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TO:

The Honorable Josh Shapiro  
Governor  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
508 Main Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

The Honorable Debra B. Todd  
Chief Justice of Pennsylvania  
One Oxford Centre, Suite 3130  
301 Grant Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

The Honorable Kim L. Ward  
President Pro Tempore  
Senate of Pennsylvania  
292 Main Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120-3039

The Honorable Joanna E. McClinton  
Speaker of the House  
Pennsylvania House of Representatives  
139 Main Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120-2191

The Honorable Jay Costa  
Minority Floor Leader  
Senate of Pennsylvania  
535 Main Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-3043

The Honorable Bryan Cutler  
Minority Leader  
Pennsylvania House of Representatives  
423 Main Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-2100

Pursuant to Article V, Section 18(a)(6) of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and Section 2104 of Title 42, Judiciary and Judicial Procedures, the Judicial Conduct Board of Pennsylvania respectfully submits this Annual Report covering the period from January 1 through December 31, 2022.

This Annual Report is available to the general public on the Board’s website at http://www.jcbpa.org.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa L. Norton  
Chief Counsel  
On Behalf of the Judicial Conduct Board
The Judicial Conduct Board is an independent Board within the Judicial Branch mandated by the Pennsylvania Constitution to receive and investigate complaints of misconduct against judges of Pennsylvania’s Unified Judicial System and, where appropriate, to file formal charges against, and prosecute, those judges found to have engaged in improper behavior.

The Board, through its staff, is required to investigate every allegation made against Pennsylvania state court judges. This procedure is an essential safeguard to the integrity of, and public confidence in, the judiciary and the judicial process. Judges are held to a high standard of conduct. This standard is set forth in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as well as in the Code of Judicial Conduct and the Rules Governing the Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges.

The members and staff of the Judicial Conduct Board are committed to preserving the honor, dignity, independence, and integrity of Pennsylvania’s judiciary. Race, color, age, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, ancestry, religious creed, disability, political affiliation and the position or status of the complainant or judge are not considerations in reviewing cases. The Board’s duties to the public require the honesty, intelligence, professionalism, and diligence of every Board and staff member.

The Board’s objective is to enforce high standards of ethical conduct for judges, who, when serving in their adjudicatory function, must be free to act independently and in good faith on the merits, but who also must be held accountable to the public should they engage in misconduct.
### Overview of the Board

#### 2022 Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge Members</th>
<th>Attorney Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Honorable Renée Cohn Jubelirer*  
Chair of the Judicial Conduct Board  
Commonwealth Court of PA  
(Term expiration 08/30/2023) | Scott B. Cooper, Esquire*  
Secretary of the Judicial Conduct Board  
(Term expiration 07/29/2025) |
| Honorable Nina Wright Padilla  
(Term expiration 01/25/2022) | Honorable Patricia H. Jenkins, Esquire  
(Term expiration 01/25/2022) |
| Honorable Mia R. Perez  
(Term expiration 01/25/2026) | Honorable Susan Peikes Gantman*  
(Term expiration 08/15/2022) |
| Honorable William C. Wenner*  
(Term expiration 03/13/2024) | Mandi L. Culhane, Esquire  
(Term expiration 02/04/2022) |
| | Sudhir R. Patel, Esquire*  
(Term expiration 02/07/2026) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Members</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Det. Joseph Brown  
(Term expiration 12/03/2022) | Rev. James P. McCloskey, Ph.D.*  
(Term Expiration 06/19/2024) |
| Nancy L. Clemens*  
Vice Chair of the Judicial Conduct Board  
(Term Expiration 01/20/2024) | Andrew E. Masich, Ph.D.*  
(Term Expiration 11/06/2024) |
| K. Celeste Trusty  
(Term Expiration 02/29/2024) | Wayne E. Evans  
(Term Expiration 02/19/2022) |
| Michael D. Brunelle*  
(Term Expiration 02/29/2024) | Tara Mobley*  
(Term Expiration 11/13/2026) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa L Norton, Chief Counsel**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Colby L. Miller***  
Interim Deputy Chief Counsel | James P. Kleman, Jr.  
Senior Deputy Counsel |
| Elizabeth A. Hoffheins  
Assistant Counsel | John C. Harlacker  
Chief Investigator |
| Leo P. Zuvich  
Investigator | Tammie L. Kelley  
Investigator |
| Joelle E. Conshue  
Legal Assistant | Pamela D. Scipioni  
Legal Assistant |
| Elizabeth Sickler  
Administrative Assistant | Elizabeth R. Donnelly  
Assistant Counsel |
| | Paul A. Fontanes  
Senior Investigator |
| | Susan Campbell  
Administrative Coordinator |
| | Colleen M. McKinney  
Administrative Assistant |

* *Current members as of December 31, 2022*

** *Current Chief Counsel*

*** *Current Deputy Chief Counsel*
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AUTHORITY OF THE BOARD

The Judicial Conduct Board was created by an amendment to the Pennsylvania Constitution adopted on May 18, 1993, and declared in effect by the Governor on August 11, 1993. It is the independent board within the judicial branch of the Commonwealth’s government responsible for investigating allegations of judicial misconduct or physical or mental disability.

The Board has jurisdiction over Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justices, Superior and Commonwealth Court Judges, Common Pleas Court Judges, Philadelphia Municipal Court Judges, and Magisterial District Judges. The Board has no jurisdiction over federal judges and magistrate judges, administrative hearing officers or administrative law judges for state agencies or mediators, arbitrators or masters.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

There are 12 members of the Board. Board Members serve staggered four-year terms. The Board comprises the following individuals:

• Six citizen members who are neither attorneys nor judges;
• Three attorneys who are not judges; and
• Three judges, one from each of the following court levels: an appellate court judge from either the Superior or Commonwealth Court; a common pleas court judge; and a magisterial district judge.

Members meet regularly to conduct Board business and receive no compensation for their service.

One of the critical features of the Board’s system is its structural independence. The 12 board members are appointed by two appointing authorities: the Governor appoints six members and the Supreme Court appoints six members. The Governor appoints a common pleas court judge, two attorneys and three citizen members. The Supreme Court appoints a Superior or Commonwealth Court judge, a magisterial district judge, an attorney and three citizen members. Neither the Governor nor the Supreme Court controls a majority of the appointees to the Board. No more than half of the members may be registered in the same political party.

GOVERNING LAW

The Board is governed by Article V, Section 18(a) of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and Chapter 21, Subchapter A of Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes (available on website http://www.jcbspa.org). As an independent Board in the Judicial Branch having its own constitutional and statutory provisions regarding confidentiality of papers, records, and proceedings, the Board is not governed by the Open Meetings Act or the Pennsylvania Administrative Code.

DEFINING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

Judicial misconduct is conduct that, among other things, violates either the Pennsylvania Constitution, the Code of Judicial Conduct, or the Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges.

EXAMPLES OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

The conduct forming the basis of a judicial misconduct complaint could arise from the judge’s violation of the law or the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. Examples of judicial misconduct include: inappropriate courtroom demeanor such as yelling, profanity, gender bias, or racial slurs; improper ex parte communications with only one of the parties or attorneys in a case; a public comment regarding a pending case; or failure to recuse or disqualify in a case where the judge has an interest in the outcome of the case or in which the parties or attorneys are related to the judge. Judicial misconduct also arises from out-of-court activities such as driving under the influence or other criminal activity, improper financial or business dealings, sexual harassment or official oppression. Lastly, judicial misconduct could occur through a judge’s failure to cooperate with respect to his or her obligations arising from a Board inquiry or for a judge retaliating against a party or the party’s attorney for cooperating in a Board inquiry.

Importantly, however, the Board cannot and does not act as a criminal investigation agency; it has no authority to arrest and imprison a judge. Likewise, the Board cannot intervene in a case pending before a judge and cannot reverse rulings of a judge (which is the role of the appellate courts) or reassign a case to another judge or remove or seek the recusal of a judge from a particular case.

SOURCES OF COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS

The Board has the duty to consider allegations from any source, including complaints from individuals, public news sources, or information received in the course of investigations that form the basis for new allegations. The Board also accepts and, where warranted, investigates, anonymous complaints.
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BOARD LIMITATIONS
The Board does not have the authority to review the correctness of the legal decisions of any judge for any possible errors or to change the decision or ruling of any judge. For example, if the Board finds that a judge’s actions constitute any form of misconduct, the Board can only file formal charges in the Court of Judicial Discipline and seek an appropriate sanction against the judge, which could include the judge’s removal from the bench. However, even removal would not change the judge’s ruling in the underlying case. Only an appellate court or the Pennsylvania Supreme Court acting in its supervisory capacity or exercising its so-called King’s Bench authority can review and reverse a particular court decision.

Additionally, the Board cannot provide legal assistance or advice to a complainant. The Board cannot remove a judge from a case. The Board cannot award damages or provide monetary relief to complainants, get prisoners out of jail, or jail a judge who violates the criminal law.

BOARD INVESTIGATIONS AND ACTIONS
Cases are reviewed, analyzed, and investigated by the Board staff. The first step in an investigation involves a preliminary inquiry, which may include interviews with the complainant, attorneys and other witnesses, and the review of relevant documents. The Board then considers the results of the investigation in reviewing the complaint. The Board has several options available when deciding whether to take action on a case. At this stage, the Board is most likely to make one of two choices:

• Dismiss the complaint because it is clear that the allegations do not warrant disciplinary actions against the accused judge because no provisions of the Constitution, the Code of Judicial Conduct or the Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges have been violated; or
• Authorize a full investigation to determine if there is evidence of misconduct.

• After a full investigation is authorized and conducted, the Board will:
  • Dismiss the complaint because there is no probable cause of judicial misconduct. Typically, the allegations resulting in a dismissal involve legal error, are time barred by the Board’s four-year limitations period, or cannot be proven; or
  • Issue a Letter of Caution to the judge under investigation where the conduct did not rise to a violation of the Code or Rules but the conduct may lead to judicial misconduct if not corrected or constituted only a minor violation that was recognized and rectified by the judge; or
  • Issue a Letter of Counsel to the judge under investigation where the evidence suggests a violation of the Code or Rules, but was an isolated incident or the result of inadvertence; or
  • File formal charges against the judge in the Court of Judicial Discipline following a determination by a majority of the Board that there is probable cause to believe that the judge engaged in misconduct.

The types of actions that could be taken by the Court of Judicial Discipline include dismissal of the complaint, public or private reprimand, public censure, fine, probation, suspension with or without pay, removal from the bench which carries with it forfeiture of judicial office, prohibition from future judicial service, or other discipline as authorized by the Constitution and warranted by the record. A detailed discussion of the Board’s procedures for analyzing complaints and allegations and an overview of the complaint process is further discussed in the following table “Judicial Conduct Board of Pennsylvania – Complaint Resolution Process.” The number and types of action taken by the Board in calendar year 2022 are presented in the “Case Statistics” section of this report.
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Judicial Conduct Board of Pennsylvania – Complaint Resolution Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INITIAL SCREENING</strong></th>
<th><strong>PRELIMINARY INQUIRY</strong></th>
<th><strong>FULL PROCEEDINGS</strong></th>
<th><strong>SUPREME COURT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Counsel reviews each Confidential Request for Investigation or “complaint” to determine whether it is within jurisdiction of the Judicial Conduct Board (JCB).</td>
<td>JCB attorney and/or investigator conducts preliminary inquiry, writes preliminary investigation report, and recommends whether to dismiss or to proceed to full investigation as to some or all allegations.</td>
<td>Staff prepares formal complaint, files complaint with the Court of Judicial Discipline, and serves same upon judge. Matter becomes public upon filing.</td>
<td>If the Court of Judicial Discipline dismisses the complaint against the judge, the JCB may appeal to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff returns non-JCB complaints (e.g., complaints against attorneys or federal judges) to complainants with appropriate instructions.</td>
<td>Staff distributes preliminary inquiry report and recommendation, along with pertinent materials, to JCB members.</td>
<td>Attorney and/or investigator conduct additional investigation, if necessary, as to issues raised in judge's response.</td>
<td>If the Court of Judicial Discipline imposes discipline on the judge on any of the charges, the judge may appeal to the Supreme Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff prepares electronic and paper-copy file, sends acknowledgment letters to complainants, and returns paper-copy file to Chief Counsel.</td>
<td>JCB Members review preliminary investigation report and recommendation, and vote to dismiss, to have staff conduct additional preliminary inquiry, or to proceed to full investigation as to some or all allegations.</td>
<td>Staff distributes judge's response and any supplemental investigation report and recommendation, along with pertinent materials, to JCB members.</td>
<td>If the accused judge is a justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, the appeal is heard by a Special Tribunal made up of judges randomly chosen for the Superior and Commonwealth Courts as provided in Article V, §18(c)(1) of the Pennsylvania Constitution and sections 726 and 727 of Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Counsel assigns complaints to staff attorneys.</td>
<td>JCB Members review judge's response, and any supplemental investigation report and recommendation, and vote to dismiss, to have staff conduct additional investigation, to issue Letter of Caution or Letter of Counsel, or to file formal charges before the Court of Judicial Discipline.</td>
<td>JCB Members review judge's response, and any supplemental investigation report and recommendation, and vote to dismiss, to have staff conduct additional investigation, to issue Letter of Caution or Letter of Counsel, or to file formal charges before the Court of Judicial Discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Court of Judicial Discipline dismisses the complaint against the judge, the JCB may appeal to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. If the Court of Judicial Discipline imposes discipline on the judge on any of the charges, the judge may appeal to the Supreme Court. If the accused judge is a justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, the appeal is heard by a Special Tribunal made up of judges randomly chosen for the Superior and Commonwealth Courts as provided in Article V, §18(c)(1) of the Pennsylvania Constitution and sections 726 and 727 of Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure).
BOARD ORGANIZATION AND STAFF
In 2022, the Board had 15 staff positions, including the Chief Counsel, Deputy Chief Counsel, one Senior Deputy Counsel, one Deputy Counsel, two Assistant Counsel, four investigators, and five support staff. All staff members are full-time employees of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Under the Constitution, the Board appoints a Chief Counsel who acts as Board executive director and whose general duties include managing and supervising the administrative activities of the Board’s office, its attorneys, investigators, and support staff. The Chief Counsel’s specific responsibilities include the following: providing legal advice to the Board; reviewing and processing complaints; developing statistics concerning Board activities; preparing the Board’s annual budget; administering the funds of the Board; and keeping the Board informed of all developments potentially affecting the work of the Board.

The Board’s legal staff, which consists of Chief Counsel, Deputy Chief Counsel, one Senior Deputy Counsel, one Deputy Counsel, two Assistant Counsel, two legal assistants and four investigators, is responsible for the evaluation and investigation of complaints. The attorneys are primarily responsible for reviewing and evaluating complaints alleging judicial misconduct. The investigators conduct investigations in consultation with the assigned attorneys. The legal assistants perform various support services for staff counsel and investigators.

The Chief Counsel and the other attorneys serve as trial counsel during proceedings before the Court of Judicial Discipline and are responsible for preparing cases and presenting the evidence that supports the charges before the Court of Judicial Discipline as specified in the Constitution. When necessary, these attorneys also brief and argue appeals to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (or the constitutional Special Tribunal if the matter on appeal involves a Supreme Court justice) from rulings of the Court of Judicial Discipline. The staff attorneys also respond to requests for information under the Right-to-Know Law and handle appeals arising from those requests.
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BUDGET

The Judicial Conduct Board’s budget is included in the budget allotted to the Judicial Branch of the Commonwealth’s government. It is formulated and administered independently by the Board. For the 2022-2023 fiscal year (July 1, 2022 — June 30, 2023), the Board’s appropriation is $2,555,000. This appropriation provides funding for salaries and benefits for the staff of the Judicial Conduct Board, as well as annuitant benefits, operational expenses and fixed assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year*</th>
<th>Amount Appropriated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>$2,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$2,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>$2,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>$2,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>$2,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Judicial Conduct Board’s budget is approximately .5% (five tenths of one percent) of the overall budget of the Judicial Branch of the Commonwealth and .05 % (five one hundredths of one percent) of the budget of the Commonwealth.

Outreach and Education

In 2022, the Board issued a number of press releases regarding cases pending in the Court of Judicial Discipline and noting important Board activities. The Board has expanded the functionality of its website. Board members and staff regularly participate in educational seminars for a variety of groups.

BOARD WEBSITE

The Board’s website can be accessed at http://www.jcbpa.org. The website provides downloadable complaint forms. The website also offers answers to frequently asked questions regarding the Board, such as its composition, structure, and jurisdiction; the judicial misconduct complaint process; a description of the range of actions available to the Court of Judicial Discipline from dismissal to sanction; and links of interest to other websites dealing with judicial ethics.

Also included on the website are the Board’s governing authorities: Article V, Section 18 of the Pennsylvania Constitution: selected provisions from Title 42 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, and the Board’s Rules of Procedure.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND CONFIDENTIALITY OF BOARD PROCEEDINGS

The availability of information and records maintained by the Board is governed by Article V, Section 18(a)(8) of the Pennsylvania Constitution which states: “[c]omplaints filed with the board or initiated by the board shall not be public information.” This section also provides that “statements, testimony, documents, records or other information or evidence acquired by the board in the conduct of an investigation” are not public information. Additionally, this constitutional mandate requires that “[a]ll proceedings of the board shall be confidential.” Rule 17 of the Board’s Rules of Procedure, adopted pursuant to the Board’s constitutional rule making authority, provides that “all information and proceedings relating to a complaint and records of the Board’s deliberations shall be confidential.” This constitutional provision and the Board’s Rules mandate the confidentiality of the fact that a complaint has been filed and is pending before the Board.
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Pursuant to these provisions, Board meetings and proceedings are confidential and not open to the public. The confidentiality of the Board’s proceedings and the non-public nature of documents or information submitted to or gathered by the Board are designed to protect complainants from retaliation by judges under investigation and to protect judges from the embarrassment resulting from the public release of unfounded allegations. These confidentiality requirements are subject to limited exceptions set forth in Article V, Section 18(a)(8) of the Constitution and Rules 14 and 18 of the Board’s Rules of Procedure. They generally involve disclosure of the fact of an investigation if the investigation has become public knowledge by means independent of any action by the Board. They also allow certain disclosures to criminal law enforcement and professional disciplinary agencies if the information submitted to or obtained by the Board relates to violations of the criminal laws or rules of professional conduct. Disclosures are also allowed if the information would call for the exercise of the supervisory authority of the Supreme Court or a president judge.

Formal charges filed by the Board with the Court of Judicial Discipline are matters of public record. Hearings in the Court are public proceedings.

2022 STATISTICS

During 2022, the Board received or initiated 945 confidential requests for investigation. The Board filed formal charges in the Court of Judicial Discipline against one judge and filed two Petitions for Interim Suspension Without Pay.

The Board closed 964 pending matters in 2022. Not all cases are dismissed or otherwise acted upon in the year in which they are received by the Board. Of those, 360 were determined to be unfounded after preliminary inquiry and 534 presented claims of legal error and not misconduct. Another 14 were dismissed because the Board lacked jurisdiction over the official against whom the complaint was filed. At the request of the complainants, 4 matters were withdrawn. The Board dismissed 1 after a full investigation. The Board authorized the issuance of notices of full investigation in 21 matters. The Board dismissed 42 cases with Letters of Caution1 and dismissed 9 cases with Letters of Counsel 2. Charges were filed against 1 judge in the Court of Judicial Discipline and the Board also filed a Petition for Interim Suspension Without Pay in the Court of Judicial Discipline concerning 2 judges.

1 A Letter of Caution is explained below under “Complaint Dispositions.”
2 A Letter of Counsel is explained below under “Complaint Dispositions.”
CLASSIFICATIONS OF ALLEGATIONS

There were 945 complaints received or initiated during the 2022 calendar year. On average, the Board received 78 complaints each month. The Board classified each complaint received into one of the following categories:

Abuse of the Prestige of Office .......................................................... 9.......................0.9 %
Administrative Appointment .............................................................. 1.......................0.1 %
Bias ................................................................................................. 96.....................10.2 %
Campaign Activities ......................................................................... 2.......................0.2 %
Conflict ............................................................................................ 49.......................5.2 %
Delay (Diligence) .............................................................................. 50.......................5.3 %
Demeanor .......................................................................................... 98.....................10.4 %
Ex Parte ............................................................................................. 15.......................1.6 %
Extrajudicial Activities ................................................................. 1.......................0.1 %
Failure to Accord Right to be Heard ........................................... 10.......................1.1 %
Failure to Comply with Law .......................................................... 36.......................3.8 %
Failure to Perform Duties ................................................................. 1.......................0.1 %
Fairness .............................................................................................. 11.......................1.2 %
Improper Practice of Law ............................................................... 1.......................0.1 %
Incompatible Practices ..................................................................... 1.......................0.1 %
Legal Error ........................................................................................ 531.....................56.2 %
No Jurisdiction .................................................................................. 14.......................1.5 %
Order & Decorum in Courtroom .................................................... 1.......................0.1 %
Political .............................................................................................. 1.......................0.1 %
Prejudicing Proper Admin Justice .................................................. 7.......................0.7 %
Public Confidence ............................................................................. 3.......................0.3 %
Responding to Lawyer Misconduct .............................................. 1.......................0.1 %
Self-Report by Judge ...................................................................... 1.......................0.1 %
Violations of the Law ....................................................................... 5.......................0.5 %
Total ................................................................................................. 945.......................100 %

INVESTIGATIVE INQUIRES

LETTERS OF INQUIRY:
The Board typically considers a Letter of Inquiry to be a less serious mode of inquiry to a judicial officer than a Notice of Full Investigation (described below). Letters of Inquiry are issued generally when the matter under investigation may constitute misconduct by the judge, but the conduct would not likely form the basis of a public Court of Judicial Discipline complaint. The scope of Letters of Inquiry may be broad, although their most common use concerns allegations of judicial delay. It is a less formal means of seeking information from a judicial officer concerning the alleged events or circumstances than a deposition or Notice of Full Investigation. Letters of Inquiry may be sent either formally pursuant to a Board directive or informally from staff counsel. During 2022, the Board and staff counsel issued 101 Letters of Inquiry to judicial officers.
After a Letter of Inquiry is issued, staff counsel may determine that subsequent interviews are required either to corroborate or refute the judicial officer’s written response. Information obtained through a Letter of Inquiry could lead to the issuance of a Notice of Full Investigation or a Board dismissal.

NOTICE OF FULL INVESTIGATION:
If, after appropriate preliminary inquiry into a case, the Board determines that sufficient evidence of judicial misconduct exists such that the case may result in the filing of formal charges in the Court of Judicial Discipline, it will issue a Notice of Full Investigation to the judicial officer. This is required by the Constitution. Before the Board determines there is probable cause of misconduct, the judicial officer must be apprised of the nature and content of the complaint and given an opportunity to respond. After the Board issues the Notice of Full Investigation, the judicial officer has an opportunity to respond to the allegations in writing. A Notice of Full Investigation may address several matters under investigation involving the same judge. In 2022, the Board authorized 21 Notices of Full Investigation.

COMPLAINT DISPOSITIONS
The Board disposed of 964 cases in 2022 either by dismissal after preliminary inquiry, strictly legal error dismissal, dismissal after full investigation, dismissal with a Letter of Caution, dismissal with a Letter of Counsel or by the filing of formal charges. Not all cases are dismissed or otherwise acted upon in the year in which they are received by the Board.

DISMISSAL AFTER PRELIMINARY INQUIRY:
Of the 964 cases closed in 2022, 360 were dismissed after preliminary inquiry. These complaints involved facts that, even if true, would not constitute judicial misconduct. Investigation showed that either the allegations were unfounded or were not supported by sufficient facts or were not provable, or, when questioned, the judge gave an adequate explanation of the situation.

DISMISSAL AS STRICTLY LEGAL ERROR:
Of the 964 cases closed in 2022, 534 were dismissed as strictly legal error. These complaints generally deal with allegations of legal error and disagreements with judicial rulings. Also included in this category are complaints that are outside the Board’s four-year limitation period.

DISMISSAL WITH A LETTER OF CAUTION:
The Board dismissed 42 cases with Letters of Caution in 2022. The Board issues Letters of Caution when the judicial officer’s conduct constitutes an aberration or an oversight or other minor error in judicial comportment. The purpose of a Letter of Caution is to constitute a “wake-up call” or private warning about conduct that could lead to a finding of judicial misconduct if not corrected promptly by the judicial officer. The judicial officer is not required to sign or accept a Letter of Caution.

DISMISSAL WITH A LETTER OF COUNSEL:
The Board dismissed 9 cases with Letters of Counsel in 2022. Generally, the Board issues Letters of Counsel in cases where there is sufficient evidence of judicial misconduct to warrant the filing of formal charges in the Court of Judicial Discipline, but the evidence suggests that it was an isolated incident or first-time infraction by a judicial officer. The Letter of Counsel is a private reprimand and is subject to the judicial officer’s acceptance. Evidence of genuine remorse on the part of a judicial officer is weighed heavily by the Board in its decision whether to issue a Letter of Counsel or to file formal charges. The conduct at issue in a Letter of Counsel (and the Letter of Counsel,
itself) may be used as evidence against the judicial officer in a complaint before the Court of Judicial Discipline if the judicial officer is charged with a new violation.

RESIGNATIONS OR RETIREMENTS:
Two judicial officers resigned while facing Board investigation.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

PETITIONS FOR INTERIM SUSPENSION:
The Board may file petitions for interim suspension with the Court of Judicial Discipline. Such petitions are appropriate when the Board has filed formal charges against a judge in the Court of Judicial Discipline or when a judge has been charged with a felony. The Court may issue orders for interim suspension prior to a hearing and may do so with or without pay. These interim orders are not appealable as final orders. The Board filed 2 Petitions for Interim Suspension Without Pay in 2022.

SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIVITY DURING 2022

| Dismissals after Preliminary Inquiry – 360 |
| Strictly Legal Error Dismissals - 534 |
| Non-Jurisdiction Dismissals - 14 |
| Letters of Inquiry – 101 |
| Notices of Full Investigation – 21 |
| Dismissals After Full Investigation - 1 |
| Letters of Caution – 42 |
| Letters of Counsel - 9 |
| Withdrawals – 4 |
| Formal Complaints in the Court of Judicial Discipline – 1 |
| Petitions for Interim Suspension – 2 |

SUMMARY OF COURT OF JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE SANCTIONS IMPOSED DURING 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDICIAL OFFICER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF MISCONDUCT</th>
<th>DATE AND SANCTION IMPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDJ John R. Caffese 1 JD 2022</td>
<td>Petition for Interim Suspension without Pay</td>
<td>12/14/2022 Order Suspended without pay effective immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2022, there were 1,191 jurists within the Board’s jurisdiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Jurists</th>
<th>Senior Jurists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Pleas</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magisterial District Judges</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Municipal Court</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the complaints filed with the Board, 14 complaints concerned individuals who did not fall within the Board’s jurisdiction such as attorneys, federal judges, workers’ compensation judges, other government officials and miscellaneous individuals. The Judicial Conduct Board staff responded to each of these complaints and, where appropriate, referred complainants to the disciplinary or other authority having jurisdiction or authority over the person who was the subject of the request for investigation.

**LEVEL OF JUDICIAL OFFICE**

(Complaints Received During 2022 Calendar Year)
As stated previously, upon conclusion of its investigation of a complaint, the Board may dismiss the matter with a letter to the judicial officer communicating the Board’s concern or a warning to the judge not to engage in specified behavior. In 2022, the Board expressed concern or warning to judges about the following types of conduct:

1. **LETTERS OF COUNSEL** are issued by the Board as a private admonitions in cases where there is sufficient evidence of judicial misconduct to file formal charges with the Court of Judicial Discipline, but mitigating or extenuating circumstances exist that weigh against the filing of formal charges. The Board’s issuance of a Letter of Counsel is subject to a judge’s acceptance and appearance before Chief Counsel of the Judicial Conduct Board. Examples of the type of conduct addressed by Letters of Counsel include the following:

   - Canon 1, Rule 1.1; Canon 2, Rule 2.2 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
     - A judge failed to conduct proper arraignments and payment determination hearings for several defendants who defaulted on payments for fines and costs. In some cases, the judge sentenced the defendants to incarceration despite not having held proper hearings.

   - Canon 1, Rule 1.1; Canon 2, Rule 2.9(A) – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
     - A judge engaged in communications in a criminal matter with the father of a defendant without the knowledge of or participation of any representative of the Commonwealth. The judge also entered dispositions in several summary traffic matters without the participation or knowledge of any representative of the Commonwealth and refused to conduct marriages of gay couples.

   - Canon 1, Rules 1.1 and 1.2; Canon 2, Rule 2.16(B) - Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
     - A judge sent a text message containing an implied threat to a police officer who the judge believed was responsible for a complaint being lodged against the judge.

   - Canon 1, Rule 1.2; Canon 2, Rule 2.11 - Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
     - A judge created the appearance of impropriety and improperly failed to recuse from presiding over a criminal case in which the defendant’s attorney had recently donated a substantial sum of money to the judge’s campaign for a seat on the Court of Common Pleas and in which the judge had a large campaign sign posted on the defendant’s front yard.

   - Canon 1, Rules 1.2 and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.2, 2.5(A), 2.5(B), 2.6(A) and 2.8(B) - Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
     - A judge subjected a defendant to an unlawful period of incarceration when the judge committed the defendant to jail for several weeks without first conducting a preliminary arraignment. The judge knowingly approved timesheets of a district court clerk that inaccurately asserted that the clerk had worked on days when the clerk was home sick. The judge failed to cooperate with the President Judge and Court Administration concerning personnel investigations.
• Canon 2, Rule 2.2 - Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge held two hearings in violation of Rule 455 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Criminal Procedure when the defendants were not present for the hearings where the defendants were likely to receive, and did receive, a sentence of incarceration upon conviction.

• Canon 2, Rule 2.8 - Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge used inappropriate and offensive phrases when speaking about victims of domestic violence.

2. LETTERS OF CAUTION are issued as private warnings of potential judicial misconduct. Examples of the type of conduct addressed by Letters of Caution include the following:

• Canon 1, Rule 1.1; Canon 2, Rules 2.6 and 2.8 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  o A judge failed to comply with the AOPC Language Access Policy and Rules of Judicial Administration when he denied a defendant an accommodation for hearing assistance during a court proceeding. In addition the judge denied the defendant his right to be heard. The judge made comments to defendant that were undignified and discourteous.

• Canon 1, Rule 1.2 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  o A Judge appeared to violate Canon 2, Rule 2.11(A) (regarding disqualification) by adjudicating a petition after having formally recused from the matter, despite the fact that there was no basis for the judge’s refusal.

• Canon 1, Rule 1.2 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  o During a court proceeding a judge created the appearance of impropriety by citing research that could have been interpreted as racially offensive.

• Canon 1, Rule 1.2; Canon 2, Rule 2.7 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  o A judge failed to hear and decide a matter assigned to the judge by recusing from the matter in spite of the judge’s assertion that there was no reason for recusal. Further, the judge created the appearance of
impropriety by issuing an administrative order in the case after recusing from the case.

- Canon 1, Rule 1.2; Canon 2, Rule 2.8 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge acted in an impatient and discourteous manner towards a litigant by explaining that an objection means “keep your mouth shut.” In addition, the judge made an unwarranted and crass personal attack on a psychotherapist when the judge said, “I don’t know if she would know a delusional thought if she tripped over it.”

- Canon 2, Rule 2.5 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge delayed rendering an opinion on a PCRA case for over 2 years. The judge failed to list the case on his 703 report.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.5 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge issued an opinion in a custody matter four (4) months after the deadline.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.5(A) – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge was unduly delayed in authoring a Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a) opinion, which resulted in the delayed transmittal of the trial record to the appellate court.

- Canon 2, Rules 2.5 and 2.16 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge delayed in ruling on the defendant’s Post Conviction Relief Act Petition for several years and failed to include this matter on the judge’s Rule 703 Reports. Additionally, the judge’s response to counsel’s Letter of Inquiry contained several inaccuracies, implicating the judge’s cooperation with disciplinary authorities.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.6 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge found the defendant not guilty of Indirect Criminal Contempt. Following a motion from the Commonwealth to revisit this decision, the judge reversed his decision and found the defendant guilty without her presence and without notice having been provided.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.6 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge held a custody hearing in the absence of an incarcerated father. The judge was aware of the father’s incarceration.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.11 – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A judge opted to recuse in a divorce matter but issued an additional ruling concurrently with the judge’s order recusing from the case.

- Canon 2, Rules 2.11(A)(2)(a) and 2.11(A)(2)(b) – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - A Judge presided over and adjudicated petitions filed by their adult child, who was an attorney.

- Canon 4, Rule 4.1(A)(9) – Code of Judicial Conduct
  - While a candidate, a judge misstated the results of a plebiscite conducted by the local bar association about the then-potential candidates for judge in the county.

- Canon 1, Rule 1.1; Canon 2, Rule 2.2 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  - Without scheduling a defendant for a bail revocation proceeding or issuing a warrant for the defendant’s arrest, a judge verbally instructed a police officer to arrest the defendant and bring him before the judge if observed operating a motor vehicle without a license.
• Canon 1, Rule 1.2 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge participated in Facebook livestream regarding a defendant who then appeared before the judge for an arraignment and preliminary hearing.

• Canon 1, Rule 1.2; Canon 2, Rule 2.2 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge gave advice to a criminal defendant appearing before the judge. The judge criticized a defendant’s attorney in open court which created the impression that the judge could not be fair/impartial regarding cases involving the attorney.

• Canon 1, Rule 1.2; Canon 2, Rule 2.2 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge’s staff modified an official court docket. The judge engaged in ex parte communication with the attorney for tenant in a case pending before the judge.

• Canon 1, Rule 1.2; Canon 2, Rule 2.9 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge and the judge’s spouse spoke to their neighbor regarding a case pending in the judge’s court. The ex parte communication undermined confidence in the independence of the judiciary.

• Canon 2, Rule 2.2 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge would arrive to court one to two hours late on days when hearings were scheduled to occur. The judge did so to allow the parties time to resolve their cases prior to the scheduled hearing. However, the judge’s late arrival resulted in a backlog of cases pending resolution and delayed the beginning of hearings.

• Canon 2, Rule 2.2 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge failed to uphold and apply the law as it relates to a criminal defendant’s right to counsel during a bail modification hearing.

• Canon 2, Rules 2.2, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.12 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge and his staff routinely failed to properly process in forma pauperis petitions and accompanying civil complaints in accordance with Rule 206(E) of the Rules of Civil Procedure Governing Actions and Proceedings Before Magisterial District Judges and the standard procedures established by the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts. Failing to follow proper procedures may negatively impact indigent litigants’ access to the courts.

• Canon 2, Rules 2.2 and 2.5 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge failed to uphold the law when he did not issue his verdict and sentence directly after the conclusion of trial. The judge failed to provide the defendant a copy of the order imposing a sentence which contained information regarding the defendant’s appeal rights.

• Canon 2, Rules 2.2 and 2.6(B) – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  o A judge improperly participated in the plea bargaining process by refusing to accept plea agreements to reduce the grading of the pending charge to a summary offense unless the defendant was able to pay the fine, costs, and any restitution at the time of the imposition of sentence. The judge also refused to allow defendants subject to such putative plea agreements to pay any monetary penalties in installments.

• Canon 2, Rule 2.5 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
A judge failed to act with diligence in delaying a decision after a civil hearing for approximately 7 months. Additionally, the judge failed to include the outstanding matter on the judge’s Rule 703 Reports.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.5 – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  - A judge refused to review relevant case law despite admitting his unfamiliarity with the law.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.8 - Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  - A judge exhibited intemperate conduct while conducting a sentencing via video conference.

- Canon 2, Rule 2.9(A) – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  - A Judge engaged in a conversation with a defendant’s parent, without the participation or knowledge of representatives of the Commonwealth, that led to the reduction of the defendant’s bail.

- Canon 4, Rules 4.1(A)(9) and 4.1(B) – Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges
  - While a candidate, a judge recklessly made a false or misleading statement about the judge’s election opponent.

The nationwide statistics of judicial discipline are outlined below.*

Since 1980, 470 judges have been removed from office. This corresponds to an average of 11 judges removed each year.

### In 2022:

- 6 judges were removed from office.
- 27 judges agreed to resign or retire and never serve in judicial office again.
- 3 former judges were barred from judicial office.
- 18 judges were suspended without pay. One suspension was indefinite. One was until the end of the judge’s term based on the suspension of his law license for misconduct as an attorney. One was for “a reasonable time to permit the executive and legislative branches to consider whether the respondent should retain his judicial office.” The other suspensions were from 18 months to 10 days. 4 of the suspensions were stayed in whole or in part subject to the judge committing no further misconduct and other conditions. 6 included a censure, reprimand and/or fine.
- 72 judges or former judges received public reproofs. There were 14 censures, 31 reprimands, 21 admonishments and 6 warnings. In 9 of those cases, the judges were also ordered to obtain additional education or mentoring.
- 1 judge and one former judge was ordered to cease and desist certain conduct.
- 1 judge was ordered to complete a mentorship and be on unsupervised probation until the end of his term.
- 3 judges were suspended with pay for 30 days each in a state that does not have the option of suspension without pay.
- In 3 cases, there were findings of misconduct but no sanction was imposed, however, 1 judge was ordered to pay over $12,680 in costs incurred by the conduct commission to investigate and prosecute the matter.
- 4 former judges were disciplined in attorney discipline proceedings for conduct while they were judges.

JUDICIAL CONDUCT BOARD MEMBERS’ BIOGRAPHIES
HONORABLE RENÉE COHN JUBELIRER, Chair (January 25, 2022 – December 31, 2022); Vice-Chair (August 2, 2021 – January 24, 2022); Secretary (February 4, 2020 – August 2, 2021); The Pennsylvania State University (B.A., English), with distinction; Northwestern University School of Law (J.D.), cum laude, executive editor Law Review; Duke University School of Law (L.L.M., Judicial Studies); former teaching fellow in legal research and writing at Stanford Law School; former assistant professor of torts and remedies at DePaul University College of Law; former associate at Sidley & Austin, Chicago, Il.; former vice president and shareholder at Frank, Frank, Penn & Bernstein, Allentown, Pa.; former family and divorce mediator and arbitrator, Court of Common Pleas of Lehigh County, Pa.; former deputy and assistant solicitor for Lehigh County, Pa.; former in-house counsel for ATX Telecommunications Services, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.; former township commissioner of South Whitehall Township; elected Judge, Commonwealth Court, 2001, retained for ten-year term, 2011 and 2021; elected President Judge, January 2022; former adjunct professor of professional responsibility at Penn State Dickinson School of Law; former chair, Pennsylvania Supreme Court's Appellate Court Procedural Rules Committee; former co-chair of Pennsylvania Supreme Court’s Public Access Working Group – Trial and Appellate Court Records; former co-chair of Public Access Implementation Committee; appointed by Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as inaugural member of Continuing Judicial Education Board of Judges; appointed as co-chair of the Pennsylvania Commission on Judicial Independence; serves on Workers’ Compensation Liaison, Appellate Advocacy, Judicial Administration, and Women in the Profession Committees of the Pennsylvania Bar Association; member of American Bar Association, Pennsylvania Bar Association, Montgomery County Bar Association, Centre County Bar Association, and National Association of Women Judges; Fellow of the American Bar Foundation; emeritus member of the James S. Bowman American Inn of Court; author, “Communicating Disagreement Behind the Bench: The Importance of Rules and Norms of an Appellate Court,” 82 Law and Contemporary Problems 103-132 (2019); co-author of “The Power of Rulemaking,” a chapter in THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA –

LIFE AND LAW IN THE COMMONWEALTH, 1684-2017 (John J. Hare ed., The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2018); appointed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as a judge member on August 31, 2019.

NANCY L. CLEMENS, Vice Chair (December 5, 2022 – December 31, 2022); Secretary (September 7, 2022 – December 5, 2022); Bloomsburg University (B.A., Psychology, 1987); Shippensburg University (M.S., Criminal Justice Administration, 1999); Fellowship at the National Center for State Courts’ Institute for Court Management (2008); serves as the Children and Youth Service Line Director for Service Access and Management, Inc. (SAM), overseeing all of SAM's Children and Youth programming across Pennsylvania; served as Administrator of the Tioga County Department of Human Services in Wellsboro; Probation/Parole Officer (1995-2002); District Court Administrator for Tioga County (2003-2016); Certified Court Executive, received a Special Commendation from Pennsylvania Supreme Court for work on the Judicial Security Council (2016); served as a commissioned officer in the United States Army, branched Military Police (1987-1991); served in variety of law enforcement and combat preparatory roles while stationed at Fort Richardson, Alaska; active member of Tioga County’s Criminal Justice Advisory Board, Children’s Roundtable and Opioid Coalition; Board Member for Tioga County Partnership for Community Health; instructor at Mansfield University Municipal Police Academy, the Pennsylvania State University Deputy Sheriffs’ Academy, and the Child Welfare Resource Center; appointed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as a lay member on January 20, 2020; serves as Chair of the Board’s Personnel Committee.
SCOTT B. COOPER, ESQUIRE, Secretary (December 5, 2022 – December 31, 2022); University of Albany (B.A.), Widener University School of Law (J.D.); Partner at Schmidt Kramer P.C., specializes in personal injury law with an emphasis on motor vehicle accident and insurance cases; member and past-president of the Pennsylvania Association for Justice (PAJ); member of the American Association for Justice (AAJ) and the Pennsylvania Bar Association; currently serves as President of the Dauphin County Bar Association; serves on the Board of Directors of the Joe Allegrini Children’s Hero Fund; serves on the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania’s Civil Procedure Rules Committee and previously served on the Supreme Court’s Appellate Rules Committee; served as co-chair for then Governor-Elect Tom Wolf’s transition team committee for the Department of the Commonwealth/State and has been appointed as a Hearing Officer with the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; is a frequent lecturer and author; active in the community through his involvement with the Harrisburg Jewish Community Center and as an Adjunct Professor at Widener University Commonwealth Law School, Harrisburg; appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania as an attorney member on August 16, 2022.

MICHAEL BRUNELLE; University of New Hampshire (B.A.), Managing Director of GSL Public Strategies Group as well as GSL Consulting’s state and local government consulting practice; served as Chief of Staff to the Office of Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf; served two full terms as a State Representative in the New Hampshire House of Representatives as well as Executive Director of the New Hampshire Democratic Party; Former Executive Director of the Service Employees International United (SEIU) Pennsylvania State Council, National Campaign Director of SEIU, and a national political affairs manager for a “Big Five” technology company; appointed as a lay member by the Governor of Pennsylvania to complete a term that expires in February 2024.

HONORABLE SUSAN PEIKES GANTMAN, PRESIDENT JUDGE EMERITUS; University of Pennsylvania (B.A. cum laude, M.A., 1974); Villanova University School of Law (J.D., 1977); former senior member and Co-Chair of the Family Law Section at Cozen O’Connor in West Conshohocken, PA from 1998 – 2003; former partner and Chair of the Domestic Relations Section at the West Conshohocken, PA law firm of Sherr Joffe & Zuckerman, P.C.; served as the solicitor for the Montgomery County Office of Children and Youth and Montgomery County Housing and Community Development; former Assistant District Attorney for Montgomery County; former Law Clerk for the Honorable Richard S. Lowe of the Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas; her election to a ten-year term on the Superior Court was confirmed in January 2004, and she won retention in 2013; elected by her peers as President of the Superior Court for the five-year term beginning January 7, 2014 to January 6, 2019. On April 1, 2020 Judge Gantman took senior status on the Court; retired December 2021; member of the Pennsylvania and Montgomery County Bar Associations; former Chair of the Superior Court of Pennsylvania’s Records Management Committee; received numerous recognitions, is a frequent lecturer and is involved in community service; appointed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as an attorney member on August 16, 2022.

ANDREWE. MASICH, Ph.D; University of Arizona, Tucson (B.A., History and Anthropology (double major)); University of Arizona, Tucson (M.A., History); Carnegie Mellon University (Ph.D., Philosophy); serves as President and Chief Executive Officer of the Senator John Heinz History Center in Pittsburgh; serves as a commissioner (past chairman) of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission—the History Center, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, is the largest history museum in Pennsylvania; The Historical and Museum Commission is the Commonwealth’s official history agency; serves as an Adjunct Professor of History at Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh; the steering committee of Made By Us, a national history education coalition; member of America250PA (the Pennsylvania Commission for the United States Semiquincentennial) and as a board member of the Duquesne Club; authored or co-authored numerous books on a wide-range of American history-related topics; appointed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as a lay member on the Judicial Conduct Board on

REVEREND JAMES P. MCCLOSKEY, C.S.Sp. Ph.D.; Duquesne University, (B.A., Philosophy); Catholic Theological Union, Chicago, IL (M.Div.); Weston School of Theology, Cambridge, MA (M.Th.); Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA (M.Ed.); Fordham University, New York, NY (Ph.D.); serves as Senior Advisor to the President for Strategic Initiatives, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh; served in variety of leadership and teaching positions with Holy Ghost Preparatory School, Bensalem; Congregation of the Holy Spirit, in Pittsburgh and in Rome, Italy; and Duquesne University; served in pastoral roles with St. Mark the Evangelist Church, New York City, NY; Duquesne University; and the Diocese of San Pedro, Paraguay; serves on the board of directors of the Thea Bowman Foundation and is a member of the International Commission for Safeguarding, Congregation of the Holy Spirit, Rome, Italy; previously affiliated with numerous boards and commissions in Rome, Pittsburgh, Chicago and greater Philadelphia; appointed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as a lay member on the Judicial Conduct Board on June 20, 2020.

TARA MOBLEY; St. Petersburg College (B.S., Business Management); Capella University (M.B.A., Business Management); serves as Chief Executive Officer of Knox Law; former Chief Operating Officer of Knox Law; has extensive experience in financial, human resources, and operations management in banking, manufacturing, technology, and public accounting firms; served as the Vice President of Operations at Crosstree Capital, a global leader in health science M&A; served on the Product and Service Review Committee for the Association of Legal Administrators, a non-profit 501(c)(6) organization; currently sits on the Executive Committee and Prevention Committee for The Bradley H. Foulk Children’s Advocacy Center of Erie County and also serves as its Treasurer appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania as a lay member on November 14, 2022.

SUDHIR R. PATEL, ESQUIRE; Lehigh University (B.A.), Villanova University School of Law (J.D.); Partner at Fanelli, Evans & Patel, P.C.; areas of practice include personal injury, medical malpractice, construction litigation and criminal defense; member of the Million Dollar Advocates Forum; served as President of the Pennsylvania Association for Justice (PAJ), long-standing member of the PAJ’s Board of Governors as well as its Executive Committee. member of the American Association for Justice (AAJ), active member and past President of the Schuylkill County Bar Association; speaker at numerous continuous legal education seminars, frequent lecturer on issues ranging from social media to personal injury/medical malpractice damages and developing a profitable law practice; serves as a Mediator, both privately and through the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania’s Mediation Program; active in his community; appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania as an attorney member on February 8, 2022.

HONORABLE WILLIAM C. WENNER; Harrisburg Area Community College, (A.A.S., Police Science); Advanced undergraduate work, University of Virginia; 34th Municipal Police Officers Academy of the Pennsylvania State Police (1979); Magisterial District Judge, District Court 12-3-03, Dauphin County (2003-present); served as Chief County Detective for the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) of the Dauphin County District Attorney’s Office from 1995 until ascending to the bench; joined the CID staff as a county detective in 1988 and was promoted to Detective Sergeant in 1992; while Chief of CID served as Coordinator for the Dauphin County Crisis Response Team; graduate of prestigious FBI National Academy as well as the State Constables Training Program; as well as the State Constables Training Program; prior to joining CID, he served as a law enforcement officer in positions of successively greater responsibility with the police departments in Paxtang, Penbrook and Susquehanna Township in Dauphin County; currently serves as a member of the Special Court Judges Association of Pennsylvania, the Dauphin County Prison Board, and the MDJ Court Security Task Force of the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts; serves as lead firearms instructor for the police academy of Harrisburg Area Community College; serves as a regular guest lecturer for both the Pennsylvania State Police Academy and the Pennsylvania Game...
Commission; appointed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania as a judge member on March 14, 2020.

HONORABLE NINA WRIGHT PADILLA, Chair (August 2, 2021 – January 24, 2022); Vice-Chair (February 4, 2020 - August 2, 2021); University of New Hampshire (B.A.), University of Maryland (B.S.), University of Maryland School of Law (J.D.); private law practice for 10 years, with a concentration in Consumer Bankruptcy, as well as general civil litigation and criminal law; elected judge, First Judicial District in 2003; currently assigned to Commerce Court - Civil Trial Division; 2014 was assigned to Civil Trial Division where she presided over civil jury trials; subsequently assigned to the Motions and Statutory Appeals Program, Class Actions and Conservatorships, frequently assigned to Election Court; sat in Philadelphia Family Court, Domestic matters of Divorce, Support, Custody, Domestic Violence and Criminal Abuse; June 2012 was assigned to the Criminal Trial Division; served as a panelist in legal education programs for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Philadelphia Bar Association and the Hispanic Bar Association of Pennsylvania; serves as Committee Chair of the Board of View and Board of Revision of Taxes Committee for the Court of Common Pleas Board of Judges; co-chairs Judicial Fellows Program for the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; serves as a mentor for many college and law school graduates and was previously a mentor for Big Brothers Big Sisters of America youth mentoring program; Judicial Conduct Board Member January 2018 – January 2022.

MANDI L. CULHANE, ESQUIRE; Bucknell University (B.A.), magna cum laude; George Mason University School of Law, now the Antonin Scalia Law School (J.D.), magna cum laude; Shareholder, law firm of GRB Law, with offices in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia; practices within the firm’s Municipal, Municipal Creditors’ Rights, Real Estate and Litigation Groups; admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, the United States District Courts for the Western and Middle Districts of Pennsylvania, all Pennsylvania and West Virginia state courts; member of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania and American Bar Associations; joined Allegheny County Bar Foundation Fellows Class in 2010 and participated in Allegheny County Bar Foundation Young Lawyer’s Division Bar Leadership Initiative Class in 2007-2008; 2010-2019, recognized as a Pennsylvania Super Lawyer Rising Star for her work in areas of appellate practice and municipal law; Judicial Conduct Board Member from February 2018 – February 2022.

WAYNE E. EVANS, Pennsylvania State University (A.S., Business Administration); Real Estate Designations-E-pro and Green; Broker and Owner of Wayne Evans Realty in Scranton; retired from Verizon Communications, served as an engineer; served as Director of the Assessment Office of Lackawanna County; consultant for 21st Century Appraisals for the Luzerne County Reassessment; Finance Chair while serving as Scranton City Councilman, July 2014 – July 2019; served as Interim Mayor of the City of Scranton, July 24, 2019 – January 6, 2020; current Member of the Architectural Heritage Association, Greater Scranton Board of Realtors and a Board Member of the Economic Committee-Scranton Tomorrow; Board Member Neighborworks of NEPA and SLIBCO, the development arm of the Greater Scranton Board of Realtors; past President of the Greater Scranton Board of Realtors, South Scranton Residents Association, South Renaissance Community Development Corporation and the Architectural Heritage Association; served as Chairman of the Elm Street Program-Steering Committee; previously, Member of the Historic and Architectural Review Board (HARB) City of Scranton, Scranton City Planning Commission for 10 years, Ethics Board of Scranton and the Chamber of Commerce Metro Action Board; Judicial Conduct Board Member from February 2022 - February 2022.

HONORABLE PATRICIA H. JENKINS, Vice-Chair (February 1, 2022 – August 15, 2022); Albright College (B.S.), Dickinson Law School (J.D.); Master of Laws degree, Villanova University Graduate Tax Program; appointed to Delaware County Court of Common Pleas by Governor Robert P. Casey in 1993; elected to full term later in 1993; retained for two ten-year terms; appointed by Governor Tom Corbett to the Superior Court until January 2016; served as Senior
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Judge on the Superior Court until end of 2016; following service as Senior Judge, returned to the practice of law; former partner at Kassab Archbold Jackson & O’Brien law firm; served as solicitor for Delaware County Department of Human Services; taught Paralegal Studies at Villanova and Widener Universities; served on the advisory board of Villanova’s Matthew J. Ryan Center for the Study of Free Institutions and the Public Good, named in honor of her late husband, Pennsylvania State Representative and Speaker of the House, the Honorable Matthew J. Ryan; member of the American, Pennsylvania and Delaware County Bar Associations; served on Board of Overseers of the Veterinary School of the University of Pennsylvania from 2007-2016; served on Board of Directors of Riddle Memorial Hospital and Board of Trustees of Haverford State Hospital; Judicial Conduct Board Member from August 2018 - August 2022.

DET. JOSEPH M. BROWN, Vice Chair (September 7, 2022 – December 3, 2022); Secretary (February 1, 2022 – September 7, 2022); Alvernia University (B.A., Criminal Justice-2020); Masters in Public Administration from West Chester University (2022). Detective, Berks County Office of the District Attorney; retired as Sergeant with West Reading Police Department (1991-2019); while at West Reading, served as patrol officer, criminal investigator and ultimately, patrol sergeant; experienced polygraph examiner; serves as President Berks Lodge #71, Fraternal Order of Police; serves as President Berks County Police Heroes Fund (founder); serves as Treasurer of Pennsylvania State Order of Police, organization represents over 40,000 active and retired members of law enforcement across the Commonwealth; Northwestern University School of Police Staff and Command (2018); Reading Area Community College, Associates Degree in Public Administration (2016), Associates Degree in Law Enforcement Administration (1999); Reading Police Academy (1986); Awards and Commendations: Police Officer of the Year (1998), Medal of Honor, Combat Cross (2), Wound Award, Gallantry Star (3), Exceptional Duty Award, Federal Bureau of Investigation-Letter of Commendation, Reading Bureau of Police-Letter of Commendation, and West Reading Police Department-Letter of Commendation; Professional Memberships: American Association Police Polygraphists, American Polygraph Association; Volunteer activities: Judicial Conduct Board Member from December 2018 – December 2022.

HONORABLE MIA R. PEREZ; Tufts University (B.A.), Temple University’s Beasley School of Law (J.D); trial attorney for the Defender Association of Philadelphia; Associate attorney at Friedman Schuman Applebaum, PC; established Perez Law LLC; in 2016, she became one of the youngest judges to serve on the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas; currently sits in the Criminal Division; one of five Criminal Judges to participate in the Case Accelerated Resolution Program which was designed to bring expedited resolutions to the cases pending as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Serves as the Supervising Judge of the city’s Investigating Grand Jury Program; serves as an adjunct professor at Temple University’s James E. Beasley School of Law; Judicial Conduct Board Member from January 2022 - December 2022.
CONFIDENTIAL REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Please type or print. If you wish to provide documents to support your allegations, please attach copies of those documents. **We cannot return documents.** The Board’s jurisdiction extends only to Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justices, Superior and Commonwealth Court Judges, Common Pleas Court Judges, Philadelphia Municipal and Magisterial District Judges. Once completed, you must sign and return this form to the address above.

NOTICE: The Judicial Conduct Board has no authority to change a Judge’s decisions or rulings. Our jurisdiction extends only to conduct that violates the Code of Judicial Conduct or the Rules Governing Standards of Conduct of Magisterial District Judges, which may be found at our website at [www.jcbpa.org](http://www.jcbpa.org).

Your Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Email Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Telephone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City:</th>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Zip:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judicial Officer’s Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Type of Judicial Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magisterial District Judge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| County: | |
|---------||
|         | |

Case Information: (If misconduct allegations relate to Court Proceedings.)

| Case Has Been Appealed | |
|------------------------||
| Case Name:             | |
| Case Docket Number:    | |

Your Attorney: | Opposing Attorney: | Witness: | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
<th>Phone:</th>
<th>Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that I have read the information concerning the Judicial Conduct Board’s function, jurisdiction, and procedures included in the accompanying brochure. I further swear (or affirm) that the above information is true and accurate. The statements in this complaint are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.)

Date: ________________________  Your Signature__________________________________
Please use this page to explain your complaint, providing as much detail as possible. Attach additional pages if needed.

Please note, it is not required that you present your grievance to the Board in person. Personal interviews are not required and are not usually necessary for our preliminary review, investigation, and understanding of grievances. If we need further information relative to your grievances, you will be contacted by phone, letter or email.

(BACK SIDE OF REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL INVESTIGATION)