

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND IMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINE

The above-entitled matter having come on for hearing on October 15, 1998, before the NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE (hereinafter referred to as the COMMISSION), Fred D. Gibson, III, Esq. appearing as Special Prosecutor for the State of Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline, and William B. Terry, Esq. appearing as attorney for the RESPONDENT.

After hearing the allegations and proofs of the parties, the arguments of counsel and having considered the evidence introduced by both parties, the RESPONDENT having stipulated that the evidence clearly and convincingly established grounds for disciplinary action for a violation of the provisions of Canon 3B(8) of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct, the COMMISSION states that this proceeding was a Formal Hearing pursuant to the Administrative and Procedural Rules applicable to the NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE for the purpose of determining whether the acts and conduct of the RESPONDENT warrant the imposition of discipline. The COMMISSION makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law which constitute the Decision of the Commission in this matter.

Findings of Fact

The COMMISSION finds that the legal evidence presented by the Special Prosecutor at the Formal Hearing clearly and convincingly established each of the facts hereinafter set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 3 of these Findings of Facts:

1.

- 8 9
- 12 13 14 15 16 17

10

11

18 19

20 21

22 23

25 26

24

27 28

- RESPONDENT is a District Court Judge for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, Family Division. That while serving in said capacity RESPONDENT failed to dispose of judicial matters promptly and efficiently in the case of <u>Callahan v. Callahan</u>, Case No. D153104, in that matters were orally decided by the RESPONDENT on or about March 4, 1996, March 20, 1996 and October 30, 1996 and written orders with respect to each of those matters were not entered until March 12, 1997.
- RESPONDENT is a District Court Judge for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, Family 2. Division. That while serving in said capacity RESPONDENT failed to dispose of judicial matters promptly and efficiently in the case of Johnson v. Johnson, Case No. A143627 in that on or about June 23, 1995, RESPONDENT took the matter under submission and did not render a decision until on or about January 17, 1997.
- RESPONDENT is a District Court Judge for the County of Clark, State of Nevada, Family 3. Division. That while serving in said capacity RESPONDENT failed to dispose of judicial matters promptly and efficiently in the case of <u>Leysath v. Leysath</u>, Case No. D164546 in that on or about August 3, 1995, the presentation of evidence was concluded and counsel were ordered by the RESPONDENT to submit written final arguments. That on or about November 7, 1995, RESPONDENT orally announced her decision in the matter and the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decree of Divorce were not entered until June 18, 1997.

From the above facts, the COMMISSION concludes:

Conclusions of Law

- That RESPONDENT's conduct as set forth in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the Findings of Fact, 1. violated ARJD 11(3) and:
 - Canon 3B(8) which provides, "A judge shall dispose of all judicial matters promptly, a. efficiently and fairly."

Decision and Imposition of Discipline

At the conclusion of the Probable Cause Hearing on May 28, 1998, the COMMISSION suggested to the RESPONDENT that she attend the course entitled "Decision Making" at the National Judicial College located in Reno, Nevada, pending the setting of a date for the formal hearing. The

COMMISSION was able to make the foregoing suggestion at the conclusion of the probable cause hearing since the RESPONDENT had stipulated there was probable cause that a violation of the Canons had occurred. The RESPONDENT has provided the Commission with a Certificate of Completion of the aforementioned course.

At the Formal Hearing conducted on October 15, 1998, the RESPONDENT demonstrated to the COMMISSION that through diligent effort she had brought her calendar current. RESPONDENT also provided the COMMISSION with documented evidence of procedures she has instituted to ensure that her decisions would be entered promptly in the future. RESPONDENT also made a sincere public apology for any inconvenience or difficulty her delay in rendering decisions may have caused the litigants in the cases mentioned in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

The NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE concludes that the diligent and extraordinary effort RESPONDENT has made to correct the matters complained of and the sincere public apology made at the formal hearing are appropriate discipline for the conduct evidenced in this case. The COMMISSION orders the RESPONDENT to attend the course entitled "Survival Skills for the Domestic Relations Judge" at the National Judicial College in Reno, Nevada, and to provide the COMMISSION with a Certificate of Completion.

DATED this 24⁴ day of October, 1998.

NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

1 From Brusa

FRANK BRUSA, Chairman

BRENT ADAMS, Commissioner

MICHAEL R. GRIFFIN, Commissioner

HARLAN ELGES, Vice-Chairman

NEVADA COMMISSION ON

JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

ALERIE COOKE, Commissioner

ALAN J. ZEFEBVRE Čommissioner

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that on the 27th day of October, 1998, I placed the FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND IMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINE in the United States Mail, postage pre-paid, addressed to the undersigned:

William B. Terry, Esq. 530 South Seventh Street Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorney for Respondent

Fred D. Gibson, III, Esq. 2300 W. Sahara, Suite 740 Las Vegas, NV 89102 Special Presenter

Munelle MICHELLE WRIGHT, Commission Clerk