FILED

BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DEC - 6 1996

COMMISSION ON JULIUM LUMUUCT

In re the Matter of:

No. 95-2016

The Honorable Kenneth L. Jorgensen, Superior Court Judge of Grant County.

STIPULATION PURSUANT TO WAC 292-12-020(6) AND WASHINGTON STATE CONSTITUTION ARTICLE IV, SECTION 31

Pursuant to the Washington State Constitution, Article IV, Section 31, and WAC 292-12-020(6)¹, the Commission on Judicial Conduct ("Commission") and The Honorable Kenneth L. Jorgensen, Judge of the Grant County Superior Court, do hereby stipulate and agree as provided herein.

The Commission is represented in these proceedings by attorney Andrew C. Bohrnsen and The Honorable Kenneth L. Jorgensen is represented by attorneys Thomas Frey and Anne Bremner.

I. STIPULATED FACTS SUPPORTING CHARGES

- 1. That The Honorable Kenneth L. Jorgensen ("Respondent") is now and has been since 1992 a Superior Court Judge of Grant County.
- 2. On August 2, 1995, Respondent was sent a letter from the Commission informing him that a verified statement was filed in accordance with WAC 292-12-010(4) and WAC 292-12-020(2), and that the Commission was pursuing initial proceedings. A Statement of Allegations was enclosed. Thereafter, on December 29, 1995, an Amended Statement of Allegations was provided to Respondent,

STIPULATION: 1

The Law Offices of Bohrnsen & Owen, P.S.

Attorneys at Law West One Bank Building N. 9 Post, Suite 550 Spokane, WA 99201 Telephone: 509.838,2688 Fax: 509.838,2698

5 6

, т

1

2

3

4

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

2627

28

29

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 31, of the Washington State Constitution, the Commission on Judicial Conduct adopted rules on April 6, 1990, designated as Washington Administrative Code, Chapters 292-08 and 292-12 WAC, and on August 9, 1996, has repealed such rules effective on September 18, 1996, adopted Commission on Judicial Conduct Rules of Procedure (CJCRP) and for confidentiality effective on September 18, 1996.

6

12 13

14

10

11

15 16

17

18 19

2021

2223

2425

2627

28 29 accompanied by a cover letter in accordance with WAC 292-12-010(4) and WAC 292-12-020(2).

- 3. That on both occasions, the Respondent was invited to respond. Respondent responded to the initial Statement of Allegations on August 16, 1995, and responded to the Amended Statement of Allegations on January 8, 1996.
- 4. That on March 8, 1996, a Statement of Charges was filed in Commission offices in accordance with WAC 292-12-030. Respondent was personally served. The Respondent failed to file an answer within 21 days after service of the Statement of Charges. A General Denial was entered on Respondent's behalf, filed April 8, 1996, by the Executive Director of the Commission on Judicial Conduct.
- That in Cause No. 83-3-00290-7, <u>Debbie Rae Cole (f/k/a</u> Debbie Rae Smith) v. Travis Dean Smith, Respondent received a personal phone call from Petitioner's mother, ex-parte, improperly soliciting the quashing of a bench warrant issued by The Honorable Evan Sperline, Judge of the Superior Court of Grant County. said file was highlighted throughout with information regarding the Affidavit of Prejudice filed against Respondent on record in the Clerk's office. In addition, this record indicates that Respondent acknowledged with his signature on this affidavit on December 7, 1992. That in response to said telephone call to the residence of The Honorable Kenneth L. Jorgensen from the mother of Debbie Rae Cole, Judge Jorgensen quashed said warrant, lawfully issued by The Honorable Evan Sperline, Superior Court Judge for Grant County, and directed a deputy of the Grant County Sheriff's Department to not fulfill his duties pursuant to said warrant and to return without said Debbie Rae Cole in custody. That as a result of quashing said warrant, no hearing was ever held, Ms. Cole was allowed to leave the State of Washington, and The Honorable Judge Evan Sperline was compelled to reissue another warrant which remains unserved.
- 6. That in Cause No. 93-3-00536-0, <u>Mark Steven Johnson v.</u>

 <u>Carol Johnson</u>, the Petitioner-father initially appeared before the Respondent as a complaining witness in the company of the Grant

STIPULATION: 2

The Law Offices of Bohrnsen & Owen, P.S.

1 County Deputy Prosecutor, Jerald Hamley, seeking an arrest warrant to be issued against Carol Johnson, then residing in the State of 2 Arizona, on the charge of custodial interference. In the course of 3 giving testimony, Mr. Johnson advised the Respondent that he was 4 aware of the fact that his wife resided in the State of Arizona, 5 that the child was residing with his wife in the State of Arizona, 6 and that a dissolution proceeding was pending in the State of 7 The Respondent failed to contact the Arizona court in Arizona. order to ascertain the status of the dissolution action, and issued 8 a bench warrant for Carol Johnson. Thereafter, the Petitioner-9 father, at the suggestion of the Respondent, reappeared before the 10 ex-parte, having previously filed a new dissolution Respondent, 11 action in the State of Washington. The Petitioner-father, acting 12 pro se, requested the court to enter an order granting him temporary 13 child custody, ex parte, without notice to the other party or the other party's counsel. That Respondent unilaterally assumed 14 jurisdiction over a cause of action, ex-parte, at the request of the 15 Petitioner-father, based on a personal relationship. That a cause 16 of action was already lawfully pending before and within the State 17 of Arizona. That prior to assuming jurisdiction, the Respondent was 18 advised that said action was pending and that the minor child of the 19 parties was residing with the mother. That thereafter, Respondent improperly issued an arrest warrant for the Respondent-20 mother named in the Grant County action, then a resident of the 21 Further, that Respondent issued a Writ of State of Arizona. 22 Extradition and assisted in advising the Petitioner-father as to the 23 proper method to seek enforcement of said Writ in the State of 24 Arizona. Thereafter, that the Respondent refused to consult with 25 The Honorable Judge William J. O'Neil, Judge of Pinal County, regarding the case pending in Arizona and refused to respond to his 26

7. That on December 15, 1995, the Respondent had ex-parte communications with the Grant County Prosecutor in which Respondent

efforts to do so until after Respondent closed the case filed in the

STIPULATION: 3

Grant County Superior Court.

27

28

29

The Law Offices of Bohrnsen & Owen, P.S.

 was overheard discussing the specifics of a plea bargain in Grant County Superior Court Cause No. 95-1-00496-5, State of Washington v_{\star} Gregory Paul Roberts. That assigned defense counsel, Tom Earl, was not notified, was not present, and did not consent to this ex-parte discussion.

- 8. That the Respondent has, by his conduct, repeatedly given the appearance of having had additional ex-parte contacts with both parties and counsel at locations outside of the Court, off the record, and to the exclusion of opposing parties and opposing counsel where issues in controversy were discussed and matters of substance appeared to be decided without notice to opposing counsel.
- 9. That the Respondent's demeanor in the course of acting as a Superior Court Judge of the State of Washington in and for the County of Grant has on multiple occasions given the impression to both parties and attorneys that he was failing to be attentive to the matters pending before him.
- 10. That the Respondent has demonstrated a level of competency below that demanded of a Superior Court Judge for the State of Washington in civil matters involving, but not limited to, general jurisdiction, evidence, domestic relations, and ethics.
- 11. That the Respondent has failed to avail himself of educational assistance programs for judges which relate to duties and responsibilities including, but not limited to, the National Judicial College and the Superior Court Judges' Association Mentor Program.
- 12. That Respondent's incompetence and failure to address competency problems have placed an unmanageable burden on the Superior Court Clerk's Office, administrative staff, and Judge Evan Sperline, the only other duly elected Superior Court Judge in Grant County.
- 13. That the Respondent has given the appearance to have been swayed by personal affiliations and relationships with members of organizations to which Respondent belongs thereby appearing to give favorable treatment as a result of that affiliation. That said

STIPULATION: 4

The Law Offices of Bohrnsen & Owen, P.S.

 appearance has resulted in the filing of numerous Affidavits of Prejudice thereby placing an additional burden on the Superior Court Clerk's Office, administrative staff, and Judge Evan Sperline.

II. STIPULATED AGREEMENT AND SANCTIONS

- 1. Respondent agrees and stipulates to the facts as set forth above.
- 2. That said conduct constitutes a violation of Canons 1, 2(A), 2(B), 3(A)(1), 3(A)(4), 3(A)(5), and 3(A)(6).
- 3. Respondent agrees and stipulates that the facts as set forth above warrant the Commission entering an Order of Censure.
- 4. That the Respondent agrees and stipulates to immediately register and successfully complete the following courses sponsored by the National Judicial College:

(c) (d)	General Jurisdiction Advanced Evidence Decision Making Ethics for Judges	1 week 1 week 1 week 2½ days
(e)	Judicial Writing	1 week

- 5. That Respondent agrees and stipulates to register and attend not less than 15 hours of CLE in areas of jurisdiction, evidence, ethics and civil procedure, per year, for two years commencing upon entry of the Commission's Order. All seminars must be pre-approved by Commission and proof of attendance filed upon successful completion.
- 6. That the Respondent agrees and stipulates to schedule and meet with an approved Judicial Mentor not less than once per month.
- 7. That the Respondent agrees and stipulates that he will disclose to opposing parties and counsel any personal relationship, excluding those involving merely name and facial familiarity, based upon the Respondent's common membership in a club or congregation with said party or attorney in any formalized organization.
- 8. That the Respondent agrees and stipulates that he shall not make any exculpating statements to the press, media, or public which in any way retracts from the facts stipulated to the above sanctions entered by this Commission.

STIPULATION: 5

The Law Offices of Bohrnsen & Owen, P.S.

7

4

13 14

12

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

2223

2425

26

2728

29

9. That the Respondent shall take no action which may be reasonably perceived as retaliatory in nature related to these proceedings.

10. That Respondent stipulates and agrees that by entering into this Stipulation and agreement he hereby waives his procedural and appeal rights pursuant to CJCRP 25² and Article IV, Section 31, of the Washington State Constitution in this proceeding No. 95-2016-F-60.

III. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

1. The Commission and Respondent agree that they intend, by this Stipulation, to bring this matter to conclusion.

2. That this Stipulation shall not become effective until approved by the Washington Commission on Judicial Conduct. If the Stipulation is not accepted, the proceedings will go forward as though this Stipulation had not been entered into. Furthermore, until such time as the Commission accepts this Stipulation, its terms and conditions shall be strictly confidential and, in the event this Stipulation is not accepted, then its terms and conditions shall not constitute evidence at the time of hearing nor shall any provision contained within this Stipulation and Agreement be disclosed nor made public.

DATED this day of October, 1996.

JORGENSEN

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

T ...

By:

NDREW C. BOHRNSEN

Attorney for Commission

STAFFORD FREX COOPER

By: THOMAS D FREY

Atterney for Respondent

² Effective September 18, 1996.

STIPULATION:

The Law Offices of Bohrnsen & Owen, P.S.

IV. ORDER OF CENSURE

Based on the foregoing Stipulation and Agreement set forth herein, the Commission hereby orders, and Respondent is hereby CENSURED for violating Canons 1, 2(A), 2(B), 3(A)(1), 3(A)(4), 3(A)(5) and 3(A)(6) of the Code of Judicial Conduct. Such conduct detrimentally affects the integrity of the judiciary and undermines public confidence in the administration of justice. Respondent shall follow a corrective course of action as enumerated in Section II, Stipulated Agreement and Sanctions, govern his conduct in accordance therewith, and shall confirm with the foregoing Agreement.

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

By:

HAROLD D. CLARKE, III

Presiding Officer

STIPULATION: 7

The Law Offices of Bohrnsen & Owen, P.S.