

NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL ETHICS



2020-2021 BIENNIAL REPORT

FY 2020 – FY 2021 BIENNIAL REPORT

I.	The Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline	1
II.	Commission Action	6
III.	Commission Members	14
IV.	The Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics	14
V.	Standing Committee Action	16
VI.	Members of the Standing Committee on Judicial Ethics	17
	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 forms. 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. That part of the website contains the explanation of the Standing Committee’s responsibilities, copies of its advisory opinions, and a listing 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 2021

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 rules governing the Commission, all of the Commission's public decisions and orders, and 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 the inherent power of the appointing authority pursuant to Nevada Supreme Court case law. The Chair and Vice-Chair are selected from the three primary lay appointees, by vote of the entire Commission. Current lay members are Chairman Gary Vause (Democrat, Clark County), Vice-Chair Stefanie Humphrey (Republican, Carson City), John Krmpotic (Republican, Washoe County) and Joseph Sanford (alternate) (Democrat, Lyon County).

Two district judge members are appointed by the Nevada Supreme Court. District judge alternates are appointed to serve in case of disqualification, and 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 Stephen J. Bishop (Ely Township Justice Court), Richard Glasson (Tahoe Justice Court) and Natalie Tyrrell (North Las Vegas Justice Court). Municipal court alternate members are Martin Hastings (Las Vegas Township), Dorothy Nash Holmes (Reno Municipal Court) and Kristin Luis (Carson City Justice/Municipal Court).

Two lawyer members are appointed by the State Bar of Nevada. Standing alternates are appointed to serve in case of disqualification. Current lawyer members are Karl Armstrong (Las Vegas), Don Christensen (Reno), Laurence Irwin (alternate)(Reno), Bill Hammer (alternate) (Las Vegas) and Christopher Laurent (alternate) (Las Vegas)

Process.

Complaints are filed with the Clerk of the Commission. The Executive Director may file complaints 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” (also referred to as “Prosecuting Officer”). 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.

In January 2018, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Charles Weller, District Court Judge, Second Judicial District Court. On September 20, 2018, 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, for which Judge Weller was publicly reprimanded and ordered to successfully attend a judicial education course at his own expense, ordered to pay a two thousand five hundred dollar (\$2,500) fine to the Domestic Violence Resource Center, and ordered to send written letters of apology to five (5) individuals who witnessed the misconduct. On September 28, 2018, Judge Weller filed a Notice of Appeal with the Nevada Supreme Court. On January 23, 2020, Judge Weller filed a Motion to Voluntarily Dismiss Appeal.

In October 2017, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Rena G. Hughes, District Court Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court. On June 18, 2018, 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, 2.5(A) and 2.6(A), for which Judge Hughes was publicly reprimanded and ordered to attend a National Judicial College course at her own expense. On June 21, 2018, Judge Hughes filed a Notice of Appeal. On July 16, 2020, in a 5-2 decision, the Nevada Supreme Court issued its Opinion in *Hughes v. Nev. Comm'n on Judicial Discipline*, 136 Nev. Adv. Op. 46, 467 P.3d 627 (2020), reversing the Commission's imposition of discipline against Respondent and suggesting that "an appropriate remedy may well have been to dismiss the complaint without holding a hearing and issue a non-disciplinary letter of caution" The Supreme Court further opined in *Hughes* that the Commission should generally not initiate disciplinary proceedings from complaints over legal decisions or factual findings "where relief may ordinarily lie in the appeals process."

In October 2017, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Jennifer Henry, Hearing Master, Eighth Judicial District Court. In April 2017, Hearing Master Henry Filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition with the Nevada Supreme Court. In May 2018, the Nevada Supreme Court issued a stay and the matter was temporarily postponed. In February 2019, the Nevada Supreme Court denied Hearing Master Henry's Petition for Writ of Prohibition and lifted the stay. On December 12, 2019, 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; Canon 2, Rules 2.5(A), 2.6(A) and 2.8(B), for which Hearing Master Henry was publicly admonished and ordered

to attend a judicial education course at her own expense. On December 19, 2019, Hearing Master Henry filed a Notice of Appeal. On December 23, 2020, the Nevada Supreme Court issued an *Order of Affirmance*, upholding the Commission's decision in its entirety.

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.

As discussed above, 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 work flow. The Commission meets either in person or by telephone conference calls many times during the year to review complaints, to 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 about 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 December 2018, the Honorable Melanie Andress-Tobiasson, Justice of the Peace, Las Vegas Township Justice Court, filed a Petition for Writ of Prohibition with the Nevada Supreme Court along with a request for stay which was granted. At the time, the Commission had not filed a Formal Statement of Charges against her; however, the case was under investigation. By Order dated May 10, 2019 (Case No. 77551), the Nevada Supreme Court lifted its stay of the judicial discipline proceedings in this matter and the investigation continued. In August 2020, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against Judge Andress-Tobiasson. On September 30, 2020, the Commission entered into a Stipulation and Order of Consent to Resignation ("Stipulation and Order") in which Judge Andress-Tobiasson agreed to resign from her judicial position and neither seek nor accept judicial office in the State of Nevada at any time in the future. The Stipulation and Order also required the Commission to dismiss all pending matters regarding Judge Andress-Tobiasson.

In July 2019, the Commission entered into a Stipulation and Order of Consent to Public Reprimand regarding the Honorable Kent Jasperson, Justice of the Peace, Pahrump Township Justice Court. Judge Jasperson admitted that he committed violations of Canon 1, Rule 1.1; and Canon 2, Rules 2.2, 2.5, 2.6(A) and 2.9(A) & (C), and accepted the Commission's public reprimand and agreed to complete a National Judicial College Course at his own expense.

In December 2019, the Commission held a two-day consolidated interim suspension hearing regarding the Honorable Melanie Andress-Tobiasson and the

Honorable Amy Chelini, Justices of the Peace, Las Vegas Justice Court, regarding allegations of judicial misconduct that posed a substantial threat of serious harm to the public or the administration of justice. Following the hearing, the Commission issued an Order Continuing Commission Investigations. As of the date of this Biennial Report, both consolidated matters have been resolved by Judge Andress-Tobiasson's Stipulation and Order of Consent to Resignation and Judge Chelini's Stipulation and Order of Consent to Public Reprimand.

In August 2020, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Kerry Earley, District Court Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court. The Commission entered into a Stipulation and Order of Consent to Public Admonishment filed on January 19, 2021, in which Judge Earley admitted that she committed violations of Canon 1, Rule 1.2; and Canon 2, Rule 2.8(B) and accepted the Commission's public admonishment.

In August 2020, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable William S. Potter, District Court Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court. The Commission entered into a Stipulation and Order of Consent to Public Admonishment filed on September 30, 2020, in which Judge Potter admitted that he committed violations of Canon 1, Rules 1.1 and 1.2; and Canon 2, Rules 2.3 and 2.8, and accepted the Commission's public admonishment.

In September 2020, the Commission filed its Formal Statement of Charges against the Honorable Richard Scotti, District Court Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court. The Commission entered into a Stipulation and Order of Consent to Public Reprimand filed on March 15, 2021, in which Judge Scotti admitted that he committed violations of Canon 1, Rules 1.1 and 1.2; and Canon 2, Rule 2.8(B), and accepted the Commission's public reprimand.

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).

See also Commission Procedural Rule 29. During Fiscal Year (“FY”) 2020, the Commission did not impose any private, informal discipline. During FY 2021, the Commission also did not impose any private, informal discipline, but did enter into a deferred discipline agreement in one matter, with the underlying case being subsequently dismissed upon completion of the conditions imposed in the agreement pursuant to NRS 1.468.

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* Commission Procedural Rules 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 14 cases during FY 2020.

- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a justice court judge regarding compliance with the law and maintaining the appearance of impartiality.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a justice court judge regarding maintaining the appearance of impartiality.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a justice court judge regarding maintaining the appearance of impartiality.

- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a justice court judge regarding maintaining the appearance of impartiality.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a municipal court judge regarding compliance with the law, maintaining the appearance of impartiality, and maintaining proper demeanor toward litigants.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law and timeliness of rulings.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding maintaining proper decorum in and out of the courtroom and maintaining the appearance of impartiality.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding timeliness of rulings.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law and maintaining the appearance of impartiality.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law and due diligence.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a justice court judge regarding compliance with the law.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law and maintaining the appearance of impartiality.

The Commission issued 7 letters of caution during FY 2021.

- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law 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 maintaining proper decorum in the court room and demeanor toward litigants.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding due diligence and compliance with the law.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding due diligence, compliance with the law, and maintaining the appearance of impartiality.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a district court judge regarding compliance with the law.
- The Commission issued a cautionary letter to a justice court judge regarding maintaining proper decorum in the court room and demeanor toward litigants.

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 2020 and FY 2021 can be reviewed in Appendix B.

It should also be pointed out that there are nearly 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, 82 district court judges, 67 justices of the peace and 30 municipal court judges (9 of which also serve as Justices of the Peace). Additional judicial

officers include senior justices and judges (61), part-time judges (190), and numerous hearing/special masters, commissioners and referees.

During FY 2020, the Commission received 215 new complaints, considered 11 requests for reconsideration, authorized 19 investigations, initiated 3 public cases and completed 210 cases. The Commission's number of open cases as of June 30, 2020 (end of FY 2020) was 41. As of September 30, 2020, the date of publication of the 2020 Annual Report, the number of open cases was 57, most of which were considered by the Commission at its quarterly meeting held in October 2020. For FY 2020, the average case duration¹ was 109 days, the average length of time to complete investigations was 86 days, the percentage of the operating budget expended on investigations was 25%, and the total number of disciplinary decisions imposed was 2.

During FY 2021, the Commission received 183 new complaints, considered 5 requests for reconsideration, authorized 7 investigations, initiated 5 public cases and completed 171 cases. The Commission's number of open cases as of June 30, 2021 (end of FY 2021) was 53. As of September 30, 2021, the date of publication of this Biennial Report, the number of open cases was 80, most of which will be considered by the Commission at its quarterly meeting to be held in October 2021. For FY 2021, the average case duration (see footnote 1 below) was 129 days, the average length of time to complete investigations was 112 days, the percentage of operating budget expended on investigations was approximately 10%, and the total number of disciplinary decisions imposed was 5.

In striving to be more proactive than reactive, and to foster the Commission's "teach rather than catch" philosophy, the General Counsel and Executive Director ("GCED") of the Commission 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 the biennium, approximately 72 inquiries were received, many of which required detailed research, follow-up discussions and numerous staff hours to address.

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 Commission determines that a formal statement of charges is to be filed.

Budget and Staff

The Legislature approved a budget of \$960,109 for FY 2020. This amount included \$187,092 in operating funds. However, the Commission had to redistribute approved funds to the Operating category and request Interim Finance Committee (“IFC”) Contingency Funds due to its case load and case related expenses. The IFC approved additional funding in the amount of \$49,593. The Commission’s total expenditures were \$972,677 allowing \$37,025 to be reverted to the General Fund.

The Legislature initially approved a budget of \$964,109 for FY 2021. This amount included \$187,895 in operating funds. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission had to cut its budget by \$35,418. The Commission subsequently had to redistribute approved funds to the Operating category and request Interim Finance Committee (“IFC”) Contingency Funds due to its case load and projected case related expenses. The IFC approved additional funding in the amount of \$69,000. The Commission’s total expenditures were \$928,867 allowing \$68,824 to be reverted to the General Fund.

The Commission’s staff consists of the General Counsel/Executive Director (“GCED”), an Associate General Counsel, and three Management Analysts. The Commission contracts with private Prosecuting Officers 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.

Current Litigation

None.

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. The current members of the Commission are as follows:

Regular Commission Members	Alternate Commission Members
Gary Vause, Chair	Honorable Stephen J. Bishop
Stefanie Humphrey, Vice-Chair	Honorable Richard Glasson
Karl Armstrong, Esq.	Honorable Thomas Gregory
Donald Christensen, Esq.	Honorable Martin Hastings
Honorable Mark R. Denton	Honorable Dorothy Nash Holmes
Honorable David Hardy	Honorable Kristin Luis
John Krmpotic	Honorable Thomas K. Stockard
	Honorable Natalie L. Tyrrell
	Bill Hammer, Esq.
	Laurence Irwin, Esq.
	Christopher Laurent, Esq.
	Joseph Sanford

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 Patricia Halstead, Esq. (Halstead Law Offices) and the current Vice-Chair is Christopher Cannon, Esq. (Law Offices of Christopher Cannon). The officers are appointed by the Commission on Judicial Discipline following nomination by the members of the Standing Committee. 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. 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. The members are appointed to two-year terms with a limit of no more than four consecutive full terms.

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 conference(s) 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.

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 by majority vote determined 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 2020 – FY 2021 - Advisory Opinions

The Committee did not receive any requests in FY 2020 or FY 2021 that required the Committee to issue a new advisory opinion.

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 here.

Judicial Members

Honorable Scott Freeman
Second Judicial District Court

Honorable Melissa Saragosa
Las Vegas Justice Court

Joanna Kishner
Eighth Judicial District Court

Honorable Jim C. Shirley
Eleventh Judicial District Court

Honorable Scott E. Pearson
Reno Justice Court

VACANT

Attorney Members

Patricia Halstead, Esq., Chair
Halstead Law Offices

Nadia Hojjat, Esq.
Clark County

Christopher Cannon, Esq., Vice-Chair
Law Offices of Christopher Cannon

Elissa Luzaich, Esq.
Clark County

Audrey Beeson, Esq.
Law Offices of Frank Toti & Audrey
Beeson

Janet Pancoast, Esq.
Cisneros & Marias

Susan Bush, Esq.
Clark County

Todd Reese, Esq.
Carson City

Patrick Chapin, Esq.
Patrick Chapin, Ltd.

Nicole Ting, Esq.
State of Nevada


Homero Gonzalez, Esq.
Brandon Smerber Law Firm

Frank Toddre II, Esq.
State of Nevada

APPENDIX A


COMPLAINT
PROCESS:

CONFIDENTIAL
PROCEEDINGS



COMPLAINT
PROCESS:

FORMAL
PUBLIC
PROCEEDINGS



APPENDIX B

CASE DISPOSITIONS¹
FISCAL YEAR 2020

Disposition of Complaints	Number
Dismissed after initial review	190
Dismissed after investigation - no action taken	6
Dismissed with cautionary letter*	14
Proceed to Formal Statement of Charges*	0
Total=	210

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

*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 private reprimand or deferred discipline agreement

CASE DISPOSITIONS¹
FISCAL YEAR 2021

Disposition of Complaints	Number
Dismissed after initial review	148
Dismissed after investigation - no action taken	10
Dismissed with cautionary letter*	7
Proceed to Formal Statement of Charges*	5
Deferment of Formal Disciplinary Action	1
Total=	171


Discipline Imposed/Disposition of Formal Statement of Charges	Number
Fines	0
Judicial education	0
Informal discipline	0
Public admonishment	2
Public charges dismissed	0
Public reprimand	1
Public censure	0
Psychiatric evaluation	0
Written apologies	0
Suspension without pay	0
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.


Category	Number of Complaints
General Jurisdiction Judges	141
Limited Jurisdiction Judges	50
Supreme/Appellate Court Justices	10
Non-Judges	14
Total	215

Types of Judges Complained Against FY 2020




Category	Number of Complaints
General Jurisdiction Judges	107
Limited Jurisdiction Judges	64
Supreme/Appellate Court Justices	1
Non-Judges	11
Total	183

Types of Judges Complained Against FY 2021




Category	Number of Complaints
Civil	53
Criminal	74
Family	63
Other	25
Total	215

Area of Law- Complaint Origination FY 2020




Category	Number of Complaints
Civil	47
Criminal	76
Family	45
Other	15
Total	183

**Area of Law- Complaint Origination
FY 2021**




Category	Amount
Anonymous	1
Attorneys	16
Citizens	22
Commission	4
Inmates	51
Judges	2
Litigants	119
Total	215



Category	Amount
Attorneys	3
Citizens	18
Commission	1
Inmates	22
Litigants	138
Media	1
Total	183


Sources of Complaints FY 2021



APPENDIX C


Category	Amount
Personnel	\$ 672,448
Operating	\$ 187,092
Cost Allocations	\$ 28,952
Travel	\$ 36,581
Training	\$ 15,308
I.T.	\$ 19,728
Total	\$ 960,109

Commission Budget Legislatively Approved FY 2020




Category	Amount
Personnel	\$ 674,207
Operating	\$ 187,895
Cost Allocations	\$ 29,739
Travel	\$ 36,581
Training	\$ 15,308
I.T.	\$ 20,379
Total	\$ 964,109

Commission Budget Legislatively Approved FY 2021



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.