FILED

AUG - 9 1990

OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTONOF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

In Re the Matter of)	
)	CJC No. 98-2785-F-77
The Honorable Grant L. Anderson)	
Pierce County Superior Court)	STATEMENT OF CHARGES
930 Tacoma Avenue South)	
Tacoma, Washington 98402)	
)	

I. JUDICIAL SERVICE

- 1. From 1978 through 1992, Judge Grant L. Anderson was a part-time municipal court judge for the City of Fircrest, Washington.
- From January, 1993, to the present, Judge Anderson has been a Pierce County Superior Court Judge.

II. FACTS

3. The charges herein are based on a pattern of misconduct, the critical facts of which were unknown to the Commission until after completion of CJC No. 96-2179-F-64 in April 1998. The facts establish a pattern of dishonesty and deception spanning approximately a decade. The first involves Judge Anderson's false testimony in CJC No. 96-2179-F-64. Related matters, which also bear on Judge Anderson's motive to testify falsely, include the filing of inaccurate federal tax returns of Pacific Lanes, Inc. and Hoffman-Stevenson, Inc., and the submission of false and/or misleading documents to First Interstate Bank. The other remaining matters involve the filing of a backdated Inventory of Assets signed by Judge Anderson as the personal representative of the Charles Hoffman estate, and the making of a false police report to the City of Tacoma, alleging a burglary of the residence of Samuel Allotta.

(A). PATTERN OF DISHONESTY AND DECEPTION AFFECTING OFFICIAL

PROCEEDINGS and OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- 4. Beginning on January 12, 1998, the Commission held a hearing in Tacoma, Washington, in In Re the Matter of the Honorable Grant Anderson, No. 96-2179-F-64. During the fourth day of the hearing, on January 15, 1998, Judge Anderson testified under oath on direct examination in his own defense. He testified about his lack of knowledge or participation in the changing of a monthly lease rate from \$6,000 to \$12,000 that a bowling alley, Pacific Lanes, paid its landlord, Hoffman-Stevenson, Inc. In particular, Judge Anderson testified as follows:
 - Q: Were rental payments for the bowling alley also being paid to Hoffman-Stevenson at that point when you took over?
 - A: The rental payments had been set up on the books when I arrived and they stayed in that same fashion. It wasn't, frankly, until yesterday that I learned that that was a paper transaction by the accountant and that a check was never written.
 - Q: Was that amount \$12,000 when you took over?
 - A: That's the amount that had been on and had been in my understanding primarily generated by tax considerations.

See Ex. 1.

- 5. Following direct and cross-examination, Judge Anderson was questioned by members of the Commission. In response to a question from alternate Commission Member Dale Brighton, Judge Anderson testified as follows:
 - Q: Yesterday the accountant testified that the rent had been \$1200 a month and that it had been -
 - A: \$12,000
 - Q: Excuse me, \$12,000, and it had been established before he started with the books, he didn't know where that came from, he didn't know why that had been changed to the 6. He was told to do it, but he didn't know what initiated -

A: The \$12,000 figure was, to the best of my knowledge, established by Knight, Vale & Gregory before I was ever involved, for tax purposes of between the estates, excuse me, between the corporations. I didn't, frankly, realize until Mr. Iverson testified yesterday that it was a book entry by the accountant and there was never a check written that went back and forth. The \$6,000 was negotiated reasonable real rent as opposed to a tax entry rent that had been taking place before. They were both cash flow numbers....

See Ex. 1.

- 6. Contrary to Judge Anderson's sworn testimony, he was directly involved in increasing the rent to \$12,000.00 per month.
 - 7. Judge Anderson had several motives for testifying falsely:
- (A) The rental increase was accomplished through a document entitled "Addendum to the Lease." See Ex. 2. This document was provided to the Commission by a third party after April 1998. The addendum states that it was "made and entered" on May 15, 1989. Id. The addendum was signed by Judge Anderson on behalf of both the lessor and the lessee. Id. The notary affidavit included as a part of the document states that Judge Anderson signed the document on May 15, 1989. Id. Contrary to the representations in the addendum, the addendum was not prepared until March 20, 1990, as evidenced by the word processing footer in the lower left-hand corner. See Ex. 2. Time records from Judge Anderson's law firm also confirm that the addendum was prepared by his firm on March 19, 1990. See Ex. 3.
- (B) Based on the backdated addendum, Pacific Lanes claimed in its 1989 tax return (prepared in 1990) that it had paid \$144,000.00 in rent, and deducted that amount from its gross income on the tax return. See Ex. 4. The rent under the lease dated July 1, 1988, however, was \$6,500.00 per month. See Ex. 5. Additionally, the actual contemporaneous records of Hoffman-Stevenson, Inc. for the period ending December 1989, show that it received \$78,000.00 in rental income from the bowling alley. See Ex. 6.

- (C) In November 1992, Judge Anderson sought a release of a Creditor's Claim filed against the estate of Charles C. Hoffman by First Interstate Bank. See Ex.7. Judge Anderson provided the First Interstate Bank with financial statements of both corporations which represented that Hoffman-Stevenson, Inc. was receiving \$12,000.00 per month in rental income from Pacific Lanes, Inc. Id. The financial statements were contrary to the 1992 federal tax returns of both corporations. See Ex. 8 and 9.
- 8. On October 12, 1989, Judge Anderson caused a false Police Report to be filed with the Tacoma Police Department stating a burglary had been committed by David Santos at the residence of Sam Allotta on September 25, 1989. See Ex.10. The Police Report was provided to the Commission by a third party after April 1998. Judge Anderson made false and misleading statements to the officer who prepared the Police Report including, but not limited to, the representations that various witnesses, including Nicholas Iacobazzi and Jenny Roper, had made statements to Judge Anderson that the witnesses had not, in fact, made. See Ex. 11. The police and prosecutor's office relied on the police report and subsequently charged Mr. Santos with burglary. These charges were later dropped by the prosecutor in the interest of justice.
- 9. In December, 1992, in his capacity as Personal Representative for the Charles Hoffman Estate, Judge Anderson filed, or caused to be filed, a backdated "Inventory of Assets" in Pierce County Superior Court. See Ex. 12. The inventory was purportedly notarized and signed on November 8, 1989. Id. Records from Judge Anderson's law firm show, however, the inventory was not even prepared until nearly three years later. See Ex. 13. Additionally, the inventory is on the stationery of a law firm that did not exist in 1989. See Ex. 14.

III. PRIOR CJC DISCIPLINARY ACTION No. 96-2179-F-64

10. In August 1997 the Commission made a finding that Probable Cause exists to believe that Judge Anderson violated Canons 1, 2(A), 5(C)(3) and 6(C). Statement of Charges were served on Judge Anderson August 4, 1997. See Ex.15. On April 3, 1998, Judge Anderson was found by the Commission to have violated the Code of Judicial Conduct, Canons 1, 2(A), 5(C)(3) and 6(C). See Ex.16.

IV. STATEMENT OF ALLEGATIONS

1. On January 26, 1999, the Commission sent Judge Anderson Statements of Allegations in CJC No. 98-2785 and CJC No. 97-2644 pursuant to CJCRP 17(e). Judge Anderson responded to the Statements of Allegations on February 22, 1999. The Commission has since consolidated the Statements of Allegations under CJC No. 98-2785.

V. PROBABLE CAUSE

2. On August 6, 1999, the Commission determined that there was probable cause that Judge Anderson violated Canons 1, and 2(A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, which provide in pertinent part:

Canon 1

Judges Shall Uphold the Integrity and Independence of the Judiciary.

An independent and honorable Judiciary is indispensable to justice in our society. Judges should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing high standards of judicial conduct, and shall personally observe those standards so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary will be preserved. The provisions of this Code are to be construed and applied to further that objective.

Canon 2

Judges Should Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in All Their Activities.

¹The testimony charged as false is underscored.