

ANNUAL REPORT

**FISCAL YEAR
2026**



STATE OF NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE & STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL ETHICS

**Judicial.nv.gov
P.O. Box 18123
Reno, NV 89511**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	The Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline	1
II.	Commission Action	4
III.	Commission Members	10
IV.	The Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics	10
V.	Standing Committee Action	13
VI.	Members of the Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics	13
	Appendix A – Complaint Flow Charts	
	Appendix B – Statistics	
	Appendix C – Organizational Chart & Budget Chart	

Introduction

Section 1.464 of the Nevada Revised Statutes directs the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline (the “Commission”) to submit annual and biennial reports summarizing the activities of the Commission during the preceding fiscal year or the preceding two fiscal years. This Report responds to that directive and includes statistical information regarding the disposition of complaints and a statement of the budget and expenses of the Commission. There is also a description of the Commission’s authority and processes with regard to judicial discipline, a description of the actions taken by the Commission during the fiscal year, and a list of the Commission members and alternate Commission members.

Included in this Report is also a description of the Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics (the “Standing Committee”). The Standing Committee was created by the Nevada Supreme Court in 1997, with a revision in 2011, and its authority can be found in the Rules Governing the Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics, Part VIII of the Supreme Court Rules. Although this information is not required to be a part of this Report, the Standing Committee is an integral part of the maintenance of judicial ethics in this State. The Standing Committee acts as a reference point for judges and the public, and also as a preventive measure, so that ethical problems can be avoided. Additionally, pursuant to the Supreme Court Rules, the Executive Director of the Commission is also the Executive Director of the Standing Committee. This effectively melds the Commission and the Standing Committee functions regarding judicial ethics, although the two bodies operate independently. Both the Commission and the Standing Committee are comprised of volunteers who agree to undertake important functions.

Much of the work of the Commission and the Standing Committee is reflected on the detailed website maintained by Commission staff. The website, found at <https://judicial.nv.gov/>, is divided into two parts, one for the Commission and one for the Standing Committee. The former provides extensive information as to the mission and processes of the Commission, including reference to the constitution, statutes, procedural rules and complaint form. It also contains the Commission’s disciplinary decisions, an index of the decisions, case references, statistics, and other information. The same is true for the Standing Committee portion of the website which contains the explanation of the Standing Committee’s responsibilities, all published advisory opinions, an index of advisory opinions by topic, and a list of current members. Accordingly, this Report incorporates much of the information set forth on the Commission’s website.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul C. Deyhle
General Counsel and Executive Director
Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline

September, 2026

I. The Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline.

Established by the Nevada Constitution, Article 6, Section 21, the Commission is the body authorized to censure, retire, remove or otherwise discipline judges in this State. Disciplinary decisions of the Commission may be appealed by the affected judge to the Nevada Supreme Court. The Legislature establishes the grounds for disciplinary action, including violations of the Revised Code of Judicial Conduct which the Nevada Supreme Court has adopted. Article 7 of the Constitution still provides for impeachment by the Legislature. The Nevada Supreme Court has referred to the Commission as a court of judicial performance.

The Legislature has adopted sections 1.425 - 1.4695 of the Nevada Revised Statutes which supplement the constitutional provisions and provide for the circumstances under which a judge may be disciplined and many of the procedural aspects of judicial discipline. The Commission has also adopted Procedural Rules which supplement the constitutional and statutory provisions. The Commission decides whether a judge is incapacitated and what actions to take in that instance. The Commission's website has extensive information regarding the Commission, constitution, statutes and procedural rules governing the Commission. The website also includes all of the Commission's public decisions and orders, as well as information regarding members and staff.

Membership.

The Commission is comprised of three lay members, two district court judges and two lawyers. The three lay members are appointed by the Governor. No more than two lay members can be of the same political party, and they must reside in different counties. Alternates are appointed pursuant to NRS 1.445. The Chair and Vice-Chair are selected from the three primary lay appointees, by vote of the entire Commission.

Current lay members are Chair Stefanie Humphrey (Republican, Carson City), Vice-Chair John Krmpotic (Republican, Washoe County), Joseph Sanford (Democrat, Lyon County), and Dana Endacott (Alternate) (Republican, Churchill County).

Two District Court judge members are appointed by the Nevada Supreme Court. District Court judge alternates are appointed to serve when the regular member is disqualified, unable to serve, or when a vacancy exists. Limited jurisdiction judges are appointed as alternates to serve during public proceedings against judges from that level of the judiciary pursuant to statutory mandate. No judge may sit in a case involving a judge from his or her court.

Current District Court judicial members are Mark Denton (Eighth Judicial District, Clark County), David Hardy (Second Judicial District, Washoe County), Thomas Gregory

(Alternate) (Ninth Judicial District, Douglas County) and Thomas Stockard (Alternate) (Tenth Judicial District, Churchill County). Justice Court alternate members are Kendra Bertschy (Reno Justice Court), Stephen J. Bishop (Ely Township Justice Court), Harmony Letizia (Las Vegas Justice Court), and Barbara Schifalacqua (Henderson Justice Court). The Municipal Court alternate members are Christopher Hazlett-Stevens (Reno Municipal Court), and Ryan Toone (Mesquite Justice/Municipal Court).

Two lawyer members are appointed by the State Bar of Nevada. Alternates are appointed to serve when the regular member is disqualified, unable to serve, or when a vacancy exists. Current lawyer members are Karl Armstrong (Las Vegas), Patricia Halstead (Reno), Jeremy Clarke (Alternate) (Reno), and Bill Hammer (Alternate) (Las Vegas).

Process.

Complaints are filed with the Clerk of the Commission. The Commission may authorize the Executive Director to file a complaint as well. The Commission and its staff review all complaints, and the Commission meets to decide whether to investigate the complaints or any portion of a particular complaint. At this stage, the Commission must find that a reasonable inference can be drawn that a judge committed misconduct or is incapacitated. If so, the Commission directs the Executive Director to authorize an investigation. The Executive Director contracts with a private investigative agency to perform independent investigative functions. The Commission must then decide from investigative reports whether there is a likelihood that it could find “a reasonable probability that the evidence available for introduction at a formal hearing could clearly and convincingly establish grounds for disciplinary action against the judge named in the complaint.” If so, the Commission must require the judge to respond to the complaint. After the judge responds and the Commission considers the response, the Commission must again decide whether there is the required evidence for disciplinary action. It is after such a finding that a case could move forward to a public proceeding.

If a public proceeding ensues, the Executive Director contracts with private counsel to serve as “Special Counsel.” The Special Counsel independently reviews the evidence and files a Formal Statement of Charges, based on counts for which the Commission issued a finding of reasonable probability. The judge, with or without counsel, files an answer and a public hearing, similar to a trial, ensues. The burden of proof is on the Special Counsel to show by clear and convincing evidence that a violation of the Revised Code of Judicial Conduct occurred.

Other possible dispositions include summary dismissal without investigation, dismissal after full or limited investigation and issuance of a letter of caution (characterized under the rules as a “non-disciplinary event”). If the Commission

determines that a judge has committed misconduct which is minor and would be most appropriately addressed through rehabilitation, treatment, education or minor corrective action, the Commission may enter into an agreement with the judge to defer formal disciplinary proceedings and require the judge to undergo the appropriate corrective action.

See Appendix A for flow charts.

Possible Sanctions.

The main function of the Commission is to protect the public, not to discipline judges. Nevertheless, the range of punishments includes: permanent removal from office, bar to holding judicial office, suspension with or without pay, completion of a probationary period pursuant to conditions deemed appropriate by the Commission, pursuit of a remedial course of action, fines (normally payable to local law libraries), additional education and training at the judge's expense, public censure, public or private reprimand, or requirement to undergo monitoring by the Commission and mentoring by an appropriate individual. Judges can also be required to issue public and private apologies to affected individuals. Judges can further be required to undergo physical and/or psychiatric evaluation and testing if the issue of a mental or physical disability is raised during the disciplinary process.

Appellate Review.

Only a judge, not a complainant, can appeal from the Commission's decision. Appeal is taken directly to the Nevada Supreme Court. The Nevada Supreme Court defers to the Commission's findings of fact and it determines if the record supports the findings. The Nevada Supreme Court conducts a *de novo* review of legal issues, including appropriateness of the punishment. The Nevada Supreme Court can lessen the punishment or increase it. The Court has adopted the "objective reasonable person standard" to evaluate whether conduct violates the Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct. The Commission applies the same standard.

See matter regarding the Honorable Michele Fiore, Pahrump Justice of the Peace, under "Formal Proceedings/Public Actions" section on Page 5

Time Limitations

Effective in January of 2010, the Nevada Legislature imposed time limits on the Commission's ability to consider complaints filed against judges. In NRS 1.4655, the law now provides that the Commission shall not consider complaints from acts occurring more than three years before the date of the complaint or more than one year after the

complainant knew or should have known of the conduct, whichever is earlier. Exceptions to this time limit are when there is a continuing course of conduct and the end of the conduct is within the time limit; there is a pattern of recurring misconduct and at least one act is within the time periods; and, any period in which the judge has concealed or conspired to conceal evidence of misconduct is not included in the time limits. The Legislature has also required that the Commission take action within 18 months after receipt of a complaint by dismissing the complaint, attempting to resolve it pursuant to statute, entering into a deferred discipline agreement, imposing discipline pursuant to an agreement with the judge, or authorizing the filing of a formal statement of charges based on the required evidentiary standard.

The Commission is authorized to extend these time limitations pursuant to NRS 1.4681 for good cause shown. Additionally, the time limits are to be computed without including periods of delay attributable to another judge, periods of delay between Commission meetings, periods of negotiation between the Commission and the subject judge, and periods when a complaint is held in abeyance pending the disposition of a court case related to the complaint. Any dismissal for failure to comply with time limits shall not occur unless the Commission determines that the delay is unreasonable and the judge's rights to a fair hearing have been violated. A delay of an investigation by more than 24 months after the filing of a complaint is *prima facie* evidence of an unreasonable delay.

The Legislature has established a statute of limitations on judicial misconduct complaints. Notably, most jurisdictions in the country have no statute of limitations for judicial misconduct, with some disciplinary actions taking place based on conduct committed many years prior and sometimes even before an individual became a judge.

II. Commission Action

The work of the Commission described below shows that the Commission and its staff are challenged by a constant and varied workflow. The Commission meets either in person, by telephone, or video conference many times during the year to review complaints, consider investigations, and to determine the resolution of cases. It also meets in person for formal proceedings. Additionally, the Chairperson is constantly in contact with the Executive Director regarding policy and meeting matters.

Formal Proceedings/Public Actions

The Commission has the authority to impose discipline including censure and removal pursuant to NRS 1.440(1). A public proceeding is held only when the Commission has made a finding that a reasonable probability exists that the evidence available for

introduction at a formal hearing could clearly and convincingly establish grounds for disciplinary action against a judge.

In July 2024, the Commission issued an Order suspending the Honorable Michele Fiore, Pahrump Justice Court Judge, with pay, pursuant to NRS 1.4675(1)(a) and (5), based on a pending indictment charging Judge Fiore with a crime punishable as a felony pursuant to the laws of the United States as set forth in the Criminal Indictment filed against Judge Fiore in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada (Case No. 2:24-cr-0155) on July 16, 2024.

In October 2024, the Commission issued an Order suspending the Honorable Michele Fiore without pay, pursuant to the guilty verdict filed in United States District Court for the District of Nevada (Case No. 2:24-cr-0155) on October 3, 2024, which found Judge Fiore guilty of one count of Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1349) and six counts of Wire Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1343), all felonies. In November 2024, Judge Fiore filed an appeal with the Nevada Supreme Court regarding the Commission's Order suspending her without pay (Case No. 89037).

In April 2025, President Donald Trump issued a full and unconditional pardon to Judge Fiore for her actions related to Case No. 2:24-cr-0155 in United States District Court for the District of Nevada. In May 2025, the Commission issued its Order rescinding Judge Fiore's suspension without pay, and simultaneously ordered Judge Fiore suspended with pay, pursuant to NRS 1.4675(4), which provides that the Commission may suspend a judge "with salary pending a final disposition of the complaint if the Commission determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the judge poses a substantial threat of serious harm to the public or to the administration of justice." In May 2025, Judge Fiore filed an appeal of the Commission's Order suspending her with pay in the Nevada Supreme Court (Case No. 90650).

In June 2025, Judge Fiore filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Prohibition in the Nevada Supreme Court regarding the Commission's May 19, 2025 Order suspending Judge Fiore with pay (Case No. 90810). Judge Fiore requested and the Nevada Supreme Court granted a Stay in the Commission's pending case on July 2, 2025.

In March of 2026, the Nevada Supreme Court held oral argument and subsequently entered an order consolidating the three (3) above referenced dockets. In April 2026, the Nevada Supreme Court issued its Order Dismissing Appeal, Denying Petition and Affirming Interim Suspension, allowing the Commission to continue its proceedings against Judge Fiore.

In April 2026, the Commission filed Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Michele Fiore, Justice Court Judge, Pahrump Township Justice Court, Nye County. The public hearing has been set for October 19-22, 2026 in Las Vegas, Nevada.

In April 2025, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Erika Ballou, District Court Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County. On September 22, 2025, the Commission entered its Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Imposition of Discipline finding that Respondent had committed violations of Canon 1, Rules 1.1 and 1.2; and Canon 2, Rules 2.2 and 2.5, for which Judge Ballou was suspended from the exercise of judicial office without salary for eighteen months with twelve months suspended, placed on probation for two years and required to complete at her own expense a specialized remedial training program with the National Judicial College.

In April 2026, the Commission entered into a Stipulation and Order of Consent to Public Reprimand regarding the Honorable Max Bunch, Senior Judge, Union Township Justice Court, Humboldt County. Judge Bunch admitted that he committed violations of Canon 1, Rules 1.1 and 1.2; and Canon 2, Rule 2.5(A), and accepted the Commission's public reprimand.

In May 2026, the Commission entered into a Stipulation and Order of Consent to Immediate Resignation and Permanent Bar from Judicial Office regarding the Honorable Erika Ballou, former District Court Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County. Judge Ballou admitted that she committed violations of Canon 1, Rules 1.1 and 1.2; and Canon 2, Rules 2.3(A) and (B), and 2.8(B), resigned from her judicial position immediately and accepted the Commission's bar from serving as judge in the future.

Informal Resolution and Private Discipline

The informal resolution of a complaint outside of a formal, public hearing is available to the Commission at different stages of the disciplinary process and in different forms. Of course, pursuant to NRS 1.4653, the Commission is authorized to remove a judge, publicly censure a judge or impose "other forms of discipline" when the judge has committed willful misconduct, has willfully or persistently failed to perform the duties of office, or is habitually intemperate. Public censure or other forms of discipline may also be imposed if the violation of the Revised Code of Judicial Conduct was not knowing or deliberate. The different stages of the process where other forms of discipline may be imposed include:

- A complaint alleges that a judge is incapacitated, an investigation reveals a judge may have a disability, or the judge raises a disability as an issue before the filing of a formal statement of charges. The Commission shall attempt to resolve these

matters informally and this includes voluntary retirement and addressing the disability adequately through treatment and with a deferred discipline agreement. NRS 1.4665(2).

- If the Commission reasonably believes that a judge has committed an act or engaged in behavior that would be more appropriately addressed through rehabilitation, treatment, education or minor corrective action, the Commission may enter into an agreement with the judge to defer formal disciplinary proceedings and require the desired action. NRS 1.468(1). This cannot be done if the Commission has determined pursuant to NRS 1.467 that there is sufficient evidence that could establish grounds for disciplinary action under NRS 1.4653 (willful misconduct or habitually intemperate). The misconduct must be minor in nature. Upon compliance with the conditions of the agreement, the Commission may dismiss the complaint or take other appropriate action. NRS 1.468(2)-(6).
- After a judge responds to a complaint and the Commission finds that a reasonable probability exists that the evidence available for introduction at a formal hearing could clearly and convincingly establish grounds for disciplinary action against the judge, the Commission can then find that the misconduct would be addressed more appropriately through rehabilitation, treatment, education or minor corrective action and the Commission may enter into a deferred discipline agreement. This is not available for misconduct involving several described actions. NRS 1.467(3),(4).

During Fiscal Year 2026, the Commission did not impose any informal discipline. When such nonpublic discipline is imposed, those matters remain confidential pursuant to NRS 1.4683.

Cautionary Letters

The Commission is authorized at several stages in the disciplinary process to issue a letter of caution to a judge as described here:

- The Commission determines that a complaint does not contain allegations of objectively verifiable evidence from which a reasonable inference could be drawn that a judge committed misconduct or is incapacitated but a letter of caution is appropriate. NRS 1.4657(2).
- After authorizing an investigation, the Commission reviews the report and determines that there is not a reasonable probability that the evidence available for introduction at a formal hearing could clearly and convincingly establish

grounds for disciplinary action against a judge but a letter of caution should be issued. NRS 1.4667(2).

- After initially finding sufficient evidence and requiring a judge to answer a complaint, the Commission determines that there is not a reasonable probability that the evidence available for introduction at a formal hearing could clearly and convincingly establish grounds for disciplinary action against a judge but a letter of caution should be issued. NRS 1.467(2).

See *also* PRJDC Rules 10, 12 and 13. Pursuant to NRS 1.4657(2), a letter of caution is not a form of discipline. Nevertheless, when a letter of caution is issued, it can be considered by the Commission when deciding the appropriate action to take on a subsequent complaint unless the letter of caution is not relevant to the misconduct alleged in the subsequent complaint. A cautionary letter is not available for misconduct involving several described forms of serious misconduct. NRS 1.467(4).

The Commission issued letters of caution in 6 cases during FY 2026.

- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding maintaining proper demeanor toward litigants.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding timeliness of rulings.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a municipal court judge regarding maintaining the appearance of impartiality and avoiding abuse of the prestige of judicial office.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding timeliness of rulings.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a justice court judge regarding compliance with the law, timeliness of rulings and maintaining the appearance of impartiality.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding maintaining proper demeanor toward litigants and maintaining the appearance of impartiality.

Statistical Information

The large majority of complaints filed with the Commission regarding judicial conduct result in a dismissal. This is primarily due to the fact that many complainants seek a remedy with the Commission regarding the merits of their litigation when the Commission has no jurisdiction over such matters. Additionally, many complaints are bare allegations of bias or prejudice by the complainant who feels that he or she lost in the litigation because the judge must have been biased against the complainant, although there is no real evidence of such. Many complaints are also filed by inmates seeking yet another avenue of relief from their convictions or are of the categories mentioned above. A percentage breakdown of the types of complainants who filed judicial complaints in FY 2026 can be reviewed in Appendix B.

It should also be pointed out that there are over 600 judges, judicial officers, continuing part-time judges, *pro tempore* part-time judges, and retired judges subject to recall for service over which the Commission has jurisdiction. During election years, this figure climbs even higher since the Commission's jurisdiction extends to not only sitting judicial officers, but also all candidates for judicial office as well. Currently, there are 7 Supreme Court Justices, 3 Court of Appeals judges, 90 district court judges, 59 justices of the peace and 31 municipal court judges (9 of which also serve as Justices of the Peace). Additional judicial officers include senior justices and judges (70), part-time judges (190), and numerous hearing/special masters, commissioners and referees.

During FY 2026, the Commission received 368 new complaints, considered 16 requests for reconsideration, authorized 9 investigations, initiated 4 public cases and completed 382 cases. The Commission's number of open cases as of June 30, 2026 (end of FY 2026) was 80. As of September 30, 2026, the date of publication of this Annual Report, the number of open cases is 111, most of which will be considered by the Commission at its quarterly meeting to be held in October 2026. For FY 2026, the average case duration¹ was 129 days, the average length of time to complete investigations was 62 days, the percentage of the operating budget expended on investigations was 8%, and the total number of complaints resulting in discipline was 5.

See additional statistical information in Appendix B.

¹ Calculated from the date a complaint is received by the Commission until the complaint is either dismissed or the Commission determines that a formal statement of charges is to be filed.

Budget and Staff

The Legislature approved a budget of \$1,520,532 for FY 2026. This amount includes \$243,292 in operating funds. The Commission's total expenditures were \$1,363,474, allowing \$157,058 to be reverted to the General Fund.

The Commission's staff consists of the GCED, two Senior Associate General Counsels, an Administrative Services Officer/Deputy Director and two Management Analysts. The Commission contracts with private attorneys who act as "Special Counsel" and private investigators as necessary to comply with its constitutional and statutory mandates. In addition to providing legal counsel to the Commission, the GCED is also responsible for the administrative duties of the Commission and the Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics.

See Appendix C for organizational and budget charts.

III. Commission Members

The members of the Judicial Discipline Commission volunteer a substantial amount of time to carry out the extremely large amount of work required to fulfill the constitutional and statutory duties of the Commission. The current members of the Commission are as follows:

Regular Commission Members	Alternate Commission Members
Stefanie Humphrey, Chair	Honorable Kendra Bertschy
John Krmpotic, Vice-Chair	Honorable Stephen Bishop
Joseph Sanford	Honorable Thomas Gregory
Karl Armstrong, Esq.	Honorable Christopher Hazlett-Stevens
Patricia Halstead, Esq.	Honorable Harmony Letizia
Honorable Mark R. Denton	Honorable Barbara Schifalacqua
Honorable David Hardy	Honorable Thomas Stockard
	Honorable Ryan Toone
	Jeremy Clarke, Esq.
	Bill Hammer, Esq.
	Dana Endacott

IV. The Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics.

The Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics was created by Nevada Supreme Court Rules, Part VIII, in 1997. The Standing Committee's purpose is to provide judges and aspirants to judicial office advisory opinions regarding ethical matters that may arise in

the ordinary course of judicial service, or in the elective or appointive process. The GCED of the Commission also serves as the Executive Director of the Standing Committee.

The Standing Committee renders non-binding advisory opinions on hypothetical questions regarding the Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct and assists the Nevada Supreme Court by studying and recommending additions to, amendments to, or repeal of provisions of the Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct or other laws governing the conduct of judges and judicial candidates.

The Standing Committee is comprised of six judges appointed by the Nevada Supreme Court. Three must be limited jurisdiction judges and three must be district court judges. Twelve attorneys are appointed by the State Bar of Nevada, one of whom is the Chairperson and one of whom is the Vice-Chair. The current Chairperson is Rost Olsen, Esq. (Washoe County District Attorney's Office) and the current Vice-Chair is Kendall Lovell, Esq. (Fennemore Craig, P.C.). The officers are appointed by the Commission on Judicial Discipline following nomination by the members of the Standing Committee. Members are appointed to two-year terms with a limit of no more than four consecutive full terms.

Twelve non-attorneys (lay members) were previously appointed by the Governor to sit on the Standing Committee for the purpose of resolving election practice disputes. However, in 2012 the Nevada Supreme Court removed the Standing Committee's jurisdiction to resolve election practice disputes. Consequently, the lay members were removed from the Standing Committee by amendment to the Supreme Court Rules, effective October 5, 2015.

Ethical Inquiries.

A judge or judicial candidate may contact Standing Committee staff with an ethical inquiry. Staff receives several inquiries per week, which often require research to address. If an ethical inquiry has not been addressed by the Standing Committee in previously issued advisory opinions, staff may suggest that a formal advisory opinion request be submitted.

In striving to be more proactive than reactive, and to foster the Commission's and Standing Committee's "teach rather than catch" philosophy, the Executive Director welcomes and encourages open communication with the judiciary. Numerous judicial ethics inquiries and requests for guidance are received every year from the judiciary and judicial office candidates. During FY 2026, approximately 29 inquiries were received, many of which required detailed research, follow-up discussions and numerous staff hours to address.

Advisory Opinions.

Process.

The opinion process begins when a judge or candidate submits a written hypothetical request to the Executive Director. Legal research submitted by the judge is accepted and encouraged. The Chairperson decides whether to form a panel and if he/she does, the Standing Committee's staff contacts attorneys and judges to participate. Each panel must have one district judge and one limited jurisdiction judge, and six attorneys (including either the Chair or Vice-Chair). Panel members discuss the ethical issue(s) via telephonic or video conference and vote whether to issue an opinion or not and what the conclusion will be. The Chair or Vice-Chair drafts the opinion or assigns the task to another attorney member of the panel. Each panel member reviews the draft and provides input regarding the written product. The final opinion is signed by the panel Chair and then filed with the clerk of the Nevada Supreme Court. Final opinions are also posted permanently on the Standing Committee's website at <https://judicial.nv.gov/>.

Limitations.

The Standing Committee shall not act on requests for opinions when any of the following circumstances exist:

1. There is a pending Nevada State Bar or Judicial Discipline Commission complaint, investigation, proceeding, or litigation concerning the subject of the request.
2. The request constitutes a complaint against a member of the judiciary.
3. The request involves procedures employed by the Judicial Discipline Commission in processing complaints against judges.
4. The request involves activities, the propriety of which depends principally on a question of law unrelated to judicial ethics.
5. Where it is known that the request involves a situation in litigation or concerns threatened litigation or involves the propriety of sanctions within the purview of the courts, such as contempt.
6. The Standing Committee has decided by majority vote that it would be inadvisable to respond to the request and has specified in writing its reasoning to the person who requested the opinion.

V. Standing Committee Action

It should be noted that the website for the Judicial Discipline Commission also contains the website for the Standing Committee.

See <https://judicial.nv.gov/>. The Standing Committee portion of the website is divided into the following areas:

- a. Purpose of the Standing Committee
- b. Introduction to the Standing Committee
- c. Rules Governing the Standing Committee
- d. Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct
- e. Advisory Opinions
- f. Advisory Opinions by Topic
- g. Committee Members and Staff
- h. Committee Openings

This portion of the website is an excellent reference for those who may have judicial ethics questions. The Revised Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct is set forth in full as are all advisory opinions issued by the Standing Committee. The section on advisory opinions indexed by topic allows a person to narrow a search regarding an issue to a relevant area of interest. Because so much information has been provided on the website, it will not be repeated here in the interest of economy.

Fiscal Year 2026 - Advisory Opinions

The Committee issued 1 advisory opinion during FY 2026.

JE25-001 Propriety of a sitting judicial officer presiding over matters initiated when the judicial officer served as the elected or appointed district attorney, state attorney general, or public defender and the state or other client of the district attorney's/attorney general's/public defender's office is a party.

VI. Members of the Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics

The members of the Standing Committee are a dedicated group of individuals who volunteer their time and answer important judicial ethics questions. Judges and judicial aspirants frequently request informal and formal guidance in the form of requests for advisory opinions. The names of the Standing Committee members are listed on the following page.

Judicial Members

Honorable Scott Freeman
Second Judicial District Court

Honorable Scott E. Pearson
Reno Justice Court

Honorable Joanna Kishner
Eighth Judicial District Court

Honorable Elana Lee Graham
Las Vegas Justice Court

Honorable Courtney Ketter
North Las Vegas Municipal Court

Honorable Bryce Shields
Eleventh Judicial District Court

Attorney Members

Rost C. Olsen, Esq., Chair
Washoe County District Attorney's Office

Homero Gonzalez, Esq.
Pacific West Injury Law

Kendall Lovell, Esq., Vice-Chair
Fennemore

Denice McKay, Esq.
Nevada Dept. of Administration

Susan Bush, Esq.
Director of Office of Appointed Counsel

Janet Pancoast, Esq.
Pancoast Law, Chtd.

Diana Collins, Esq.
Nevada Office of the Attorney General

Nicole Ting, Esq.
Nevada Office of the Attorney General


Briana Collings, Esq.
Robertson, Johnson, Miller & Williamson

William Voy, Esq.

APPENDIX A


FORMAL COMPLAINT PROCESS:

CONFIDENTIAL PROCEEDINGS



COMPLAINT PROCESS:

FORMAL PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS



APPENDIX B

CASE DISPOSITIONS¹

FISCAL YEAR 2026

Disposition of Complaints	Number
Dismissed after initial review	369
Dismissed after investigation - no action taken	3
Dismissed with cautionary letter	6
Proceed to Formal Statement of Charges or Stipulated Agreement*	4
Total=	382

Discipline Imposed/Disposition of Formal Statement of Charges	Number
Counseling	0
Fines	0
Judicial education*	2
Informal discipline ²	0
Probation*	2
Public admonishment	0
Public charges dismissed	0
Public reprimand	1
Public censure	0
Psychiatric evaluation	0
Rehabilitation Program	0
Suspension without pay*	2
Removal/Barred from holding judicial office*	2
Resignation*	2


*Includes consolidated matters

¹Case dispositions do not represent the number of complaints filed with the Commission in any given fiscal year. Rather, they indicate the actions taken by the Commission at the various stages of the judicial discipline process.

²Includes deferred discipline agreements.


Category	Amount
Litigants	248
Inmates	66
Citizens	41
Attorneys	10
Judicial Officers	2
Commission	1
Total	368

Sources of Complaints
FY 2026




Category	Number of Complain
Criminal	133
Civil	117
Family	86
Other	32
Total	368

Area of Law- Complaint Origination FY 2026



Category	Number of Complain
General Jurisdiction Judges	214
Limited Jurisdiction Judges	100
Non-Judges	38
Supreme/Appellate Court Justices	16
Total	368


Types of Judges Complained Against
FY 2026



APPENDIX C

ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

Budget Account 1497



*This position serves as both the Executive Director and General Counsel to the Commission on Judicial Discipline, but only serves as Executive Director to the Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics. The Standing Committee does not have a General Counsel.

Category	Amount
Personnel	\$ 1,097,442
Operating	\$ 243,292
Travel	\$ 35,298
Cost Allocations	\$ 81,539
I.T.	\$ 43,183
Training	\$ 19,778
Total	\$ 1,520,532

Commission Budget Legislatively Approved FY 2026

