at Bridgeport and Waterbury.

### § 87. Delaware

Delaware constitutes one judicial district.

Court shall be held at Wilmington.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 875.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 148 (Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, § 75, 36 Stat. 1108).

Minor changes in phraseology were made.

### § 88. District of Columbia

The District of Columbia constitutes one judicial district.

Court shall be held at Washington.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 875.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

This section expressly makes the District of Columbia a judicial district of the United States.

Section 41 of this title also makes the District of Columbia a judicial circuit of the United States.

Section 11-305 of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 ed., provides that the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia shall possess the same powers and exercise the same jurisdiction as the district courts of the United States, and shall be deemed a court of the United States.

It is consonant with the ruling of the Supreme Court in *O'Donoghue v. United States*, 1933, 53 S.Ct. 740, 289 U.S. 516, 77 L.Ed. 1356, that the (then called) Supreme Court and Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia are constitutional courts of the United States, ordained and established under article III of the Constitution, Congress enacted that the Court of Appeals “shall hereafter be known as the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia” (Act of June 7, 1934, 48 Stat. 926); and also changed the name of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to “district court of the United States for the District of Columbia” (Act of June 25, 1936, 49 Stat. 1921). In *Federal Trade Commission v. Klesner*, 1927, 47 S.Ct. 557, 274 U.S. 145, 71 L.Ed. 972, the Supreme Court ruled: “\* \* \* The parallelism between the Supreme Court of the District [of Columbia] and the Court of Appeals of the District [of Columbia],