	COMMISSION ON UNITED BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON	
1	BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT	
2	OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON	
3		7
4	In The Matter Of:)	
. 5	The Honorable Edwin L. Poyfair,)CJC No. 6691-F-153Clark County Superior Court Judge)	
6 7) STIPULATION, AGREEMENT) AND ORDER OF CENSURE	
8)	
9	The Washington State Commission on Judicial Conduct ("Commission") and the	
10	Honorable Edwin L. Poyfair, Judge of the Clark County Superior Court ("Respondent"),	
11	stipulate and agree as provided herein. This stipulation is submitted pursuant to Article IV,	
12	Section 31 of the Washington Constitution and Rule 23 of the Commission's Rules of	
13	Procedure and shall not become effective until accepted by the Commission.	
14		
15	I. STIPULATED FACTS	
16	1. Respondent is now, and was at all times referred to in this document, a	
17	judge of the Clark County Superior Court. He has served in that capacity since 1992.	
18 19	Matter One: In Re the Adoption of L. MH.	
20	2. On January 28 and February 11, 2011, Respondent presided over two	
21	hearings ¹ in a voluntary adoption case, In Re the Adoption of L. MH., Cause No. 10-5-	
22	00250-7. In that matter, a birth mother, "M.M.", had placed her child, born March 8, 2010,	
23	for adoption with a married couple when the child was approximately six weeks old. The	
24	January 28, 2011 hearing was set to terminate the parental rights of the biological father,	
25	who had not previously participated in the case. Shortly before that hearing, M.M. learned	
26 27	that the prospective adoptive father had a history of sexual misconduct with young girls,	
28	¹ Respondent presided over two subsequent hearings in the case, only the first two are the subject of this disciplinary matter.	

whereupon M.M. no longer wished the couple to adopt her child. M.M. believed, incorrectly, that she had already waived her rights to the child. To prevent the adoption, and believing that she had no legal right to obtain return of the child to her, M.M. persuaded the birth father, "G.H.," to come to court on the 28th and ask for the child to be placed with him. Neither M.M. nor G.H. were represented by counsel at this hearing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

After calling the case and learning the names of the parties in court, Respondent 7 immediately inquired whether G.H., who is of Hispanic origin and spoke Spanish, was in 8 this country legally. When G.H. answered that he was not legally here, Respondent replied ġ that "Well then maybe we should call Immigration before you leave and find out if they wish 10 you detained." Respondent did call a law enforcement officer to the courtroom, but was 11 12 informed by that officer that he could not detain G.H. In the 26 minute hearing, 13 Respondent referenced G.H.'s immigration status seven times, going so far as to say that 14 he was "going to note for the authorities that he is illegal and that if in fact he should not 15 be here then he should be picked up and he should be sent back." Respondent then 16 required G.H. to give him his identification. Later in the hearing, Respondent returned to 17 the subject and said, "I don't know where Immigration is right now, I know that they, up in 18 King County, they're having a field day picking people up, I don't know down here what 19 they're doing ... " 20

In response to M.M.'s desire that the child be placed with G.H., Respondent said,
"Ma'am, this isn't WalMart. And he doesn't get to go to the shelf and pick a baby off all
right?" He went on to say, "It's not taking back a pair of shoes." When M.M. attempted to
explain that she no longer wanted the petitioners to adopt her child because she had
learned the prospective adoptive father had a history of sexual misconduct with young girls,
Respondent cut her off and threatened her with contempt of court, saying, "You're going
to spend the weekend here if you open your mouth again before I tell you to open it."

- 2 -

1 Although Respondent had the case file present in the courtroom, he made no effort 2 to check the status of the case. Respondent states that at the time of this January 28th 3 hearing he was concerned that all statements made by M.M. and G.H. were verbal and that 4 they did not present any written pleadings. Respondent understands now that none were 5 required by law. He never informed M.M. that her rights had not been terminated. He did 6 not inquire as to the allegations concerning the prospective adopting father. Instead, he 7 continued the case while permitting the child to remain with the petitioners for adoption. 8 Respondent continued the matter to February 11 and without explanation 3. 9 or direction, told the birth parents, neither of whom were represented by lawyers, that they 10 11 needed to file "answers" in order to prevent the adoption and that failure to do so would 12 result in him finalizing the adoption. In addition, despite indicating on the record that the 13 apparently confused birth parents had an absolute right to counsel, Respondent did not 14 give them any information as to how they could obtain a court-appointed attorney. 15 G.H. did not come to court for the hearing on February 11. On the record 4. 16 M.M. explained G.H. was not present because Respondent "scared him" and he thought 17 he was going to "get deported" to which Respondent replied that "he ought to be." Both 18 G.H. and M.M. had filed declarations with the court, indicating their desire to stop the 19 adoption. Respondent told M.M. that the declarations were not in the proper form, and in 20 granting a one week extension, said "if you fail to get your response within one week, then 21 22 I'm going to finalize the adoption." There is, however, no prescribed form which must be 23 used by a birth parent to indicate her revocation of consent prior to termination of rights. 24 Respondent still did not direct M.M. to court-appointed counsel, though she was plainly 25 legally entitled to such representation. In referring to G.H., Respondent said he "would not 26 grant custody of a child to an illegal." Respondent did not return the child to the mother, 27 a legal parent, and not having done so, he once more left the child with the prospective 28

- 3 -

adopting couple without any inquiry into potential danger to the baby.

1

18

25

2 5. At no point in these hearings did Respondent explain to the biological 3 parents that an unfinalized voluntary adoption placement may be revoked by the biological 4 parents at any point prior to the termination of each of their parental rights. While 5 Respondent did advise the parties that the adoption would not go forward on that day, he 6 told them the court could and would authorize adoption of the child against their wishes, 7 which was entirely incorrect legally and contrary to their fundamental constitutional liberty 8 rights to parent their natural child. Instead, he urged these unrepresented litigants to talk 9 with the prospective adoptive parents' lawyer, stating it would be best to try to work 10 11 something out, strongly hinting that the best resolution would be for them to agree to the 12 adoption. A person's immigration status is legally immaterial to the question of whether 13 he can parent his biological child, unless there is some competing interest in the parenting 14 of that child, such as another party entitled to seek custody or an allegation by the state 15 that the biological parent has neglected or abused the child. There was no such legally 16 competing interest in this case.² 17

Matter Two: Oslund-Jones v. Jones

On March 30, 2011, Respondent presided over a hearing in another matter,
 a contentious dissolution involving custody of one minor child, Oslund-Jones v. Jones,
 Cause No. 08-3-01930-3. The Respondent was frustrated by the level of conflict between
 the parties, who had been before the court no less than twenty (20) previous times in the
 matter. In that March 30 hearing, Respondent twice called one litigant a "liar" and, at a

26 M.M. and G.H. secured counsel to represent them and, at a hearing on April 27, 2011, before a different judicial officer, the child was ordered to be returned, immediately, to M.M. and G.H. By then, the child had been with the prospective adopting couple for three months since the birth parents attempted to inform the court of the potential danger and to regain custody. While they shared custody of the child for a time, G.H. was later deported. It is unknown whether Respondent's inappropriate inquiry as to the birth father's immigration status, in open court, was the cause of the immigration detention and deportation.

different point in the hearing, loudly chastised the litigant and her attorney to "Just listen!,"
while the person was apparently taking notes. He had previously told the parties that when
they "lay the daughter on the altar of the court, she becomes mine."

7. In responding to the Commission's preliminary inquiries regarding both cases,
Respondent explained that the frustrations and stresses of the domestic calendar, coupled
with his deep concern for the well-being of the children involved, were significant factors
underlying his conduct.

II. AGREEMENT

A. Respondent Violated the Code of Judicial Conduct

9

10

11

24

25

26

12 1. Based upon the foregoing stipulated facts, Respondent and the Commission 13 agree Respondent violated Canon 1 (Rule 1.2) and Canon 2 (Rules 2.2, 2.3(A) and (B), 14 and 2.8(B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct by failing to return a child to the child's 15 undisputed biological parent, failing to recognize the parent's legal right to revoke her 16 consent.³ failing to provide adequate information as to obtaining counsel to the child's 17 parents despite recognizing they had an absolute right to same, injecting immigration 18 status into the matter as a means of intimidating a litigant to keep him from pursuing 19 custody of his child, and displaying an impatient, undignified and discourteous demeanor. 20

21 2. Canon 1 requires judges to uphold the integrity of the judiciary by avoiding
 22 impropriety and the appearance of impropriety and by acting at all times in a manner that
 23 promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

3. Canon 2 requires judges to perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently. Rule 2.2 requires judges to uphold the law and to perform all

By refusing to return the child to the mother and failing to recognize the mother's right to revoke her consent to the adoption, Respondent continued the child in the care of persons who, with the mother's revocation, had no right to the child. This in itself is a failure to follow the law.

duties of judicial office fairly and impartially. Rule 2.3(A) requires that judges perform the
duties of judicial office without bias or prejudice. Rule 2.3(B) states that judges shall not
manifest bias or prejudice or engage in harassment, which is defined as verbal or physical
conduct that denigrates or shows hostility or aversion toward a person on bases such as
race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation,
marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation. Rule 2.8(B) requires judges be
patient, dignified and courteous.

4. Discourteous and intolerant behavior by a judge in the judge's official capacity 9 erodes the public's confidence in the impartiality and integrity of the judicial system in 10 11 several ways. Judicial intemperance can give the impression that the judge's ruling is 12 based on personal feelings, rather than on the law and facts of a case. It is bullying 13 conduct, in that a litigant is not free to respond in kind because of the power imbalance. 14 This is particularly troubling in a case where such a fundamental and heartfelt interest as 15 child custody is at stake. It creates the possibility that those subjected to the conduct will 16 be intimidated and/or distracted from presenting their cases. Public confidence in the 17 integrity and impartiality of the judiciary is also undermined when a judge's conduct creates 18 in the mind of a reasonable person the perception that the judge is exercising bias or 19 prejudice, regardless of whether the perceived bias or prejudice exists. 20

21

27

28

2.

B. Imposition of Sanction

1. The sanction imposed by the Commission must be commensurate to the
 level of Respondent's culpability and must be sufficient to restore and maintain the dignity
 and honor of the judicial position. The sanction should also seek to protect the public by
 assuring that Respondent and other judges will refrain from similar acts of misconduct in
 the future.

In determining the appropriate level of sanction to impose, the Commission

- 6 -

1 has carefully considered the factors set out in CJCRP 6(c).

2

28

A. Characteristics of Respondent's Misconduct.

(i) Whether the misconduct is an isolated instance or evidence of a pattern of conduct.
Respondent expressed frustration and anger at litigants in custody matters in more
than one hearing and in more than one case. While the Commission does not have
evidence that he consistently does so, it is not accurate to call this misconduct an
isolated incident. In addition, his improper conduct appears to stem from his sense
of personal involvement in child custody matters.

(ii) The nature, extent, and frequency of occurrence of the acts of misconduct. The
nature of the misconduct was intimidation of unrepresented litigants who were seeking
to retain custody of their biological child; and anger and intimidation directed at litigants
who were contesting custody of their child. The conduct took place over the course
of hearings in two cases.

(iii) Whether the misconduct occurred in or out of the courtroom. The misconduct
 occurred in the courtroom.

18 (iv) Whether the misconduct occurred in the judge's official capacity or in the judge's 19 private life. The misconduct occurred in the judge's official capacity. 20 (v) Whether the judge flagrantly and intentionally violated the oath of office. It is the 21 paramount duty of a judge to uphold the constitution: to afford due process to all 22 litigants, and to assure that litigants' constitutional rights are protected. While there is 23 24 not evidence that Respondent intentionally or flagrantly transgressed his oath of office, 25 he failed to explain and protect the constitutional rights of the litigants in the voluntary 26 adoption case during the hearings at issue. 27

(vi) The nature and extent to which the acts of misconduct have been injurious to other

- 7 -

persons. The misconduct was significantly injurious as it deprived the biological
parents of their child for an additional three months, denied the child the care and
comfort of her parents, and left the child in potential danger from the prospective
adoptive father during that time. The judge's intemperate demeanor reasonably
appeared to inhibit the litigants' ability to present their concerns to the court in both
cases at issue.

8 (vii) The extent to which the judge exploited the judge's official capacity to satisfy
 9 personal desires. Respondent did not exploit his office for personal gain.

(viii) The effect the misconduct has upon the integrity of and respect for the judiciary.
Respondent has explained his conduct by observing that family court can be frustrating
and emotional. He further explains that his conduct stems from his strong concern for the
well-being of children. However, it is precisely in the resolution of emotional,
contentious issues that a judge is required to be detached, neutral, and to resolve
contests based on law and a full presentation of facts, and not emotion, no matter how
sincere.

18

B. Service and Demeanor of Respondent.

(i) Whether the judge has acknowledged or recognized that the acts occurred. By
entering into this stipulation, Respondent has acknowledged that the acts occurred
and that his conduct was inappropriate.

(ii) Whether the judge has evidenced an effort to change or modify the conduct. Prior
 to entry of this stipulation, Respondent voluntarily attended ethics training at the Spring
 2011 Semi-Annual Judges' Conference held at Suncadia and has publicly announced
 his retirement, effective May 1, 2012. Respondent's retirement was planned prior to
 the initiation of this proceeding.

- 8 -

(iii) The judge's length of service in a judicial capacity. Respondent has been a full
time judicial officer for twenty years. As mitigating factors upon announcing his
retirement, Respondent has received several complimentary responses concerning
his twenty years of service on the Superior Court bench. In addition, Respondent was
voted Jurist of the Year in 2008, by the Family Law section of the Washington State
Bar Association.

8 (iv) Whether there has been prior disciplinary action concerning the judge.
 9 Respondent was previously admonished by the Commission in 1995 in a matter
 10 regarding a custody case.⁴

(v) Whether the judge cooperated with the commission investigation and proceeding.
Respondent's early, more emotional response to the Commission was tempered over
time while resolving the case. Respondent sincerely apologizes for his improprieties
and errors.

(vi) Whether the judge complied with an opinion by the ethics advisory committee. This
 factor is not applicable.

3. Based upon the stipulated facts, upon consideration and balancing of the
above factors, Respondent and the Commission agree that Respondent's stipulated
misconduct shall be sanctioned by the imposition of a censure. A "censure" is a
written action of the Commission that requires Respondent to appear personally before
the Commission and that finds that the conduct of Respondent is a violation of the

25

In that disciplinary action, pursuant to a stipulation and agreement, the Commission admonished the judge who, without subpoena or official summons but under threat of subpoena, signed a two-page affidavit that provided opinion evidence concerning the parenting skills of both parties in a pending matter. In the affidavit, the judge declared "I am currently a sitting superior court judge" and that his opinion was shared by other judges in the county. (*In re the Honorable Edwin L. Poyfair*, CJC No. 94-1921-F-57.)

-9-

Code of Judicial Conduct that detrimentally affects the integrity of the judiciary, and
undermines public confidence in the administration of justice. It is the highest level of
sanction the Commission can impose on its own. With a censure, the Commission
could also recommend to the Supreme Court that a respondent judge be suspended
or removed from office. The Commission and Respondent agree that such a
recommendation is not warranted in this matter, however. A censure shall include a
requirement that the respondent follow a specified corrective course of action.

9 4. Respondent agrees that he will not repeat such conduct in the future,
 10 mindful of the potential threat any repetition of his conduct poses to public confidence
 11 in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and to the administration of justice.

5. Respondent agrees that he will promptly read and familiarize himself
again with the Code of Judicial Conduct in its entirety and provide the Commission
with confirmation of this fact within one month of the date of entry of this stipulation,
agreement and order. In light of the training referenced above and Respondent's
announced intention to retire, the Commission has not sought additional remedial
measures.

20 Standard Additional Terms and Conditions

19

Respondent agrees that by entering into this stipulation and agreement,
 he waives his procedural rights and appeal rights in this proceeding pursuant to the
 Commission on Judicial Conduct Rules of Procedure and Article IV, Section 31 of the
 Washington State Constitution.

7. Respondent further agrees that he will not retaliate against any person
 known or suspected to have cooperated with the Commission, or otherwise associated
 with this matter.

وسرور برجع معالأ محبا محافية

Respondent affirms he has consulted with or has had an opportunity to 8. consult with counsel prior to entering into this stipulation. Hon. Edwin L. Poyfair Date Rita L. Bender Dáte Disciplinary Counsel Commission on Judicial Conduct ġ - 11 -

	Hon, Edwin L. Poyfair	<u></u> Date	
•			
	Rita L. Bender Disciplinary Counsel	Date	
	Commission on Judicial Conduct		ľ
		•	ŀ
		- · ·	
		•	
		· · · · ·	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	· · · ·		
	- 11 -		

ORDER OF CENSURE

1

I	ORDER OF CENSURE
2	Based on the above Stipulation and Agreement, the Commission on Judicial
3	Conduct hereby orders Respondent, Judge Edwin L. Poyfair, CENSURED for the above
4	set forth violations of the Code of Judicial Conduct. Respondent shall not engage in such
5	conduct in the future and shall fulfill all of the terms of the Stipulation and Agreement as
6 7	set forth therein.
. 8	
9	DATED this day of, 2012
10	
11	ALL CLA
12	John W. Sleeter, Chair
13	Commission on Judicial Conduct
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27 28	
20	_ 11 _