

## **FY22**

On September 21, 2021, the Judicial Conduct Commission dismissed two separate complaints with warnings against a District Court judge as to the following Rule violation: Rule 2.5 violation for failing to expeditiously determine matters under submission and failing to resolve issues without unnecessary cost or delay. The matters were under advisement for many months in excess of the periods allowed under the administrative rules. The Judge acknowledged the negative impact of not expeditiously determining these cases and the avoidable delay and unnecessary costs caused by the judge's lack of action. Although the Judicial Council had suspended these certain administrative rules during the period of time at issue due to the pandemic, the Judge understands that ethical obligations of diligence under the Code of Judicial Conduct were not suspended. In mitigation, the Commission recognized the impact of the pandemic, the loss of a judicial clerk and staff turnover, the significant personal issues facing the Judge during this time, as well as that the Judge has taken full responsibility for the lack of action, did not intend to violate the Code of Judicial Conduct, was apologetic, and worked with the Commission to resolve these matters. The Commission found that the behavior and misconduct were troubling, but relatively minor for which no public sanction was warranted.