

# **REPORT: JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES IN ALL FIFTY STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

*Office of Senator Sheldon Whitehouse*

*November 2024*

This report examines the judicial-misconduct procedures in all fifty states. All fifty states have some mechanism for enforcing judicial codes of conduct and ethics rules. These regimes all incorporate procedures to receive complaints of, investigate, and address judicial misconduct, including at the state supreme court (or equivalent) level—similar to the processes that apply to almost all federal judges under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act. Most of these state judicial-ethics regimes have been in place since the 1960s or 1970s.

In addition, although the details vary, almost all states have a process similar to what the Supreme Court Ethics, Recusal, and Transparency Act would require. Such procedures include:

- Allowing anyone to file complaints alleging misconduct by supreme court justices, subject to initial screenings by investigators,
- Empowering a special commission, often including sitting or former judges, to investigate and find facts regarding complaints of ethical misconduct by justices, and
- Permitting ethics commissions to impose or recommend disciplinary actions, including against justices who have committed misconduct.

## **Alabama: Judicial Inquiry Commission and Court of the Judiciary**

- In 1973, the state constitution established a Judicial Inquiry Commission, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and other appointees, to investigate misconduct by Alabama Supreme Court justices and lower court judges, as well as a Court of the Judiciary comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public to adjudicate complaints.<sup>1</sup>
- The state constitution empowers the Alabama Supreme Court to create the Commission's and Court of the Judiciary's procedural rules.<sup>2</sup>
- Anyone may file a complaint alleging judicial misconduct. The Commission is authorized to investigate complaints, take testimony, and subpoena evidence. When it finds a reasonable basis that a violation has occurred, the Commission must file charges in the Court of the Judiciary.<sup>3</sup>
- The Court of the Judiciary adjudicates charges brought by the Commission and can discipline justices and judges, including removal, after notice and public hearing.<sup>4</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

**Alaska: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1968, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Conduct, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Alaska Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>5</sup>
- State statute defines the Commission's powers and duties.<sup>6</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and conduct hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>7</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices or judges, including removal, by the Alaska Supreme Court.<sup>8</sup>

**Arizona: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1970, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Conduct, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Arizona Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>9</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission's powers and authorizes the Arizona Supreme Court to create the Commission's rules.<sup>10</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>11</sup>
- The Commission can informally sanction justices and judges or recommend discipline, including removal, by the Arizona Supreme Court.<sup>12</sup>

**Arkansas: Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission**

- In 1988, the state constitution established a Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Arkansas Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>13</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission's powers and authorizes the Arkansas Supreme Court to establish further rules. State statute further defines the Commission's powers and duties.<sup>14</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>15</sup>
- The Commission can discipline justices and judges, including censure, subject to appeal to the Arkansas Supreme Court, or the Commission can recommend discipline, including removal, by the Arkansas Supreme Court.<sup>16</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

**California: Commission on Judicial Performance**

- In 1960, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Performance, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by California Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>17</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorizes the Commission to establish additional rules.<sup>18</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>19</sup>
- The Commission can discipline justices and judges, including removal, subject to review by the California Supreme Court or by a panel of randomly selected lower court judges in the case of discipline of California Supreme Court justices.<sup>20</sup>

**Colorado: Commission on Judicial Discipline**

- In 1966, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Discipline, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate judicial misconduct by Colorado Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>21</sup>
- The state constitution and state statute define the Commission’s powers and duties and authorize the Colorado Supreme Court to create the Commission’s rules.<sup>22</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>23</sup>
- The Commission can informally discipline justices or judges or can recommend formal discipline, including removal, by the Colorado Supreme Court.<sup>24</sup>

**Connecticut: Judicial Review Council**

- In 1976, the state constitution authorized the legislature to create a Judicial Review Council and in the same year the legislature established such a Council. That body, which comprises lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, is charged with investigating misconduct by Connecticut Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>25</sup>
- State statute defines the Council’s powers, duties, and procedures.<sup>26</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Council, or the Council can initiate an investigation on its own. The Council is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>27</sup>
- The Council can discipline justices or judges, up to suspension for a maximum of one year and subject to appeal to the Connecticut Supreme Court or can recommend removal or a longer suspension by the Connecticut Supreme Court.<sup>28</sup>

*JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE*

**Delaware: Court on the Judiciary and Preliminary Investigatory Committee**

- In 1979, the state constitution established a Court on the Judiciary, comprising Delaware Supreme Court justices and lower court judges, to investigate misconduct by Delaware Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. In turn, the Court on the Judiciary established a Preliminary Investigatory Committee comprising lawyers and members of the public to conduct initial investigations.<sup>29</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Court’s powers and duties and authorizes the Court to create rules for the investigation and adjudication of misconduct complaints.<sup>30</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Court. After an initial screening by the Chief Justice of the Delaware Supreme Court, complaints are referred to a panel within the Preliminary Investigatory Committee to gather facts and determine whether probable cause exists that a justice or judge has committed misconduct.<sup>31</sup>
- Upon a finding of probable cause by the Preliminary Investigatory Committee panel, or a determination of probable cause by the Chief Justice, matters are referred to a board of examining officers, comprising judges selected by the Chief Justice, for a hearing and adjudication. The Court on the Judiciary is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation, and it delegates to boards of examining officers the power to do the same.<sup>32</sup>
- A board of examining officers submits its findings and recommendations to the full Court on the Judiciary, which can censure, remove, or retire a Delaware Supreme Court justice or judge—subject to additional adjudication concerning disputed issues of material fact.<sup>33</sup>

**Florida: Judicial Qualifications Commission**

- In 1966, the state constitution established a Judicial Qualifications Commission, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Florida Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. The constitution divides the Commission into Investigative and Hearing panels.<sup>34</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties and directs the Commission to adopt rules of proceedings, subject to repeal by the legislature or the Florida Supreme Court.<sup>35</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission’s Investigative Panel can initiate an investigation on its own. The Investigative Panel is empowered to access all information from executive, legislative, and judicial agencies and to subpoena evidence and take testimony as part of its investigation.<sup>36</sup>
- Upon a finding of probable cause by the Investigative Panel, formal charges are submitted to the Hearing Panel for adjudication. The Hearing Panel is entitled to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings.<sup>37</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices and judges, including removal, by the Florida Supreme Court.<sup>38</sup>

**Georgia: Judicial Qualifications Committee**

- First in 1972 and again in 2017, the state constitution directed the legislature to establish a Judicial Qualifications Committee, and in 2017 the legislature established the current committee. That body, which comprises lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, investigates misconduct by Georgia Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. State statute divides the Committee into Investigative and Hearing Panels.<sup>39</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Committee’s duties and authorizes the legislature and Georgia Supreme Court to create additional implementing rules, which must comply with due process.<sup>40</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Committee, or the Committee acting through the appointed director of the Investigative Panel can initiate an investigation on its own. The director screens and investigates complaints, and if a full investigation is authorized by the Investigative Panels, the director is empowered to subpoena evidence and take testimony.<sup>41</sup>
- Upon a finding of reasonable cause to believe that a judge committed misconduct, the Investigative Panel can informally discipline or privately admonish the justice or judge, or it can file formal charges with the Hearing Board—or with a special supreme court comprising lower court judges if a Supreme Court justice is alleged to have committed the misconduct.<sup>42</sup>
- The Hearing Board is empowered to conduct discovery and hold hearings, and the director of the Investigative Panel and justice or judge can subpoena evidence and take testimony when matters are before the Hearing Board.<sup>43</sup>
- The Hearing Board can recommend discipline of justices and judges, including removal, by the Georgia Supreme Court.<sup>44</sup>

**Hawaii: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1978, the state constitution directed the Hawaii Supreme Court to establish a commission on judicial discipline, and the next year the Hawaii Supreme Court established a Commission on Judicial Conduct. That body, which comprises lawyers and members of the public, investigates misconduct by Hawaii Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>45</sup>
- The state constitution broadly defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorizes the Hawaii Supreme Court to adopt rules of procedure and implementation.<sup>46</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and conduct hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>47</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline, including removal, of justices and judges by the Hawaii Supreme Court.<sup>48</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

**Idaho: Judicial Council**

- In 1967, the state constitution directed the state legislature to establish provisions for the retirement, discipline, and removal of judges, and in the same year the state legislature established a Judicial Council. That body, which comprises the Chief Justice of the Idaho Supreme Court, lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, investigates misconduct by Idaho Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>49</sup>
- State statute defines the Council's powers and duties. The Council also adopts procedural rules.<sup>50</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Council, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and conduct hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>51</sup>
- The Council can recommend discipline of justices or judges, including removal, by the Idaho Supreme Court.<sup>52</sup>

**Illinois: Judicial Inquiry Board and Courts Commission**

- In 1970, the state constitution established a Judicial Inquiry Board, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Illinois Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. The state constitution also established a Courts Commission, comprising one justice of the Illinois Supreme Court, lower court judges, and members of the public, to adjudicate complaints brought by the Board.<sup>53</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Board's and Commission's powers and duties and authorizes each body to adopt procedural rules.<sup>54</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Board, which is empowered to take testimony and subpoena evidence as part of its investigation. Upon finding reasonable basis for a complaint, the Board can charge a judge before the Commission.<sup>55</sup>
- The Commission can issue a final decision reprimanding, censuring, suspending, or removing a justice or judge.<sup>56</sup>

**Indiana: Commission on Judicial Qualifications**

- In 1970, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Qualifications, comprising the Chief Justice of the Indiana Supreme Court, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Indiana Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>57</sup>
- The state constitution and state statute define the Commission's powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>58</sup>
- Any Indiana citizen can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to take testimony and subpoena witnesses and evidence as part of its investigation. If the Commission finds probable cause for a complaint, it can initiate a formal hearing to be adjudicated by three Masters appointed by the Indiana Supreme Court.<sup>59</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- Following a hearing, the Commission, the Masters, or both can recommend discipline, including removal, of justices and judges by the Indiana Supreme Court.<sup>60</sup>

**Iowa: Commission on Judicial Qualifications**

- In 1972, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Qualifications to investigate misconduct by Iowa Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. The next year, the Iowa General Assembly established the composition of the Commission to include lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public.<sup>61</sup>
- State statute defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorize the Commission to adopt its own rules of procedure.<sup>62</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to take testimony, subpoena evidence, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>63</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline, including removal, of justices and judges by the Iowa Supreme Court.<sup>64</sup>

**Kansas: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1974, the Kansas Supreme Court established a Commission on Judicial Conduct, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Kansas Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. The Supreme Court has since divided the Commission into two panels, one of which acts as an “Inquiry Panel” and the other a “Hearing Panel.”<sup>65</sup>
- Kansas Supreme Court rules define the Commission’s powers and duties and authorize the Commission to adopt its own rules of procedure.<sup>66</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission. The Inquiry Panel conducts initial investigations of complaints, and it is empowered to subpoena witnesses and take testimony as part of its investigation.<sup>67</sup>
- If the Inquiry Panel finds that misconduct occurred, it can issue a letter of caution or a cease-and-desist order to the justice or judge, or it can refer the complaint to the Hearing Panel for formal proceedings.<sup>68</sup>
- The Hearing Panel is empowered to compel the attendance of witnesses and take testimony as part of the hearing. The Hearing Panel can admonish a justice or judge, issue a cease-and-desist order, or recommend censure, suspension, or removal by the Kansas Supreme Court.<sup>69</sup>

**Kentucky: Judicial Conduct Commission**

- In 1975, the state constitution established a Judicial Conduct Commission, comprising lower court judges, a lawyer, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Kentucky Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>70</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorizes the Kentucky Supreme Court to establish the Commission’s procedural rules.<sup>71</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to take testimony, subpoena evidence, and conduct hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>72</sup>
- The Commission can discipline justices and judges, including removal, subject to review by the Kentucky Supreme Court.<sup>73</sup>

**Louisiana: Judiciary Commission**

- In 1968, the state constitution established a Judiciary Commission, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Louisiana Supreme Court justices and judges.<sup>74</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorizes the Louisiana Supreme Court to establish the Commission’s rules of procedure.<sup>75</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents as part of its investigation.<sup>76</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices and judges, including removal, by the Louisiana Supreme Court.<sup>77</sup>

**Maine: Committee on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1978, the Maine Supreme Judicial Court established a Committee on Judicial Conduct, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Maine Supreme Judicial Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>78</sup>
- A Maine Supreme Judicial Court order defines the Committee’s powers and duties and authorizes the Committee to create additional rules of procedure.<sup>79</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Committee, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>80</sup>
- The Committee can recommend discipline, including removal, of justices and judges by the Maine Supreme Judicial Court.<sup>81</sup>

**Maryland: Commission on Judicial Disabilities**

- In 1966, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Disabilities, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Maryland Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>82</sup>
- The state constitution and state statute define the Commission’s powers and duties and authorize the Maryland Supreme Court to create the Commission’s rules of procedure.<sup>83</sup>



**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>84</sup>
- The Commission can publicly reprimand a justice or judge, or it can recommend discipline, including removal, by the Maryland Supreme Court.<sup>85</sup>

**Massachusetts: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1978, state statute established a Commission on Judicial Conduct, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>86</sup>
- State statute defines the Commission's powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>87</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate proceedings on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, conduct discovery, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>88</sup>
- The Commission can recommend sanctions, including suspension, by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. Only the state legislature can remove judges.<sup>89</sup>

**Michigan: Commission on Judicial Tenure**

- In 1968, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Tenure, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Michigan Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>90</sup>
- The state constitution defines Commission's powers and duties and authorizes the Michigan Supreme Court to establish rules of implementation.<sup>91</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate proceedings on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>92</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of judges or justices by the Michigan Supreme Court, including suspension, involuntary retirement, or removal.<sup>93</sup>

**Minnesota: Board on Judicial Standards**

- In 1971, state statute established a Board on Judicial Standards, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Minnesota Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>94</sup>
- State statute defines the Board's powers and duties and authorize the Minnesota Supreme Court to establish rules of implementation and enforcement.<sup>95</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Board, or the Board can initiate proceedings on its own. The Board is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>96</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- The Board on Judicial Standards can recommend discipline of judges or justices by the Minnesota Supreme Court, including removal.<sup>97</sup>

**Mississippi: Commission on Judicial Performance**

- In 1979, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Performance, comprising judges, a lawyer, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Mississippi Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>98</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission's powers and duties, and state statute authorizes the Commission to establish rules of implementation with the approval of the Mississippi Supreme Court.<sup>99</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission or the Commission may initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>100</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of judges or justices by the Mississippi Supreme Court, including removal.<sup>101</sup>

**Missouri: Commission on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline**

- In 1972, the state constitution established a Commission on Retirement, Removal, and Discipline, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Missouri Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>102</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission's powers and duties, and the Missouri Supreme Court determines the Commission's procedural rules.<sup>103</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>104</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices and judges by the Missouri Supreme Court, including removal.<sup>105</sup>

**Montana: Judicial Standards Commission**

- In 1973, the state constitution established a Judicial Standards Commission, comprising judges, a lawyer, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Montana Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>106</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission's powers and duties and authorizes the Commission to establish procedural rules.<sup>107</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission or the Commission may initiate an investigation on its own after receiving information alleging judicial misconduct. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>108</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices and judges by the Montana Supreme Court, including removal.<sup>109</sup>

**Nebraska: Commission on Judicial Qualifications**

- In 1966, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Qualifications, comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Nebraska Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>110</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorizes the Nebraska Supreme Court to establish the Commission’s procedural rules.<sup>111</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>112</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices and judges by the Nebraska Supreme Court, including removal.<sup>113</sup>

**Nevada: Commission on Judicial Discipline**

- In 1976, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Discipline comprising judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Nevada Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>114</sup>
- The state constitution and state statute define the Commission’s powers and duties and authorize the Commission to establish its own procedural rules.<sup>115</sup>
- Anyone can submit a complaint to the Commission, or the Commission may initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>116</sup>
- The Commission can discipline judges or justices, including removal, subject to appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court.<sup>117</sup>

**New Hampshire: Committee on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1977, the New Hampshire Supreme Court established a Committee on Judicial Conduct, comprising judges, one clerk of court, a lawyer, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by New Hampshire Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>118</sup>
- New Hampshire Supreme Court rules define the Committee’s powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>119</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Committee, or the Committee may initiate an investigation on its own. The Committee is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>120</sup>
- The Committee can issue informal resolutions, such as reprimands, or recommend formal disciplinary action by the New Hampshire Supreme Court, including suspension. Only the state legislature can remove justices and judges.<sup>121</sup>

**New Jersey: Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1974, the New Jersey Supreme Court established an Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct, comprising retired judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by New Jersey Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>122</sup>
- New Jersey Supreme Court rules define the Committee’s powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>123</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Committee regarding lower court judges, or the Committee may initiate an investigation on its own. Regarding New Jersey Supreme Court justices, the Committee can open an investigation upon referral by the New Jersey Supreme Court to the Committee. The Committee is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>124</sup>
- The Committee can recommend discipline, including suspension or initiation of procedures for removal, to the New Jersey Supreme Court. Only the governor, the state legislature, or the New Jersey Supreme Court itself can move the New Jersey Supreme Court to remove a lower court judge. Only the state legislature can impeach and remove New Jersey Supreme Court justices.<sup>125</sup>

**New Mexico: Judicial Standards Commission**

- In 1968, the state constitution established the Judicial Standards Commission, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by New Mexico Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>126</sup>
- The state constitution and state statute define the Commission’s powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>127</sup>
- Anyone can submit a complaint to the Committee. After investigating, the Committee may hold a hearing on the matter or appoint three justices or judges to hear evidence and issue a report. The Committee can also petition a district court to subpoena evidence and witnesses.<sup>128</sup>
- The Committee can recommend discipline, including removal, by the New Mexico Supreme Court.<sup>129</sup>

**New York: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1978, the state constitution established the New York Commission on Judicial Conduct, replacing previous Commissions created in 1974 and 1976. The current Commission comprises lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public to investigate misconduct by all state judges, including those on the New York Court of Appeals (New York’s highest court).<sup>130</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorizes the Commission to establish rules of procedure.<sup>131</sup>
- Anyone can submit a complaint to the Commission. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as a part of its investigation.<sup>132</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- The Commission may issue determinations regarding appropriate discipline for a judge or justice, including removal, to the New York Court of Appeals.<sup>133</sup>

**North Carolina: Judicial Standards Commission**

- In 1973, state statute established the Judicial Standards Commission, comprising lower court judges and members of the public, to investigate misconduct against North Carolina Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>134</sup>
- State statute authorizes the Commission to employ an executive director, Commission counsel, and an investigator, all of whom may serve subpoenas. The Commission is empowered to adopt its own procedural rules subject to approval by the North Carolina Supreme Court.<sup>135</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as a part of its investigation.<sup>136</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices and judges, including removal, by North Carolina Supreme Court.<sup>137</sup>

**North Dakota: Judicial Conduct Commission**

- In 1975, state statute established the Judicial Conduct Commission, comprising two lower court judges, one lawyer, and four members of the public, to investigate misconduct by North Dakota Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>138</sup>
- State statute defines the Commission's powers, duties, and procedural rules. The North Dakota Supreme Court is authorized to create additional procedural rules.<sup>139</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission. The Commission is empowered to subpoena witnesses and evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as a part of its investigation.<sup>140</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline of justices and judges, including removal, by the North Dakota Supreme Court.<sup>141</sup>

**Ohio: Office of Disciplinary Counsel and Board of Professional Conduct**

- In 1957, the Ohio Supreme Court established the Board of Professional Conduct by rule. The Board, which comprises lawyers, judges, and members of the public, investigates and prosecutes misconduct by lower court judges. The Ohio Supreme Court also created a parallel process to adjudicate complaints against Ohio Supreme Court justices, described below. Ohio Supreme Court rules define the scope of these disciplinary processes.<sup>142</sup>
- Anyone can submit a complaint regarding an Ohio Supreme Court justice to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel. If the Office of Disciplinary Counsel determines that substantial evidence supports the complaint, the office must prepare submit a formal complaint to the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, who shall convene a panel of three eligible appellate judges to investigate the complaint.<sup>143</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- If the panel determines good cause exists to investigate the complaint, the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals must appoint a special disciplinary counsel to conduct an investigation. Following an investigation, the special disciplinary counsel must either recommend the complaint be dismissed (a final determination) or file a formal complaint with the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals.<sup>144</sup>
- Following the filing of a formal complaint, the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals appoints three successive panels to investigate the complaint: a probable cause panel, a hearing panel, and an adjudicatory panel. The adjudicatory panel consists of thirteen appellate judges and is empowered to conduct an oral argument, if necessary, and issue a final order.<sup>145</sup>

**Oklahoma: Council on Judicial Complaints**

- In 1974, state statute established the Council on Judicial Complaints to investigate misconduct by members of the state’s courts of last resort (the Oklahoma Supreme Court and the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals) and lower court judges. The council comprises three members, only two of whom may be lawyers.<sup>146</sup>
- State statute provides for the Council’s powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>147</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Council. The Council is empowered to conduct hearings, take testimony, and subpoena evidence as a part of its investigation.<sup>148</sup>
- The Council may choose to forward its findings to the Oklahoma Supreme Court or another body with disciplinary power.<sup>149</sup>

**Oregon: Commission on Judicial Fitness and Disability**

- In 1967, state statute established the Commission on Judicial Fitness and Disability, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Oregon Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>150</sup>
- State statute defines the Commission’s powers, duties and procedural rules.<sup>151</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission. The Commission is empowered to hold hearings, take testimony, and issue any process necessary to compel the attendance of witnesses and production of evidence.<sup>152</sup>
- The Commission can recommend discipline, including removal, by the Oregon Supreme Court.<sup>153</sup>

**Pennsylvania: Judicial Conduct Board and Court of Judicial Discipline**

- In 1968, the state constitution established a Judicial Inquiry and Review Board to investigate misconduct by Pennsylvania Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. In 1993, a constitutional amendment replaced this Board with a two-tier system: a Judicial Conduct Board, which investigates and prosecutes charges of misconduct, and a Court of Judicial Discipline, which adjudicates disputes. The Judicial Conduct Board and

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

Court of Judicial Discipline both comprise lower court judges, a justice of the peace, lawyers, and members of the public.<sup>154</sup>

- The state constitution and state statute define the Board’s and Court’s powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>155</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Board, which conducts an initial investigation. The Board may file formal charges with the Court of Judicial Discipline if it finds clear and convincing evidence of misconduct.<sup>156</sup>
- If the Board files charges, the Court of Judicial Discipline must conduct a hearing. The Court of Judicial Discipline is a court of record and can subpoena witnesses and compel the production of evidence.<sup>157</sup>
- The Court of Judicial Discipline can order discipline, including removal from office. Under the Pennsylvania Constitution, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court’s scope of review on the discipline ordered is “whether the sanctions imposed were lawful.”<sup>158</sup>

**Rhode Island: Commission on Judicial Tenure and Discipline**

- In 1974, state statute established the Commission on Judicial Tenure and Discipline, comprising lower court judges, magistrates, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Rhode Island Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>159</sup>
- State statute defines the Commission’s powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>160</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and conduct hearings.<sup>161</sup>
- The Commission can issue a private reprimand or recommend discipline, including removal, by the Rhode Island Supreme Court.<sup>162</sup>

**South Carolina: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1997, the South Carolina Supreme Court created by rule the Commission on Judicial Conduct, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to recommend resolutions of claims of misconduct by justices and judges. The Supreme Court’s investigatory arm, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, oversees the Commission.<sup>163</sup>
- South Carolina Appellate Court rules define Commission’s powers, duties, and procedural rules.<sup>164</sup>
- Anyone can submit a complaint to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, which may choose to initiate an investigation and, ultimately, to file formal charges with the Commission on Judicial Conduct. The Commission must then conduct a hearing on the matter. The Commission is empowered to subpoena witnesses and evidence.<sup>165</sup>
- The South Carolina Supreme Court reviews the Commission’s recommendations and issues a decision.<sup>166</sup>

**South Dakota: Judicial Qualifications Commission**

- In 1972, the state constitution directed the legislature to establish a Judicial Qualifications Commission, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by South Dakota Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>167</sup>
- The state constitution empowers the South Dakota Supreme Court to create the Commission’s procedural rules.<sup>168</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>169</sup>
- The Commission can informally discipline or privately reprimand a justice or judge, or it can recommend formal discipline, including removal, by the South Dakota Supreme Court.<sup>170</sup>

**Tennessee: Board of Judicial Conduct**

- In 2019, the state legislature, as part of the fourth reform of state judicial ethics bodies that began in 1971, replaced its preexisting Board of Judicial Conduct with a new Board comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public. That body investigates misconduct by Tennessee Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>171</sup>
- State statute defines the Board’s powers and duties and authorizes the Board to establish its procedural rules.<sup>172</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Board, or the Board can initiate an investigation on its own. The Board is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>173</sup>
- The Board can discipline justices and judges, including suspension, and it can recommend that the Tennessee Supreme Court recommend removal by the state legislature.<sup>174</sup>

**Texas: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1965, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Conduct, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by members of the state’s courts of last resort (the Texas Supreme Court and the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals) and lower court judges.<sup>175</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties, authorizes the Texas Supreme Court to establish the Commission’s procedural rules, and permits the state legislature to expand upon the constitutional provisions governing the Commission.<sup>176</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>177</sup>



**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- The Commission can discipline justices and judges, including by imposing training or education requirements and public reprimands, and it can recommend suspension, retirement, or removal by a reviewing tribunal of justices or judges selected by the Chief Justice of the Texas Supreme Court, subject to appeals to the Texas Supreme Court.<sup>178</sup>

**Utah: Judicial Conduct Commission**

- In 1985, the state constitution, building on a previous commission established legislatively in 1971, established a Judicial Conduct Commission comprising lower court judges, lawyers, legislators, and members of the public. That body investigates misconduct by Utah Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>179</sup>
- The state constitution establishes the Commission's powers and duties generally, and state statute further defines the Commission's powers, duties, and procedures.<sup>180</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>181</sup>
- The Commission can discipline justices and judges, including removal, subject to automatic review by the Utah Supreme Court.<sup>182</sup>

**Vermont: Judicial Conduct Board**

- In 1978, the Vermont Supreme Court established a Judicial Conduct Board comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, which investigates misconduct by Vermont Supreme Court justices and judges.<sup>183</sup>
- Vermont Supreme Court rules define the Board's power, duties, and rules of procedure.<sup>184</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Board, or the Board can initiate an investigation on its own. The Board is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>185</sup>
- The Board can discipline justices or judges, including suspension, subject to appeal to and automatic review of suspensions by the Vermont Supreme Court.<sup>186</sup>

**Virginia: Judicial Inquiry and Review Commission**

- In 1971, the state constitution established a Judicial Inquiry and Review Commission, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Virginia Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>187</sup>
- The state constitution and state statute together establish the Commission's powers, duties, and rules of procedure. State statute also authorizes the Commission to establish additional rules of procedure.<sup>188</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena witnesses, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>189</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- The Commission can require counseling and privately reprimand justices and judges, or it can file a formal complaint with the Virginia Supreme Court recommending censure, removal, or retirement.<sup>190</sup>

**Washington: Commission on Judicial Conduct**

- In 1980, the state constitution established a Commission on Judicial Conduct, comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Washington Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>191</sup>
- The state constitution and state statute together establish the Commission's powers, duties, and rules of procedure.<sup>192</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, which is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>193</sup>
- The Commission can admonish, reprimand, or censure justices and judges, subject to review by Washington Supreme Court, or it can recommend suspension or removal by the Washington Supreme Court.<sup>194</sup>

**West Virginia: Judicial Investigation Commission, Judicial Hearing Board, and Office of Disciplinary Counsel**

- In 1976, the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals established a Judicial Investigation Commission, comprising lower court judges, magistrates, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by West Virginia Supreme Court justices and lower court judges. That court also established a Judicial Hearing Board, comprising lower court judges, other judicial officials, and members of the public, to adjudicate complaints. Finally, the court established an Office of Disciplinary Counsel to investigate and prosecute judicial misconduct.<sup>195</sup>
- West Virginia Supreme Court rules define the Commission's, Board's, and Office's powers and duties. These rules also authorize the Commission and Board to propose rules of procedure, subject to approval by the West Virginia Supreme Court.<sup>196</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, or the Commission may order an investigation on its own initiative. At the request of the Office, the Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence and take testimony as part of its investigation.<sup>197</sup>
- After receiving a report with the Office's findings and recommendations, the Commission determines whether probable cause exists to formally charge a justice or judge with misconduct.<sup>198</sup>
- After receiving a formal misconduct charge from the Commission, the Board conducts a hearing and submits a recommended decision to the West Virginia Supreme Court. The Board is empowered to subpoena witnesses and take testimony as part of this process.<sup>199</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- The Commission can publicly admonish justices and judges, and the Board can recommend discipline, including suspension without pay for up to one year, by the West Virginia Supreme Court.<sup>200</sup>

**Wisconsin: Judicial Commission**

- In 1977, the state constitution empowered the state legislature to establish procedures providing for discipline of Wisconsin Supreme Court justices and lower court judges who engage in misconduct. In 1978, the state legislature—replacing a commission established in 1972 by the Wisconsin Supreme Court—established a Judicial Commission comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public to investigate such misconduct.<sup>201</sup>
- State statute defines the Commission’s powers, duties, and rules of procedure and authorizes the Commission to establish additional rules of procedure.<sup>202</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence and take testimony as part of its investigation.<sup>203</sup>
- After finding that probable cause exists as to whether a justice or judge committed misconduct, the Commission can request a jury hearing or file a formal complaint to be adjudicated by a judicial conduct and disability panel.<sup>204</sup>
- The findings and recommendations resulting from the jury hearing or panel are submitted to the Wisconsin Supreme Court, which can discipline justices or judges, including removal.<sup>205</sup>

**Wyoming: Commission on Judicial Conduct and Ethics**

- In 1996, the state constitution established the Commission on Judicial Conduct and Ethics comprising lower court judges, lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by Wyoming Supreme Court justices and lower court judges.<sup>206</sup>
- The state constitution defines the Commission’s powers and duties and directs the Wyoming Supreme Court to adopt rules of procedure for the Commission, which specify the Commission’s powers and duties and permit the Committee to adopt further rules of procedure.<sup>207</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. Commission investigatory panels can subpoena evidence and take testimony as part of investigations and refer complaints to adjudicatory panels for formal proceedings, which can involve subpoenaing evidence, taking testimony, and holding hearings.<sup>208</sup>
- Findings of misconduct are referred to a disciplinary panel, which can privately discipline a justice or judge or recommend public censure, removal, or retirement by the Wyoming Supreme Court.<sup>209</sup>

**District of Columbia: Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure**

- In 1970, D.C. statute established a Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, comprising one federal judge serving in D.C., lawyers, and members of the public, to investigate misconduct by District of Columbia Court of Appeals and Superior Court judges.<sup>210</sup>
- D.C. statute defines the Commission’s powers and duties and authorizes the Commission to establish additional rules and procedures.<sup>211</sup>
- Anyone can submit complaints to the Commission, or the Commission can initiate an investigation on its own. The Commission is empowered to subpoena evidence, take testimony, and hold hearings as part of its investigation.<sup>212</sup>
- The Commission can discipline judges, including removal, subject to appeal to the D.C. Court of Appeals and to a special court of judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.<sup>213</sup>

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

- 
- <sup>1</sup> ALA. CONST. art. VI, §§ 156, 157.  
<sup>2</sup> *Id.* §§ 156(c), 157(c).  
<sup>3</sup> Ala. Jud. Inquiry Comm’n R. 6-7; ALA. CONST. art. VI, § 156(b).  
<sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 157(a).  
<sup>5</sup> ALASKA CONST. art. IV, § 10.  
<sup>6</sup> ALASKA STAT. §§ 22.30.010 *et seq.*  
<sup>7</sup> *Id.* §§ 22.30.011(a-b), 22.30.066(a).  
<sup>8</sup> *Id.* § 22.30.011(d).  
<sup>9</sup> ARIZ. CONST. art. 6.1 §§ 1, 5.  
<sup>10</sup> ARIZ. CONST. art. 6.1, § 5.  
<sup>11</sup> Commission on Judicial Conduct, *How to File a Complaint*, <https://www.azcourts.gov/azcjc/How-to-File-a-Complaint>; Ariz. Comm’n on Jud. Conduct R. 13, 22, 26, 27.  
<sup>12</sup> *Id.* R. 17, 18, 28, 29.  
<sup>13</sup> ARK. CONST. amend. 66(a); ARK. CODE ANN. § 16-10-402(a).  
<sup>14</sup> ARK. CONST. amend. 66(f); ARK. CODE ANN. §§ 16-10-401 *et seq.*  
<sup>15</sup> ARK. CONST. amend. 66(b); Ark. Jud. Discipline & Disability Comm’n R. 8(C), 9(A), 9(C).  
<sup>16</sup> ARK. CONST. amend. 66(c).  
<sup>17</sup> CAL. CONST. art. VI, §§ 8, 18.  
<sup>18</sup> *Id.* § 18(i).  
<sup>19</sup> Cal. Comm’n on Jud. Performance R. 109, 121-123.  
<sup>20</sup> CAL. CONST. art. VI, §§ 18(d), (f).  
<sup>21</sup> COLO. CONST. art. VI, § 23(3).  
<sup>22</sup> COLO. CONST. art. VI, § 23(3)(h); COL. REV. STAT. § 13-5.3-102.  
<sup>23</sup> Colo. R. of Jud. Discipline, R. 4(d), 13(b), 13(f), 20.  
<sup>24</sup> COLO. CONST. art. VI, § 23(3)(e-f).  
<sup>25</sup> CONN. CONST. art. XI; CONN. GEN. STAT. § 51-51k.  
<sup>26</sup> CONN. GEN. STAT. §§ 51-51k *et seq.*  
<sup>27</sup> *Id.* §§ 51-51(a), 51-51(c), 51-51o.  
<sup>28</sup> *Id.* §§ 51-51n(a), 51-51r.  
<sup>29</sup> DEL. CONST. art. IV, § 37; Del. Ct. on the Judiciary R. 3.  
<sup>30</sup> DEL. CONST. art. IV, § 37.  
<sup>31</sup> Del. Ct. on the Judiciary R. 5, 7, 8.  
<sup>32</sup> DEL. CONST. art. IV, § 37; Del. Ct. on the Judiciary R. 9, 13.  
<sup>33</sup> DEL. CONST. art. IV, § 37; Del. Ct. on the Judiciary R. 14-15.  
<sup>34</sup> FLA. CONST. art. V, § 12(a-b).  
<sup>35</sup> *Id.* § 12(a)(4).  
<sup>36</sup> Fl. Jud. Qualifications Comm’n R. 6(a), 6(e), 22(a).  
<sup>37</sup> *Id.* R. 7(a), 11, 22(b).  
<sup>38</sup> FLA. CONST. art. V, § 12(b-c).  
<sup>39</sup> GA. CONST. art. VI, § VII, para. VI; GA. CODE ANN. § 15-1-21(a), (e).  
<sup>40</sup> GA. CONST. art. VI, § VII, paras. VI-VIII.  
<sup>41</sup> Ga. Jud. Qualifications Comm. R. 4, 14(A-B), 17(A-B).  
<sup>42</sup> *Id.* R. 17(D)(1-2), 26.  
<sup>43</sup> *Id.* R. 14(C), 22, 24.  
<sup>44</sup> *Id.* R. 6(B), 24(D).  
<sup>45</sup> HAW. CONST. art. VI, § 5; Haw. Sup. Ct. R. 8.1.  
<sup>46</sup> HAW. CONST. art. VI, § 5.  
<sup>47</sup> Haw. Sup. Ct. R. 8.2(a).  
<sup>48</sup> *Id.* R. 8.9(f).  
<sup>49</sup> ID CONST. art. V, § 28; IDAHO CODE §§ 1-2101, 1-2103.  
<sup>50</sup> *Id.* § 1-2102.  
<sup>51</sup> *Id.*; *see* Idaho Jud. Council R. 5(d); IDAHO CODE § 1-2103.  
<sup>52</sup> IDAHO CODE § 1-2103.  
<sup>53</sup> ILL. CONST. art. VI, § 15.  
<sup>54</sup> *Id.* §§ 15(c); 15(e), 15(g), 15(i).

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

---

- <sup>55</sup> Ill. Jud. Inquiry Bd. R. 4(a), 4(b), 6(a).  
<sup>56</sup> ILL. CONST. art. VI, § 15(e).  
<sup>57</sup> IND. CONST. art. 7, § 9.  
<sup>58</sup> *Id.* § 11; IND. CODE § 33-38-14.  
<sup>59</sup> IND. CODE § 33-38-13-13(a), (b); Ind. R. for Admissions to the Bar and the Discipline of Att’ys. R. 25, art. VIII(E)(4), VIII(F), .  
<sup>60</sup> IND. CODE § 33-38-13-26; Ind. R. for Admissions to the Bar and the Discipline of Att’ys. R. 25 art. VIII(N), VIII(O), VIII(P).  
<sup>61</sup> IOWA CONST. art. V, § 19; IOWA CODE §§ 602.2102(1), 602.2104(1).  
<sup>62</sup> IOWA CODE §§ 602.2102, 602.2105.  
<sup>63</sup> *Id.* §§ 602.2104(2), 602.2104(3); Iowa Ct. R. 52.9(1), 52.9(3).  
<sup>64</sup> IOWA CONST. art. V, § 19.  
<sup>65</sup> KAN. CONST. art. III, §15; Kan. Sup. Ct. R. 602-607.  
<sup>66</sup> Kan. Sup. Ct. R. 604(f), 604(g).  
<sup>67</sup> *Id.* R. 604(e), 610.  
<sup>68</sup> *Id.* R. 610(a).  
<sup>69</sup> *Id.* R. 610(a), 614, 618(a), 618(g), 619.  
<sup>70</sup> KY. CONST. § 121.  
<sup>71</sup> *Id.*  
<sup>72</sup> Ky. Sup. Ct. R. 4.030, 4.170(1), 4.220; KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § 34.330.  
<sup>73</sup> KY. CONST. § 121.  
<sup>74</sup> LA. CONST. art. V, §§ 25(A), 25(C); La. Sup. Ct. R. XXIII § 3(a)(1).  
<sup>75</sup> LA. CONST. art. V, § 25(C).  
<sup>76</sup> La. Sup. Ct. R. XXIII §§ 3(a)(1)-(2), 5(a).  
<sup>77</sup> LA. CONST. art. V, § 25(C).  
<sup>78</sup> Me. R. of the Comm. on Jud. Responsibility and Disability R. 1, 3.  
<sup>79</sup> *Id.* R. 3, 8.  
<sup>80</sup> *Id.* R. 4-5.  
<sup>81</sup> *Id.* R. 3.  
<sup>82</sup> MD. CONST. art. 4, § 4(A)(a).  
<sup>83</sup> *Id.* §§ 4(A-B); MD. CODE ANN., CTS. & JUD. PROC. § 13-401.  
<sup>84</sup> MD. CONST. art. 4, § 4B(a)(1)(ii); MD. CODE ANN., MD. R. § 18-409.1(a)(1).  
<sup>85</sup> MD. CONDE ANN., MD. R. §18-427; MD. CONST. art. 4, § 4(B)(b)(1).  
<sup>86</sup> MASS. GEN. LAWS ch. 211C, § 1.  
<sup>87</sup> *Id.* §§ 1 *et seq.*  
<sup>88</sup> *Id.* §§ 5-7.  
<sup>89</sup> *Id.* §§ 7-8; The Commonwealth of Mass., *Commission on Judicial Conduct Annual Report 2022* at 5, <https://www.mass.gov/doc/cjc-annual-report-2022/download>.  
<sup>90</sup> MICH. CONST. art. 6, § 30.  
<sup>91</sup> *Id.*  
<sup>92</sup> Mich. Ct. R. 9.220-243.  
<sup>93</sup> MICH. CONST. art. 6, § 30.  
<sup>94</sup> MINN. STAT. § 490A.01.  
<sup>95</sup> *Id.* § 490A.02.  
<sup>96</sup> *Id.*, Minn. Bd. on Jud. Standards R. 2, 9-10.  
<sup>97</sup> Minn. Bd. on Jud. Standards R. 11.  
<sup>98</sup> MISS. CONST. art. 6, § 177A.  
<sup>99</sup> *Id.*; MISS. CODE ANN. § 9-19-23.  
<sup>100</sup> Miss. Comm’n on Jud. Performance R. 5, 8.  
<sup>101</sup> MISS. CONST. art. 6, § 177A; Miss. Comm’n on Jud. Performance R. 8.  
<sup>102</sup> MO. CONST. art. 5, § 24.  
<sup>103</sup> *Id.* § 24.  
<sup>104</sup> Mo. R. Governing the Mo. Bar and the Jud. R. 12.07, 12.10-11, 12.18.  
<sup>105</sup> MO. CONST. art. 5, § 24.  
<sup>106</sup> MONT. CONST. art 7, § 11.  
<sup>107</sup> *Id.*

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT  
OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

---

- <sup>108</sup> *Id.*; MONT. CODE ANN. § 3-1-1106; Mont. Procedural R. of the Jud. Standards Comm’n R. 10, 12-13.
- <sup>109</sup> MONT. CONST. art. 7, § 11.
- <sup>110</sup> NEB. CONST. art. 5, § 28.
- <sup>111</sup> *Id.* § 30.
- <sup>112</sup> NEB. REV. STAT. § 24-721.
- <sup>113</sup> NEB. CONST. art. 5, § 30.
- <sup>114</sup> NEV. CONST. art. 6, § 21.
- <sup>115</sup> *Id.*; NEV. REV. STAT. §§ 1.425 *et seq.*
- <sup>116</sup> NEV. CONST. art. 6, § 21; NEV. REV. STAT. §§ 1.466, 1.4663, 1.4673.
- <sup>117</sup> NEV. CONST. art. 6, § 21; NEV. REV. STAT. § 1.4677.
- <sup>118</sup> N.H. Sup. Ct. R. 39; N.H. Judicial Branch, *Judicial Conduct Committee*, <https://www.courts.nh.gov/resources/committees/judicial-conduct-committee>.
- <sup>119</sup> N.H. Sup. Ct. R. 39, 40.
- <sup>120</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>121</sup> *Id.* R. 40; N.H. CONST. pt. II, arts. 17, 38, 73.
- <sup>122</sup> N.J. Stat. Ann. Rules of Ct. R. 2:15-1, -2.
- <sup>123</sup> *Id.* R. 2:15-1 *et seq.*
- <sup>124</sup> *Id.* R. 2:15-6, -8, -13, -14.
- <sup>125</sup> *Id.* R. 2:14-1, 2:15-15, -17; N.J. CONST. art. 6, § 6; N.J. CONST. art. 7, § 3.
- <sup>126</sup> N.M. CONST. art. VI, § 32; N.M. STAT. ANN. § 34-10(1-4).
- <sup>127</sup> N.M. CONST. art. VI, § 32.
- <sup>128</sup> *Id.*; N.M. STAT. ANN. § 34-10-2.1(C).
- <sup>129</sup> N.M. CONST. art. VI, § 32.
- <sup>130</sup> *Id.* § 22.
- <sup>131</sup> N.Y. CONST. art. VI, § 22.
- <sup>132</sup> N.Y. State Comm’n on Jud. Conduct R. 7000.3-7000.6.
- <sup>133</sup> N.Y. CONST. art. VI, § 22.
- <sup>134</sup> N.C. GEN. STAT. § 7A-375.
- <sup>135</sup> *Id.* §§ 7A-375(f-g).
- <sup>136</sup> *Id.* § 7A-377.
- <sup>137</sup> *Id.* § 7A-376.
- <sup>138</sup> N.D. CENT. CODE § 27-23-02.
- <sup>139</sup> *Id.* § 27-23-03.
- <sup>140</sup> *Id.* § 27-23-06.
- <sup>141</sup> *Id.* § 27-23-03(1).
- <sup>142</sup> Ohio Stat. Gov’t. Bar R. 5; Ohio Bd. of Professional Conduct, *Guide to the Board of Professional Conduct* at 1, 5, 8, [https://www.bpc.ohio.gov/\\_files/ugd/b9a93d\\_72f53b6350ba4010b05e2c5eff97f95a.pdf](https://www.bpc.ohio.gov/_files/ugd/b9a93d_72f53b6350ba4010b05e2c5eff97f95a.pdf).
- <sup>143</sup> Sup. Ct. Rules for the Gov’t of the Judiciary of Ohio, R. 2 §§ 2(B), 3, 4(A)(1).
- <sup>144</sup> *Id.* at Rule 2 § 4(B).
- <sup>145</sup> *Id.* at Rule 2 §§ 4(C), 4(D).
- <sup>146</sup> OKLA. STAT. tit. 20, §§ 1651-1653; OKLA. CONST. art. 7 §1(a).
- <sup>147</sup> *Id.* § 1651.
- <sup>148</sup> *Id.* § 1658.
- <sup>149</sup> Okla. Council on Judicial Complaints, *About*, <https://oklahoma.gov/cojc/about.html>.
- <sup>150</sup> OR. REV. STAT. §§ 1.310-1.410.
- <sup>151</sup> *Id.* §§ 1.410–1.425.
- <sup>152</sup> *Id.* §§ 1.415–1.420.
- <sup>153</sup> *Id.* § 1.430.
- <sup>154</sup> The Unified Judicial Sys. of Pa., *History of the Judicial Disciplinary Process in Pennsylvania*, <https://www.pacourts.us/Storage/media/pdfs/20210223/012443-historyofthejudicialdisciplinaryprocessinpennsylvania-003225.pdf>; PA. CONST. art. 5, § 18.
- <sup>155</sup> PA. CONST. art. 5, § 18; 42 PA. CON. STAT. §§ 2101-2106.
- <sup>156</sup> Judicial Conduct Bd. of Pa., *How the Board Operates*, <https://judicialconductboardofpa.org/how-the-board-operates/>.
- <sup>157</sup> PA. CONST. art. 5, § 18(b)(5).
- <sup>158</sup> *Id.* § 18(c)(2).

**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT**  
**OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

---

- <sup>159</sup> R.I. GEN. LAWS § 8-16-1.
- <sup>160</sup> *Id.* § 8-16.
- <sup>161</sup> *Id.* §§ 8-16-4, 8-16-4.1.
- <sup>162</sup> *Id.* §§ 8-16-5, 8-16-6.
- <sup>163</sup> S.C. App. Ct. R. 502-2(r), 502-3, 502-5.
- <sup>164</sup> *Id.* R. 502-3.
- <sup>165</sup> *Id.* R. 502-15, 502-22– 502-26.
- <sup>166</sup> *Id.* R. 502-27.
- <sup>167</sup> S.D. CONST. art. V, § 9.
- <sup>168</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>169</sup> See S.D. CODIFIED LAWS app. §§ 16-1A Judicial Qualification Comm. Rule III (2)(a), (3), (8-10), (13), (18).
- <sup>170</sup> S.D. CONST. art. V, § 9; S.D. CODIFIED LAWS §§ 16-1A Judicial Qualification Comm. Rule III (19).
- <sup>171</sup> TENN. CODE ANN. § 17-5-201(a); Admin. Office of the Courts, *About the Board of Judicial Conduct*, <https://www.tncourts.gov/boards-commissions/court-judiciary/about>.
- <sup>172</sup> TENN. CODE ANN. §§ 17-5-201(f), 17-5-301 *et seq.*
- <sup>173</sup> *Id.* §§ 17-5-301(a-b), 17-5-303(a).
- <sup>174</sup> *Id.* §§ 17-5-301(f)(1), 17-5-310(a).
- <sup>175</sup> TEX. CONST. art. 5, §§ 1-a(2), 1-a(6).
- <sup>176</sup> *Id.* §§ 1-a(5-9), 1-a(11), 1-a14.
- <sup>177</sup> *Id.* § 1-a(7); TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. §§ 33.022(c)(2), 33.024, 33.027(a); Office of State Comm'n on Jud. Conduct, *Frequently Asked Questions*, <https://www.scjc.texas.gov/faq/>.
- <sup>178</sup> TEX. CONST. art. 5, §§ 1-a(6)(A), 1-a(8-9).
- <sup>179</sup> UTAH CONST. art. VIII, § 13; UTAH CODE ANN. § 78A-11-103(1); Office of the Legis. Auditor Gen., Rep. No. 2002-06, *A Review of the Judicial Conduct Commission 7* (2002), [https://le.utah.gov/audit/02\\_06rpt.pdf](https://le.utah.gov/audit/02_06rpt.pdf).
- <sup>180</sup> UTAH CONST. art. VIII, § 13; UTAH CODE ANN. §§ 78A-11-109, 78A-11-110.
- <sup>181</sup> UTAH CODE ANN. §§ 78A-11-110, 78A-11-113; UTAH ADMIN. CODE R. 595-3-11; see Utah Jud. Conduct Comm'n, *Complaint Forms*, <https://jcc.utah.gov/compliant-form/>.
- <sup>182</sup> UTAH CONST. art. VIII, § 13; UTAH CODE ANN. §§ 78A-11-105(1), 78A-11-111(1).
- <sup>183</sup> VT. CONST. ch. 2, § 36; Vt. R. of Sup. Ct. for Disciplinary Control of Judges R. 4(1), 6.
- <sup>184</sup> Vt. Rules of Sup. Ct. for Disciplinary Control of Judges.
- <sup>185</sup> *Id.* R. 6(3), 6(6), (9)(4).
- <sup>186</sup> *Id.* R. 6(1-2), R. 12(1), R. 12(6).
- <sup>187</sup> VA. CONST. art. VI, § 10; VA. CODE ANN. § 17.1-901.
- <sup>188</sup> VA. CONST. art. VI, § 10; VA. CODE ANN. §§ 17.1-901 *et seq.*
- <sup>189</sup> Office of the Exec. Sec'y, Supreme Court of Va., *About the Judicial Inquiry and Review Commission*, <https://www.courts.state.va.us/agencies/jirc/about.html>; Va. CONST. art. VI, § 10; VA. CODE ANN. §§ 17.1-902, 17.1-907.
- <sup>190</sup> VA. CONST. art. VI, § 10; VA. CODE ANN. § 17.1-902.
- <sup>191</sup> WASH. CONST. art. IV, § 31; WASH. REV. CODE §§ 2.64.010-2.64.020.
- <sup>192</sup> WASH. CONST. art. IV, § 31; WASH. REV. CODE §§ 2.64.010 *et seq.*
- <sup>193</sup> WASH. REV. CODE § 2.64.060.
- <sup>194</sup> WASH. CONST. art. IV, § 31; WASH. REV. CODE § 2.64.055.
- <sup>195</sup> W. Va. R. Judi. Disciplinary Procedure R. 1, 3, 5.
- <sup>196</sup> See *id.* R. 1-5.
- <sup>197</sup> *Id.* R. 2, 2.2, 5.4.
- <sup>198</sup> *Id.* R. 2.6-2.7.
- <sup>199</sup> *Id.* R. 4, 4.6, 4.8.
- <sup>200</sup> *Id.* R. 2.7(c), 4.12.
- <sup>201</sup> WIS. CONST. art. VII, § 11; WISC. STAT. § 757.83(1)(a); Wis. Jud. Comm'n, *Annual Report 4* (2023), <https://www.wicourts.gov/courts/committees/judicialcommission/wjcannualreport2023.pdf>.
- <sup>202</sup> WIS. STAT. §§ 757.83(3) *et seq.*
- <sup>203</sup> *Id.* § 757.85(2); Wis. Jud. Comm'n, *Annual Report 5* (2023), <https://www.wicourts.gov/courts/committees/judicialcommission/wjcannualreport2023.pdf>.
- <sup>204</sup> WIS. STAT. §§ 757.85(5); 757.87.
- <sup>205</sup> *Id.* §§ 757.89, 757.91; WIS. CONST. art. VII, § 11.
- <sup>206</sup> WYO. CONST. art. 5, § 6.



**JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES REPORT**  
**OFFICE OF SENATOR SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**

---

<sup>207</sup> WYO. CONST. art. 5, § 6(e-f); *see* Wyo. Comm'n on Jud. Conduct and Ethics R.

<sup>208</sup> Wyo. Comm'n on Jud. Conduct and Ethics R. 7(a-e), 7(g-h), R. 8(a), 8(e)(1-3).

<sup>209</sup> *Id.* R. 3(a), 16(e).

<sup>210</sup> D.C. CODE §§ 11-1521, 11-1522.

<sup>211</sup> *Id.* §§ 11-1521, 11-1525(a).

<sup>212</sup> *Id.* § 11-527(a)(1), (c).

<sup>213</sup> *Id.* §§ 11-526(a)(2), 11-1529.