IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF UTAH

-0000000

Re: Inquiry Concerning a Judge

No. 20180843-SC

JCC Case No. 19-6JU-001

ORDER

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Supreme Court by Article VIII, Section 13 of the Utah Constitution and Utah Code Ann. § 78A-11-111, the Court approves the implementation of the Judicial Conduct Commission's Order of Reprimand. The following shall be deemed public documents: (l) this order; (2) the Judicial Conduct Commission's Order of Reprimand dated 25 October 2018; and (3) the Judicial Conduct Commission's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. All other materials, records, and proceedings of the above-captioned matter will remain private and confidential pursuant to Subpart (6) of Utah Supreme Court Standing Order 5 and Utah Code § 78A-11-112(3) for a period of thirty (30) years from the date of this order.

FOR THE COURT:

ted Matthew B. Durran

Chief Justice

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 2, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing ORDER was deposited in the United States mail or was sent by electronic mail to be delivered to:

19-6JU-001 614 E 400 S MANTI UT 84642

ALEX G PETERSON

JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSION

apeterson@utah.gov

Nicole Gray

Clerk of Court

Case No. 20180843

JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSION, 19-6JU-001

BEFORE THE UTAI	H JUDICI	AL CONDUCT COMMISSION
IN RE:)	SUBSTITUTE ORDER OF REPRIMAND
HON. BRODY KEISEL)	Case No. 19-6JU-001

The Judicial Conduct Commission authorized its staff to negotiate the terms of and enter into a written Stipulation for discipline by consent in this matter. The Stipulation has been signed and approved by the Commission's Executive Director and the Hon. Brody Keisel, and sets forth facts and conclusions that support both a finding of judicial misconduct and the issuance of a reprimand for ex parte communications in violation of Rule 2.9. The Judicial Conduct Commission hereby approves the Stipulation and recommends that the Utah Supreme Court impose a reprimand in this matter.

The Judicial Conduct Commission hereby orders that the Hon. Brody Keisel be reprimanded. This Order shall only take effect upon implementation of the same by the Utah Supreme Court.

DATED this 45h day of October, 2018.

James S. Jardine, Chair

Judicial Conduct/Commission

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the day of October 2018, I mailed, via postage prepaid first class mail, a true and correct signed copy of the foregoing Order of Reprimand to:

Hon. Brody L. Keisel 614 East 400 South Manti, Utah 84642

IN RE: FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	BEFORE THE UTAH JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSION		
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		FINDINGS OF FACT AND	
		CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	
HON. BRODY KEISEL			

The Judicial Conduct Commission ("JCC"), having reviewed the parties'
Stipulation and having approved the same, now therefore enters the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The Hon. Brody Keisel ("Judge Keisel") was appointed to the Sixth
 District Juvenile Court in February 2018 and has served continuously as a Juvenile
 Justice Court Judge since that time.
- 2. Judge Keisel has never been privately or publicly disciplined by the Judicial Conduct Commission ("JCC") or the Utah Supreme Court.
 - 3. In March 2018, Judge Keisel began working on juvenile cases.
- 4. Over time, Judge Keisel became acquainted with various Juvenile Justice Services ("JJS") case workers.
- 5. Judge Keisel was assigned a particularly difficult and long-running juvenile case ("Case J").
- 6. As he oversaw Case J, Judge Keisel regularly interacted with the assigned JJS case worker ("Ms. CW") in the courtroom.
 - 7. In late April / early May, Ms. CW requested a meeting with Judge

Keisel to discuss various difficulties with Case J.

- 8. In late April / early May, Judge Keisel met with Ms. CW and discussed substantive matters regarding Case J. They also briefly discussed personal matters regarding each other's health and medical concerns.
- 9. After a May 8th hearing regarding Case J, Ms. CW called Judge Keisel regarding Case J and updated him on the progress, difficulties and a possible order requesting return to detention.
- 10. During the early evening on May 15th, Judge Keisel received a phone call from Ms. CW requesting a pickup order in Case J.
- 11. On May 16th, during a detention hearing in Case J, these earlier communications were not disclosed. Judge Keisel scheduled the next hearing for 23 May.
- 12. During the next several days, Judge Keisel received messages fromMs. CW regarding Case J, possible resolutions and possible orders.
- 13. Subsequent to May 16th, but prior to the 23 May scheduled hearing,

 Judge Keisel had a meeting with Ms. CW in his Manti office, where they discussed

 possible resolutions of Case J. They also briefly again discussed their own personal
 medical histories.
- 14. At the May 23rd schedule hearing these communications were not disclosed.
- 15. In hindsight, Judge Keisel recognizes that these communications with Ms CW regarding Case J were ex parte in nature and should have been disclosed to all the parties in Case J.

- 16. On 5 July 2018, Judge Keisel self-reported this matter to the Utah Judicial Conduct Commission.
- 17. Judge Keisel submitted a letter addressed to the Judicial Conduct Commission admitting responsibility, acknowledging the communications, apologizing for his conduct, expressing his regret, and acknowledging that he should have disclosed these communications to all the parties.
- 18. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.9 Ex Parte Communications provides that "A judge shall not initiate, permit, or consider ex parte communications, or consider other communications made to the judge outside the presence of the parties of their lawyers, concerning a pending or impending matter, except as follows:"
- 19. Judge Keisel acknowledges and admits that his communications withMs. CW were ex parte and did not fall under the allowed exceptions.
- 20. Judge Keisel did not intend any violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- Nevertheless, Judge Keisel's communications with Ms. CW violated
 Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.9.
- 2. Judge Keisel negligently (but not intentionally, willfully or with bad faith) engaged in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice which brings a judicial office into disrepute.
 - 3. Judge Keisel has accepted responsibility for his actions and has

expressed sincere remorse for any harm his actions may have caused.

4. A public reprimand is an appropriate sanction in this matter and Judge Keisel agrees to accept the same.

DATED this 15th day of October, 2018.

James S. Jardine, Chair

Judicial Conduct Commission

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 15 day of October, 2018, I mailed, via postage prepaid first class mail, a true and correct signed copy of the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law to:

Hon. Brody Keisel 614 East 400 South Manti, Utah 84642