



## State of New York



Statement of Robert H. Tembeckjian  
Administrator and Counsel  
Commission on Judicial Conduct



New York State Assembly  
Standing Committee on the Judiciary  
Standing Committee on Codes



Public Hearing on Reform of the  
New York State Justice Courts



Albany, New York  
December 14, 2006

**New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct**  
**61 Broadway ♦ New York, New York 10006**  
**212-809-0566 (ph) ♦ 212-809-3664 (fax)**  
**[www.scjc.state.ny.us](http://www.scjc.state.ny.us)**

Chairwoman Weinstein, Chairman Lentol, and Members of the Assembly

Judiciary and Codes Committees:

My name is Robert H. Tembeckjian, and I am the Administrator and Counsel to the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct.

I thank your two Standing Committees for the decision to examine the New York State Town and Village Justice Courts, and for the invitation to discuss the Judicial Conduct Commission's perspectives. I also thank Chairwoman Weinstein for having met with me twice in recent months to discuss judicial ethics issues and other matters of importance to the Commission.

As you know, the Commission is the state agency that investigates complaints against judges and justices of the state unified court system and, where appropriate, disciplines judges for having engaged in misconduct. Its authority derives from the State Constitution. The Commission's 11 members are appointed by the Governor, the Chief Judge and the leaders of the Assembly and Senate. Although its budget comes out of the Executive Branch, the Commission is functionally independent. No one appoints a majority of its members, and by law the Commission elects its own chair and appoints its own Administrator or Chief Executive Officer.

As you also know, the Commission has never taken a position on some of the more sensitive issues you are likely to be considering, such as whether all town and village justices should be attorneys, or whether this entire system of part-time justice courts should be replaced by a full-time district court structure such as Nassau and Suffolk Counties have implemented. The Commission declines to take such positions in order to preserve its independence and impartiality as it acts on the hundreds of

complaints it receives each year regarding judges at all levels of the court system. We would not want there to be even an appearance that the Commission's decisions were motivated by its view as to whether these courts should be altered or abolished. If a town justice is removed from office, for example, there should be no doubt that the Commission's evaluation of the judge's misconduct, not its evaluation of the town and village court system, was the basis for the decision.

The town and village courts are an extensive network of nearly 1,300 courts and 2,300 part-time justices, the great majority of whom are not lawyers. They are the place most New Yorkers are likely to have their first and perhaps only experience with the courts. They handle a broad range of cases, from routine speeding tickets, to serious DWI's, to contentious small claims and local property disputes, to misdemeanor trials and felony arraignments.

Over the years, the Commission has made recommendations in its annual reports to improve the town and village court system, based on its experiences with them in disciplinary cases. For example, we have called for the recording of all proceedings in town and village courts. We have called for enhanced training and education in such areas as the judge's obligation to advise defendants of certain fundamental rights, and take steps to effectuate them, such as the right to counsel and the right to assigned counsel for the indigent, and the criteria on which bail decisions are to be rendered. We have reminded town and village justices of the requirement that court proceedings be held in public, not in chambers or in such non-neutral settings as a police barracks. And we have called for every court to have a listed address and telephone number, to enhance public access.

The Commission appreciates the broad-ranging reform program for the town and village courts recently announced by Chief Judge Kaye and Chief Administrative Judge Lippman. Their program is an enormous step forward, designed to improve the existing system in ways that do not require legislation, while the Legislature contemplates whether and how to change the fundamental structure of the town and village courts. Though there may be competing views on whether the system should be changed fundamentally, no one can disagree with the idea that the system we have now should be improved while its ultimate fate is debated. In the time it would take for a constitutional amendment to take effect, for example, hundreds of thousands of people would have passed through the town and village courts. The Chief Judge's plan would clearly enhance the quality of justice our fellow citizens would receive.

I have been asked to provide an overview of the Commission's disciplinary enforcement experiences with part-time town and village justices, both lawyers and non-lawyers, as compared to judges of higher courts, most of whom are full-time and all of whom are law-trained and licensed. I believe it is sensible to do so in two ways – by statistics, and by subject matter.

### **Statistics**

The authority to render disciplinary determinations was shifted from the courts to the Commission in April 1978. Since then, as indicated in the following table, the Commission has rendered 631 public decisions, 445 of which (70.5%) were against town and village justices. Since the roughly 2,300 town and village justices comprise 68% of the approximately 3,400 judges throughout the state unified court system, it could

not be said from this statistic alone that town and village justices are more likely than higher court judges to be disciplined.

Of the 151 cases egregious enough to warrant removal from judicial office, however, 114, or 76%, were against town and village justices.

<b>DISCIPLINARY DETERMINATIONS BY THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT</b>			
	Town & Village Court Justices	All Other Judges	Total
Removal from Office	114	37	151
Public Censure	179	75	254
Public Admonition	139	71	210
Stipulated Resignation/Retirement	13	3	16
Totals	445	186	631

The Commission is now receiving over 1,500 complaints per year. From 1975<sup>1</sup> through December 31, 2005, the total number of complaints received was 34,323. Of these, approximately 9,605 (28%) were against town and village justices. Yet of the 6,611 full-scale investigations conducted by the Commission, about 4,033 (61%) were against town and village justices.

This 30-year statistical profile indicates that complaints of misconduct against town and village justices are more likely to have merit, warrant investigation and result in punishment than complaints against judges of higher courts. It also underscores that the lion's share of Commission resources is devoted to investigating and litigating complaints against town and village justices.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the constitutional provision governing the Commission went into effect in April 1978, the Commission began operations as a legislatively-created temporary agency in 1975.

Let me say a word here about the Commission's resources, which are not commensurate with our important constitutional role and enormous caseload. In 1978, when our caseload was 641 complaints, we had a staff of 63, including 21 lawyers, on a budget of \$1.644 million. Had that budget simply been adjusted for inflation, it would be slightly more than \$5 million today. Yet a long era of fiscal reductions has left us with 28½ staff, including only 10 lawyers, on a budget of \$2.7 million, to handle over 1,500 complaints. Where it once took less than 20 months to complete an investigation and a full due-process disciplinary hearing, it now takes over 26 months. One complex case can tie up more lawyers and investigators than we can spare, taking time and attention away from other cases. We are close to a breaking point, which is not in the public interest. It is unfair for the eventually exonerated judge to remain under the cloud of inquiry for longer than necessary, and unfair to the public that it takes us longer to remove unfit incumbents from the bench – all for want of a relatively modest sum.

However the court system may ultimately evolve, it seems clear that effective enforcement of judicial ethics rules is an essential element in promoting public confidence in the administration of justice. But the resources allocated to the Commission on Judicial Conduct for this important job are simply not enough.

### **Subject Matter**

As to most of the subject matter areas Commission investigations cover – conflicts of interest, intemperate demeanor, asserting the prestige of judicial office for private benefit, inappropriate political activity – town and village justices and higher-court judges alike have been disciplined by the Commission. There are three areas,

however, where we have had proportionally more experience with town and village justices.

1. Uniquely, town and village court justices are responsible for promptly depositing court funds (such as fines and bail) in court bank accounts and promptly remitting such funds to the State Comptroller. Full-time judges of higher courts do not literally handle the court's money or, in general, directly supervise the administrative staff that does. The higher courts tend to have full-time professional staffing to handle such matters. Through 2005, we have had 92 complaints that resulted in public discipline, including removals from office, for the mishandling of funds or the failure to supervise rigorously the clerical staff assigned to handle the money. Virtually all of these were town and village justices.

2. Full-time judges are not permitted to practice law. Part-time judges who are also licensed to practice law may do so, but their judicial duties must take priority, and there are restrictions on the scope of their law practice. For example, a part-time lawyer-judge may not practice in his or her own court, and may not appear in cases before another part-time lawyer-judge in the same county, to avoid even the appearance that they would accommodate each other with favorable rulings. Fortunately, the Commission was far more likely to encounter problems in this area 20 years ago than today.

3. The Code of Judicial Conduct requires a judge to respect and comply with the law, to be faithful to the law and to maintain professional competence in it. The Commission has determined and the Court of Appeals has upheld discipline against judges of both town and village courts and higher courts for shocking disregard of

fundamental rights – whether it was the city court judge who repeatedly failed to advise defendants of the right to counsel or the town justice who summarily held a defendant guilty without a plea, trial or other due process. It would be fair to say, however, that in this regard, the Commission has seen proportionally more legitimate complaints involving town and village justices than others.

### **Conclusion**

It is important to remember that, because of the Commission’s role as the state’s judicial ethics enforcer, I am more likely to be acquainted, at least by reputation if not personally, with judges who have gotten into trouble for bad conduct than judges who have avoided it with good conduct. Nothing pleases me more – or greatly relieves a judge – than when I am introduced to a jurist whose name is utterly unfamiliar to me.

I offer these observations to the Judiciary and Codes Committees without agenda, in response to a request that I appear and give some straightforward commentary based on 30 years of experience and a formidable body of judicial disciplinary law. We take our cases as they come, and our record speaks for itself.

Any system will have both its strengths and flaws, and so long as it is made up of fallible human beings, there will be a need for a Commission on Judicial Conduct, whose annual report aptly describes its mission: “to enforce high standards of conduct for judges, who must be free to act independently, on the merits and in good faith, but also must be held accountable by an independent disciplinary system should they commit misconduct.”