



1 **BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE**

2 **STATE OF NEVADA**

3 In the Matter of )  
 4 THE HONORABLE MELANIE ANDRESS- )  
 TOBIASSON, Justice of the Peace, Las Vegas ) CASE NO. 2019-090  
 5 Justice Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, )  
 6 Respondent. )

8 In the Matter of )  
 9 THE HONORABLE AMY CHELINI, Justice ) CASE NO. 2019-091  
 of the Peace, Las Vegas Justice Court, Clark )  
 10 County, State of Nevada, )  
 11 Respondent. )

13 **ORDER CONTINUING COMMISSION INVESTIGATIONS**

14 Pursuant to prior written notice, the above-entitled matter was set for a two-day consolidated  
 15 public interim suspension hearing before the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline  
 16 (“Commission”) commencing on December 16, 2019, in Las Vegas, Nevada. Thomas C. Bradley, Esq.  
 17 and Brian R. Hutchins, Esq. served as the Prosecuting Officers to the Commission (hereinafter, the  
 18 “Prosecuting Officers”) and were present. Respondent Andress-Tobiasson (“Tobiasson”) was  
 19 represented by William B. Terry, Esq. and Respondent Chelini was represented by Thomas F. Pitaro,  
 20 Esq., all of whom were present. During the hearing, the Commission considered all evidence and  
 21 testimony presented.<sup>1</sup>

22 ///

23 ///

25 <sup>1</sup> The information previously relied on by the Commission in determining that Respondents pose a substantial threat of  
 26 serious harm to the public or the administration of justice is contained, in its entirety, in Prosecuting Officers’ Exhibit 1,  
 27 Bates Nos. 1 through 1019, which was admitted into evidence at the public hearing on December 16 and December 17,  
 28 2019. Prosecuting Officers’ Exhibit 1 includes, among other things, (i) the complaints filed against each Respondent; (ii)  
 Investigation Reports prepared and submitted to the Commission by the Commission’s investigator, along with multiple  
 supporting exhibits pertaining to each Respondent; and (iii) interview summaries prepared by the Commission’s investigator  
 of sixteen (16) investigative interviews, together with the interview transcripts of said interviews (collectively referred to  
 herein as either the “*pre-intent to suspend* evidentiary record” or “evidentiary record”).

1           **A.     PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND *PRE-INTENT TO SUSPEND EVIDENTIARY***  
2           **RECORD**

3           At its meeting on May 31, 2019, the Commission unanimously authorized the Executive  
4 Director of the Commission to file complaints against Respondents based on objectively verifiable  
5 evidence from which a reasonable inference could be drawn<sup>2</sup> that Respondents were abusing the  
6 prestige of their respective offices, interfering in Human Resource matters pertaining to the assignment  
7 and discipline of court clerks, creating a hostile work environment for Las Vegas Justice Court  
8 Administration and staff, as well as various other allegations of misconduct. The Commission  
9 authorized a thorough investigation into these matters.<sup>3</sup>

10           On October 18, 2019, the Commission unanimously decided to suspend the Respondents with  
11 pay pursuant to NRS 1.4675 based on the results of the Commission’s investigation (set forth in  
12 Prosecuting Officers’ Exhibit 1) which revealed evidence of (i) Justice Court administrators and others  
13 being bullied, harassed, threatened and intimidated by Respondents, thereby creating a hostile work  
14 environment;<sup>4</sup> (ii) the Justice Court Administrator, Justice Court Division Administrator and the Justice  
15 Court Clerk Supervisor being terminated allegedly in retaliation for either informing the Chief Judge of  
16 issues involving Respondents or for cooperating with the Commission’s investigations of  
17 Respondents;<sup>5</sup> (iii) other current Justice Court employees being retaliated against for allegedly either  
18 filing a complaint with the Commission and/or cooperating with the Commission’s investigations of  
19 Respondents; (iv) Justice Court administrators and supervisors being routinely addressed as “Mother  
20 Fu\*\*ers” and “Fu\*\*king Bitches” by Respondents *during working hours and toward and around*  
21 *employees;*<sup>6</sup>           (v) Respondent Tobiasson on more than one occasion wearing a sweater *inside and*

22 <sup>2</sup> NRS 1.4657(1) states that “[t]he Commission shall, in accordance with its procedural rules, examine each complaint that it  
23 receives to determine whether the complaint alleges objectively verifiable evidence from which a reasonable inference could  
24 be drawn that a judge committed misconduct or is incapacitated.”

25 <sup>3</sup> NRS 1.4657(3) states that “[i]f the Commission determines that a complaint does contain such allegations, the Commission  
26 shall authorize further investigation.”

27 <sup>4</sup> In their respective Commission investigative interviews, several witnesses stated that they and others were scared of  
28 Respondents and in fear of losing their jobs. One witness even expressed a fear of her physical safety based on statements  
made by Respondent Tobiasson that she [Respondent Tobiasson] knows a lot of people in town and that they “take care of  
things.” This witness perceived Respondent Tobiasson’s statements to be veiled threats of what Respondent could do to her  
if she [the witness] did not comply with Respondent Tobiasson’s demands.

<sup>5</sup> The Justice Court Division Administrator and Court Clerk Supervisor were both fired on July 3, 2019, just one (1) day  
after the Commission investigator contacted them to schedule an interview for July 5, 2019.

<sup>6</sup> The Nevada Supreme Court has held that “[a]busive conduct towards staff violates judicial canons.” *Matter of Halverson*,  
123 Nev. 493, 521, 169 P.3d 1161, 1180 (2007). The Nevada Supreme Court further noted that “[m]any cases nationwide  
hold that abusive conduct toward court personnel, ..., is inappropriate and subject to judicial discipline.” *Id.* The Nevada  
Supreme Court also discussed cases from Michigan and Maine which involved interim and temporary suspensions imposed

1 around the Justice Court that reads “Eat Sh\*t and Die”;<sup>7</sup> (vi) the Justice Court’s daily operations in  
2 servicing the public being plagued by strife and internal conflict by virtue of the practice of  
3 “blacklisting” and “reverse-blacklisting” court clerks by Respondents and others;<sup>8</sup> and (vii)  
4 Respondents’ interference in Justice Court Administration’s court clerk assignments as well as in  
5 disciplinary investigations and actions involving their respective court clerks.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, even the  
6 current Justice Court Administrator, Grissell Hernandez, characterized the Las Vegas Justice Court as a  
7 “mess” and a “sh\*t show across the board” due to lack of leadership and supervision.<sup>10</sup>

8 Based on its detailed review of the evidentiary record at the time, including Investigation  
9 Reports submitted by the Commission’s investigator, along with multiple supporting exhibits and  
10 witness interviews and related transcripts, the Commission decided to suspend the Respondents with

---

11 against judges based on abusive, discourteous and intemperate conduct and vulgar language. *Id.* (citations omitted).  
12 Moreover, in *Halverson*, fn. 57, the Nevada Supreme Court cites to an exhaustive list of judicial misconduct cases involving  
13 indecorous behavior toward court staff, including use of vulgarities and profanity, and confrontational, demeaning, impatient  
and undignified behavior.

14 <sup>7</sup> In her interview with the Commission’s investigator and at the hearing, Respondent Tobiasson admitted to wearing the  
15 sweater and even remarked that “I guess some could say it was inappropriate.” There was also evidence admitted at the  
16 hearing of a photo (taken in Respondent Tobiasson’s judicial chambers and posted to her personal Facebook page) of  
17 Respondent Tobiasson posing with a life-sized cardboard cutout of a famous actor (located in her judicial chambers even as  
18 of the date of the hearing) with her hand over the actor’s groin area. *See* Prosecuting Officers’ Exhibit 2, Bates No. 1027. In  
19 *Halverson*, the Nevada Supreme Court cited to *Matter of Ackel*, 155 Ariz. 34, 745 P.2d 92 (1987), which held that the use of  
20 profanity and sexual innuendo brings judicial office into disrepute. *Halverson*, 123 Nev. at 521, fn. 57, 169 P.3d at 1180, fn.  
21 57.

22 <sup>8</sup> “Blacklisting” refers to the practice of judges restricting certain clerks from working in their judicial departments, while  
23 “reverse-blacklisting” refers to the practice of judges restricting certain clerks from working in *other* judicial departments.  
24 *See* Chief Judge Bonaventure’s email to all Las Vegas Justice Court Judges dated December 31, 2015, Prosecuting Officers’  
25 Exhibit 1, Bates Nos. 51-52. Chief Judge Bonaventure also stated in his email that some court clerks “manipulate judges or  
26 misconduct themselves to produce these results. I have also been made aware that some judges refuse to report errors clerks  
27 make or refuse to allow clerks to be disciplined for errors. This all has created an unworkable, impractical, unrealistic  
28 position for court administration and staff.” *Id.* The evidentiary record supported that Respondent Tobiasson allegedly  
ordered two female court clerks, who filed complaints against Respondent Tobiasson’s male court clerk for improper  
behavior toward them, to not be assigned to her court. The evidentiary record further demonstrated that if anyone filed a  
complaint against Respondent Chelini’s court clerk for improper behavior toward them, Respondent would allegedly  
“blacklist” them and not permit them in her courtroom.

<sup>9</sup> The evidentiary record before the Commission revealed that Respondents would demand that court clerk transfers not take  
place, disciplinary actions not be taken and/or imposed and, in some cases, would order Justice Court Administration to not  
speak to their respective clerks or discipline them in any way, despite evidence that these clerks created a hostile work  
environment by bullying, demeaning and belittling other court clerks and, with respect to Respondent Tobiasson’s court  
clerk, exhibiting improper behavior toward women. The evidentiary record before the Commission further revealed that  
Respondent Chelini demanded that any coaching and counseling ordered to be given to her court clerk be rescinded, even if  
it had already occurred, so it would not appear on her court clerk’s employment record. The Nevada Supreme Court has  
held that “[f]ailure to cooperate with court administration violates judicial canons when it interferes with court functioning.”  
*Halverson*, 123 Nev. at 523, 169 P.3d at 1181 (citing in fn. 64 to several cases imposing judicial discipline for rude,  
disrespectful, and hostile treatment of court personnel which adversely impacted court administration).

<sup>10</sup> In her interview with the Commission’s investigator, Ms. Hernandez actually admitted that “when I was promoted into a  
new division at a new complete role, so I went from being the executive assistant to being basically the manager of a whole  
division, there was no expectation given to me. So I could have technically sat in my office for a whole year and done  
nothing.” *See* Prosecuting Officers’ Exhibit 1, Interview Transcript, Bates No. 403.

1 pay pursuant to NRS 1.4675. In *Halverson*, the Nevada Supreme Court observed that “in determining  
2 whether a current threat [of harm to the public or administration of justice] exists, the Commission  
3 should consider the totality of the circumstances, based on the information available to it.” *Halverson*,  
4 123 Nev. at 497, 169 P.3d at 1165.<sup>11</sup> In its Notice of Intent to Suspend Respondents, the Commission  
5 informed Respondents that they were entitled to a minimum of seven (7) days’ notice of the  
6 Commission’s intention to suspend them and an opportunity to respond pursuant to NRS 1.4675(5).

7 The Nevada Supreme Court has offered this Commission guidance in applying evidence to  
8 suspension hearings brought before it. Our Supreme Court’s seminal case, *Halverson, supra* (line 1),  
9 has also carefully considered interim suspension cases from other states. The Supreme Court has  
10 concluded, *inter alia*, that (i) “interim suspension is warranted to protect the integrity of the judiciary  
11 pending the resolution of the case”; (ii) “the question in judicial interim suspension cases is not one of  
12 guilt or innocence, but the seriousness of the charges against the judge and the consequent effect on  
13 public confidence in the judiciary”; and (iii) with respect to certain enumerated factors relevant to a  
14 temporary suspension determination, including, in part, what “effect the conduct has had on the  
15 integrity of and the public’s respect for the judiciary.” *Id.* at 510-512, 169 P.3d at 1173-1174 (citations  
16 omitted).

17 As further noted by the Nevada Supreme Court, “[a]n effective justice system requires public  
18 confidence in the judiciary’s integrity. As stated by the Michigan Supreme Court in *Del Rio*, ‘it is  
19 important not only that the integrity of the judiciary be preserved but that the appearance of that  
20 integrity be maintained.’” *Halverson*, 123 Nev. at 522, 169 P.3d at 1180 (citation omitted).

21 Moreover, the Nevada Supreme Court further observed that “focusing the inquiry on whether a  
22 judge poses a current or future threat does not require the Commission to disregard evidence of past  
23 misconduct that would indicate an ongoing problem. Past misconduct is a reasonable basis upon which  
24 to predict future conduct, and we have expressly recognized this premise in several legal contexts.” *Id.*  
25 at 512, 169 P.3d at 1174 (citations omitted).

26  
27  
28 <sup>11</sup> “A common thread running through judicial interim suspension decisions is the need to protect the integrity of and public  
confidence in the judiciary.” *Halverson*, 123 Nev. at 524, 169 P.3d at 1182 (citation omitted).

1 On November 5, 2019, each Respondent filed a Response to Notice of Commission’s Intent to  
2 Suspend With Salary, wherein both Respondents chose to not waive their respective rights to a public  
3 hearing before being suspended by the Commission. Accordingly, pursuant to the Commission’s Order  
4 Setting Consolidated Hearing issued on November 8, 2019,<sup>12</sup> and NRS 1.4675(5), a consolidated public  
5 hearing was scheduled for December 16 and 17, 2019, at the William S. Boyd School of Law, Thomas  
6 & Mack Moot Court Facility, in Las Vegas, Nevada. At the public hearing, the Commission considered  
7 over 1,211 pages of exhibits and the sworn testimony of 10 witnesses.

8 **B. STANDARD OF LAW**

9 **Nevada Constitution, Art. 6, Sec. 21(9)**

10 The Commission in its discretion may suspend a justice or judge from the exercise of his  
11 office pending the determination of the proceedings before the Commission.

12 **NRS 1.4675**

13 (4) During any stage of a disciplinary proceeding, the Commission may suspend the  
14 judge from the exercise of office with salary pending a final disposition of the complaint  
15 if the Commission determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the judge poses  
16 a substantial threat of serious harm to the public or to the administration of justice.

17 (5) The Commission shall give the judge 7 days’ notice of its intention to suspend the  
18 judge pursuant to this section and shall give the judge an opportunity to respond. The  
19 Commission shall hold a public hearing before ordering such a suspension, unless the  
20 judge waives the right to the hearing. The decision of the Commission must be made  
21 public.

22 (6) A judge suspended pursuant to this section may appeal the suspension to the  
23 appellate court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to the rules fixed by the Supreme  
24 Court pursuant to Section 4 of Article 6 of the Nevada Constitution. If a judge appeals  
25 such a suspension:

26 (a) The standard of review for such an appeal is an abuse of discretion standard;

27  
28 <sup>12</sup> Each Respondent filed a Motion to Consolidate Hearing on November 5, 2019. A Notice of Non-Opposition to Respondents’ Motions to Consolidate was filed by Co-Prosecuting Officer Thomas C. Bradley, Esq. on November 8, 2019.

1 and

2 (b) The proceedings held at the appellate court of competent jurisdiction  
3 pursuant to the rules fixed by the Supreme Court concerning the suspension must  
4 be open to the public.

5 **Commission Procedural Rule 9. Suspension**

6 (1) The Commission may suspend a Judge from the exercise of the office in accordance  
7 with NRS 1.4675 and NRS 1.4677(1).

8 (2) The Commission shall give the Respondent seven (7) days' notice of its intention to  
9 suspend. The Judge may submit documents in opposition to suspension which shall be  
10 considered by the Commission. The Commission shall hold a public hearing before  
11 ordering such a suspension unless the Judge waives the right to the hearing.

12 (3) A Respondent suspended under these rules may appeal to the Nevada Supreme  
13 Court.

14 (4) The Commission shall promptly file a certified copy of the notice of suspension with  
15 the clerk of the Nevada Supreme Court.

16 **Procedural Due Process and Interim Suspension Standards**

17 *Matter of Halverson*, 123 Nev. 493, 169 P.3d 1161 (2007). In *Halverson*, the Nevada  
18 Supreme Court addressed numerous issues concerning the procedure to be followed and  
19 the standards to be applied in judicial interim suspension cases.

20 **C. COMMISSION'S DECISION AND ORDER**

21 In exercising its discretion as conferred on the Commission pursuant to Art. 6, Sec. 21(9) of the  
22 Nevada Constitution, the Commission has decided to not take action against Respondents at this time.  
23 The Commission's investigations against Respondents shall continue in accordance with Nevada law  
24 until such time that the Commission decides, if at all, to file a Formal Statement of Charges against  
25 Respondents. Respondents are ordered to fully cooperate with the Commission's ongoing  
26 investigations against them pursuant to NRS 1.460 (Public officers and employees to cooperate with  
27  
28

1 Commission)<sup>13</sup> and Rule 2.16 (Cooperation with Disciplinary Authorities)<sup>14</sup> of the Revised Nevada  
2 Code of Judicial Conduct.

3         The Commission also reminds Clark County that they have a legal obligation to comply with  
4 constitutionally authorized subpoenas duces tecum issued by the Commission in connection with these  
5 matters.<sup>15</sup> Under the Nevada Constitution, Art. 6, Sec. 21(11)(b), as a *Court* of Judicial Performance,  
6 the Commission is authorized to “[s]ummon witnesses to appear and testify under oath and compel the  
7 production of books, papers, documents and records[.]” To date, Clark County has rejected, and is  
8 currently refusing to comply with, certain subpoenas duces tecum issued by the Commission, the effect  
9 of which is obstructing the Commission’s investigations against Respondents, thereby delaying the  
10 receipt of critical documents and information needed by the Commission to further proceed in the  
11 investigatory phase of the judicial discipline process.<sup>16</sup>

12         If the Commission decided to suspend Respondents at this time, NRS 1.4675(7) requires that the  
13 Prosecuting Officers file Formal Statement of Charges against Respondents within just sixty (60) days.  
14 As noted in *Halverson*, “[i]f the Commission unduly prolongs its decision about whether to file formal  
15 charges, so that the suspension extends beyond what could reasonably be characterized as temporary,  
16

---

17 <sup>13</sup> NRS 1.460(1) states that “[a]ll public officers and employees of the State, its agencies and political subdivisions and all  
18 officers of the court shall cooperate with the Commission in any lawful investigation or proceeding of the Commission and  
19 furnish information and reasonable assistance to the Commission or its authorized representative.”

20 <sup>14</sup> Code Rule 2.16(A) requires judges to “cooperate and be candid and honest with judicial and lawyer disciplinary  
21 agencies.” Comment [1] to Code Rule 2.16 provides that “[c]ooperation with investigations and proceedings of judicial and  
22 lawyer discipline agencies, as required in paragraph (A), instills confidence in judges’ commitment to the integrity of the  
23 judicial system and the protection of the public.”

24 <sup>15</sup> See Nevada Constitution, Art. 6, Sec. 21(11)(b), NRS 1.460, NRS 1.466 and Commission Procedural Rule 20. The  
25 Commission found it very troubling that Clark County’s Office of Diversity (“OOD”) provided a closing memorandum of a  
26 highly confidential employee investigation concerning one of the Prosecuting Officers’ witnesses to two of Respondents’  
27 witnesses as a “public record.” See Memorandum of the OOD dated March 20, 2019, Respondents’ Exhibit F (not Bates  
28 stamped by Respondents’ counsel). This Memorandum was subsequently included in Respondents’ hearing exhibits by  
Respondents’ counsel just a few days prior to the hearing and apparently provided to a reporter who has since publicly  
disseminated such information, all the while the Commission’s subpoena duces tecum for certain personnel records remain  
rejected to this day along with the Commission’s subpoena duces tecum for electronic mail messages for certain former  
Clark County employees which have also not been produced to date. In the course of the Commission hearing, however, the  
Justice Court Administrator, Grissell Hernandez, after refusing to answer the Prosecuting Officer’s question regarding the  
identity of the person who filed the complaint with the OOD, and after having to be ordered to do so by Presiding Judge  
Mason Simons, eventually testified that the individual who filed the complaint against the witness in question was in fact  
Respondent Chelini’s court clerk.

<sup>16</sup> If Clark County continues to reject the Commission’s lawfully issued subpoenas duces tecum, the Commission will be  
forced to hold Clark County in contempt of court and impose a penalty to enforce the subpoenas pursuant to NRS 1.466(2)  
and Commission Procedural Rule 20. If Clark County continues to refuse to comply, the Commission shall then follow the  
procedures set forth in NRS 1.466(3),(4) and (5) before the Clark County District Court to address Clark County’s continued  
non-compliance.

1 then the due process analysis could change.” *Halverson*, 123 Nev. at 518-519, 169 P.3d at 1178. <sup>17</sup> Not  
2 only does much more evidence remain to be gathered and analyzed (interrupted by the public  
3 suspension hearing), but the ‘60 day’ rule would inhibit the Commission from continuing its thorough  
4 investigations.

5         Consequently, to avoid violating NRS 1.4675(7), as well as any due process challenges  
6 identified in *Halverson* based on delays in filing formal charges, the Commission has decided to forego  
7 the expediency of suspending the Respondents at this time in favor of continuing its investigations,  
8 particularly in light of the anticipated delays associated with Clark County’s ongoing refusal to comply  
9 with the Commission’s subpoenas duces tecum, as well as the existence of additional information and  
10 evidence received by the Commission following the issuance of the Notices of Intent to Suspend  
11 Respondents and during the hearing, which are currently being investigated and followed-up on by the  
12 Commission.

13         Moreover, based on testimony during the hearing by Respondents and certain witnesses, the  
14 Commission feels compelled to point out that not one Las Vegas Justice Court judge who testified on  
15 behalf of Respondents could bring themselves to admit that routine utterances of sub-judicial standard  
16 profanity inside the Las Vegas Justice Center, *during working hours* and toward and around employees,  
17 and the wearing of clothing *inside and around* the Las Vegas Justice Court containing vulgar  
18 statements, were inappropriate or a violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct.<sup>18</sup>

19         Finally, in case the meaning of judicial integrity, honor, respect and dignity are in doubt, the  
20 Commission, Respondents and respective counsel, as well as other members of the judiciary, the press  
21 and the public, should be mindful of what is stated in the Preamble to the Code of Judicial Conduct:

22                 [1] An independent, fair and impartial judiciary is indispensable to our system of  
23 justice. The United States legal system is based upon the principle that an independent,  
24 impartial, and competent judiciary, **composed of men and women of integrity**, will  
25 interpret and apply the law that governs our society. Thus, the judiciary plays a central  
role in preserving the principles of justice and the rule of law. **Inherent in all the Rules**

---

26 <sup>17</sup> As the Nevada Supreme Court observed in *Halverson*, “should the Commission unreasonably delay its investigation, then  
[a judge] may file a motion with the Commission to modify or vacate the interim suspension, or [ ] may seek writ relief  
from this court.” *Halverson*, 123 Nev. at 519, 169 P.3d at 1178-1179.

27 <sup>18</sup> Remarkably, these occurrences were dismissed by Respondents’ witnesses and counsel as being (i) merely colloquial  
28 phrases that are also heard on television and in songs; (ii) simply the manner in which someone is accustomed to speaking or  
greeting people; and (iii) in the eyes of the beholder, thereby seemingly relegating such vulgarities to acceptable behavior  
for judges who represent the judicial system of this State since they did not occur inside a courtroom.



1 contained in this Code are the precepts that judges, individually and collectively,  
2 must respect and honor the judicial office as a public trust and strive to maintain  
3 and enhance confidence in the legal system.

4 [2] Judges should maintain the dignity of judicial office at all times, and  
5 avoid both impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in their professional  
6 and personal lives. They should aspire at all times to conduct that ensures the  
7 greatest possible public confidence in their independence, impartiality, integrity,  
8 and competence.

9 [3] The Code of Judicial Conduct establishes standards for the ethical conduct of  
10 judges and judicial candidates. It is not intended as an exhaustive guide for the  
11 conduct of judges and judicial candidates, who are governed in their judicial and  
12 personal conduct by general ethical standards as well as by the Code. The Code is  
13 intended, however, to provide guidance and assist judges in maintaining the highest  
14 standards of judicial and personal conduct, and to provide a basis for regulating  
15 their conduct through disciplinary agencies.

16 See Preamble to Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct (emphasis added).<sup>19</sup>

17 It is further ordered pursuant to Code Rule 2.16(B) that no person known or suspected to have  
18 assisted or cooperated with an investigation of a judge shall be retaliated against, directly or indirectly.

19 It is further ordered that the Chairman is authorized to sign this Order on behalf of all voting  
20 Commissioners.

21 DATED this 24th day of December, 2019.

22 STATE OF NEVADA  
23 COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE  
24 P.O. Box 48  
25 Carson City, NV 89702

26 By:   
27 GARY VAUSE  
28 COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

29 <sup>19</sup> Code Rule 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary) states that “[a] judge shall act at all times in a manner that  
30 promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary and shall avoid impropriety and  
31 the appearance of impropriety.” The Comments to Code Rule 1.2 provide, in relevant part, that “[p]ublic confidence in the  
32 judiciary is eroded by improper conduct and conduct that creates the appearance of impropriety. This principle applies to  
33 both the professional and personal conduct of a judge[;] [a] judge should expect to be the subject of public scrutiny that  
34 might be viewed as burdensome if applied to other citizens and must accept the strictures imposed by the Code[;] [and]  
35 [c]onduct that compromises or appears to compromise the independence, integrity, and impartiality of a judge undermines  
36 public confidence in the judiciary. (Emphasis added).

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline and  
3 that on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2019, I served a copy of the ORDER CONTINUING COMMISSION  
4 INVESTIGATIONS by email and by placing said document in the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid,  
5 addressed to the following:

6 William B. Terry, Esq.  
7 William B. Terry, Chartered  
8 530 South Seventh Street  
9 Las Vegas, NV 89101-6011  
[Info@williamterrylaw.com](mailto:Info@williamterrylaw.com)  
Counsel for Respondent Judge Andress-Tobiasson

10 Thomas F. Pitaro, Esq.  
11 601 Las Vegas Blvd. South  
12 Las Vegas, NV 89101  
[pitaro@gmail.com](mailto:pitaro@gmail.com)  
13 Counsel for Respondent Judge Chelini

14 Thomas C. Bradley, Esq.  
15 Law Office of Thomas C. Bradley  
16 435 Marsh Avenue  
17 Reno, NV 89509  
[tom@tombradleylaw.com](mailto:tom@tombradleylaw.com)  
Prosecuting Officer

18 Brian R. Hutchins, Esq.  
19 BH Consulting, LLC  
20 P. O. Box 2366  
21 Carson City, NV 89701  
[bhconsultingllc@sbcglobal.net](mailto:bhconsultingllc@sbcglobal.net)  
Prosecuting Officer

22 

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 Valerie Carter, Commission Clerk  
25  
26  
27  
28