



# Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline: 1999 Annual Report

## Introduction and Overview

The following report details the Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline's ("Commission") background and report of activities for calendar year 1999.

Colorado's first disciplinary commission for judges was created in 1966, when Colorado voters approved an amendment to the state constitution that replaced the political process of electing judges with a system based on merit selection, appointment, and retention. At the time Colorado's Commission was created, only five other states had disciplinary commissions to supplement impeachment as the traditional method for disciplining or removing judges. Today, all 50 states and the District of Columbia have these types of judicial disciplinary bodies.

Colorado's voters amended the constitutional provisions affecting the Commission in 1982, making changes to the Commission's procedures and membership. The Commission's name was changed from the "Colorado Commission on Judicial Qualifications" to the "Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline." The Commission's membership also was expanded to include more citizen members.

Today, the Commission consists of ten members. These members include four citizen members, who cannot be judges or attorneys, appointed by the Governor; two lawyers, each having practiced law for at least ten years in Colorado, appointed by the Governor; and two district court judges and two county court judges appointed by the Colorado Supreme Court. Appointments made by the Governor require confirmation by the Colorado State Senate. While Commission members serve four-year terms without salary, they do receive reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses.

At the close of 1999, the Commission membership included:

<i>Member</i>	<i>Home Town</i>	<i>Category</i>
Barbara L. Crowfoot	Fort Collins	Citizen
Phillip S. Figa	Englewood	Attorney
Benjamin C. Glidden	Black Forest	Citizen
John M. Holcomb	Denver	Citizen

Eric C. Jorgenson	Fort Morgan	Attorney
M. Jon Kolomitz	La Junta	District Judge
Roy G. Olson, Jr.	Evergreen	County Judge
Ruth A. Steel	Englewood	Citizen
Paul D. Tallman	Cheyenne Wells	County Judge
William L. West	Greeley	District Judge

While the Commission operates independently, it is housed within the judicial branch of government. Its procedural rules are approved by the Colorado Supreme Court and its operating budget is approved and provided by the Colorado State Legislature.

## Commission Responsibilities and Powers

The Commission has constitutional jurisdiction to investigate and act upon allegations of a judge's:

- Willful misconduct in office, including misconduct which, although not related to judicial duties, brings the judicial office into disrepute or is prejudicial to the administration of justice;
- Willful or persistent failure to perform judicial duties, including incompetent performance of judicial duties;
- Intemperance, including extreme or immoderate personal conduct, recurring loss of temper or control, abuse of alcohol, or the use of illegal narcotics or dangerous drugs;
- Any conduct that constitutes a violation of the Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct; or
- Disability interfering with the performance of judicial duties, which is, or is likely to become, of a permanent character.

Misconduct involving a violation of criminal laws also may fall within the Commission's jurisdiction, although the Colorado Supreme Court can take action directly to suspend or remove a state judge charged or convicted of a misdemeanor, felony, or offense involving moral turpitude.

The Commission has jurisdiction over the conduct of the 284 justices, judges, and senior judges who serve the Colorado state court system. It does not have jurisdiction over magistrates,

the 17 county court judges in Denver, or the more than 300 full-time and part-time municipal court judges serving on the bench in cities and towns throughout the state of Colorado.

Local municipalities approach judicial discipline in different ways. While complaints against judges in most cities must go to the city council or mayor, the City and County of Denver has a separate Denver County Court Judicial Performance Commission to handle complaints against its county court judges and magistrates. The City of Lakewood has a Judicial Review Commission that considers grievances against its municipal court judges.

## Commission Process and Procedures

Any person may file a complaint against a judge by completing forms provided by the Commission or by writing a letter addressed to the Commission. It is the policy of the Commission to accept and review all complaints filed, even if such complaints relate solely to a complainant's disagreement with a decision or order a judge may have entered in a court case. The Commission also may commence investigations on its own motion without a written complaint.

Complaints are reviewed during the Commission's regularly scheduled meetings. The Commission also holds special meetings, hearings, and telephone conferences as needed throughout the year.

Some complaints are dismissed following initial discussion and evaluation by the Commission or its staff because the complaints do not fall within the responsibilities and powers granted to the Commission under the Colorado Constitution. As previously stated, for example, because the Commission is not a court it must dismiss any complaints involving factual or legal issues that can be reviewed only by an appellate court.

If a complaint is dismissed following this initial review, the judge is not notified of the complaint. If the Commission determines further investigation is warranted, the judge is informed about the complaint and told the name of the complainant or that the Commission is proceeding on its own motion. The Commission provides the judge an opportunity to respond to the complaint and to present additional information that may assist the Commission in its investigation of the matter.

Preliminary investigations may include reviewing court transcripts; evaluating the judge's response; obtaining statements from the complainant, attorneys who might be involved, other judges, court clerks, litigants, or other persons who may have some knowledge of the allegations; and conducting legal research into the substantive area of alleged misconduct. The Commission's staff screens all complaints and conducts all reviews and investigations.

Following the preliminary investigation, the Commission may dismiss the case; continue the case for further action, investigation, or review; issue a private admonition, reprimand or censure, either in person or by letter, to the judge; order a physical or mental examination of the judge; or order the judge to undergo a specific remedial program, such as an educational, court management, or counseling program. The Commission also may begin a formal action against the judge. In each case, the complainant is fully informed in writing about each stage of the Commission's decision-making process.

A formal action is commenced when the Commission hires an attorney to act as its special counsel in proceedings against a judge. The attorney prepares a written statement of charges; files it with the Commission; and, after the judge has had an

opportunity to respond to the charges, a formal hearing is scheduled. The special counsel and the judge, together with the judge's attorney if the judge has retained one, are present at all formal hearings before the entire Commission.

After hearing the evidence, the Commission may dismiss the case; take any of the informal actions described above; or recommend to the Colorado Supreme Court that the judge be removed, retired, suspended, censured, reprimanded, or otherwise publicly disciplined.

All matters before the Commission are handled in the strictest of confidence, pursuant to constitutional and statutory requirements [Article VI, § 23 (3) (g) of the Colorado Constitution, and §§ 24-72-401 and 402 of the Colorado Revised Statutes].

While requests for the disqualification of a judge in a matter pending before that judge are not granted automatically, the Commission does have the authority to disqualify a judge under certain circumstances.

Complaints against judges who are members of the Commission are automatically disclosed to them, and they must respond to all complaints, whether frivolous or not. Judge-member commissioners do not participate in any discussions or decisions involving complaints against them.

Judge-member commissioners who sit on the bench in the same judicial district as a judge against whom a complaint is brought are disqualified automatically from participating in that case. Judge-member commissioners also are disqualified from participating in a case if they are friends of the respondent-judge or if, for any other reason, their participation in that judge's case may raise an appearance of impropriety.

Likewise, citizen-member and attorney-member commissioners also are disqualified if they live in the same judicial district as the respondent-judge; if they are friends of that judge; or if, for any other reason, their participation in that judge's case may raise an appearance of impropriety.

## 1999 Caseload Description

During 1999, the Commission responded to over 2,245 telephone calls or personal visits to its offices either to answer questions about the Commission's responsibilities or to direct individuals to proper agencies or offices that could address their questions. The Commission also distributed a total of 572 complaint forms to individuals requesting those forms.

At the close of 1999, the Commission had received and processed a total of 143 new complaints. When considering the total number of complaints received and processed during 1999, the Commission's caseload in 1999 was down approximately 9 percent when compared to 1998.

During 1999, the number of substantive matters meriting Commission action was comparable to 1998. As explained in greater detail below, this continuity in Commission action can be attributed in part to an intensive judicial ethics training program for all judges continued by the Commission during 1999, as well as the Commission's staff taking a more proactive role in educating the general public on the role and responsibility of the Commission in addressing concerns about the conduct of Colorado's judges.

At the close of 1999, the Commission had processed to completion all of the 143 cases that it had received during the year. It carried over no (0) cases into calendar year 2000. Corrective actions taken against judges in 1999 totaled one (1) of the total 143 complaint/case dispositions.

## 1999 Case Attributes

### Judges

Of the total 143 cases disposed of during 1999, complaints filed involved 125 of the 284 judges at all levels of the Colorado state judicial system. In other words, some judges had more than one complaint filed against them during the course of the year.

These 284 judges consist of 115 district judges; 99 county judges; 47 senior judges; and 23 appellate judges.

As indicated in Table 1, three-fourths, or 75 percent, of all complaints filed were against district court judges. Other complaints filed were primarily against full-time county court judges.

**Table 1**

*Type of Judge Named in Complaint (1999)*

<i>Type of Judge</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
District Judge	108	75%
County Judge (full-time)	23	16
County Judge (part-time)	1	1
Senior Judge	1	1
Appellate Judge	10	7
Juvenile Judge	0	0
Probate Judge	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Case Type

In 1999, types of cases giving rise to complaints were weighted toward criminal matters.

As indicated in Table 2, 74 percent of all complaints filed involved criminal proceedings. Eleven percent of all complaints filed involved civil cases. Eleven percent, or 16 complaints, related to domestic relations cases.

**Table 2**

*Type of Case Giving Rise to Complaint (1999)*

<i>Type of Case</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Civil	16	11%
Criminal	105	74
Domestic	16	11
Juvenile	3	2
Off-bench Conduct	1	1
Small Claims	0	0
Probate	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Subject Matter of Complaints

During 1999, the subject matter of complaints generally dealt with a complainant's dissatisfaction with a judge's legal rulings in criminal cases. As Table 3 indicates, a total of 135

REGULAR AND TEMPORARY

PLACEMENT

▼ ATTORNEYS

▼ PARALEGALS

▼ SUPPORT

STAFF

## TEMPLETON & ASSOCIATES

SPECIALISTS IN LEGAL SUPPORT SERVICES

Moving your practice  
into the 21st Century with  
Full-service Legal Staffing

535 16th Street, Suite 810  
Denver, CO 80202

**303-571-0311**

cases, or 94 percent of all complaints filed, dealt with an individual's dissatisfaction with the judge's legal rulings in that individual's case. As explained above, the Commission is not an appellate court and does not have any authority to review the substantive issues involved in a judge's ruling. Therefore, the Commission had no other option than to dismiss any complaints involving legal issues that could be reviewed only by an appellate court.

**Table 3**  
*Subject Matter of Complaints (1999)*

<i>Subject Matter</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Dissatisfaction with a Legal Ruling	135	94%
Administrative or Procedural Concern	4	2
Partiality or Favoritism	1	1
Injudicious Courtroom Demeanor or Control	0	0
Administrative Inefficiency or Delay in Decision-making	1	1
Personal Misconduct Either On or Off the Bench	1	1
Racial, Ethnic or Gender Bias	1	1
Physical or Mental Disability	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Type of Complainant**

During 1999, there were several categories of complainants. Table 4 details the categories of these complainants. The vast majority of complainants, nearly 9 out of 10 (or 88 percent), were individuals who were directly involved as litigants in cases in which the respondent-judge presided. Approximately 10 percent of complaints came from individuals who were not directly involved in cases, but perhaps were a friend or relative of the litigant (e.g., mother, father, or sibling). Two percent of the complaints were brought by attorneys.

Finally, of note in 1999 was the high number of complaints that came from individuals incarcerated in state correctional facilities. Over 81 percent (116 of the 143 complainants filing cases with the Commission during 1999) came from individuals incarcerated in state correctional facilities for criminal offenses.

**Table 4**  
*Type of Complainant (1999)*

<i>Complainant</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Litigant in Case	126	88%
Attorney in Case	4	2
People Not Directly Involved	13	10
Judge Self-Report	0	0
Commission Motion	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Complaints Filed by Judicial District**

Complaints filed by judicial district are reported in Table 5. After each judicial district, the number of judges serving in that district is listed in parenthesis.

As might be expected, the larger the district (in terms of number of judges and caseload), the greater the number of complaints filed. For example, the five (5) judicial districts encompassing the Denver metropolitan area (1st Judicial District, 2nd Judicial District, 17th Judicial District, 18th Judicial District, and 20th Judicial District) accounted for approximately 36 percent of all complaints filed. The remaining 64 percent of the complaints were distributed among judges from the remaining 17 of the 22 judicial districts outside the Denver metropolitan area, the Colorado Court of Appeals, and the Colorado Supreme Court.

**Table 5**  
*Complaints Filed by Judicial District (1999)*

<i>Judicial District (Number of Judges)</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1 (16)	9	7%
2 (24)	13	9
3 (4)	5	4
4 (21)	22	15
5 (7)	3	2
6 (5)	1	1
7 (10)	3	2
8 (8)	10	7
9 (8)	3	2
10 (9)	3	2
11 (7)	10	7
12 (8)	1	1
13 (11)	2	1
14 (5)	7	5
15 (6)	2	1
16 (5)	2	1
17 (13)	9	7
18 (22)	15	11
19 (7)	2	1
20 (9)	3	2
21 (6)	2	1
22 (3)	6	4
Court of Appeals (16)	3	2
Supreme Court (7)	7	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Commission Action**

During Commission meetings held to discuss the 143 new cases filed during 1999, the Commission resolved all 143 of the complaints.

As Table 6 indicates, the Commission requested responses from judges in two (2) of the cases. Furthermore, as indicated by Table 7, the Commission requested its staff to investigate two (2) complaints.

**Table 6***Commission Request for Judge Response (1999)*

<i>Request</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Yes	2	1%
No	141	99
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 7***Investigation by Commission or Special Counsel (1999)*

<i>Investigation</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Staff	2	1%
Special Counsel	0	0
No Investigation	141	99%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Complaint Disposition

The disposition of complaints and the Commission's cumulative workload for the last 3 years are shown in Table 8.

Of the 143 cases processed to completion by the Commission during 1999, 142 cases were dismissed following review by the Commission. Of these dismissals, approximately 5 percent (7 of the 142 cases) were dismissed based on a finding of "no misconduct" after Commission review. More significant, 135 of the 142 cases, or 95 percent, were found to be "appellate in nature" and, therefore, outside the legal jurisdiction of the Commission.

A total of one (1) case resulted in corrective action being taken against a judge. In that case, the Commission determined that there was judicial misconduct and issued a private letter of admonition against the respondent-judge.

**Table 8***Caseload Disposition for Calendar Years 1997, 1998, and 1999*

<i>Calendar Year</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>1999</i>
Cases pending at beginning of year	2	0	0
Complaints received during year	114	157	143
<b>TOTAL CASELOAD</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>143</b>

### *Complaints Dismissed:*

Requests withdrawn, additional information not submitted, matter became moot, or was resolved administratively, dismissed by staff	1	0	0
Appellate in nature	97**	138**	135**
Lack of jurisdiction or unfounded	0	0	0
No evidence of misconduct or any other ground for judicial discipline (allegations unsubstantiated)	11	16	7
<b>TOTAL COMPLAINTS DISMISSED BY COMMISSION</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>142</b>

### *Other Actions:*

Retirement or resignation during or following investigation, while case still pending	3	0	0
Dismissed following Supreme Court review	0	0	0
<b>RETIREMENTS OR DISMISSALS BY SUPREME COURT</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### *Corrective Actions:*

Admonition, reprimand or censure, either by private letter or personal appearance	4	1	1
Retirement for medical disabilities	0	2	0
Public reprimand by Supreme Court	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL CORRECTIVE ACTIONS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>TOTAL CASES TERMINATED</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>CASES PENDING AT YEAR END</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

*\*\*In 1997, 1998, and 1999, the Commission dismissed a significant number of complaints following initial review because the complaints dealt solely with concerns about judicial decisions. Under the Colorado Constitution, such concerns about legal issues can be reviewed only by an appellate court. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over these types of appellate matters.*

## Cumulative Overview

As a result of the Commission's activity during the last 33 years, 21 judges have been ordered retired for a disability, and the Commission has issued 159 private letters of admonition, reprimand, or censure against judges. The Colorado Supreme Court has issued one public reprimand against a judge.

Although not necessarily reflected in the statistics, 42 judges have resigned or retired during or following Commission investigations. The Commission emphasizes, however, that many judges resign or retire from the Colorado judicial system each year for reasons completely unrelated to the disciplinary activities of the Commission.

## Sample Cases

The Commission is often asked to describe types of misconduct it considers serious enough to merit disciplinary action. Some examples of judicial misconduct that have required action by the Commission during the past few years are highlighted below. As used here, admonitions are private, informal letters of discipline issued to a judge providing a warning that his or her conduct or behavior suggests an appearance of impropriety falling outside expected minimum standards of judicial conduct.

Letters of reprimand or censure also are private. These letters inform the judge that the Commission has determined that there has been a direct violation of the canons of the Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct and, further, that such conduct is unacceptable. In reaching these types of disciplinary findings, the Commission determines that the misconduct, while serious, does not merit a formal hearing or recommendation to the Colorado Supreme Court that the judge be publicly disciplined or removed from office.

As examples, during the past few years, the Commission has issued private admonitions, reprimands, or censures to judges who:

- Engaged in *ex parte* contacts with litigants and attorneys in cases pending before the judge, violations of Canons 1, 2 A. and B., and 3 A. (4), Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Delayed issuing decisions in civil cases, violations of Canon 3 A. (5), Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Experienced a loss of temper or control with litigants in cases pending before the judges, violations of Canons 1, 2 A. and B., and 3 A. (3), Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Engaged in *ex parte* communications with a witness who would be testifying in a case scheduled to be heard in the judge's court, a violation of Canons 1, 2 A. and B., and 3 A. (4), Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Made inappropriate remarks about the conduct of an attorney to a member of the press, a violation of Canons 1 and 3 A. (6), Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Heard a case involving an individual that was a client in the part-time judge's law firm, a violation of Canons 1, 2 A. and B., 3 C. (1) (a), (b), and (c), 8 B. (7), and 8 C. (1) and (3), Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Strongly suggested to a litigant that the litigant file a grievance against the litigant's attorney, a violation of Canons 1 and 2 A., Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Became intemperate and verbally abusive toward an employee and a customer of a business establishment, a violation of Canons 1 and 2 A. and B., Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct;
- Demonstrated rudeness and verbally abusive behavior toward a police officer while that officer was investigating a traffic stop involving the judge, a violation of Canons 1 and 2 A., Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct; and,
- Pled guilty to driving while the judge's ability was impaired by alcohol, a violation of Canons 1 and 2 A., Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct.

Beginning in 1992 and continuing through 1999, the Commission undertook a proactive educational program to inform new and continuing judges of their duties and responsibilities under the eight (8) Canons of the Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct. The Commission concluded that this type of an educational program demonstrated positive results, particularly by contributing to a smaller number of complaints filed, and corrective actions having to be taken, against judges since 1992 compared to earlier years.

Also, in July 1994, based on the recommendation of the Commission, the Colorado Supreme Court, through Chief Justice Directive 94-01, announced the creation of, and promulgated procedural rules for, the Colorado Judicial Ethics Advisory Board.

This board provides ethical advice to Colorado's state judges and justices and complements the educational activities undertaken by the Commission. The board is composed of five members, with the Commission's executive director and general counsel serving as the board's reporter and chief ethics advisor.

In addition to its oversight and educational activities, the Commission also provided reminders to judges concerning their conduct and activities that appeared to place them in danger of violating the Canons; made suggestions to judges concerning the overall management of their dockets; referred complaints to other agencies or departments for the resolution of problems outside the jurisdiction of the Commission; and aided in the administrative resolution of several matters.

## Conclusion

During 1999, the Commission's overall caseload was comparable to that of 1998. When considering total corrective actions taken against judges during 1999 as a percentage of total complaint/case dispositions, there was a similar number of corrective actions taken against Colorado state judges in 1999 compared with 1998.

Although much of the Commission's work is not completely visible to the public because of constitutional confidentiality limitations, every effort is made to act in the public's interest while safeguarding individual rights and reputations from unfounded accusations of misconduct. The Commission's performance during the last thirty-three (33) years suggests that it has succeeded in improving and strengthening Colorado's judiciary while carrying out its public responsibilities.

The Commission performs a vital role in maintaining a fair and impartial judiciary. Since the judicial selection and tenure system is based on merit selection, rather than political election, the Commission serves to maintain the balance between independence and accountability in the judiciary.

For further information about the Commission, its role and responsibilities, please write Rick Wehmhoefer, Executive Director and General Counsel, Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline, 899 Logan Street, Suite 307, Denver, Colorado 80203, or call him at (303) 894-2110. ■

## American Judicature Society Guidebook Assists in Implementing Sentencing Policy Reform

The American Judicature Society ("AJS") has published *Implementing Sentencing Policy Reform: Gaining Political Support Through Research, Analysis and Outreach*, a guidebook on sentencing policy reform. The guidebook offers tips defining coherent goals, demonstrating effective performance, establishing bases for public support, and providing constructive accountability through careful planning. Also included are case studies and suggestions for beginning the process. Individual copies of the guidebook are \$15, plus \$5 for postage and handling. For information or to order, Rodney Wilson, (312) 558-6900, ext. 147, or [rwilson@ajs.org](mailto:rwilson@ajs.org). For more information about the AJS, visit [justice.org](http://justice.org).