1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	ш

28

BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON Co.

DUCT FILED

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

In Re the Matter of

The Honorable Stephen R. Shelton, Judge of the Puyallup Municipal Court

CJC No. 6284-F-148

STATEMENT OF CHARGES

Pursuant to authority granted in article IV, section 31 of the Washington State Constitution, the Revised Code of Washington, chapter 2.64, and the Commission on Judicial Conduct Rules of Procedure ("CJCRP"), 17(d)(4)(C), the Commission on Judicial Conduct orders this Statement of Charges filed alleging violations of the Code of Judicial Conduct by Judge Stephen R. Shelton.

I. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

- 1. Judge Stephen R. Shelton ("Respondent") is now, and was at all times referred to in this document, a judge of the Puyallup Municipal Court.
- 2. On January 27, 2010, the Commission on Judicial Conduct received a complaint that Respondent, without legal authority, summarily incarcerated an alleged crime victim who was present at an arraignment hearing on September 11, 2009. Following an independent investigation of the matter, the Commission initiated disciplinary proceedings against Respondent pursuant to CJCRP 17(c)(3) by serving him with a Statement of Allegations on May 20, 2010. The Statement of Allegations alleged that Respondent may have violated Canons 1, 2(A), 3(A)(1), 3(A)(3) and 3(A)(4) of the Code of Judicial Conduct by summarily holding a purported victim of domestic violence, whose initials are C.A., in contempt and imposing a day in jail without lawful authority and contrary to RCW 7.21 et. seq. It was alleged this conduct

occurred during an arraignment proceeding on September 11, 2009, in case C0066961.

- 3. Respondent filed a written response to the Statement of Allegations on June 23, 2010.
- 4. On November 12, 2010, attorneys Anne Bremner and Peter Altman of Stafford Frey Cooper filed a Notice of Appearance with the Commission's office. Respondent, through counsel, filed a supplemental written response on November 23, 2010.
- 5. At its executive session on December 3, 2010, the Commission on Judicial Conduct made a finding that probable cause exists to believe that the Respondent violated Canons 1, 2(A), 3(A)(1), 3(A)(3) and 3(A)(4) of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

II. CONDUCT GIVING RISE TO CHARGES

On September 11, 2009, Respondent presided over an arraignment proceeding in a case charging a defendant with domestic violence harassment. The charge was based upon a claim that the defendant verbally threatened to harm his girlfriend, C.A. After the defendant's arrest, but prior the arraignment proceeding, C.A. made a written statement at the Puyallup Police Department expressing her desire to recant an earlier statement she made to the police shortly after the incident. In this subsequent statement, C.A. claimed that she instigated the altercation that led to her boyfriend's arrest and lied to the police about what occurred.

At the arraignment proceeding, Respondent reviewed the police reports, including C.A.'s subsequent, recanting statement. C.A. was present at the proceeding and asked if she could address the court. Respondent replied, "No, ma'am. You can have a moment in a minute, trust me." Without further discussion, Respondent then summoned his bailiff and directed C.A. to "please stand up, please put your hands behind your

back," at which point C.A. was handcuffed. Respondent then asked her to sit down and, after verifying there was no one else living in her home (other than the defendant), Respondent explained:

Okay, I'm going to go ahead and give [the defendant] an opportunity to maintain all of his rights, that's why I've not accepted his plea. I'm going to, at this point in time, find you [C.A.] in contempt of court because you have written a second statement stated, ah, stating you "called the police, they came and I lied and said he had threatened me which is untrue. I want to recant my statement. I was frightened and afraid I would be arrested." I'm gonna find you in contempt of court. I'm gonna impose a day in jail. So you'll be released in the morning Ah, this gives the City an opportunity to further review the case and if [the defendant] is still in custody on Monday, then I'll certainly be reviewing his case at pretrial. If he's able to post bail, then he will still be scheduled to come to court on Monday afternoon. It's the order of the court. Thank you gentlemen.

C.A. was thereafter taken from the courthouse and booked into the Puyallup jail, where she spent the remainder of the day and night, and was released from custody the following morning.

Respondent had no lawful basis to hold C.A. in summary contempt on these facts. Further, he did not comply with the procedural requirements for holding someone in summary contempt. He failed to issue an order identifying the facts to support summary imposition of contempt and the sanction imposed, he failed to certify that he personally observed any alleged contempt, and he did not allow C.A. an opportunity to speak in mitigation of the contempt. Respondent's conduct contravened well-settled law and infringed deeply upon an individual's fundamental right to due process and liberty.

III. BASIS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

On December 3, 2010, the Commission determined that probable cause exists to believe that Respondent has violated Canons 1, 2(A), 3(A)(1), 3(A)(3) and 3(A)(4) of the Code of Judicial Conduct. These sections of the Code state:

1	CANON 1	
2	Judges shall uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary.	
3	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	
4		
5		
6		
7	Comment	
8	Deference to the judgments and rulings of courts depends upon public confidence in the	
9	with the law, including the provisions of this Code. Public confidence in the impartiality of the judiciar is maintained by the adherence of each judge to this responsibility. Conversely, violation of this Code	
0		
1	diminishes public confidence in the judiciary and thereby does injury to the system of government under law.	
2	CANON 2	
3	Judges should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety	
4	in all their activities.	
5	 (A) Judges should respect and comply with the law and should act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary. 	
6		
7	Comment	
8 9	Maintaining the prestige of judicial office is essential to a system of government in which the judiciary functions independently of the executive and legislative branches. Respect for the judicial office facilitates the orderly conduct of legitimate judicial functions. Judges should distinguish between proper and improper use of the prestige of office in all of their activities.	
20		
1	CANON 3	
22	Judges shall perform the duties of their office impartially and diligently.	
23	(A) Adjudicative Responsibilities	
4	(A) Adjudicative Responsibilities.	
5	(1) Judges should be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it	
26		
7	(3) Judges should be patient, dignified and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers and others with whom judges deal in their offici	
28	capacity	
	STATEMENT OF CHARGES - 4	

Comment The duty to hear all proceedings fairly and with patience is not inconsistent with the duty to dispose promptly of the business of the court. Courts can be efficient and businesslike while being patient and deliberate. Judges should accord to every person who is legally (4) interested in the proceeding, or that person's lawyer, full right to be heard according to law IV. RIGHT TO FILE A WRITTEN ANSWER In accordance with CJCRP 20, Respondent may file a written answer to this Statement of Charges with the Commission within twenty-one (21) days after the date of service of the Statement of Charges. COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON. Reiko Callner Executive Director P.O. Box 1817 Olympia, WA 98507