FY-2025

On 16 July 2024, the Commission dismissed a complaint against a juvenile court judge for violation of Rule 1.1 by improperly granting a party's request to violate a temporary restraining order ("TRO") during a hearing. The judge was aware of the TRO and had no authority to permit its violation. After the hearing, they realized the error and recused at the next hearing after apologizing to all parties and publicly acknowledging the mistake. Subsequently, they self-reported to the presiding judge, met with Judicial Council members, and self-reported to the Commission. The Commission found the behavior and misconduct were troubling but relatively minor for which no public sanction was warranted.

On 17 October 2024, the Commission dismissed a complaint against a justice court judge for violations of:

1. Rule 2.8(B) The judge became impatient and found an attorney in contempt which was later vacated.
2. Rule 2.6(B) When defendants requested a trial, the judge required defendants to provide tax returns to verify indigency.
3. Rule 2.9(A) & (C) The judge spoke to a defendant's private probation provider without both parties and asked for a meeting with only prosecuting attorneys.
4. Rule 1.3 (cmt 1) In the prosecutor only meeting, they felt pressured by the judge.
5. Rule 2.4(B) & (C) The judge ordered recoupment fees with a mind of benefitting a county agency.

The judge took full responsibility for their behavior and was apologetic. The Commission found the behavior and misconduct were troubling but relatively minor for which no public sanction was warranted.

On 3 December 2024, the Commission dismissed a complaint against a justice court judge for violation of Rule 2.8(B) for being impatient with a court clerk. The court clerk disagreed with the judge. Impatiently, the judge asked the clerk if they wanted to quit their job. The judge took full responsibility for their behavior and was apologetic. The Commission found the behavior and misconduct were troubling but relatively minor for which no public sanction was warranted.

On 4 March 2025, the Commission dismissed a complaint against a justice court judge for violation of Rules 1.3 and 2.4(B) for not allowing defendants a choice in probation services providers ("PSP") by offering only one PSP or assigning the same PSP without any input from the defendant. This conduct may be viewed as advancing the interests of such PSP or seem that the judge might be influenced by that PSP. The judge understands this conduct has a negative impact on the confidence and integrity of the judiciary. The judge took full responsibility for their behavior and was apologetic. The Commission found the behavior and misconduct were troubling but relatively minor for which no public sanction was warranted.

On 4 March 2025, the Commission dismissed a complaint against a district court judge for violation of Rule 2.5(A) by not issuing an expeditious ruling. Despite the complexity of the case, challenging parties, and personal impediments, the judge acknowledged lacking diligence in issuing rulings. The judge took full responsibility for their behavior and was apologetic. The Commission found the behavior and misconduct were troubling but relatively minor for which no public sanction was warranted.