

REPORT OF THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

**Juvenile Restitution in Virginia:
Review and Recommendations
(2025 Appropriation Act, Item
31.V.)**

TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 3

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2025**

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
KARL R. HADE

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY &
LEGAL COUNSEL
RONALD N. REGNERY

COURT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
SANDRA L. KARISON, DIRECTOR

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
CAROLINE E. KIRKPATRICK, DIRECTOR

FISCAL SERVICES
BARRY M. WENZIG, DIRECTOR

HUMAN RESOURCES
RENÉE FLEMING MILLS, DIRECTOR

SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
100 NORTH NINTH STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219-2334
(804) 786-6455

JUDICIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
JOBY KNUTH, DIRECTOR

JUDICIAL SERVICES
PAUL F. DELOSH, DIRECTOR

LEGAL RESEARCH
EILEEN A. LONGENECKER, DIRECTOR

LEGISLATIVE & PUBLIC RELATIONS
ALISA W. PADDEN, DIRECTOR

MAGISTRATE SERVICES
JONATHAN E. GREEN, DIRECTOR

September 2, 2025

The Members of the General Assembly

Dear Senators and Delegates:

Item 31, Paragraph V, of the Appropriation Act, Chapter 725, 2025 Virginia Acts of Assembly, provided funding for the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia (OES) to contract with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to perform a study on juvenile restitution, including: (i) the frequency of court-ordered juvenile restitution in the Commonwealth; (ii) the average amount of restitution ordered; (iii) the percentage of juveniles who pay court-ordered restitution in full; (iv) the percentage of juveniles penalized for failure to pay restitution; (v) the percentage of victims completely compensated with restitution; and (vi) the demographics of juveniles ordered to pay restitution and make recommendations based on its findings to make the juvenile restitution process more rehabilitative while ensuring victims of crimes are compensated.

I am now submitting the report prepared by the National Center for State Courts, which details the review of juvenile restitution in Virginia and their recommendations.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With kind regards, I am

Very truly yours,

Karl R. Hade

KRH:jrs

Juvenile Restitution in Virginia: Review and Recommendations



PROJECT DIRECTOR

Teri Deal, Ph.D.

PROJECT TEAM

Lisa Williams, M.A.

Erika Stevens, M.A.

Brynne Connerty, B.A.

Conor Geiger, M.S.Ed

August 29, 2025



Acknowledgement

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) project team gratefully acknowledges the Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia, for assistance and leadership with this project.

Throughout the project, we were fortunate to work with several dedicated staff of the Supreme Court of Virginia, including Alisa Padden, Director of Legislation and Public Relations, Jennette Runner, JDR Court Management Analyst, Christi Eads, Manager of JDR Court Services, and Derek Kestner, Information Security Officer. We also extend gratitude to the court professionals and partners who participated in the focus groups.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	1
Executive Summary	4
Goals of the Study	4
Overview of Findings	4
Overview of Recommendations	4
National Picture of Juvenile Restitution	5
Literature Review	5
Impacts of Juvenile Restitution	5
Current Practices in Virginia.....	5
Emerging Practices in Juvenile Restitution	6
Methodology.....	8
Policy Review	8
Juvenile Case Management System (JCMS) and Financial Accounting System (FAS) Data Review	8
Data Collection	8
Data Analysis and Limitations	8
Focus Groups and Interviews	9
Data Collection	9
Data Analysis and Limitations	10
Findings.....	11
1. What is the frequency of court-ordered juvenile restitution in the Commonwealth?	11
2. What is the average amount of juvenile restitution ordered?	13
3. What is the percentage of juveniles who pay court-ordered restitution in full?.....	17
4. What is the percentage of juveniles who are penalized for failure to pay restitution?	18
5. What is the percentage of victims who are completely compensated with restitution?.....	19
6. What are the demographics of juveniles ordered to pay restitution?.....	20
7. What is the process for juvenile restitution in Virginia?.....	22
8. What opportunities are there for improvements to the juvenile restitution process?	23
Expand restitution alternatives that provide victim restoration and juvenile accountability	23

Implement uniform timelines, payment tracking, and responsibilities in collecting and tracking
restitution.....23

Empower victims with information about options and processes for restoration24

References..... 25

Appendix A: Data Elements and Quantitative Data Systems..... 26

*Appendix B. Median and Maximum Restitution, by Charge Type and Jurisdiction, Person and
Property Offenses..... 27*

Executive Summary

Goals of the Study

In July 2024, the Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia (OES) contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to study juvenile restitution in the Commonwealth, including: (i) the frequency of court-ordered juvenile restitution in the Commonwealth; (ii) the average amount of restitution ordered; (iii) the percentage of juveniles who pay court-ordered restitution in full; (iv) the percentage of juveniles penalized for failure to pay restitution; (v) the percentage of victims completely compensated with restitution; (vi) the demographics of juveniles ordered to pay restitution; and (vii) make recommendations based on the study findings to make the juvenile restitution process more rehabilitative while ensuring victims of crimes are compensated.

Overview of Findings

NCSC reviewed recent literature and best practices on restitution, conducted focus groups with system partners, and analyzed data from the Commonwealth's juvenile court management system (JCMS) and financial accounting system (FAS).

The findings indicate that Virginia courts rarely order restitution in juvenile cases, although there is variation across counties in terms of the frequency, charge types (e.g., felony, misdemeanor), and offense categories (e.g., person, property) that result in an order of restitution. While the median amount of restitution ordered is \$500 across the Commonwealth, that amount varies considerably by offense type and jurisdiction. When restitution is ordered in juvenile cases, it is typically paid in full within one year. Focus group participants noted that cases involving unpaid restitution often require more staff time and resources.

Overview of Recommendations

We offer the following recommendations to support a juvenile restitution process that is rehabilitative while ensuring victim compensation:

- Expand restitution alternatives that provide victim restoration and juvenile accountability
- Implement uniform timelines, payment tracking, and responsibilities in collecting and tracking restitution
- Empower victims with information about options and processes for restoration

National Picture of Juvenile Restitution

Literature Review

Restitution has historically been a feature of the juvenile justice system, intended to compensate victims and promote accountability. However, recent research and national conversations raise concerns about whether restitution in its current form effectively achieves these goals. As Virginia examines its juvenile restitution practices, comparing them to emerging best practices can better align youth accountability with developmentally appropriate and effective justice.

Impacts of Juvenile Restitution

Juvenile restitution is designed to compensate victims for monetary losses caused by a youth's conduct; however, research has shown that it often fails to deliver timely or meaningful relief to victims and may place undue burden on young people and their families. Youth frequently lack the financial means or legal capacity to pay restitution, particularly if they are not old enough to work, leading to extended system involvement, strained family dynamics, and delayed rehabilitation goals. Families may feel pressured to cover these debts, diverting income from basic needs like rent, utilities, and groceries. Potential consequences for non-payment, which in some states include detention, denial of diversion opportunities, extended supervision, and civil judgments, can affect long-term access to jobs, housing, education, and credit (Smith et al., 2022).

Further, payment of restitution is not associated with reduced criminogenic risk and may increase risk. Piquero and Jennings (2017) followed a sample of justice-involved youth ordered to pay restitution for two years. They found that youth ordered to pay restitution had a higher likelihood of recidivism, and the amount of restitution owed was positively correlated to the likelihood of recidivism. If they still owed restitution when their case closed, they exhibited an even higher risk of recidivism.

While intended to serve restorative purposes, restitution may also contribute to racial and economic disparities in the justice system. Nationally, youth of color and those from low-income families are disproportionately subject to restitution orders, reflecting broader systemic inequities in justice involvement (Smith et al., 2022). These patterns raise concerns about fairness and reinforce the need for individualized, developmentally appropriate approaches.

Current Practices in Virginia

In Virginia, the General Assembly may define and provide by law a right to restitution to victims of crimes (Virginia Constitution art. I, § 8-A, 1997). Courts are required to impose restitution at adjudication for certain delinquency offenses, including some assaults and vandalism of specific types of property. Judges must determine the amount, repayment timeline, and conditions at sentencing. While the law allows for payment in installments, no statute authorizes a formal assessment of a youth's ability to pay or places responsibility for payment on parents or guardians. For specified offenses, community service must accompany restitution orders (Va. Code Ann. § 16.1-278.8, 2024).

Compared to nationally recognized promising practices, Virginia’s statutes currently lack certain procedural safeguards to ensure fairness and rehabilitative alignment. Current Virginia law will be discussed further within the context of each emerging practice described below.

Emerging Practices in Juvenile Restitution

Juvenile justice professionals across the country are increasingly questioning whether restitution actually helps rehabilitate young people. A broad body of research identifies practices that better balance accountability with youth development and fairness. While local approaches vary, most include a common set of principles designed to reduce harm, support victim recovery, and maintain fairness. Nationally recognized promising practices emphasize standardized guidance and alternative solutions, such as capping the amount of restitution ordered, offering restorative alternatives such as community volunteer hours, and separating victim compensation from youth punishment.

Several jurisdictions, including some in Virginia, integrate these principles into restitution alternatives, although replication requires adaptation to legal and administrative contexts.

1. Ensure Restitution Orders are ‘Reasonable and Realistic’

Many courts across the country now consider the youth's age, education level, employment status, income, and family financial obligations when determining restitution amounts. The Pennsylvania Restitution Benchbook (2020) advises judges to ensure restitution orders are “reasonable and realistic”, based on the youth’s opportunities and developmental stage. Research also cautions that placing a burden on youth to prove inability to pay can be harmful, especially when parents’ income is considered despite no legal obligation. Current Virginia statutes permit courts to allow installment payments and set restitution conditions, but do not require an upfront determination of what is reasonable or realistic and do not authorize courts to hold parents accountable for restitution (Va. Code Ann. § 16.1-278.8, 2024).

2. Establish Restitution Caps and Time Limits

Some states impose caps on the total amount of restitution that can be ordered or collected from a youth to prevent excessive burdens. Time-limited repayment windows, often tied to the length of supervision, also help maintain the system’s rehabilitative goals (Smith et al., 2022). Current Virginia statutes do not set a maximum amount for juvenile restitution, nor do they require a timeline for repayment beyond the term of court supervision (Va. Code Ann. § 16.1-278.8, 2024). This may result in extended involvement in the justice system.

3. Provide Community Service and Restorative Alternatives

Some courts across the country use non-financial alternatives when monetary restitution is not feasible, such as community service or participation in a restorative justice program. These approaches hold youth accountable without creating financial hardship. To be effective, these programs must be developmentally appropriate, time-limited, and tailored to a youth’s needs, interests, and capacities (Smith et al., 2022). Some states require the victim to agree to an alternative to restitution for the young person to be eligible for the opportunity. Virginia law authorizes community service for certain offenses, but does not allow it as a general substitute for restitution.

Research shows that restorative justice processes, such as victim-offender mediation, can promote youth accountability, reduce recidivism, and lead to higher victim satisfaction (Bouffard et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2022). An evaluation in Northeast Pennsylvania found that incorporating restorative practices led to shorter repayment periods and improved empathy among youth (Smith et al., 2022). Two nationally recognized models that exemplify this approach include Community Works West and the AFTER Program, both based in San Francisco. These programs engage youth in restorative dialogues and connect them to skill-building opportunities while victims receive compensation from external funds (Smith et al., 2022).

When courts offer alternatives to traditional restitution, victims must be compensated through other methods. Some courts across the country, including Virginia courts using Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act (VJCCCA) funding, have tried paying youth for completing community service. This approach allows youth to repair victim harm while contributing meaningfully to their communities. However, these types of alternatives have not been associated with changes in how often restitution is ordered or successfully collected (Verrecchia, 2024). This limited impact is likely due to only certain jurisdictions accessing this funding, as happens in Virginia. A few programs are unlikely to change restitution programs across the state. Focus group participants supported expanding access to a variety of alternative options, with community service as their preferred choice.

4. Expand Victim Compensation Options

Many experts support supplementing or replacing restitution with expanded victim compensation programs. These programs, often funded through the federal Victims of Crime Act (VOCA), can provide timely compensation to victims, especially when youth lack the means to pay (Smith et al., 2022).

In Virginia, the Virginia Victims Fund may offer reimbursement to eligible victims of violent crimes, but the fund is not available in many non-violent restitution cases (Va. Code Ann. § 19.2-368.2, 2024). Even when available, the fund may still pursue repayment from the youth, reintroducing financial burdens (Va. Code Ann. § 19.2-368.15, 2024). Nationally recognized promising practices separate victim compensation from enforcement of payment obligations to ensure both parties are supported appropriately (Smith et al., 2022).

5. Consider Diversion and Early Resolution Options

Promising practices also emphasize resolving restitution obligations outside of formal court involvement when possible. Diversion programs that incorporate restitution or restorative services can promote accountability and victim satisfaction without the collateral consequences of an adjudication (Smith et al., 2022).

Virginia offers some pre- and post-disposition services through the VJCCCA, which may include restorative justice programs. Restitution is still statutorily required for adjudications of some delinquent offenses, and community-based alternatives are not widely available.

Methodology

To understand how juvenile restitution is ordered, implemented, and experienced in Virginia, NCSC conducted a mixed-methods study including policy review, focus groups, and analysis of administrative data.

Policy Review

The NCSC project team reviewed Va. Code § 19.2 of the Code of Virginia, Criminal Procedure, and Va. Code §16.1-226-16—16.1-225, Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Courts, and Va. Code § 16.1-278.8, Delinquent Juveniles to determine current practices and requirements for Virginia courts regarding juvenile restitution.

Juvenile Case Management System (JCMS) and Financial Accounting System (FAS) Data Review

Data Collection

JCMS is Virginia's statewide case management system for juvenile cases, and FAS is an electronic system used to track payments to the court. Through a data sharing agreement, the Office of Executive Secretary (OES) provided charge information and demographic data from JCMS and restitution details from FAS for all cases disposed between January 1, 2021, and December 31, 2024. Appendix A lists the specific data elements requested from each system.

OES provided two separate datasets, and cases were linked between systems using the case number. Because Virginia collects data at the charge level, each charge had a separate case number. No cases had more than one defendant, although some cases were linked in the system with a separate variable containing a flag for joint and several cases.¹

Data Analysis and Limitations

One of the limitations of the study is that the administrative data is tracked at the charge level, while the research questions are best answered at the case or individual level. To group charges into cases, NCSC matched records using the FIPS code (county identifier) and the 6-digit base case number, which identifies individual youth in the data. For this analysis, we defined a case as all charges with an offense date or a filing date occurring within five (5) days for the same individual in the same jurisdiction. However, this methodology is limited due to the assumptions that charges occurring within this time frame correspond to all charges related to a single course of action and that any charges occurring beyond that limit are unrelated and constitute a new case. Most analyses were conducted at the charge

¹ This variable indicated only how many accounts were linked to each individual case, not which particular accounts were linked.

level due to this uncertainty. Case-level analyses are identified where relevant and were most commonly used to confirm findings at the charge level.

Before flattening the data to case level for analysis, several charges were dropped from the dataset. Cases dropped included those in which the youth's date of birth was before 1990 or their calculated age at the time of offense was over 18, and where the offense date was before 2000. These cases were typically either old records that appeared only because courts were cleaning their Age of Pending Cases reports or cases that were filed in the juvenile court in error. There were also 432 cases in the FAS but not the JCMS. This subset of cases was dropped from the analysis because they included cases disposed outside of the requested time frame but entered into FAS during the data collection period.

A second limitation is related to how data are stored in the FAS. Individuals who complete restitution payments are automatically removed from the system after 399 days. That means there are some cases in the JCMS data that do not appear in the FAS system because their restitution was paid in full. There is a paid-in-full variable with a date in the JCMS; however, that variable was not provided in the dataset.

While we were able to answer the key questions about juvenile restitution in Virginia, some answers were limited by incomplete or unavailable data. For example, victim compensation information is currently recorded in free-text fields, making it difficult to systematically track the number or percentage of victims who were compensated. For this analysis, we assume that all restitution that is paid is provided to the victims. Some data limitations affected the analysis: missing dates prevented age calculations in certain cases, and approximately 7% of race data was missing. In some cases, we were able to infer race/ethnicity from other charges for the same individual.

Focus Groups and Interviews

Data Collection

NCSC facilitated a series of focus groups and interviews with system partners across Virginia designed to capture local practices, challenges, and opportunities related to juvenile restitution. A standard protocol guided all sessions and included the following questions:

- When and how is restitution ordered?
- Who participates in the decision-making process?
- How are restitution amounts determined?
- Is the youths' ability to pay discussed?
- What are enforcement practices and barriers?
- Is there victim involvement?
- Are there alternatives to monetary restitution used?

Participants were informed that the sessions were voluntary and confidential. All focus groups were conducted virtually. Partners who participated included: juvenile court judges, Commonwealth attorneys, victim witness program directors, clerks of court, court analysts, and Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) program managers. These participants represented perspectives from across Virginia,

including both urban and rural jurisdictions, and offered insight into the administrative and practical realities of restitution implementation.

Data Analysis and Limitations

The NCSC project team thoroughly reviewed the focus group and interview notes and used inductive and deductive coding in Taguette, an open-source tool for textual qualitative data analysis.

The study did not include interviews or focus groups with youth or families involved in restitution cases, victims of juvenile offenses, or defense attorneys. The absence of these participants is a limitation and represents an opportunity for future exploration of the restitution process from the standpoint of those most directly impacted.

Findings

The findings are organized by the eight (8) study questions included in the Office of the Executive Secretary (OES)'s request.

1. What is the frequency of court-ordered juvenile restitution in the Commonwealth?

Restitution is ordered on an estimated 2-4% of juvenile charges. Focus group participants estimated that restitution is ordered in 5-10% of cases, potentially reflecting jurisdictional differences.

Virginia law provides courts authority to order restitution in juvenile delinquency cases and mandates restitution for juveniles adjudicated delinquent for certain offenses, including some assaults and vandalism of specific types of property (Va. Code § 16.1-278.8). However, focus group participants across roles reported that courts order restitution in a small percentage of juvenile cases, typically those involving property damage, theft, or vandalism. Some focus group participants estimated that restitution is ordered in roughly 5–10% of all delinquency cases, though this varies widely by locality. Focus group participants also indicated that restitution is rarely applied in cases involving emotional harm or medical injury, especially if those losses are covered by insurance or the Virginia Victims Fund.

To describe statewide trends, NCSC analyzed JCMS data to determine the number and percentage of juvenile delinquency cases involving restitution orders, including how frequency varies across charge types and localities.

Overall, restitution was ordered for 3,277 charges (2,358 cases), representing only 2.1% of the total number of charges (3.3% of cases) in the dataset. Approximately 33% (1,086) of the charges with restitution had a disposition code of “guilty,” while 51% had “dismissed/denied” as the disposition code. Another 10% had no disposition code. For the remainder of the charges with restitution, disposition codes varied and included “transferred (i.e., to another juvenile court or a general district court),” “nolle prosequi,” “fugitive file,” and “prepaid (traffic only).²

Table 1 shows the charges where restitution was ordered by charge type. While most charges with restitution were felonies or misdemeanors, there were a few traffic and status offense charges with restitution. Two of the status offense charges originally started as class 1 misdemeanors but were later amended to status offenses; two were curfew violations, and the last included a charge description of “destroy property,” which is typically listed as a felony or misdemeanor for other charges with this

² The other disposition codes associated with at least one charge with restitution were: “complied with law,” “defer imposition of sentence,” “granted,” “guilty in absentia,” “not guilty,” “other,” and “transferred as an adult (i.e., certified to grand jury in circuit court).”

description. The ordering of restitution for status offenses is rare across the state and may represent either jurisdictional differences or errors in data entry.

Table 1. Restitution ordered by charge type

	Frequency	Percentage
Delinquency Felony	1,297	39.6%
Delinquency Misdemeanor	1,956	59.7%
Status Offense/Other	5	0.2%
Traffic Infraction	19	0.6%
Total	3,277	100%

To compare the distribution of restitution across different types of offenses, charges involving restitution were hierarchically categorized by seriousness, following standards set by previous NCSC research: person, property, drugs, weapons, DUI, other motor vehicle, legal process, public order, and other.³ Table 2 shows the frequency of each offense category where restitution was ordered. As indicated, restitution was most often ordered for property offenses, such as breaking and entering, larceny, and destruction of property. Person offenses, mostly assault and battery, were the second most common offense type where restitution was ordered. Traffic and other motor vehicle offenses were a distant third; those involving restitution were typically variations of reckless driving or failure to stop at an accident in which there was property damage.

Table 2. Restitution ordered by offense category

	Frequency	Percentage
Person	444	13.5%
Property	2,598	79.3%
Drugs	5	0.2%
Weapons	33	1.0%
DUI	9	0.3%
Traffic/Other motor vehicle	106	3.2%
Legal process	49	1.5%
Public order	23	0.7%
Other	10	0.3%
Total	3,277	100%

Notably, some offenses in Virginia statutorily require restitution. Those offenses were flagged in the dataset using the code sections provided. There were 3,715 charges where restitution was statutorily

³ Categories follow those used in the Effective Criminal Case Management (ECCM) project. Other research following these standards typically includes a category for homicide. Due to limitations of the charge descriptions in the data, homicide was combined with the person category for the current project.

required, and the disposition code was “Guilty.” Of these, restitution was ordered for only 351 charges (9.4%). In other words, nearly 91% of charges where restitution is required do not have restitution ordered, even though the individual is adjudicated delinquent and the law requires it in certain circumstances. There is no indication in the data why some individuals are required to meet the statutory requirements and others are not. However, one possible explanation is that restitution is only statutorily required “for any property damage, for loss caused by the offense, or for actual medical expenses incurred by the victim as a result of the offense,” so these may represent cases where no loss or medical expenses occurred, even though the offense falls under a relevant statute (Va. Code Ann. § 16.1-278.8, n.d.).

Limitations in the way the data are recorded in the system may partially explain this difference. However, a difference of this size also suggests jurisdictional differences in applying the legal code. Several focus group participants noted that judges are likely to consider restitution in courts with small caseloads where there is more opportunity for individualized review, while larger courts tend to streamline cases and rely more on informal resolutions.

Focus group participants indicated that many cases eligible for restitution are diverted before they reach formal court proceedings. First-time offenses such as shoplifting or minor vandalism are often handled informally, resulting in no restitution order being entered and no data being recorded in the formal court system. Focus group participants also shared that some victims choose not to request restitution, particularly when they believe the youth cannot afford it or when they are offered an alternative such as a letter of apology or community service.

2. What is the average amount of juvenile restitution ordered?

The median amount of restitution ordered per charge was \$500.00, which was also the most common amount of restitution ordered (mode).⁴ However, there was considerable variability in the amount ordered, based on offense and jurisdiction.

The amount of restitution ordered is determined using documented financial losses submitted by the victim, often through receipts, invoices, or repair estimates. These documents are typically collected by the Commonwealth’s Attorney or victim advocate and submitted alongside the social history report at disposition. There is no statutory cap or guidance on what constitutes a ‘reasonable amount,’ and courts are not required to assess a youth’s ability to pay before issuing a restitution order (Va. Code §16.1-278.8).

Focus group participants indicated that while restitution orders are often under \$1,000, there are frequent outliers, particularly in cases involving car accidents, burglaries, or multiple victims. In some instances, youth are ordered to pay thousands of dollars, especially when multiple co-defendants are

⁴ The median is reported rather than the mean due to the high amount of variance in the data.

involved. Participants expressed concern that these high-dollar amounts are often not calibrated to the youth's financial capacity and are unlikely to be paid in full.

Judges and supervision officers vary in how they address this challenge. Some consider age and family circumstances when setting an amount, or may convert unpaid balances to a civil judgment at the end of supervision. Others prioritize full restitution regardless of the youth's resources, which often leads to financial struggle among families and poor compliance with supervision. Focus group participants indicated that practices depend on whether the victim follows up, if the youth is compliant with other conditions of probation, and also on judicial discretion.

Overall, the median amount of restitution was \$500, with substantial variation due to factors such as charge type, offense category, and jurisdiction. The total amount of restitution ordered per charge ranged from \$0.85 to \$190,390.00 in the JCMS and was not always consistent with the amount listed in the FAS, which ranged from \$2.62 to \$190,390.00. In addition, approximately 1% of the amounts ordered were \$10.00 or less, as indicated in both the JCMS and FAS data.

Table 3 shows the amount of restitution ordered for each charge type. As indicated, the average amount of restitution ordered varied by charge type. While the status offenses had the highest median value, there were only five status offense charges with restitution ordered. Felony offenses had a higher median value and a higher maximum value than misdemeanors. There were relatively few (19) traffic infractions where restitution was ordered, and the range of amounts was smaller.

Table 3. Amount of restitution ordered by charge type

	Total	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Delinquency Felony	\$2,516,652.77	\$669.00	\$7.00	\$190,390.00
Delinquency Misdemeanor	\$1,586,065.80	\$360.00	\$0.85	\$27,725.00
Status Offense/Other	\$3,099.07	\$685.00	\$200.00	\$990.37
Traffic Infraction	\$22,687.65	\$500.00	\$100.00	\$5,607.37
Total	\$4,128,505.29			

Table 4 indicates the median amount of restitution for each of the case types by jurisdiction. The table reveals some variation in local practices, with only a few localities ordering restitution for status offenses and traffic infractions. Additionally, eight (8) jurisdictions did not have any charges resulting in restitution for the three (3) years included in the dataset. Finally, there is greater variability in the median amount of restitution ordered for felonies than for misdemeanors.

Table 4. Median restitution amount by jurisdiction and case type

FIPS	Delinquency Felony	Delinquency Misdemeanor	Status Offense	Traffic Infraction	FIPS	Delinquency Felony	Delinquency Misdemeanor	Status Offense	Traffic Infraction
001	\$1,151.66	\$1,101.37			075	\$303.14	\$250.00		
003	\$600.00	\$491.25		\$500.00	077	\$3,022.22	\$350.00		
005	\$263.73	\$802.44	\$685.00		079	\$11,440.92	\$1,434.93		
007	\$721.00	\$1,077.82			081	\$3,000.00	\$1,017.85		
009	\$2,203.85	\$350.00			083	\$705.00	\$1,325.00		
011	\$329.54	\$125.00			085	\$950.00	\$365.00		
013	\$650.00	\$479.50			087	\$663.89	\$473.68	\$832.70	
015	\$734.99	\$300.00		\$103.00	089	\$545.00	\$295.00		
017		\$516.13			091				
019	\$1,045.00	\$616.86			093	\$843.09	\$1,016.88		
021					097	\$3,407.09	\$1,974.90		
023	\$1,247.79	\$800.00			099	\$164.00	\$599.25		
025	\$50.00	\$249.00			101	\$3,277.63	\$333.71		
027	\$384.60	\$283.35			103				
029		\$842.51			105	\$1,846.97			
031	\$452.50	\$511.00		\$1,182.00	107	\$663.90	\$252.50		\$2,000.00
033	\$1,912.50	\$590.38		\$200.00	109	\$591.19	\$450.00		
035	\$725.00	\$725.00			111	\$1,780.00	\$1,916.47		
036		\$1,513.89			113	\$1,333.00	\$215.97		
037	\$47,603.08	\$620.00			115		\$371.00		
041	\$600.00	\$304.60	\$690.69		117	\$2,239.52	\$278.41		
043		\$280.54			119	\$205.00	\$202.15		
045	\$3,300.87				121	\$1,000.00	\$200.00		
047	\$1,875.00	\$221.00			125	\$1,295.00	\$70.00		
049					127	\$389.55	\$62.50		
051		\$981.64			131	\$904.00	\$469.50		
053	\$250.00				133	\$2,000.00			
057					135	\$849.75	\$116.67		
059	\$533.50	\$437.00			137	\$1,000.00	\$200.00		
061	\$750.68	\$257.99			139	\$641.98	\$341.39		
063	\$5,965.83	\$550.00			141	\$500.00	\$1,000.00		

FIPS	Delinquency Felony	Delinquency Misdemeanor	Status Offense	Traffic Infraction	FIPS	Delinquency Felony	Delinquency Misdemeanor	Status Offense	Traffic Infraction
065	\$1,026.67	\$706.88			143	\$2,310.51	\$900.00		
067	\$333.00	\$300.00			145	\$250.00	\$107.47		
069	\$1,161.05	\$773.82		\$460.28	147				
071	\$475.00	\$365.03			149	\$1,668.78	\$575.00		
073	\$2,325.13	\$597.00			153	\$649.99	\$652.44		\$500.00
155	\$1,504.00	\$780.10			550	\$669.00	\$834.75		\$1,000.00
157					570	\$677.45	\$169.67		
159	\$1,362.50				590	\$400.00	\$380.00		
161	\$1,000.00	\$225.00			595	\$878.50	\$297.00		
163	\$2,444.00	\$231.63			610	\$697.00	\$728.55		
165	\$588.05	\$500.00		\$2,720.58	620	\$1,560.00	\$427.49		
167	\$2,933.72	\$61.33			630	\$5,530.78	\$23.35	\$200.00	
169	\$1,000.00	\$719.17			640	\$380.00	\$500.00		
171	\$1,672.00	\$370.59			650	\$750.00	\$400.00		
173	\$644.69	\$400.00			670	\$363.52	\$350.00		
175	\$1,755.00	\$2,280.56			680	\$404.14	\$300.00		
177	\$515.66	\$254.76			690	\$651.18	\$258.00		
179	\$963.05	\$420.84		\$300.00	700	\$800.00	\$263.36		\$500.00
181	\$406.29	\$600.00			710	\$563.75	\$350.00		
183	\$514.58	\$514.58			730	\$625.00	\$390.00		
185	\$541.25	\$425.00			740	\$512.50	\$230.00		
187	\$1,852.73	\$144.37		\$2,805.00	750	\$1,181.13	\$995.00		
191	\$300.00	\$381.87			760	\$470.44	\$500.00		
193	\$600.00	\$104.95			770	\$458.00	\$406.88		\$628.57
195	\$2,260.79	\$134.00			775	\$1,750.00	\$168.10		\$200.00
197	\$305.00	\$279.60			790	\$1,700.00	\$70.00		
199	\$350.00	\$290.98			800	\$1,134.62	\$401.94		
510	\$350.00	\$250.00			810	\$575.00	\$350.00		
520	\$793.43	\$100.00			820	\$200.00	\$50.00		
530	\$237.50	\$200.00			830	\$894.78	\$237.69		
540	\$389.75	\$370.96			840	\$452.50	\$291.00		\$5,607.37

Some of the variability in the amount of restitution ordered is due to the relationship between offense category and charge type. Table 5 demonstrates the complexity of this relationship, as the median amount ordered varies between case types for the same offense categories. For example, the median amount of restitution for a felony property charge is twice the median amount for a misdemeanor property charge. Meanwhile, there is very little difference between the median amounts for misdemeanor property charges and misdemeanor person charges.

Table 5. Median restitution ordered by offense category and case type

	Delinquency Felony	Delinquency Misdemeanor	Status Offense/Other	Traffic Infraction
Person	\$383.15	\$300.00		
Property	\$703.95	\$350.00	\$832.70	
Drugs	\$400.00	\$706.50		
Weapons	\$1,672.00	\$472.62		
DUI		\$500.00		
Traffic/Other motor vehicle	\$500.00	\$750.00	\$200.00	\$500.00
Legal process	\$1,000.00	\$500.00		
Public order	\$310.68	\$1,040.00	\$690.69	\$103.00
Other	\$298.44	\$725.00	\$685.00	

Even this explanation of the differences in restitution amounts is simplified, as there are several outlier charges noticeable only when examining the relationship between charge type, offense category, and jurisdiction, particularly when considering the maximum amounts ordered. For example, Appendix B shows the median and maximum restitution amounts ordered for person and property offenses by jurisdiction and charge type, for those jurisdictions with restitution in those categories. The dataset does not have the contextual information needed to determine the reasons for the variation.

3. What is the percentage of juveniles who pay court-ordered restitution in full?

Approximately 72% of charges that were assessed restitution are fully paid within a year of disposition.

The FAS automatically removes individuals from the database 399 days after their final payment, making it impossible to determine the exact percentage of youth who paid their restitution or the total amount collected across the multi-year dataset. There is a paid-in-full variable in the JCMS; however, that field was not included in the dataset provided for this study. Instead, we used a subset of the data to approach an answer to this question.

To estimate payment completion rates, we analyzed a subset of cases where the disposition dates were within 12 months of the date the data were pulled (May 19, 2025). These individuals could not have been purged from FAS, as the 399 days would not have passed yet. Table 6 shows the frequency of fully paid restitution for charges disposed 12 months or less before the data pull.

Table 6. Charges fully paid, dispositions within one year of data pull.

	Frequency	Percentage
Fully Paid	450	71.8%
Not Fully Paid	177	28.2%
Total	627	100%

Approximately 72% of charges were fully paid within a year of disposition. At the case level, the same analysis revealed that 337 out of 482 youth (about 70%) with dispositions within the last year had fully paid their restitution within that time. This number represents an undercount of the amount of restitution that will ultimately be paid, as some of the charges have only been in the system for a few months. Meanwhile, there is evidence in the data that some individuals take several years to fully pay their restitution⁵. Overall, this sample of charges was assessed \$542,859.03 in restitution, of which \$363,639.23 has already been paid (67%)⁶.

The administrative data tell a different story than the perceptions of the focus group participants. Across all focus groups, participants emphasized that most juveniles do not pay restitution in full. Many estimated that fewer than 5% of youth fully satisfy their restitution orders, and that partial payment or nonpayment is far more common. One district reported tracking restitution balances going back nearly a decade, indicating that outstanding obligations often remain unresolved for years.

This discrepancy between the administrative data and the experiences of justice professionals could stem from several factors, including variations across jurisdictions or different ideas of what complete payment looks like. Additionally, selection bias may impact perception, as participants may spend more time and pay greater attention to the young people who are not meeting their restitution obligations, so those who pay quickly are not as easily remembered.

4. What is the percentage of juveniles who are penalized for failure to pay restitution?

Because individual courts handle non-payment of restitution differently and because there is no way to distinguish technical violations for failure to pay restitution in the data, it is not possible to determine whether and

⁵ The remaining FAS data indicate that of the \$1,524,426.82 owed in restitution for charges that were disposed 13-52 months before the data were pulled, \$310,123.56 (about 20%) has been paid but has not been purged from the system yet.

⁶ At the case level, the same analysis revealed that 337 out of 482 juveniles (about 70%) with dispositions within the last year had fully paid their restitution within that time.

how many juveniles are penalized for failure to pay restitution using the JCMS and FAS data.

Focus group participants shared that generally, the supervising officer does not hold youth on probation for not paying restitution if they are otherwise adhering to conditions of probation. However, if a young person is not successful on probation and is not paying their restitution, the officer may issue a combined violation of probation. Sometimes, this occurs if victims reach out and report that they have not yet been paid.

Court staff, particularly supervision officers, described working closely with youth to develop payment plans, set realistic goals, and encourage employment when appropriate. Some courts allow extended payment periods to lessen the burden on youth or allow youth to complete community service instead of cash payments, funded through a local grant. However, these programs are not available statewide and are often limited in capacity or lack enforcement mechanisms.

Overall, community supervision officers work with the youth, and most judges will not hold youth on probation solely for non-payment; some reported that it often depends on the court or judge. When youth turn 18, the Commonwealth attorney's office in the district may pursue payment civilly, especially if the victim's advocate's office is attached.

5. What is the percentage of victims who are completely compensated with restitution?

The percentage of victims who are completely compensated with restitution is unknown due to data limitations.

Although the total amount paid can be estimated from the data using methods described above, the dataset did not include details on victims who received restitution payments, so we are unable to calculate the total number of victims compensated or provide a percentage of victims made whole. We can reasonably assume that payment in full means that victims were fully compensated.

Participants across all focus groups reported that most victims do not receive full repayment, and that even partial payment is rare. However, since participants also underestimated overall restitution completion, their perceptions about victim compensation may be influenced by similar biases.

In certain cases, the Virginia Victims Fund can provide financial reimbursement for eligible losses, but this is not a direct substitute for restitution and does not apply to all victims or situations. Even when courts order restitution, focus group participants noted that victims are often unaware of their rights to pursue enforcement and rarely follow through once the court process concludes. Focus group participants identified several reasons why victims do not receive payment, including the court not being informed of changes in the victim's address and contact information and Victim Witness Advocates not having resources to effectively track these changes.

6. What are the demographics of juveniles ordered to pay restitution?

Juveniles ordered to pay restitution were mostly male (80%) and ages 15-17 (67%).

Demographics for individuals ordered to pay restitution were assessed both at the charge level and the case level. Case-level demographics reduce the likelihood of double-counting individuals but provide less detail about the individual charges. Demographic details were similar for case-level and charge-level frequencies.

Table 7 shows demographic details for the 2,358 cases in which restitution was ordered. Overall, a greater number and proportion of males than females were ordered to pay restitution; however, this may be attributed to there being more males than females in juvenile court. Restitution was split almost evenly between black youth and white youth, with other races being ordered restitution only rarely, although this conclusion should be considered with caution, as there is a large amount of missing data for the race variable, and some individuals had self-conflicting race data. Additionally, this percentage does not represent the diversity of the jurisdictions' populations. Age at offense represents the age at the earliest offense date for all charges for each individual. Most individuals who were ordered to pay restitution were between 15 and 17 years old, with the frequencies increasing with the youth's age.⁷

Table 7. Demographics for Defendants in Restitution Cases

(N = 3,109)	Total	%
Gender		
Male	1,885	79.9%
Female	473	20.1%
Race		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	0.1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	12	0.5%
Black	1,077	45.7%
White	1,098	46.6%
Missing	168	7.1%
Age at Offense		
9	3	0.1%
10	9	0.4%
11	41	1.7%
12	110	4.7%
13	220	9.3%

⁷ The two 18-year-olds in the data represent either outliers or data entry errors. These two were excluded from subsequent data analyses.

(N = 3,109)	Total	%
14	390	16.5%
15	507	21.5%
16	528	22.4%
17	546	23.2%
18	2	0.1%
Missing	2	0.1%

To understand whether restitution orders vary by demographic characteristics, we conducted a logistic regression analysis. First, we examined whether age at offense, race, and gender predicted restitution orders at the charge level. This initial model was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (5, n = 140,061) = 619.11, p < .001$, with race, gender, and age at offense all significant predictors. The results showed that Black youth had 21% higher odds of being ordered to pay restitution than white youth ($OR = 1.21, p < .001$)⁸, males were 66% more likely than females to be ordered to pay restitution ($OR = 1.66, p < .001$), and younger individuals were more likely to be ordered to pay restitution, with odds decreasing by 21% per year of age ($OR = 0.79, p < .001$).

The unexpected result that younger individuals are ordered to pay restitution more often suggested that case characteristics, not just demographics, might drive these patterns. To account for this possibility, we developed a second, more comprehensive model. The second model retained age at offense, race, and gender as predictors, but focused only on Black and White youth due to small sample sizes for other racial groups. We added three case-specific variables: charge type (felony or misdemeanor), offense type (person or property), and whether or not restitution was legally required for the charge. We also excluded charge types other than felony and misdemeanor and offense types other than person or property due to their comparative rarity in the dataset. By limiting the analysis to the most common charge and offense types, we reduced noise from potential outliers that might skew results.

The more comprehensive model was also significant, $\chi^2 (6, n = 36,667) = 1319.74, p < .001$, but revealed a more complex picture. Most notably, when we controlled for case characteristics, the racial disparity reversed direction: White youth became 1.4 times more likely than Black youth to receive orders to pay restitution ($OR = 1.45, p < .001$). Gender and age differences disappeared entirely once case factors were included in the analysis.

As expected, restitution is ordered 39% more often for charges where state law requires it ($OR = 1.39, p < .001$). The strongest predictor, however, was offense category, with property offenses resulting in restitution nearly 6 times more often than person offenses ($OR = 5.73, p < .001$). There was no significant difference between felony and misdemeanor charges.

⁸ The odds of being ordered restitution were 1.5 times more likely (54% higher) for Black youth than for Asian youth when the reference category was changed ($OR = 1.54, p = .031$), but there was not a significant difference between any of the other races.

The reversal of racial disparities between models suggests that demographic differences in orders of restitution largely reflect differences in the types of charges each group faces, rather than bias in how courts apply restitution policies to similar cases.

7. What is the process for juvenile restitution in Virginia?

The process for ordering and collecting juvenile restitution in Virginia follows several core steps, though specifics vary by jurisdiction.

Once a youth is adjudicated delinquent, the court may impose restitution at disposition under Va. Code § 16.1-278.8(A)(10). This statute also permits the court to defer disposition and place the juvenile on probation. The Commonwealth’s Attorney typically initiates the restitution process by gathering documentation from victims, including invoices, repair estimates, or medical bills, before the trial date.

Supervision officers incorporate these materials into a social history report, which is shared with the court, prosecution, and defense. If the parties agree on the amount, restitution is typically ordered at disposition. In some jurisdictions, restitution may also be ordered at adjudication if a plea agreement includes those terms. The order of restitution by the judicial officer is entered into the “Order of Restitution (Juvenile)” (DC-579) form, which includes the amount of restitution to be paid, the date by which all restitution is to be paid, and the terms and conditions of repayment.

Once restitution is ordered:

- The clerk’s office creates a financial account for tracking payments within the Virginia Court System FAS.
- Youth or families submit payments directly to the clerk, and these payments are tracked in the FAS.
- Funds are then disbursed by the clerk to victims as ordered by the court. Supervision officers monitor payments and help youth develop repayment plans.
- When an individual is on probation with active supervision, the probation agency supervising the individual must notify the court of the amount of restitution still outstanding either 60 days before release from supervision or at the time the agency requests release from supervision, which typically occurs when the defendant has completed all terms of probation except restitution.
- If the individual is no longer on active supervision as a condition of probation, the court must hold a restitution review hearing within two (2) years to review compliance with the Order of Restitution.
- If the individual is not in compliance, the court may modify the terms or period of probation or revoke probation.
- If restitution has not been fully paid by the restitution review hearing, the court schedules regular hearings to continue monitoring compliance.
- When an individual turns 18 years old without fully paying the restitution amount ordered, the order may be converted to a civil judgment, allowing the victim to pursue the amount of restitution owed civilly.

Diversion programs may handle restitution informally, without court orders or financial tracking. However, per focus group participants, these programs lack standardized procedures.

8. What opportunities are there for improvements to the juvenile restitution process?

The following recommendations highlight opportunities to improve Virginia's current practices and processes for juvenile restitution. They are based on both quantitative analyses and data collected from focus group participants.

Expand restitution alternatives that provide victim restoration and juvenile accountability

Statutory changes are required to allow courts to substitute community service and restorative justice programs for monetary restitution when youth cannot pay. There is emerging evidence that these types of opportunities can be effective and rehabilitative. This presents an opportunity to explore statutory revisions that would give courts the flexibility to order alternatives when young people are unable to afford restitution. Expanded options may also allow more victims to be compensated.

To explore expansion of alternatives, engage in strategic planning with community organizations to identify alternative options for payment that satisfy both victim compensation and juvenile accountability goals. Operating these programs requires dedicated resources, so it may be fruitful to examine the use of Virginia Community Crime Control Act grant funds. Gather information on alternatives to restitution already being used across the Commonwealth for innovative alternatives to restitution and share examples with other jurisdictions.

Implement uniform timelines, payment tracking, and responsibilities in collecting and tracking restitution

This study found variations across jurisdictions from initial court orders through ongoing collection efforts. These inconsistencies create inefficiencies for staff and confusion for families and victims. Virginia would benefit from developing statewide, uniform processes to address the variance in ways that jurisdictions approach restitution collection, including standardized timelines, payment tracking methods, and staff responsibilities.

Establish uniform guidelines for evaluating a youth's ability to pay before ordering restitution. Currently, judges lack consistent tools for assessing a youth's financial capacity, resulting in orders that may be unfair or impossible to collect.

Consider specific criteria for when courts should cease unsuccessful collection efforts that consume staff time without benefiting victims. This includes procedures for handling youth who "age out" of the juvenile system with outstanding restitution and how to communicate changes to youth and victims.

Examine the use of alternatives to 'joint and several' orders when dealing with restitution-eligible cases involving multiple juveniles and/or adults. Some courts split the restitution amount between all payors evenly to avoid confusion and reduce time spent by clerks determining complicated orders.

Empower victims with information about options and processes for restoration

Focus group participants shared that many victims are unaware of processes related to their compensation, and as a result, staff frequently spend time answering questions about the processes and payment status.

Consider partnering with the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney and victim witness advocates to develop comprehensive information resources for victims regarding options for restoration, applying for the Virginia Victims Fund (if applicable), and what happens if a young person does not or cannot pay. This will reduce the burden on court and clerk staff who spend time fielding calls or walk-in inquiries, particularly in smaller, rural areas with minimal staff.

These resources could include in-office signage, informational handout sheets, FAQs, and streamlined information sharing with victims regarding compensation processes and options.

References

- Bouffard, J., Cooper, M., & Bergseth, K. (2016). The Effectiveness of Various Restorative Justice Interventions on Recidivism Outcomes Among Juvenile Offenders. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 15(4), 465-480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204016647428>
- Pennsylvania Supreme Court. (2021). *In re: Establishment of the Minor Judiciary Education Board*. <https://www.pacourts.us/Storage/media/pdfs/20210526/234952-file-11360.pdf>
- Piquero, A. R., Baglivio, M. T., & Wolff, K. T. (2023). A statewide analysis of the impact of restitution and fees on juvenile recidivism in Florida across race & ethnicity. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 21(4), 279-308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15412040231180816>
- Piquero, A. R., & Jennings, W. G. (2017). Research note: Justice System–Imposed financial penalties increase the likelihood of recidivism in a sample of adolescent offenders. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 15(3), 325-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204016669213>
- Smith, L. E., Mozaffar, N. S., Feerman, J., Parker, L., NeMoyer, A., Goldstein, N. E., Hall Spence, J. M., Thompson, M. C., & Jenkins, V. L. (2022). *Reimagining restitution: New approaches to support youth and communities*. Juvenile Law Center. <http://debtorsprison.jlc.org/documents/JLC-Reimagining-Restitution.pdf>
- Verrecchia, P. (2024). Accountability in Pennsylvania: Has 15 years made a difference? *Contemporary Justice Review: CJR*, 27(2-3), 239-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2024.2431971>
- Va. Code Ann. § 16.1-278.8 (2024). <https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title16.1/chapter11/section16.1-278.8/>
- Va. Code Ann. § 19.2-368.2 (2024). <https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title19.2/chapter21.1/section19.2-368.2/>
- Va. Code Ann. § 19.2-368.15 (2024). <https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title19.2/chapter21.1/section19.2-368.15/>
- Virginia Constitution art. I, § 8-A (1997).

Appendix A: Data Elements and Quantitative Data Systems

	Requested Element	Additional detail	System
Charge Information	Case/charge number		JCMS & FAS
	Locality	Court where the case was filed	JCMS
	Unique person identifier	A number that identifies the same individual within the system (e.g., if the person has multiple charges)	JCMS & FAS
	Offense Date		JCMS
	Charge Filing Date		JCMS
	Filing Charge Description	Description of the offense at filing (Text)	JCMS
	Filing Charge Degree	Felony/misdemeanor indicator at filing	JCMS
	Disposition Charge Description	Description of the offense at disposition (Text)	JCMS
	Disposition Charge Degree	Felony/misdemeanor indicator at disposition	JCMS
	Code section	Text field indicating VA code section (if captured at both filing and disposition, please include both)	JCMS
	Charge Disposition Date		JCMS
	Charge Sentencing Date		JCMS
	Disposition Types	Indicator for when restitution is ordered. (If additional disposition information is available, such as fines or community service ordered, please include it.)	JCMS
	Continuance Code	Continuance code for deferred disposition (DD); includes a note that restitution is owed.	JCMS
Restitution	Restitution Amount	Dollar amount of the restitution	JCMS & FAS
	Date of entry into FAS	Either disposition date or date of entry into the system, whichever is available	FAS
	Restitution Amount Balance to Date	Dollar amount of the restitution owed at the time of data extraction	FAS
	Paid in full indicator	Indicator for when all fines, fees, and restitution are fully paid	FAS
	Paid in full date		FAS
	Recipient Field	Field showing how much they are due, how much has been paid toward them, and whether funds go to the Virginia Victims Fund	FAS
Demographics	Date of Birth		JCMS
	Race		JCMS
	Gender		JCMS

Appendix B. Median and Maximum Restitution, by Charge Type and Jurisdiction, Person and Property Offenses

FIPS	Person				Property			
	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)
001					\$1,151.66	\$1,101.37	\$1,151.67	\$2,157.36
003	\$300.00	\$369.50	\$300.00	\$2,315.37	\$650.00	\$596.35	\$4,569.91	\$10,184.00
005					\$263.73	\$802.44	\$263.73	\$3,996.20
007					\$721.00	\$1,077.82	\$721.00	\$1,450.00
009		\$334.81		\$350.00	\$1,925.00	\$1,034.00	\$5,798.36	\$1,034.00
011					\$329.54	\$125.00	\$2,000.00	\$125.00
013		\$400.00		\$2,558.00	\$650.00	\$500.00	\$3,275.19	\$3,491.32
015	\$1,023.17	\$477.87	\$1,418.18	\$1,235.60	\$742.50	\$180.59	\$6,200.00	\$7,750.50
017						\$619.25		\$619.25
019		\$558.72		\$2,749.10	\$1,045.00	\$675.00	\$3,500.00	\$2,700.00
023					\$1,247.79	\$800.00	\$1,969.58	\$2,033.00
025					\$50.00	\$249.00	\$50.00	\$1,592.00
027	\$249.00	\$142.98	\$249.00	\$142.98	\$675.32	\$283.35	\$966.03	\$550.00
029						\$842.51		\$842.51
031	\$284.75	\$864.03	\$284.75	\$864.03	\$500.00	\$272.50	\$3,219.00	\$930.20
033	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$3,675.00	\$1,479.94	\$4,005.17	\$2,019.44
035					\$725.00	\$380.00	\$2,297.58	\$500.00
036						\$1,513.89		\$1,513.89
037					\$47,603.08	\$620.00	\$93,469.00	\$620.00
041	\$375.00	\$250.00	\$1,278.02	\$1,518.72	\$632.50	\$304.60	\$13,439.12	\$13,439.12
043						\$280.54		\$578.00
045					\$3,300.87		\$4,700.00	
047	\$290.00	\$634.03	\$500.00	\$4,497.45	\$2,500.00	\$185.61	\$10,000.00	\$5,177.76
051						\$981.64		\$981.64
053					\$250.00		\$250.00	
059	\$272.50	\$219.66	\$4,000.00	\$1,402.23	\$610.34	\$500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,912.75
061		\$50.00		\$157.37	\$985.00	\$500.00	\$1,408.26	\$3,151.74
063					\$5,965.83	\$550.00	\$16,446.75	\$550.00
065	\$1,968.97	\$1,251.10	\$3,473.93	\$1,251.10	\$1,026.67	\$372.50	\$4,693.00	\$445.00
067		\$1,550.00		\$1,550.00	\$333.00	\$275.00	\$3,107.40	\$2,750.00
069		\$579.54		\$6,124.50	\$1,012.84	\$773.82	\$11,205.00	\$2,720.89

FIPS	Person				Property			
	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)
071					\$462.50	\$365.03	\$4,000.00	\$1,212.62
073					\$1,279.59	\$597.00	\$1,279.59	\$1,129.85
075	\$2,000.00	\$157.50	\$2,000.00	\$165.00	\$231.28	\$300.00	\$1,625.00	\$1,125.00
077					\$3,022.22	\$350.00	\$3,954.31	\$1,259.60
079		\$150.00		\$150.00	\$11,440.92	\$2,211.11	\$12,000.00	\$2,987.28
081	\$1,200.00		\$1,200.00		\$3,175.00	\$1,035.70	\$3,350.00	\$3,000.00
083	\$250.00	\$300.00	\$250.00	\$418.00	\$865.00	\$1,400.00	\$7,272.50	\$3,050.00
085	\$3,000.00	\$482.00	\$3,000.00	\$482.00	\$1,400.00	\$330.00	\$6,462.74	\$2,414.82
087	\$295.55	\$605.00	\$15,856.47	\$2,340.99	\$749.99	\$453.02	\$10,358.59	\$4,750.00
089	\$90.00		\$90.00		\$590.00	\$314.24	\$1,642.14	\$1,000.00
093	\$736.17		\$736.17		\$950.00	\$1,533.76	\$3,352.69	\$4,000.00
097					\$3,407.09	\$1,974.90	\$3,407.09	\$3,407.09
099		\$1,108.37		\$1,108.38	\$164.00	\$594.63	\$300.00	\$599.25
101	\$1,813.82	\$271.86	\$3,277.63	\$333.71	\$7,212.64	\$381.53	\$12,000.00	\$2,500.00
105					\$1,846.97		\$3,203.94	
107	\$529.17	\$1,907.12	\$1,000.00	\$4,511.00	\$663.90	\$160.00	\$2,500.00	\$4,944.99
109					\$591.19	\$450.00	\$12,118.67	\$2,000.00
111		\$1,916.47		\$1,916.47	\$1,780.00	\$4,303.48	\$1,780.00	\$8,635.17
113					\$1,333.00	\$215.97	\$1,333.00	\$250.00
115						\$371.00		\$570.00
117		\$285.00		\$512.58	\$2,239.52	\$278.41	\$4,000.00	\$801.42
119		\$99.00		\$99.00	\$205.00	\$202.15	\$205.00	\$893.55
121		\$81.00		\$10,435.13	\$1,000.00	\$322.52	\$3,611.53	\$3,611.53
125					\$1,295.00	\$70.00	\$2,627.70	\$162.00
127	\$389.55	\$231.34	\$494.86	\$401.89	\$1,345.00	\$62.50	\$2,590.00	\$300.00
131	\$440.00		\$440.00		\$904.00	\$469.50	\$2,250.00	\$904.00
133					\$2,000.00		\$2,000.00	
135					\$849.75	\$116.67	\$849.75	\$266.67
137		\$105.00		\$200.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,478.54	\$3,298.50	\$7,359.08
139					\$641.98	\$341.39	\$1,000.00	\$7,556.20
141		\$1,412.30		\$1,412.30	\$557.49	\$520.00	\$2,371.81	\$1,000.00
143	\$1,477.19	\$1,129.50	\$1,477.19	\$1,700.00	\$2,310.51	\$900.00	\$190,390.00	\$7,702.00
145		\$107.47		\$190.21	\$250.00		\$1,227.00	
149		\$310.00		\$2,216.45	\$1,668.78	\$614.33	\$2,180.50	\$3,500.00

FIPS	Person				Property			
	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)
153	\$307.50	\$243.75	\$2,334.75	\$7,588.14	\$650.00	\$800.00	\$6,254.82	\$6,690.00
155	\$1,928.33		\$1,929.85		\$1,364.58	\$550.00	\$3,415.33	\$1,400.00
159					\$1,362.50		\$1,512.50	
161	\$70.00	\$3,356.00	\$100.00	\$3,356.00	\$1,180.00	\$225.00	\$3,741.00	\$2,215.82
163	\$65.00	\$422.00	\$65.00	\$819.00	\$2,445.00	\$231.63	\$54,660.00	\$950.00
165	\$30.00	\$1,863.05	\$30.00	\$1,950.00	\$814.03	\$500.00	\$2,000.00	\$5,700.00
167					\$2,933.72	\$61.33	\$5,367.44	\$5,367.44
169		\$150.00		\$150.00	\$1,000.00	\$800.00	\$8,000.00	\$1,545.00
171		\$450.00		\$2,634.45	\$1,197.00	\$361.17	\$3,189.00	\$1,335.92
173	\$644.69	\$749.03	\$644.69	\$749.03		\$380.00		\$8,609.70
175		\$69.00		\$69.00	\$1,755.00	\$4,492.12	\$2,994.08	\$4,492.12
177	\$547.00	\$162.50	\$6,987.00	\$2,240.30	\$500.00	\$450.00	\$8,773.42	\$4,792.00
179	\$3,047.37	\$606.32	\$3,047.38	\$606.33	\$400.00	\$286.13	\$5,642.09	\$27,725.00
181	\$406.29		\$406.29					
183					\$514.58	\$601.54	\$691.92	\$688.50
185		\$192.60		\$1,987.00	\$541.25	\$350.00	\$1,444.90	\$558.42
187		\$736.06		\$1,209.12	\$1,852.73	\$125.00	\$2,640.86	\$1,000.00
191					\$300.00	\$381.87	\$500.00	\$1,013.73
193					\$600.00	\$104.95	\$600.00	\$200.00
195					\$3,099.16	\$134.00	\$10,000.00	\$700.00
197	\$60.00	\$552.67	\$60.00	\$552.67	\$550.00	\$271.15	\$550.00	\$800.00
199					\$350.00	\$290.98	\$1,247.00	\$5,000.00
510	\$350.00	\$135.00	\$800.00	\$600.00	\$350.00	\$265.00	\$512.80	\$5,750.00
520		\$193.84		\$193.84	\$793.43	\$100.00	\$1,643.33	\$177.69
530					\$237.50	\$200.00	\$300.00	\$526.00
540					\$389.75	\$335.48	\$1,566.00	\$790.00
550	\$910.00	\$690.00	\$18,293.85	\$1,536.12	\$760.00	\$1,050.00	\$5,000.00	\$7,713.11
570		\$169.67		\$169.67	\$677.45	\$125.00	\$5,582.86	\$600.00
590		\$1,252.00		\$2,354.00	\$400.00	\$380.00	\$9,054.00	\$1,000.00
595					\$878.50	\$297.00	\$927.00	\$1,400.00
610	\$697.00	\$728.55	\$697.00	\$728.55				
620					\$1,560.00	\$427.49	\$1,560.00	\$3,112.66
630					\$5,530.78	\$23.35	\$5,530.78	\$164.34
640					\$380.00	\$500.00	\$380.00	\$3,395.00

FIPS	Person				Property			
	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)	Delinquency Felony (Median)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Median)	Delinquency Felony (Maximum)	Delinquency Misdemeanor (Maximum)
650	\$621.15	\$139.94	\$1,707.27	\$940.82	\$750.00	\$500.00	\$53,134.00	\$3,949.52
670	\$560.00		\$560.00		\$317.04	\$350.00	\$1,657.66	\$1,700.00
680	\$250.00	\$624.00	\$250.00	\$830.44	\$500.00	\$206.44	\$1,974.00	\$7,457.84
690	\$100.00	\$60.00	\$100.00	\$258.00	\$1,202.37	\$1,159.91	\$1,725.03	\$1,482.00
700					\$850.00	\$276.72	\$7,000.00	\$800.00
710	\$150.00	\$224.49	\$150.00	\$500.00	\$605.44	\$350.00	\$5,642.00	\$1,550.77
730					\$625.00	\$390.00	\$20,186.00	\$390.00
740					\$450.00	\$201.98	\$1,325.10	\$729.50
750	\$1,099.99		\$1,099.99		\$1,262.26	\$995.00	\$1,262.26	\$995.00
760	\$1,500.00	\$357.91	\$1,500.00	\$465.82	\$470.44	\$500.00	\$3,464.46	\$3,719.50
770	\$297.88	\$267.88	\$450.00	\$413.76	\$429.49	\$472.37	\$4,937.00	\$1,400.00
775	\$3,518.69	\$105.29	\$3,580.20	\$1,190.78	\$1,520.00	\$168.10	\$3,300.00	\$3,991.12
790					\$1,700.00	\$70.00	\$3,000.00	\$4,000.00
800	\$322.25	\$2,816.91	\$455.38	\$2,816.91	\$1,487.50	\$359.00	\$37,660.99	\$8,109.67
810	\$270.00	\$412.79	\$1,028.00	\$2,259.26	\$587.46	\$310.92	\$17,436.33	\$4,500.00
820		\$130.66		\$1,391.39	\$200.00	\$46.92	\$11,131.32	\$823.41
830	\$262.50	\$862.40	\$262.50	\$1,100.00	\$894.78	\$115.37	\$1,600.00	\$2,980.62
840		\$177.00		\$1,608.82	\$655.00	\$296.00	\$18,875.00	\$3,184.79

