

**BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT  
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

In Re the Matter of

The Honorable Ann Danieli,  
Part-time Judge of the King County  
Superior Court

No. 12528-F-214

**STIPULATION, AGREEMENT AND  
ORDER OF ADMONISHMENT**

The Commission on Judicial Conduct (“Commission”) and King County Superior Court Part-time Judge Ann Danieli (“Respondent”) stipulate and agree as provided below. This stipulation is entered pursuant to Rule 23 of the Commission on Judicial Conduct Rules of Procedure and shall not become effective until approved by the Washington State Commission on Judicial Conduct. The Commission has been represented in these proceedings by its Executive Director, Reiko Callner, and Part-time Judge Ann Danieli has represented herself.

**I. STIPULATED FACTS**

A. At all times relevant to this Stipulation, Respondent has been a part-time judge with the King County Superior Court. King County Superior Court refers to its part-time judges as “judges pro tem” or “judges pro tempore,” indicating they are not full-time elected or appointed judicial officers. However, given the frequency of Respondent’s judicial service, she is considered a “part-time judge” as defined under the Code of Judicial Conduct Application and Terminology Sections and is subject to more Code restrictions than a pro tem judge. Pro tem judges, for purposes of the Code, serve in judicial capacity extremely rarely:

“Pro tempore judge” Without regard to statutory or other definitions of a pro tempore judge, **within the meaning of this Code a pro tempore judge is a person who serves only once or at most sporadically under a separate appointment for a case or docket.** Pro tempore judges are excused from

compliance with certain provisions of this Code because of their infrequent service as a judge. A person who serves or expects to serve part-time as a judge on a regular or periodic basis in **fewer than twelve cases or twelve dockets annually, counted cumulatively without regard to each jurisdiction** in which that person serves as a judge, is a pro tempore judge.”

(Code of Judicial Conduct Terminology Section, emphasis added.)

B. In July 2024, while investigating a complaint, investigative staff came across a number of fundraising links shared on Respondent’s personal Facebook page. The Commission opened this complaint regarding the Facebook posts that are the subject of this stipulation. At that time, Respondent’s Facebook page identified her employment, including, “Judge & Commissioner Pro Tempore at King County Superior Court Judges.” The page was available via public search, and did not restrict general members of the public.

C. Commission investigative staff viewed a number of fundraising links shared on Respondent’s Facebook page. The posts consist of the following:

1. On June 29, 2021, Respondent shared to her Facebook page a link to GoFundMe.com<sup>1</sup>. The link included information that the fundraiser was to help a woman whose taco trailer was stolen to obtain a new taco trailer.
2. On December 9, 2022, Respondent shared to her Facebook page a link to GoFundMe.com. The link included information that the fundraiser was to help two women who suffered a fire at their home.
3. On July 14, 2023, Respondent shared to her Facebook page a link to Raisely.com for a trip to Yosemite National Park for supporters of ShelterboxUSA<sup>2</sup>. Respondent added to the post: “For a friend who is going and fundraising.”

---

<sup>1</sup>GoFundMe.com is a for-profit online crowdfunding platform that allows people to raise money for events, such as celebrations or challenging life circumstances. It allows members to describe their fundraising cause on a webpage hosted on the GoFundMe site, state the amount they hope to raise, then share the project through social network links and/or email.

<sup>2</sup> Raisely.com is a fundraising site that hosted a page that asked for donations for a 4-day trip to Yosemite National Park called “Trek 4 Shelter Yosemite 2023.” The donations would go directly to ShelterBox, which aids people who have been hit by disasters around the world.

4. On November 25, 2023, Respondent shared to her Facebook page a link to Everloved.com<sup>3</sup> asking to contribute to the family of a woman who passed away. Respondent adds to the post: “Heartbreaking loss.”

5. On August 29, 2024, Respondent shared to her Facebook page a link to gofund.me, without any additional information. The link goes to a GoFundMe.com page asking for support for a man with incurable cancer who is receiving hospice care.

D. Following the Commission’s independent investigation, the Commission initiated disciplinary proceedings against Respondent pursuant to CJCRP 17(c)(3) by serving her with a Statement of Allegations on October 2, 2024. The Statement of Allegations alleged that Respondent may have violated Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, and Canon 3, Rule 3.7(B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct by posting multiple solicitations for monetary donations for third parties on Respondent’s Facebook page, on which Respondent was identified as a judicial officer. The Statement of Allegations identified the posts containing solicitations including, but not limited to, the following dates: August 29, 2024, November 25, 2023, July 14, 2023, December 9, 2022, and June 29, 2021.

E. Respondent answered the Statement of Allegations with a general denial. At the regular November 2024 meeting of the Commission, the members authorized an extension of the initial proceedings so that staff could explore the possibility of reaching a stipulated resolution with Respondent, rather than immediately proceeding to find probable cause and issuing a Statement of Charges.

F. On January 29, 2025, Respondent submitted a supplemental response to the Commission. Respondent does not deny posting the solicitations described in the Statement of Allegations.

---

<sup>3</sup> Everloved.com is a website that allows people to create a memorial webpage for those who died and also to raise money for funeral costs or other expenses.

## II. AGREEMENT

### A. Respondent's Conduct Violated the Code of Judicial Conduct

1. Based upon the above stipulated facts, Respondent and the Commission agree that the fundraising posts on Respondent's Facebook page described above violated Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, and Canon 3, Rule 3.7(B), of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

2. Rule 1.1 requires judges to "comply with the law, including the Code of Judicial Conduct." Rule 1.2 provides, "A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety." Rule 1.3 provides "A judge shall not abuse the prestige of judicial office to advance the personal or economic interests of the judge or others, or allow others to do so." Rule 3.7(B) allows judicial officers to participate in charitable organizations, but states that judges may solicit contributions for such organizations ". . . only from members of the judge's family, or from judges over whom the judge does not exercise supervisor or appellate authority. . ." The purpose of the prohibition in Rule 3.7(B) on such contributions addresses several concerns: "one is that judges may intimidate potential donors into making contributions; a second, related to the first, is that judges may trade on the prestige of their office to raise funds on behalf of an organization, even if it does not rise to the level of intimidation; and third, that donors may expect future favors in return for their largesse."<sup>4</sup>

3. The prohibition against judicial solicitation of money does not reflect on the virtue of the charity or cause in question. With a few specific exceptions, the Code of Judicial Conduct has a bright line rule against a judicial officer soliciting funds - no matter how noble the case - in order to avoid the misuse of the judicial office. While these Facebook reposts present no articulable element of coercion, it is still an abuse of the prestige of judicial office. That prestige

---

<sup>4</sup> *Judicial Conduct and Ethics*, 5th Edition, Alfani, Lubet, Shaman and Geyh, Section 9.04(2), Lexis-Nexis (2018).

is appropriately reserved for the service of the office itself, and not to be used for the benefit of the judicial officer or others, regardless of how good the cause may be.

4. The five posts on Respondent's Facebook page as described above constitute solicitations for funds to support the individual or individuals identified. Each hosting website (GoFundMe, Raisely.com, and EverLoved.com) embedded as a link in the five posts operate in whole or in part to raise funds.

5. Respondent violated Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, by abusing the prestige of judicial office by posting and/or sharing on Facebook the fundraising activities of third parties. Respondent's Facebook postings advanced the economic interests of others. Respondent's Facebook page also identified her as a judicial officer.

6. Respondent violated Canon 1, Rules 1.1 and 1.2, and Canon 3, Rule 3.7(B) by soliciting charitable fundraising contributions from individuals who are not in her family or are her fellow judicial officers.

## **B. Imposition of Sanction**

1. The sanction imposed by the Commission must be commensurate to the level of Respondent's culpability, sufficient to restore and maintain the public's confidence in the integrity of the judiciary, and sufficient to deter similar acts of misconduct in the future. In determining the appropriate level of discipline to impose, the Commission takes into account the aggravating and mitigating factors listed in CJCRP 6(c).

a. Characteristics of Misconduct. This was not an isolated incident; Respondent posted five fundraising posts over the course of four years. Respondent's Facebook page identified her as a judicial officer. Ethics Advisory Opinion (EAO 16-05) warns against the use of judicial office to promote a charitable fundraiser through social media and, significantly, there are three prior Commission cases on the issue (see *In re McCroskey*, CJC No. 9879-F-203, *In re Yu*, CJC No. 8960-F-183, *In re Svaren*, CJC No. 8348-F-182). On the other hand, there are

several mitigating factors for this type of Code violation – fundraising for a charity is generally inherently good, but judges must be scrupulous to avoid asking for money – that could be coercive or viewed as an opportunity to curry favor. The prohibitions against fundraising as a judge are peculiar to the special demands of the office of the judge. This conduct occurred outside of the courtroom and there is no indication the conduct harmed others, nor any indication that Respondent acted in a way to benefit herself.

b. Service and Demeanor of Respondent. Respondent has no prior public disciplinary history. By entering into this stipulation and agreement, Respondent has demonstrated an understanding of her impropriety and a commitment to avoid such misconduct in the future.

2. Taking into account the factors listed in CJCRP 6(c), Respondent and the Commission agree that an admonishment is the appropriate action in this matter. An “admonishment” is a written action of the Commission of an advisory nature that cautions a respondent not to engage in certain proscribed behavior. Admonishment is the least severe disciplinary action the Commission can issue.

3. Following contact from the Commission, Respondent has read and familiarized herself with the Code of Judicial Conduct in its entirety and submitted a declaration to that effect to the Commission.

4. Respondent agrees she will not repeat such conduct in the future.

5. Respondent has represented herself in these proceedings. She affirms she has had an opportunity to consult with an attorney and voluntarily chooses to represent herself in this matter and enter into this agreement.

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

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

*Ann Danieli*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Ann Danieli  
Respondent

2025-04-11

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

*J. Reiko Callner*

\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Reiko Callner  
Executive Director  
Commission on Judicial Conduct

2025-04-14

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**ORDER OF ADMONISHMENT**

Based on the above Stipulation and Agreement, the Commission on Judicial Conduct hereby orders Respondent, Part-time Judge Ann Danieli, ADMONISHED for violating Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, and Canon 3, Rule 3.7(B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct. Respondent shall fulfill all the terms of the Stipulation and Agreement as set forth therein.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of April, 2025.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristian Hedine, Chair  
Commission on Judicial Conduct



# CERTIFICATE *of* SIGNATURE

REF. NUMBER  
BTDVK-VBUN2-RBXDB-MWZXM

DOCUMENT COMPLETED BY ALL PARTIES ON  
14 APR 2025 17:15:23 UTC

## SIGNER

**ANN DANIELI**

EMAIL  
[REDACTED]

## TIMESTAMP

SENT  
11 APR 2025 21:36:37 UTC  
VIEWED  
12 APR 2025 00:08:09 UTC  
SIGNED  
12 APR 2025 00:08:26 UTC

## SIGNATURE



IP ADDRESS  
73.140.92.213

LOCATION  
SEATTLE, UNITED STATES

## RECIPIENT VERIFICATION

EMAIL VERIFIED  
12 APR 2025 00:08:09 UTC

**J. REIKO CALLNER**

EMAIL  
RCALLNER@CJC.STATE.WA.US

SENT  
11 APR 2025 21:36:37 UTC  
VIEWED  
12 APR 2025 00:58:38 UTC  
SIGNED  
14 APR 2025 17:15:23 UTC



IP ADDRESS  
75.146.58.69

LOCATION  
VASHON, UNITED STATES

## RECIPIENT VERIFICATION

EMAIL VERIFIED  
12 APR 2025 00:58:38 UTC

