

LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL MARKS
DANIEL MARKS, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 002003
NICOLE M. YOUNG, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 12659
610 South Ninth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 386-0536; FAX (702) 386-6812
Attorneys for Petitioner

Electronically Filed
Apr 27 2018 09:09 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JENNIFER HENRY,

Case No.

Petitioner,

vs.

NEVADA STATE COMMISSION
ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE,

Respondent.

_____ /

PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION

I. NRAP 26.1 DISCLOSURE

The undersigned counsel of record certifies that the following are persons or entities as described in NRAP 26.1(a), and must be disclosed. These representations are made in order that the judges of this Court may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

1. Parent Corporations and/or any publically-held company that owns 10% or more of the party's stock

NONE

2. Law Firms that have represented Petitioner Jennifer Henry
 - a. William B. Terry, Esq.
 - b. Law Office of Daniel Marks, Daniel Marks, Esq., and Nicole M. Young, Esq.

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES 3-4

I. ROUTING STATEMENT 5

II. RELIEF SOUGHT 5

III. ISSUE PRESENTED 6

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND 6

V. LEGAL ANALYSIS 6-11

 A. A Writ of Prohibition should issue against the Commission
 because it is acting outside of its constitutional authority. 6-7

 B. The Nevada Constitution was never amended to include hearing
 masters under the Commission's jurisdiction. 7-11

VI. CONCLUSION 11

VERIFICATION 12

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE 13

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 14-15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Clean Water Coal. v. The M Resort, LLC, 127 Nev. 301, 309,
255 P.3d 247, 253 (2011) 7

In re Contested Election of Mallory, 128 Nev. 436, 438,
282 P.3d 739, 741 (2012) 7

Paschell v. State, 116 Nev. 911, 914, 8 P.3d 851, 853 (2000) 8, 10

Thomas v. Nev. Yellow Cab Corp., 130 Nev. Adv. Op. 52,
 327 P.3d 518, 521 (2014) 7, 8

Statutes

NRS 1.428 9, 10

NRS 3.245 9

NRS 34.320 6

NRS 34.330 6

NRS 62B.020 9

NRS 147.170 9

NRS 159.0615 9

NRS 169.097 9

NRS 425.381 9

NRAP 17(a)(3) 5

NRCP 53 9

EDCR 1.30(7) 9

EDCR 1.46(a)(1) 9

EDCR 1.48(h) 9

Constitutional Provisions

Article 6 of the Nevada Constitution 5, 6, 8-10

////

////

I. ROUTING STATEMENT

Petitioner Jennifer Henry (hereinafter "Ms. Henry") is a hearing master with the Eighth Judicial District Court in Clark County, Nevada. Respondent Nevada State Commission on Judicial Discipline (hereinafter "the Commission") filed a "Formal Statement of Charges" against Ms. Henry on October 10, 2017. (*See* App 1-6.) Because this is a case that involves judicial discipline, this petition should be retained, heard, and decided by the Supreme Court pursuant to Nevada Rule of Appellate Procedure 17(a)(3).

II. RELIEF SOUGHT

Ms. Henry requests this Court issue a Writ of Prohibition against the Commission to arrest its proceedings against Ms. Henry because it is acting without and/or in excess of its jurisdiction. The Commission is without constitutional authority, under Article 6, section 21 of the Nevada Constitution to hold disciplinary proceedings against hearing masters, such as Ms. Henry.

In addition, Ms. Henry requests this Court stay the Commission's disciplinary proceedings against Ms. Henry until this Court has made its final decision regarding the instant petition. The public hearing is currently scheduled to take place on May 29, 2018, at 8:00 a.m. (*See* APP 7-9.)

////

////

III. ISSUE PRESENTED

Whether the Nevada Constitution provides the Commission with the power to initiate and hold disciplinary proceedings against individuals not specifically enumerated in Article 6, section 21(1) of the Nevada Constitution, such as hearing masters like Ms. Henry

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On October 10, 2017, the Commission filed a "Formal Statement of Charges" against Ms. Henry. (*See* App 1-6.) The Commission filed those charges pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission under Article 6, section 21 of the Nevada Constitution. (*See* App 1-6.) The public hearing relating to those charges is scheduled to take place on May 29, 2018, at 8:00 a.m., in Reno, Nevada. (*See* App 7-9.)

V. LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. A Writ of Prohibition should issue against the Commission because it is acting outside of its constitutional authority.

The Nevada Supreme Court may issue a writ of prohibition to an inferior tribunal "in all cases where there is not a plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law." NRS 34.330. A writ of prohibition "arrests the proceedings of any [commission] exercising judicial functions, when such proceedings are without or in excess of the jurisdiction of such [commission]."

NRS 34.320.

In this case, this Court should issue a writ of prohibition to the Commission because it has acted outside of its prescribed authority under the Nevada Constitution. A Writ of Prohibition is necessary in this case because once the Commission holds a public hearing regarding Ms. Henry, she has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy under the law since the Commission is acting outside of its authority. In addition, the Commission is wasting its resources by prosecuting individuals who are not under its jurisdiction. If this Court finds that a Writ of Prohibition must issue, then it can help conserve those resources.

B. The Nevada Constitution was never amended to include hearing masters under the Commission's jurisdiction.

"The Nevada Constitution is the 'supreme law of the state' which control[s] over any conflicting statutory provisions." *Thomas v. Nev. Yellow Cab Corp.*, 130 Nev. Adv. Op. 52, 327 P.3d 518, 521 (2014) (quoting *Clean Water Coal. v. The M Resort, LLC*, 127 Nev. 301, 309, 255 P.3d 247, 253 (2011)). A constitutional provision must be interpreted according to its plain meaning. *In re Contested Election of Mallory*, 128 Nev. 436, 438, 282 P.3d 739, 741 (2012). The Court may only go beyond the provision's plain meaning if it is ambiguous, meaning that it could be subject to "at least two reasonable yet inconsistent interpretations." *Id.* When interpreting a constitutional provision, the Court must review the document as a whole to ascertain the meaning of the provision in question. *Id.*

Statutes must be construed in harmony with the Constitution, not vice versa.

Thomas, 327 P.3d at 521. This holding, in *Thomas*, is based on the fundamental supremacy of the Constitution over a statute, stating:

If the Legislature could change the Constitution by ordinary enactment, no longer would the Constitution be superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means. It would be on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, ... alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.

Id. at 522. Further, "the legislature has no power to enlarge the jurisdiction of any court beyond that expressed in the Constitution." *Paschell v. State*, 116 Nev. 911, 914, 8 P.3d 851, 853 (2000).

In Nevada, the judiciary and the scope of its power was created by Article 6 of the Nevada Constitution. Article 6 is the supreme authority relating to the creation of the court system in Nevada. The Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, district courts, and justices of the peace are vested with judicial power in section 1 to that article. Section 1 delegates to the Legislature the establishment of municipal courts. Further, Article 6 announces that justices and judges in Nevada are elected, rather than appointed. Nev. Const. Art. 6, §§ 3, 3A, 5, and 8 (2017).

Article 6, section 21 of the Nevada Constitution established the Commission and its scope of power, including who is subject to the authority of the Commission. The Commission's authority is limited to the following individuals:

////

1. A justice of the Supreme Court;
2. A judge of the court of appeals;
3. A district judge;
4. A justice of the peace; or
5. A municipal judge.

Nev. Const. Art. 6, § 21(1) (2017). The inclusion of these individuals under the Commission's authority is supported by Article 6, section 1, which created the courts where these justices/judges would serve. Nowhere in Article 6 are hearing masters included. To include hearing masters under the Commission's authority, despite Article 6's failure to even discuss hearing masters, defies logic.

The reason why "masters" are not included under Article 6 is because masters are appointed and supervised by justices/judges. *See* NRS 3.245; NRS 62B.020; NRS 147.170; NRS 159.0615; NRS 169.097; NRS 425.381; NRCP 53; EDCR 1.30(7); EDCR 1.46(a)(1); and EDCR 1.48(h).

Despite the Nevada Constitution's clear language regarding who is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, the Nevada Legislature adopted NRS 1.428 in 1997. That statute defines "judges" that are subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, as follows:

1. A justice of the Supreme Court;
2. A judge of the Court of Appeals;
3. A judge of the district court;
4. A judge of the municipal court;

5. A justice of the peace;
6. Any other officer of the Judicial Branch of this State, whether or not the officer is an attorney, who presides over judicial proceedings, including, but not limited to, a magistrate, court commissioner, special master or referee; and
7. Any person who formerly served in any of the positions described in subsections 1 to 6, inclusive, if the conduct at issue for purposes of NRS 1.425 to 1.4695, inclusive, occurred while the person was serving in such a position.

When the Nevada Legislature adopted NRS 1.428 in 1997, it acted outside of its authority, as prescribed by the Nevada Constitution. The only way it could expand the jurisdiction of the Commission is by constitutional amendment. Instead, the Legislature attempted to expand the Commission's jurisdiction by ordinary enactment. However, "the legislature has no power to enlarge the jurisdiction of any court beyond that expressed by the Constitution." *Paschell*, 116 Nev. at 914. By adopting the catch-all provisions, which are subsections 6 and 7, to NRS 1.428, the Legislature did just that. It enlarged the jurisdiction of the Commission.

The Constitution clearly states who is subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. Nev. Const. Art. 6, § 21(1) (2017). Reading that section as a whole, it is plain to see that the Commission's jurisdiction is strictly limited. Further, this constitutional provision does not include a catch-all provision for any other individuals not specifically listed. Based on the plain language of this

constitutional provision, this Court has no need to go beyond its plain language. Because hearing masters are not included, they cannot be subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. The Legislature was without power to amend the constitutional provision at issue through ordinary enactment of legislation instead of by constitutional amendment. As such, this Court should issue a Writ of Prohibition in this case.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, this Court should issue a Writ of Prohibition against the Commission to arrest its proceedings against Ms. Henry because it is acting without and/or in excess of its jurisdiction.

In addition, this Court should stay the Commission's disciplinary proceedings against Ms. Henry, including the public hearing currently scheduled on May 29, 2018, at 8:00 a.m., until this Court reaches its final decision on the instant petition. (*See* App 7-9.)

DATED this 26 day of April, 2018.

LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL MARKS



DANIEL MARKS, ESQ.

Nevada State Bar No. 002003

NICOLE M. YOUNG, ESQ.

Nevada State Bar No. 12659

610 South Ninth Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEVADA)
)
COUNTY OF CLARK) ss:


JENNIFER HENRY, being first duly sworn under penalty of perjury,
deposes and says:

That I am the Petitioner in the above-entitled action; that I have read the foregoing **PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION** and know the contents thereof; that the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters therein contained stated upon information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.



JENNIFER HENRY

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before
me this 25th day of April, 2018.





NOTARY PUBLIC in and for said
COUNTY AND STATE


CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. I hereby certify that this petition complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in 14 point font and Times New Roman.

2. Finally, I hereby certify that I have read this petition, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, it is not frivolous or interposed for any improper purpose. I understand that I may be subject to sanctions in the event that the accompanying brief is not in conformity with the requirements of the Nevada Rules of Appellant Procedure.

DATED this 26 day of April, 2018.

LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL MARKS



DANIEL MARKS, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 002003
NICOLE M. YOUNG, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 12659
610 South Ninth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL MARKS, and that on the 20 day of April, 2018, I did serve by way of electronic filing, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing **PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION** on the following:

Thomas C. Bradley, Esq.
Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney, Boetsch, Bradley & Pace
448 Hill Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
E-Mail: Tom@stockmarketattorney.com
Tom@TomBradleyLaw.com
Prosecuting Officer

Paul C. Deyle
State of Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline
P.O. Box 48
Carson City, Nevada 89702
E-Mail: ncjdinfo@judicial.nv.gov

////

////

////

////

////

////


////

////

I further certify that on the 24 day of April, 2018, I did deposit in the U.S. Mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, with first class postage fully prepaid thereon a true and correct copy of the **PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION** to the address and e-mails as follows:

Thomas C. Bradley, Esq.
Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney, Boetsch, Bradley & Pace
448 Hill Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
E-Mail: Tom@stockmarketattorney.com
Tom@TomBradleyLaw.com
Prosecuting Officer

Paul C. Deyle
State of Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline
P.O. Box 48
Carson City, Nevada 89702
E-Mail: ncjdinfo@judicial.nv.gov


An employee of
LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL MARKS

LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL MARKS
DANIEL MARKS, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 002003
NICOLE M. YOUNG, ESQ.
Nevada State Bar No. 12659
610 South Ninth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 386-0536; FAX (702) 386-6812
Attorneys for Petitioner

Electronically Filed
Apr 27 2018 09:10 a.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JENNIFER HENRY,

Case No.

Petitioner,

vs.

NEVADA STATE COMMISSION
ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE,

Respondent.

_____ /

APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION

DOCUMENT

PAGE NO.

Formal Statement of Charges, filed before the Nevada Commission
On Judicial Discipline on October 10, 2017

APP 1-6

First Amended Order Setting Public Hearing and Notice of Panel
Members, Order Regarding Media Access, filed before the Nevada
Commission on Judicial Discipline on October 10, 2017

APP 7-9

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL MARKS, and that on the 26 day of April, 2018, I did serve by way of electronic filing, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing **APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION** on the following:

Thomas C. Bradley, Esq.
Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney, Boetsch, Bradley & Pace
448 Hill Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
E-Mail: Tom@stockmarketattorney.com
Tom@TomBradleyLaw.com
Prosecuting Officer

Paul C. Deyhle
State of Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline
P.O. Box 48
Carson City, Nevada 89702
E-Mail: ncjdinfo@judicial.nv.gov

////

////

////

////

////

////


////

////


I further certify that on the 20 day of April, 2018, I did deposit in the U.S. Mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, with first class postage fully prepaid thereon a true and correct copy of the **APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION** to the address and e-mails as follows:

Thomas C. Bradley, Esq.
Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney, Boetsch, Bradley & Pace
448 Hill Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
E-Mail: Tom@stockmarketattorney.com
Tom@TomBradleyLaw.com
Prosecuting Officer

Paul C. Deyhle
State of Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline
P.O. Box 48
Carson City, Nevada 89702
E-Mail: ncjdinfo@judicial.nv.gov


An employee of
LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL MARKS

1 THOMAS C. BRADLEY, ESQ.
2 Bar No. 1621
3 *Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney,*
4 *Boetsch, Bradley and Pace*
5 448 Hill Street
6 Reno, Nevada 89501
7 Telephone (775) 323-5178
8 Tom@TomBradleyLaw.com
9 Prosecuting Officer for the Nevada
10 Commission on Judicial Discipline
11
12
13
14
15



8 BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE
9

10 IN THE MATTER OF THE HONORABLE
11 JENNIFER HENRY, Hearing Master for the Eighth
12 Judicial District Court, Family Division, County of
13 Clark, State of Nevada,

CASE NO. 2016-142-P

14 Respondent.

15 **FORMAL STATEMENT OF CHARGES**

16 COMES NOW Thomas C. Bradley, Prosecuting Officer for the Nevada Commission on
17 Judicial Discipline ("Commission" or "NCJD"), established under Article 6, Section 21 of the
18 Nevada Constitution, who, in the name of and by the authority of the Commission, as found in
19 NRS 1.425 - 1.4695, files this Formal Statement of Charges and informs the Respondent, the
20 Honorable Jennifer Henry, Hearing Master for the Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Division,
21 County of Clark, State of Nevada ("Respondent"), that the following acts were committed by
22 Respondent and warrant disciplinary action by the Commission under the Revised Nevada Code
23 of Judicial Conduct ("the Code").

24 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

25 In or about October 10, 2016, Respondent knowingly, and in her capacity as a Hearing
26 Master for the Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Division, County of Clark, State of Nevada,
27 engaged in the following acts or a combination of these acts ("acts or actions"):
28

1 On October 10, 2016, Respondent served as the assigned hearing master in a contested
2 juvenile hearing in which a juvenile was accused of running away from police officers after the
3 police officers had approached a group of teenagers who were on the street smoking marijuana at
4 3:00 a.m. in the morning. As part of a plea agreement, the juvenile, through her counsel, agreed to
5 plead guilty to obstructing an officer, a misdemeanor offense, with all other charges dismissed in
6 exchange for the prosecutor's sentencing recommendation that the juvenile be given six-months
7 of probation. The juvenile was represented by Aaron Grigsby, a court appointed attorney. Notably,
8 Respondent and Mr. Grigsby had a strained professional relationship going back several years.

9 After the plea was entered, Respondent began to ask the juvenile questions regarding her
10 use of a cell phone which was unrelated to the underlying criminal matter. Counsel Grigsby
11 advised the Respondent that he did not wish to have his client admit to something that could get
12 her into more trouble. Respondent ignored counsel's objection which was based on the juvenile's
13 Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination and repeatedly asked the juvenile to answer her
14 questions about the juvenile's use of a cell phone.

15 Respondent lost her temper as Counsel Grigsby continually objected to Respondent's
16 repeated attempts to question the juvenile regarding the cell phone, and shouted, "ENOUGH",
17 numerous times to Counsel Grigsby. Respondent then called a recess, and upon resumption of the
18 hearing, and again began asking the juvenile to answer her questions regarding the juvenile's cell
19 phone. Counsel Grigsby continued to object noting that he did not want his client to admit to
20 anything that could result in additional charges.

21 The juvenile followed the advice of her counsel and refused to answer Respondent's
22 questions regarding the cell phone. Respondent then stated that she was sentencing the juvenile to
23 nine (9) months of probation instead of six (6) months because the juvenile declined to answer her
24 questions regarding the use of a cell phone. During the hearing, Respondent also advised Counsel
25 Grigsby he was obstructing the hearing, making prejudicial comments, and that his misconduct
26 was not an isolated incident.

1 The Respondent's actions described above violated the Code, including Judicial Canon 1,
2 Rule 1.1, failing to comply with the law, including the Code; Rule 1.2, failing to promote
3 confidence in the judiciary; Canon 2, Rule 2.2, failing to uphold and apply the law and failing to
4 perform all duties of her judicial office fairly and impartially; Rule 2.3 failing to be free from bias;
5 Rule 2.5(A) failing to perform judicial and administrative duties competently and diligently; Rule
6 2.6(A), failing to accord a party's right to be heard; and Rule 2.8 (B), failing to be patient, dignified,
7 and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others with
8 whom the judge deals in an official capacity. The Respondent abused her judicial authority by
9 engaging in any or all, or any combination of, the acts listed above.

10 COUNT ONE

11 By engaging in the acts, or combination of the acts, listed above, by sentencing the juvenile
12 to a harsher sentence because the juvenile elected to exercise her Fifth Amendment right against
13 self-incrimination, Respondent violated the Code, including Judicial Canon 1, Rule 1.1, failing to
14 comply with the law, including the Code; Rule 1.2, failing to promote confidence in the judiciary;
15 Canon 2, Rule 2.2, failing to uphold and apply the law and failing to perform all duties of her
16 judicial office fairly and impartially; Rule 2.3, failing to be free from bias; and Rule 2.5(A) failing
17 to perform judicial and administrative duties competently and diligently. The Respondent abused
18 her judicial authority by engaging in any or all, or any combination of, the acts listed above.

19 COUNT TWO


20 By engaging in the acts, or combination of the acts, listed above, in failing to be patient,
21 dignified and courteous to the juvenile and Counsel Grigsby, Respondent violated the Code,
22 including Judicial Canon 1, Rule 1.1, failing to comply with the law, including the Code; Rule 1.2,
23 failing to promote confidence in the judiciary; Canon 2, Rule 2.2, failing to uphold and apply the
24 law and failing to perform all duties of her judicial office fairly and impartially; Rule 2.5(A) failing
25 to perform judicial and administrative duties competently and diligently; Rule 2.6(A), failing to
26 accord a lawyer's right to be heard; and Rule 2.8 (B), failing to be patient, dignified, and courteous
27 to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others with whom the judge
28

1 deals in an official capacity. The Respondent abused her judicial authority by engaging in any or
2 all, or any combination of, the acts listed above.

3 Based on the information above, the Commission shall hold a public hearing on the merits
4 of these facts and Counts pursuant to NRS 1.4673 and, if violations as alleged are found to be true,
5 the Commission shall impose whatever sanctions and/or discipline it deems appropriate pursuant
6 to NRS 1.4677 and other Nevada Revised Statutes governing the Commission.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated this 9 day of October, 2017.

Submitted by: 
Thomas C. Bradley, Esq., SBN 1621
Prosecuting Officer for the NCJD

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATE OF NEVADA)
) ss
COUNTY OF WASHOE)

THOMAS C. BRADLEY, ESQ. being first duly sworn under oath, according to Nevada law, and under penalty of perjury, hereby states:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada. I have been retained by the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline to serve in the capacity of Prosecuting Officer in the matter of the Honorable Jennifer Henry, Case No. 2016-142-P.

2. I have prepared and reviewed this Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Jennifer Henry, pursuant to the investigation conducted in this matter, and based on the contents of that investigation and following reasonable inquiry, I am informed and believe that the contents of this Formal Statement of Charges are true and accurate.


Dated this 9 day of October, 2017.

[Signature]
THOMAS C. BRADLEY, ESQ.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public

This 9 day of October, 2017.

By: [Signature]
NOTARY PUBLIC




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of this Formal Statement of Charges was placed in the U.S. mail, postage pre-paid, on this 10 day of October, 2017.

William B. Terry, Esq.
Law Offices William B. Terry, Chartered
530 South Seventh Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101

By: 
David McIntosh, Legal Assistant to
Thomas C. Bradley, Esq., Prosecuting Officer for NCJD

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

2 **STATE OF NEVADA**



3
4 In the Matter of)
)
5 THE HONORABLE JENNIFER HENRY,)
 Hearing Master, Eighth Judicial District Court,)
6 County of Clark, State of Nevada,)
)
7 Respondent.)
)
8)
9)

CASE NO. 2016-142-P

10 **FIRST AMENDED ORDER SETTING PUBLIC HEARING**
11 **AND NOTICE OF PANEL MEMBERS, ORDER REGARDING MEDIA ACCESS**

12
13 TO: THE HONORABLE JENNIFER HENRY, Respondent
14 WILLIAM B. TERRY, ESQ., Counsel for Respondent
 THOMAS C. BRADLEY, ESQ., Prosecuting Officer

15 Pursuant to order of the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline (“Commission”), a public
16 hearing in the above-captioned matter has been rescheduled to commence on May 29, 2018, at the hour
17 of 8:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard and will conclude at or before 5:00 p.m.
18 The public hearing will be conducted at the office of the State Bar of Nevada, 9456 Double R
19 Boulevard, Suite B, Reno, Nevada 89521. The Respondent, Respondent’s counsel and the Prosecuting
20 Officer will appear in person.

21 The following panelists are scheduled to participate as members of the Commission: Gary
22 Vause (Chair), Hon. Leon Aberasturi, Bruce C. Hahn, Esq., Stefanie Humphrey, Laurence Irwin, Esq.,
23 John Krmpotic and Hon. Jerome Polaha.

24 Members of the media intending to record this public hearing must obtain consent to do so from
25 the Commission. Media entry requests should be directed to Gary Vause, Chair and may be mailed to
26 the Commission at Post Office Box 48, Carson City, NV, 89702, sent via facsimile to (775) 687-3607
27 or sent by electronic mail to ncidinfo@judicial.nv.gov. The request should contain the name and

28 ///


1 type of media outlet, including address, telephone and facsimile number(s). Requests must be received
2 by the Commission no later than 3:00 p.m., May 18, 2018.

3 Chairman Gary Vause is authorized to sign this order on behalf of the full Commission.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED this 6th day of April, 2018.

6
7 STATE OF NEVADA
8 COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

9 
10 _____
11 Gary Vause, Chairman

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2 I hereby certify on this 6th day of April, 2018, I transmitted a copy of the foregoing FIRST
3 AMENDED ORDER SETTING PUBLIC HEARING AND NOTICE OF PANEL MEMBERS,
4 ORDER REGARDING MEDIA ACCESS, via email and by placing said document in the U.S. Mail,
5 postage prepaid, addressed to:

6 William B. Terry, Esq.
7 William B. Terry, Chartered Attorney at Law
8 530 South Seventh Street
9 Las Vegas, NV 89101-6011
Info@WilliamTerryLaw.com
Counsel for Respondent

10 Thomas C. Bradley, Esq.
11 Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney, Boetsch, Bradley & Pace
12 448 Hill Street
13 Reno, NV 89501
Tom@stockmarketattorney.com
Prosecuting Officer

14 *Valerie Carter*

15 _____
Valerie Carter, Commission Clerk