

Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline Annual Report for 2015

Background and Jurisdiction

Formed in 1967 by the amendment to the Colorado Constitution that established a merit system for the appointment of judges, the Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline (Commission) monitors the judiciary's compliance with the Canons in the Colorado Code of Judicial Conduct (Canons or Code). Originally, the Commission was named the Commission on Judicial Qualifications.

The Commission is responsible for disciplinary proceedings to enforce Article VI, § 23(3)(d) of the Colorado Constitution, which provides that a justice or judge of any court of record may be disciplined or removed from office for misconduct, or may be retired for a disability that interferes with the performance of his or her duties. Colorado Rules of Judicial Discipline (Colo. RJD) govern the Commission's disciplinary proceedings. The Code and Colo. RJD are published in "Court Rules, Book 1" of *Colorado Revised Statutes*.

Colo. Const. Art. VI, § 23(3)(e) and Colo. RJD 35 provide for privately administered discipline, such as letters of admonition, reprimand, or censure, and for diversion programs, including training or docket management reports, that are designed to improve the conduct of the judge. The Commission may commence formal proceedings to address misconduct for which privately administered discipline would be inappropriate or inadequate. In formal proceedings, Colo. RJD 36 authorizes the Supreme Court to apply the sanctions of removal, retirement, public reprimand, or public censure or to retire a judge based on a permanent disability. A portion of the annual attorney registration fees paid to the Supreme Court by each Colorado lawyer and judge provides funding for the Commission's operations.

For a fuller understanding of the scope of the Commission's disciplinary authority, it is important to note the following:

- The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to disciplinary matters concerning judges of the county courts (exclusive of Denver County Court), district courts, Denver Probate Court, Denver Juvenile Court, and Colorado Court of Appeals, along with justices of the Colorado Supreme Court and senior judges (retired judges who serve during vacations or illnesses and assist with busy dockets). Excluded from this jurisdiction are magistrates, municipal judges, and administrative law judges (ALJs).

- County court judges in the City and County of Denver are appointed and employed by Denver and exercise dual jurisdiction over Denver municipal laws and state laws. Disciplinary matters for these judges are addressed by the Denver County Court Judicial Discipline Commission.
- In addition to its oversight of attorneys under the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct (Colo. RPC), the Office of Attorney Regulation Counsel (Attorney Regulation) is responsible for examining Code compliance by attorneys who perform judicial functions as magistrates, municipal judges, and ALJs.

As of December 31, 2015, the Colorado state judiciary comprised 341 judges and justices, including 131 in the county courts, of whom 17 served in Denver County Court; 177 in the district courts (there was one additional district court position in 2015); one in Denver Probate Court; three in Denver Juvenile Court; 22 on the Court of Appeals; and seven on the Supreme Court. In addition, 42 retired judges served in the senior judge program.

Grounds for Judicial Discipline

Colo. Const. Art. VI, § 23(3)(d) and Colo. RJD 5 provide the grounds for disciplinary proceedings:

- willful misconduct in office, including misconduct that, 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 narcotic or dangerous drugs
- any conduct that constitutes a violation of the Code.

Colo. Const. Art. VI, § 23(3)(d) also provides that a judge “may be retired for disability interfering with the performance of his duties which is, or is likely to become, of a permanent character.”

The Code includes four Canons that guide judges and justices in their conduct:

Canon 1: A judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

Canon 2: A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently.

Canon 3: A judge shall conduct the judge’s personal and extrajudicial activities to minimize the risk of conflict with the obligations of judicial office.

Canon 4: A judge or candidate for judicial office shall not engage in political or campaign activity that is inconsistent with the independence, integrity, or impartiality of the judiciary.

Each Canon provides Rules in support of the Canon (e.g., Rule 2.2 requires a judge to serve “fairly and impartially,” and Rule 2.5(A) requires a judge to perform judicial and administrative duties competently and diligently). The Code includes 38 such Rules, which are further supplemented by comments and annotations.

The Commission has no authority to revise or reverse a judge’s decision. Colo. RJD 5(e) mandates that a judge’s error in pre-trial orders, evidentiary or procedural rulings, findings of fact, conclusions of law, sentencing, or other matters vested in the trial or appellate courts under Colo. Const. Art. VI, § 1 are not considered grounds for disciplinary measures.

Colo. RJD 33.5 provides extensive procedures for the evaluation and disposition of complaints involving disabilities. Disability proceedings focus on whether a judge has a physical or mental condition that is adversely affecting the judge’s ability to perform judicial functions or to assist with his or her defense in disciplinary proceedings. The emphasis is on diagnosis and treatment and may involve transfer to temporary judicial disability inactive status pending a determination of the nature and degree of disability.

The Commission’s disciplinary and disability functions are contrasted with the responsibilities of the Office of Judicial Performance Evaluation (Judicial Performance). Judicial Performance collects views from jurors, litigants, attorneys, other judges, law enforcement, court staff, and others involved in judicial proceedings regarding a judge’s competence and overall performance; provides periodic performance reports to the judge; and disseminates public reports of its findings prior to the judge’s retention election.

The Commission and Its Executive Director

The Commission includes ten members who serve without compensation, except for reimbursement of reasonable expenses incurred in performing their duties. The composition of the Commission is determined by Colo. Const. Art. VI, § 23 (3)(a) and (b). It includes two district court judges and two county court judges, who are appointed by the Supreme Court; two lawyers who have practiced in Colorado for at least ten years, neither of whom may be a justice or judge, and who are appointed by the Governor with

the consent of the Senate; and four citizens, who are not and have not been judges, who are not licensed to practice law in Colorado, and who are appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate. Members serve four year terms and may be reappointed. The list of Commissioners as of December 2015 appears at the end of this report.

Colo. RJD 3 provides for the organization and administration of the Commission, including the appointment of an Executive Director whose duties, subject to the general oversight of members of the Commission, include the operation of a permanent office, the preliminary evaluation and investigation of complaints, the maintenance of records and statistics, the employment of investigators and special counsel, the preparation and administration of the Commission's operating budget, and the publication of this annual report.

Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings

Any person may file a complaint alleging judicial misconduct or a disability. Colo. RJD 12, 13, 14, and 16 govern the filing, preliminary evaluation, investigation, and consideration of complaints. The Commission will consider complaints in any written format that describes the alleged misconduct and provides relevant information, such as the case number of the litigation, the date of the alleged misconduct, pleadings, orders, and excerpts from transcripts. The Commission provides a complaint form on request and through its website, which includes important information regarding the grounds for judicial discipline and guidelines for preparation of the complaint. However, complaints also may be in the form of a letter or summary that provides the required information.

Complaints may be mailed, delivered, emailed, or faxed to the Commission. Arrangements can be made with the Executive Director to accommodate disabled persons in preparing and filing complaints. The Commission has the authority to initiate a complaint on its own motion.

The Commission generally meets bi-monthly and may hold special meetings or convene by conference call, when necessary. In 2015, the Commission's regular meetings were held in January, March, May, July, October, and December.

Disciplinary proceedings may involve several phases: (1) the **preliminary evaluation** process under Colo. RJD 13; (2) an **investigation** under Colo. RJD 14; (3) **consideration and decision** by members of the Commission under Colo. RJD 16, which could result in a privately administered disposition under Colo. RJD 35; (4) **disability proceedings** under Colo. RJD 33.5; or (5) **formal proceedings** under Colo. RJD 18, which could result in a public disciplinary sanction. The Commission may request the

Supreme Court to order the temporary suspension of a judge under Colo. RJD 34, with pay, pending the resolution of preliminary or formal proceedings.

Preliminary Evaluation

The Commission or the Executive Director will determine “whether a complaint provides sufficient cause to warrant further investigation and evaluation,” pursuant to Colo. RJD 13. Complaints that do not allege sufficient cause are dismissed. The Commission reviews dismissal decisions made by the Executive Director. Dismissals include complaints that:

- do not allege facts, that, if proven, would constitute grounds for disciplinary action under the Canons or Colo. RJD
- are challenging rulings by a trial or appellate court that do not involve grounds for misconduct distinct from the legal issues before the court
- are frivolous
- are beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission (e.g., a complaint directed at alleged misconduct by a lawyer or a deputy sheriff).

Dismissals under Colo. RJD 13 often involve complaints that are driven by trial or appellate issues rather than by judicial ethics. It is not uncommon for complainants—particularly those who have appeared in court pro se—to allege that a judge’s rulings on evidentiary or procedural issues or a judge’s findings of fact or conclusions of law, with which they disagree, are sufficient to establish misconduct under the Code. However, Colo. RJD 5(e) prohibits the Commission from initiating disciplinary action when the complaint is based on rulings that are under the jurisdiction of the trial court or are subject to appellate review, unless there is credible evidence of misconduct in addition to issues within the jurisdiction of the courts.

A complaint will be dismissed as groundless if it is filed as a trial tactic to create grounds for the disqualification (recusal) of a judge, when there is no reason for disqualification under applicable procedural rules.

Investigation

At each meeting, the Commission examines complaints that have survived preliminary evaluation, and reviews the Executive Director’s dismissal of complaints that do not present grounds for disciplinary proceedings. See “Review of Complaints in 2015,” below. If the Commission deems that a complaint has alleged sufficient grounds to initiate disciplinary proceedings, it authorizes the Executive Director to undertake an investigation

under Colo. RJD 14. The Executive Director notifies the judge of the investigation and the nature of the allegations. The judge is afforded an opportunity to respond.

Under Colo. RJD 14(c), the Executive Director may begin an investigation promptly on receipt of credible allegations of unreasonable delays in any litigation, so that a delay that may have occurred is not aggravated by awaiting the Commission's consideration at its next meeting.

The investigation involves steps that are appropriate in the circumstances, such as an examination of court records, a review of written transcripts or audio recordings of proceedings, interviews of witnesses, an evaluation of the judge's response, and requests for further information from the complainant or the judge.

Consideration and Decision

The complaint is assigned to one of the members of the Commission to evaluate and present to the other members for their consideration. Colo. RJD 16(c) requires that allegations of misconduct must be established by a preponderance of the evidence. A decision is made by majority vote of the members participating in the meeting, exclusive of the presenting member.

When a complaint has been fully considered by the Commission, the dispositions available, under Colo. RJD 16 and 35, include:

- dismissal of an unfounded complaint (a dismissal may be accompanied by the Commission's expression of concern about the circumstances)
- private admonishment for an appearance of impropriety, even though the judge's conduct in other respects meets minimum standards
- private reprimand or private censure for misconduct that does not merit public sanction by the Supreme Court
- the deferral of disciplinary proceedings under a diversion plan in which the judge obtains training, counseling, or medical treatment or provides periodic docket management reports to the Commission
- a stipulated private disposition that could include the judge's resignation or retirement
- the commencement of disability proceedings under Colo. RJD 33.5
- a finding of probable cause to commence formal proceedings.

Disability Proceedings

Colo. RJD 33.5 provides extensive procedures and requirements for conducting proceedings in which the Commission can evaluate and consider whether a "judge suffers

from a physical or mental condition that effects the judge's ability to perform judicial functions or to assist with his or her defense in disciplinary proceedings.”

The Supreme Court may enter orders appropriate to the nature and anticipated duration of the disability, including transfer of the judge to temporary judicial disability status; retirement for a permanent disability; and/or transfer of the judge to lawyer disability status, if the disability also prevents the judge from practicing law.

Formal Proceedings

Formal proceedings involve a trial conducted under Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure to address allegations of misconduct for which private discipline would not be sufficient. If the Commission finds probable cause to commence formal proceedings, it appoints special counsel to review the allegations and evidence of misconduct. On special counsel's concurrence that there is probable cause, special counsel will prepare and serve a statement of charges on the judge. The Commission then requests the Supreme Court to appoint three special masters, under Colo. RJD 18.5, to preside over the proceedings.

Findings by the special masters may result in the Commission's dismissal of the complaint or its recommendation to the Supreme Court for sanctions or other action, under Colo. RJD 36 and 37. A recommendation may include:

- suspension without pay for a specified period
- removal from office or retirement
- public reprimand or censure
- privately administered discipline under Colo. RJD 35
- a stipulated resolution of the charges
- measures reasonably necessary to curtail or eliminate the judge's misconduct, such as a diversion plan or deferred discipline plan
- a remand of the complaint to the Commission for disability proceedings.

Confidentiality

As provided in Colo. Const. Art. VI, § 23(3)(g), “all papers filed with and proceedings before the Commission” are confidential, unless and until such time as the Commission files a recommendation for sanctions with the Colorado Supreme Court. However, Colo. RJD 6.5 clarifies that this confidentiality requirement does not prohibit the Commission from interviewing witnesses, cooperating with Attorney Regulation or law enforcement, or responding to requests from the Supreme Court or judicial nominating commissions concerning the disciplinary record, if any, of a judge who is under consideration for

another judicial position. The Commission's proceedings, including its consideration of potential disciplinary measures, remain confidential, as required by the Constitution.

In addition, Colo. RJD 6.5(f) authorizes the Commission or a judge to request the Supreme Court to authorize the release of information about a disciplinary proceeding if the allegations of misconduct "have become generally known to the public and, in the interest of justice, should be publicly disclosed." Colo. RJD 6.5(i) authorizes the publication in this annual report of a summary of proceedings that resulted in a private disposition or a public sanction. If information is requested by Judicial Performance and the Commission determines, in its discretion, that such disclosure is consistent with the Commission's constitutional mandate, it may provide information about a judge's conduct on the condition that Judicial Performance may not publicly disclose such information without independent verification.

Review of Complaints in 2015

Types of Complaints

The Executive Director and the Commission's administrative assistant manage the intake of complaints and requests for information. When appropriate, callers are redirected to Judicial Performance, Attorney Regulation, or, if a municipal judge is involved, the city or town where the judge presides. The Commission also responds to inquiries from the judiciary regarding the provisions of the Code.

During 2015, the Commission received 175 written complaints. This is fewer than the average of 181 complaints received annually in the preceding seven years. Beginning in September 2014, the Commission began receiving complaints by email; 59 of the 175 complaints in 2015 were filed by email.

The Commission launched its website in 2010. The website provides essential information to the public, including an explanation of the Commission's procedures; a downloadable complaint form; frequently asked questions; recent annual reports; and links to the Colorado Constitution, Code, and Colo. RJD. The website has significantly increased the transparency of the Commission's authority and proceedings. The public's contact with the Commission in 2015 included approximately 1,800 web hits and 289 phone inquiries. Phone inquiries have declined substantially from the roughly 700 to 800 calls received before the website was established.

In 2015, complaints were lodged against judges in each of the state's 22 judicial districts. Two complaints were filed against judges of the Court of Appeals and none were filed against a justice of the Supreme Court.

Of the 175 complaints received in 2015, 79 arose in the criminal law docket, many of which were filed by inmates in county jails or the Colorado Department of Corrections. A total of 49 complaints involved litigation in the general civil docket, of which three were in small claims court and five were filed by inmates as habeas corpus petitions or claims against Department of Corrections personnel. Other complaints included five in traffic cases, 49 in domestic relations cases, nine in juvenile court matters, and eight in probate matters. Several complaints pertained to issues involving more than one category of litigation or more than one type of court.

In addition to complaints from litigants, many of whom had appeared in court pro se, six were filed by attorneys; nine were filed by relatives, friends, or court observers; two were filed by judges (including a judge's self-report of the judge's own behavior that involved potential grounds for misconduct); and one was initiated by the Commission.

The frequency of various grounds alleged in the 175 complaints is summarized below. Some complaints involved multiple grounds.

- administrative issues with colleagues and staff: 1
- appearance of impropriety: 1
- bias or prejudice: 29
- courtroom demeanor/intemperance: 12
- disputed rulings/appellate issues
 - appointment, inadequacy or misconduct of counsel: 8
 - bonds, sentencing, restitution, probation, unlawful detainer: 10
 - civil protection orders: 7
 - collections: 5
 - competency/mental health: 4
 - contempt proceedings: 1
 - foreclosures: none
 - habeas corpus petitions: 5
 - jurors: selection/service/misconduct: 1
 - juvenile—dependency & neglect, child placement: 9
 - landlord/tenant: 2
 - parenting plans: 12
 - permanent orders and post decree motions: 3
 - probate—estates, guardians, conservators: 8
 - procedural or constitutional rules: 18

- relevance/admissibility of evidence: 6
- service of process: 1
- sovereign citizen claims: 1
- statutory or case law issues: 1
- disability/ADA: 1
- ex parte communications: 4
- failure to manage the docket diligently, including lengthy delays in issuing rulings: 27
- prejudicial relationships with attorneys or litigants: 1
- recusal procedures: 7
- allegations directed at the conduct of officials other than state judges:
 - attorneys, district attorneys, public defenders, ALJs, or magistrates: 8
 - law enforcement or Department of Corrections staff: 2

The dispositions authorized by Colo. RJD 16 and 35 are described in “Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings—Consideration and Decision,” above. Most incidents of misconduct are addressed by private disciplinary letters or diversion plans.

The Executive Director dismissed 153 complaints under Colo. RJD 13(b) during the preliminary evaluation phase. While the Commission is provided with copies of the Executive Director’s dismissal letters for discussion at its next meeting, it also receives requests for reconsideration of dismissal from complainants. Four such requests were evaluated and the dismissals affirmed.

Through its December 2015 meeting, the Commission had considered 19 complaints, including complaints carried over from 2014. After further investigation, the Commission dismissed 14 of these 19 complaints because they did not include evidence of misconduct that would satisfy the preponderance of the evidence standard in Colo. RJD 16(c), or they involved issues under the jurisdiction of the appellate courts. Examples of complaints that are usually dismissed include a judge’s candor about the credibility of a witness; a brief instance of intemperance in stressful circumstances without evidence of a pattern of willful or persistent misconduct; errors by court staff where there is no reasonable basis to attribute them to the judge; emotionally charged hearings involving parenting issues; insisting on deadlines for efficient case management; and reasonable measures to control the actions and demeanor of attorneys and litigants, including pro se parties.

Disciplinary Measures Applied in 2015

Colo. RJD 6.5(i) authorizes the publication in this annual report of summaries of proceedings that have resulted in disciplinary dispositions or sanctions without disclosing the date or location of the misconduct or the identity of the judge.

The Commission dismissed a complaint with an expression of concern to improve a new judge's demeanor. In another situation, the Commission dismissed a complaint but encouraged a part-time judge to be more sensitive to potential conflicts between the judge's judicial duties and the judge's role as a lawyer in other matters. The Commission referred one complaint to the Denver County Court Judicial Discipline Commission, and carried over two complaints to 2016.

The Commission issued a private admonition regarding a judge's reaction to a process server's erroneous affidavit of service. Upon confession of the process server's error by the litigant's attorney, the judge reacted by prohibiting the process server, who was not present in court, from serving process in all future cases in the judge's court. The Commission determined that this created a dispute between the process server and the Court, in which the process server had the right to be heard, under Canon Rule 2.6(A), and that the judge's action involved a commitment regarding potential future incidents, which was inconsistent with the impartial performance of judicial duties, under Canon Rule 2.10(B).

The Commission successfully closed a diversion program begun in 2013, in which the judge's relationship with staff and judicial colleagues was improved significantly through an independent medical examination and counseling sessions.

The Commission ordered a diversion program requiring periodic docket management reports from a judge, after the judge had delayed issuing an order in a contempt hearing for eight months. The program was successful in improving the staff's management of case flow between the judge and staff, in addition to improving the judge's diligence in issuing decisions.

The disciplinary measures applied by the Commission in 2015 contrasted with corrective action taken in one case in 2007, four in 2008, three in 2009, seven in 2010, ten in 2011, four in 2012, three in 2013, and two in 2014. There were no judges who declined to stand for retention after complaints were filed in 2015, compared with none in 2007, seven in 2008, three in 2009, three in 2010, and none in 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014. There was one retirement for medical disability in 2006 and another in 2007. In 2012 and 2013, while disciplinary proceedings were pending, a judge resigned after receiving a diagnosis of a

medical condition that had been affecting the judge's ability to perform judicial duties competently and another judge resigned because of declining health.

Motions for Postconviction Relief

The number of complaints involving a lack of diligence in ruling on motions for postconviction relief has declined significantly, after the Office of the State Court Administrator (SCAO), on the recommendation of the Commission, implemented measures to expedite the consideration of such motions. There were 21 such complaints in 2012, six in 2013, none in 2014, and five in 2015.

Examples of Disciplinary Proceedings

Private disciplinary action in recent years has been directed at the following misconduct:

- failure to respond to Commission letters and disciplinary measures
- ex parte communications about a pending matter outside the presence of other parties or attorneys
- lack of diligence in docket management (e.g., a substantial delay in issuing a decision)
- impatience, loss of temper, or inability to control the courtroom
- disrespectful remarks to the media or through emails regarding the conduct of a litigant, a witness, an attorney, or another judge
- intemperance or verbal abuse toward an employee, a person dealing with court staff, or a customer of a business establishment
- undue reliance on staff for matters in which the judge should be fully competent
- driving while impaired or under the influence of alcohol
- sexual harassment or other inappropriate personal conduct involving a court employee, witness, attorney, or litigant
- irrelevant, misleading, or incoherent statements during arraignments and sentencing
- rulings from the bench involving unprofessional terminology, including expressions that are viewed as offensive in civilized discourse
- a pattern of errors in handling trials or issuing rulings that indicate a lack of competence
- making public statements about another judge's case
- arbitrary rulings in contempt proceedings that resulted in incarceration without due process
- use of computers, staff, and other court resources for personal or financial matters, except for incidental usage that does not significantly interfere with judicial responsibilities
- involvement in partisan politics
- failure to comply with rules applicable to retention elections

- disregard of court-imposed gag orders
- lack of cooperation with judicial colleagues
- inappropriate remarks to litigants and lawyers during trials or recesses
- discourtesy toward judicial colleagues, administrative staff, and sheriff deputies
- failure to follow applicable procedural rules and Canon rules in considering whether the judge should disqualify (recuse) from presiding
- behavior that the judge may not recognize as a symptom of a medical condition that affects judicial performance.

Proactive Measures

The Commission participates in new judge orientation programs and the annual judicial conference to inform new and experienced judges of their ethical duties and responsibilities under the Canons and to explain the Commission’s rules and procedures.

The Executive Director began periodic visits in 2010 to each judicial district to update the judiciary on current developments and the Commission’s procedures. At the close of 2013, the Executive Director had conducted such meetings in each of the 22 judicial districts. Additional meetings were held in 2014 and 2015. In 2015, thirteen judges contacted the Executive Director for information about the Canons as applied to situations of concern to them.

Based on the inquiries and complaints it receives, the Commission notifies SCAO of the type of judicial conduct that may benefit from judicial education programs.

The Commission and Staff

It is essential that the Commission operate effectively and with the public’s confidence in monitoring the judiciary’s conduct under the Canons. The Commission’s decisions are made independently from Attorney Regulation and SCAO but with their logistical support. When requested, Attorney Regulation provides investigative resources and special counsel to the Commission, and SCAO notifies the Commission of potential misconduct reported by court staff.

As of December 31, 2015, the Commission’s membership included:

<u>Member</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Category of Appointment</u>
Hon. Martha T. Minot, Chair	Durango	County Judge
Richard O. Campbell, Vice Chair	Denver	Attorney
Kathleen Kelley, Secretary	Meeker	Citizen

Bruce A. Casias	Lakewood	Citizen
Hon. Leroy D. Kirby	Brighton	County Judge
Elizabeth Espinosa Krupa	Denver	Attorney
Yolanda Lyons	Monument	Citizen
Sonia Ann Negrete-Winn	Pueblo	Citizen
Hon. William D. Robbins	Denver	District Judge
Hon. Ted C. Tow	Brighton	District Judge

The Commission extends its thanks and appreciation for the service of Commission members Federico C. Alvarez, David L. Dill, and David W. Kenney, Jr., whose terms ended in 2015.

William J. Campbell is the Executive Director of the Commission, having been appointed on February 11, 2009 as interim Executive Director and as Executive Director on July 1, 2010. Campbell's appointment followed a 37-year career as a practicing attorney. He is not related to Commission member Richard O. Campbell. Lauren Eisenbach is the Commission's administrative assistant.

To obtain further information, request a copy of the complaint form, or file a complaint, please refer to the Commission's website, www.coloradojudicialdiscipline.com, or contact the Commission directly at:

Colorado Commission on Judicial Discipline
 Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
 1300 Broadway, Suite 210
 Denver, CO 80203
 (303) 457-5131 (phone)
 (303) 501-1143 (fax)
complaints@jd.state.co.us