

SUMMARIES OF JUDICIAL DISPOSITIONS BY COMMISSION

July-September 2025

DISMISSAL BY COMMISSION AFTER ODC INVESTIGATION

In the following matters, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) conducted an investigation and recommended to an investigative panel of the Commission on Judicial Conduct (CJC) that the matter be dismissed because ODC's investigation did not find clear and convincing evidence to support the allegations of the complaint.

- 1) Complainant, a defendant in a criminal matter, alleges Circuit Court Judge is biased against him and falsely stated Complainant was not present for a hearing. ODC's investigation revealed no evidence of bias or that Judge ever indicated Complainant failed to appear for any hearing. Rather, Judge's only involvement in the matter was issuing a Rule to Show Cause order upon the Solicitor's petition alleging Complainant threatened the victim in the underlying case. Based on the evidence, the CJC concluded there is no factual basis for the complaint and dismissed the matter.
- 2) Complainant, a defendant in a criminal matter, alleges Circuit Court Judge acted improperly by refusing to relieve his public defender to allow him to proceed pro se. ODC's investigation, which included review of the hearing and supporting documentation, revealed no evidence of misconduct. Judge presided over Complainant's bond revocation hearing and continued the hearing because the public defender had been recently appointed. At this hearing, Complainant expressed a desire to represent himself, but Judge encouraged him to consult with the newly appointed public defender. Complainant later filed a formal motion to relieve counsel and proceed pro se. Judge denied the motion, encouraged Complainant to work with counsel for an additional ninety days, after which Complainant could refile the motion to proceed pro se. The decision to grant or deny a motion to proceed pro se is a legal decision controlled by law; ethical rules are generally not implicated in ruling on the motion. Complainant challenges the correctness of Judge's ruling. The ruling on such a motion must be addressed by a motion to reconsider in the trial court or through an appeal. Based on the evidence, the CJC concluded there was no factual or legal basis for the complaint and dismissed the matter.

- 3) Complainant, a party in a foreclosure action before Master-in-Equity, alleges Judge demonstrated bias by improperly 1) granting Complainant's counsel's motion to be relieved, which Complainant alleged forced him to appear pro se during a hearing; 2) denying Complainant's request to attend a hearing remotely; and 3) awarding attorney's fees to the opposing party. ODC's investigation revealed Complainant did not object to his counsel's motion to be relieved and that, after the motion was granted, Judge continued the case for 60 days to allow Complainant an opportunity to secure new representation. The evidence also demonstrated Complainant was given the option to attend the hearing remotely, and Complainant failed to avail himself of this opportunity. Lastly, the record of the proceedings establishes Judge's fair and impartial treatment of all participants in hearing and deciding the foreclosure case. Based on the evidence, the CJC concluded there was no factual basis for the complaint and dismissed the matter.

Items (4) through (8) arise from the same highly contested family court matter.

- 4) Complainant, an attorney, appeared as a party before Family Court Judge for a final hearing in a protracted custody case. Following an adverse ruling, Complainant alleges Judge was biased in favor of the ex-spouse, colluded with opposing counsel, retaliated against Complainant, and attempted to intimidate Complainant. Judge provided extensive evidence in response to the complaint, including the record of the proceedings and other supporting documentation, demonstrating the complaint has no basis in fact. The Court of Appeals subsequently affirmed Judge's ruling, commending Judge for his exemplary patience in handling the matter. The CJC dismissed the matter, concluding that the complaint was wholly without merit as Complainant lacked credibility and there was no basis in law or fact to support the allegations.
- 5) Complainant, an attorney, appeared as a party before Family Court Judge in a virtual contempt hearing in a protracted custody case. After an adverse ruling, Complainant alleges Judge yelled, threatened, bullied, and ridiculed her during the hearing and that the adverse ruling stemmed from ex parte communications and colluding with other attorneys and judges. The record of the proceedings disproves all of Complainant's allegations about conduct during the hearing, and ODC's investigation revealed emails that discredited the allegations of ex parte communication. The CJC dismissed the matter, concluding that the complaint was wholly without merit as Complainant lacked credibility and there was no basis in law or fact to support the allegations.

- 6) Complainant, an attorney, appeared as a party before Family Court Judge in an emergency hearing in a protracted custody case. Complainant alleges Judge engaged in ex parte communications, colluded with other attorneys involved in the custody case, and intimidated, bullied, and harassed Complainant. The record of the proceedings and supporting documentation establish Judge's fair and impartial treatment in dealing with Complainant. No evidence of ex parte communication or collusion was provided by Complainant or revealed through ODC's investigation. The CJC dismissed the matter, concluding that the complaint was wholly without merit as Complainant lacked credibility and there was no basis in law or fact to support the allegations.
- 7) Complainant, an attorney, appeared as a party before Family Court Judge in a motion hearing in a protracted custody case. Complainant alleges Judge was recruited to preside in the matter by other judges familiar with Complainant. Complainant also alleges Judge approached her at a function and solicited a vote and donation from Complainant to help secure Judge's seat on the bench. Complainant further alleges Judge divulged confidential details about Complainant's case to a third party. ODC's investigation revealed that Judge was assigned to Complainant's case in the normal course of business by the Clerk of Court and, although Judge knows the third party, Judge has not spoken with that person in several years. Complainant is not a legislator and therefore is not entitled to vote in judicial elections, and no evidence of donation solicitation was provided by Complainant or revealed through ODC's investigation. The CJC dismissed the matter, concluding that the complaint was wholly without merit as Complainant lacked credibility and there was no basis in law or fact to support the allegations.
- 8) Complainant, an attorney, appeared as a party before Family Court Judge in a motion hearing in a protracted custody case. Following an adverse ruling, Complainant alleged Judge colluded with opposing counsel and bullied her during the hearing. The record of the proceedings reveals Judge interacted with Complainant fairly and impartially. No evidence of collusion with opposing counsel was provided by Complainant or revealed through ODC's investigation. The CJC dismissed the matter, concluding that the complaint was wholly without merit as Complainant lacked credibility and there was no basis in law or fact to support the allegations.
- 9) Complainant alleges Probate Court Judge improperly appointed himself temporary guardian for an alleged incapacitated individual (AII) and served in this capacity for approximately six months. Judge acknowledges the temporary appointment but explains that he did not manage the AII's assets, nor he did benefit from the appointment as the medical facility served as payee for all benefits and assets of the

AII. ODC's investigation revealed that the AII was abandoned by all family, and Judge became involved because the medical facility requested assistance from the probate court with administration of the AII's care plan. The medical facility confirmed that it is commonplace for a probate judge to serve as temporary guardian in this type of emergency situation, and that all AII funds have been distributed directly to the medical facility. Additionally, the statute in place at the time of Judge's appointment specifically allowed the court to exercise the power of temporary guardian under these circumstances. Based on the statute, the CJC concluded Judge's conduct was permissible as a matter of law and dismissed the matter.

- 10) Complainant alleges Associate Probate Court Judge notarized documents regarding the improper temporary guardian appointment of the probate judge **listed in summary (9)**. Judge responds that notarization of a person's signature does not serve as an approval of the document or order. However, ODC's investigation revealed that the temporary guardian appointment of the other probate judge was proper. Complainant also raises concerns about Judge issuing an order to close the temporary guardian file at the expiration of six months because of the potential for the AII to be unprotected. At the time Judge issued the termination order, the statute mandated that temporary orders not exceed six months. Additionally, ODC's investigation confirmed there were no issues or lapses with the AII's care after the file was closed. Based on ODC's investigation, the CJC concluded that Judge acted in accordance with the law and dismissed the matter.
- 11) Complainant, a pro se litigant, alleges Probate Court Judge willfully misinterpreted the law in the adjudication of a will. Complainant also maintains that Judge and court staff have failed to properly communicate with him during the probate process. ODC's investigation revealed that this is a complicated estate, Complainant refuses to accept the terms of the will, and Complainant has unreasonable expectations about the duties of court staff. Judge states there are several required forms that Complainant has not completed and filed, but that Judge and his staff cannot advise litigants on which forms to file or how to prepare them. Court staff suggested to Complainant that he seek the advice of counsel, and Complainant has recently advised that he is in the process of hiring an attorney. Based on ODC's investigation, the CJC concluded there was no factual basis for the complaint and dismissed the matter.
- 12) Complainant, a pro se litigant, alleges Associate Probate Court Judge willfully misinterpreted the law in the adjudication of a will. Complainant also maintains that Judge and court staff have failed to properly communicate with him during the

probate process. Judge responds that she has not issued any rulings or orders in connection with the case. Judge's limited involvement in the case was notarizing a proof of delivery and sending some routine correspondence to all parties requesting submission of certain documents. ODC determined that Judge was named in the complaint based solely on her position with the probate court and not because Judge had any material involvement in Complainant's case. There is no allegation of an ethical violation. Accordingly, the CJC found no basis in fact to support Complainant's allegations and dismissed the matter.

- 13) Following an adverse ruling, Complainant alleges Probate Court Judge did not maintain order and decorum in the courtroom by failing to remove someone who made inappropriate gestures and facial expressions during the hearing. Complainant alleges multiple witnesses testified about the person's behavior. Judge responds that she did not personally observe any inappropriate behavior, was not alerted of any inappropriate behavior by Complainant or the bailiff, and denies any testimony about the behavior. In support of Judge's contention, ODC's investigation identified one witness to corroborate Judge's response and confirmed that Complainant was simply dissatisfied with the outcome of the case. Based on the evidence, the CJC concluded there was no factual basis for the complaint and dismissed the matter.
- 14) Complainant, a defendant in an eviction action, alleges Magistrate Court Judge was rude and disrespectful to her and authorized staff to hang up the phone when she called the court requesting assistance. Complainant further alleges Judge refused to provide a telephone number for Court Administration and would not allow Complainant to use a computer to test a USB drive. Judge responds that he did not preside over Complainant's eviction hearing. Judge states that, on several occasions, Complainant called the court and cursed, yelled, and made threatening comments to Judge and court staff which necessitated steps to prevent further abuse of court staff. ODC's investigation confirmed that Judge sought assistance from law enforcement and acted reasonably to protect his staff. Judge also reports that staff provided Complainant with all required information including the contact information for Court Administration, and that Judge tested the USB drive for Complainant on an office computer to determine that it functioned properly. Based on ODC's investigation, the CJC found no evidence to support Complainant's version of the facts and dismissed this matter.
- 15) Complainant, a full-time magistrate, alleges Magistrate Court Judge interfered with Complainant's attempts to become a municipal judge in addition to retaining his full-time magistrate position. Complainant alleges that Judge interfered with the contractual process by advising the hiring authority of Judge's preferred candidate,

disparaging Complainant's abilities, and claiming Judge was prohibited from accepting the position. Judge admits inquiring with various part-time magistrates in the county to gauge interest in the position, but ODC's investigation did not reveal any evidence corroborating Complainant's other allegations. The investigation did, however, reveal that Judge was attempting to follow an August 16, 2024, Administrative Order issued by the Chief Justice prohibiting full-time magistrates from engaging in outside employment during normal working hours without necessary approvals. Complainant acted contrary to the Chief Justice's Order in seeking additional employment without proper approval. Based on the evidence, the CJC concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence Judge engaged in misconduct and dismissed the matter.

- 16) Complainant appeared before Magistrate Court Judge in a property dispute with a neighbor and alleges Judge ruled against him because Judge is biased and had a conflict of interest. Specifically, after the adverse ruling, Complainant alleges Judge is biased in favor of the opposing party, who is a law enforcement officer. Judge admits he is aware that the opposing party retired from law enforcement several years ago, but Judge denies ever working closely with the officer or having a personal relationship with him. ODC's review of the hearing revealed no evidence of bias and demonstrates Judge explained the basis for his ruling several times to Complainant. Based on the evidence, the CJC concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence Judge committed misconduct and dismissed the matter.
- 17) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge failed to maintain order and decorum in his courtroom. Complainant admits that he used a racial epithet to describe Judge but complains that, in response to his inappropriate comment, Judge permitted officers in the courtroom to "lose control" of the situation. The record of the proceedings reveals that, when Complainant used the racial epithet, Judge instructed that Complainant be moved to the jury box while Judge moved on to other cases. Judge later reconvened Complainant's case. The record of the proceedings confirms Judge patiently handled Complainant's outburst and warned Complainant that he could be held in contempt for his inappropriate conduct. At no point did the record reveal an uproar or loss of control in the courtroom. We further note that, notwithstanding Complainant's disruptive behavior and racial epithet directed at Judge, Judge exercised restraint and did not hold Complainant in contempt of court. Based on the evidence, the CJC concluded there was no factual basis for the complaint and dismissed the matter.

LETTER OF CAUTION ISSUED BY COMMISSION AFTER ODC INVESTIGATION

In the following matters, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) conducted an investigation and recommended to an investigative panel of the Commission on Judicial Conduct (CJC) that the matter be resolved with a letter of caution. A letter of caution is a written caution or warning about a judge's conduct when it is determined that only minor misconduct not warranting the imposition of a sanction has been committed.

- 1) Complainant is a defendant in an action before Magistrate Court Judge for a temporary restraining order. After an adverse ruling, Complainant for the first time alleges that Judge should have recused herself due to Complainant's negative interactions with Judge's husband in the husband's role as a town council member. ODC's investigation revealed no evidence Judge has any affiliation with the town where her husband serves, or that Judge has knowledge of any interactions between her husband and Complainant.

Complainant also alleges that Judge had improper ex parte telephone calls and email exchanges with the opposing party and that Complainant observed Judge interacting with the opposing party post-trial, after which an additional restriction was added to the restraining order. ODC's investigation reveals that Judge presides in a small rural county with no clerk's office or support staff, and this necessitates her answering phones and directly communicating with litigants. Judge admits that, due to these staffing limitations, she communicated with both parties separately at various times but never about the merits of the case. ODC's investigation confirmed that Judge had telephone and email communications with the opposing party as Complainant alleged, but the communications were procedural in nature and not about the substance of the case. Judge disclosed the emails to Complainant within a few months of when they occurred when Complainant requested them as part of Complainant's appeal from Judge's ruling. As to the post-trial incident, Judge avers that she was responding to the opposing party's general questions about restraining order enforcement and appeal procedures. ODC's investigation also confirmed that Judge's final order did not contradict the oral ruling on the record.

The record of the proceedings along with other documentation revealed no evidence that Judge should have recused herself, that she altered her decision after speaking with the opposing party, or that she engaged in any conversations with the parties about substantive issues or the merits of the case. ODC's investigation demonstrated that Judge engaged in ex parte communications with both parties for scheduling or administrative purposes, which is permissible under the Code of

Judicial Conduct. *See* Canon 3B(7)(a), Rule 501, SCACR (permitting a judge to engage in ex parte communications for scheduling or administrative purposes provided (1) the judge reasonably believes no party will gain an advantage, and (2) the judge promptly notifies the other party of the substance of the communication and allows an opportunity to respond). ODC's investigation established that Judge does not have a practice of promptly notifying the other party of these permissible ex parte communications as required by the rule. However, in light of the unique and challenging circumstances this Judge faces working in a small county with no support staff and Judge's approximately ten years of service on the bench with no prior disciplinary history, the CJC determined a letter of caution was appropriate in this matter. Accordingly, the CJC issued a letter cautioning Judge to comply with the provisions of Canon 3B(7)(a) of the Code of Judicial Conduct in the performance of her judicial duties.

CONFIDENTIAL ADMONITIONS – NONE

DEFERRED DISCIPLINARY AGREEMENTS - NONE

SUMMARY OF JUDICIAL DISMISSALS BY ODC

DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION

The following matters were all dismissed because the complainant raised solely legal issues, such as challenging a ruling by a judge, maintaining a judge failed to consider evidence properly, or other similar legal challenge better suited for appeal or other relief. Moreover, some complaints fail to allege an ethical violation. Pursuant to Rules 5(b) and 19(a), RJDE, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) only has authority to investigate allegations of ethical misconduct, incapacity, or the inability to participate in a disciplinary proceeding.

- 1) Complainant disagrees with a Circuit Court Judge's ruling regarding Complainant's motion to dismiss the charges against them. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 2) Complainant alleges a Circuit Court Judge failed to provide the correct burden of proof, allowed unreliable evidence to be presented, and "overruled" their lawyer. The main point of contention appears to be a video Judge allowed into evidence, despite objections from Complainant's lawyer regarding authentication. Complainant disagreed with Judge's failure to allow Complainant's request for jury instruction on involuntary manslaughter. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 3) Complainant disagrees with a Magistrate Court Judge's ruling on bond issues. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 4) Complainant, a court employee, alleges unfair treatment by the Magistrate Court Judge. No ethical misconduct noted. Complainant has not pursued the matter through a grievance or other channels in the County. Allegations of unfair treatment in the workplace should in the first instance be pursued through the grievance system established by the employer. Dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.
- 5) Complainant alleges a Magistrate Court Judge signed arrest warrants in 2017 that were not supported by probable cause. Complainant further alleges that one of the warrants was "based on a perjured warrant affidavit." The perjury allegation appears to center on the fact that the murder victim was shot in the stomach, while the affidavit states the victim was shot in the chest. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 6) Complainant disagrees with a Magistrate Court Judge's decision not to find the opposing party in contempt for failing to appear at a hearing. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.

- 7) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge mishandled and ruled improperly concerning a pretrial motion to suppress. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 8) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge improperly refused to disqualify a juror in complainant's jury trial. The alleged conflict was disclosed to all parties. This is purely a legal challenge, one that should be addressed on appeal. This complainant further contends he has filed claims against the judge in federal court for an alleged unconstitutional conviction. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 9) Complainant in a foreclosure action alleges a Master-in-Equity made an incorrect ruling. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 10) Two separate Complainants question the legal sufficiency of warrants signed by a Magistrate Court Judge. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 11) Complainant disagrees with a Magistrate Court Judge's ruling denying Complainant's bond. Dismissed because the complaint only raised a legal issue.
- 12) Complainant alleges a Family Court Judge rendered decisions that were unfair and that did not protect Complainant's children. In addition, Complainant alleges Judge failed to properly appoint and oversee the Guardian ad Litem. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 13) Complainant alleges a Magistrate Court Judge has failed to require petitioners to fill out forms provided by Court Administration to show that petitioners meet the basic statutory requirement to bring suit. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 14) Complainant asserts a Family Court Judge ruled against Complainant in a child custody case, which Complainant believes is an "abuse of discretion." Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 15) Complainant alleges that a Magistrate Court Judge denied Complainant's standing to be heard on behalf of a represented business entity. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues.
- 16) Complainant alleges a Family Court Judge should be recused from custody proceedings because Judge was a public defender, represented the SC Guardian Ad Litem program while in private practice, and because the opposing party in Complainant's case practices in the same jurisdiction where Judge presides. Without providing any factual basis, Complainant speculates Judge engaged in *ex parte* communication. Dismissed because

only legal issues were raised in the complaint, and there was no evidence of *ex parte* communication.

- 17) Complainant alleges a Magistrate Court Judge's prior career in law enforcement presents an inherent conflict of interest when Judge is presiding over cases involving law enforcement agencies. Any issues related to a possible conflict of interest can be raised on a case-by-case basis and dealt with during appropriate hearings. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues, and there was no basis for misconduct.
- 18) Complainant alleges a Circuit Court Judge had a conflict of interest requiring recusal because Judge presided over Complainant's previous trial over thirty years earlier. Complainant also presents a series of generalized complaints. It is alleged that Judge is corrupt, although no specifics are given. Finally, the Complainant asserted—again, in a conclusory manner with no factual basis—Judge was not supposed to be conducting jury trials but was handling the Complainant's case “because [Judge] would go along with everything they were doing.” Dismissed because the complaint raised a legal issue related to the alleged conflict of interest, and all other allegations failed to be sufficiently specific.
- 19) Complainant alleges Municipal Court Judge was biased and signed Complainant's arrest warrants without evidence. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 20) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge denied his release from prison even though Complainant alleged he received "an illegal sentence." A legal challenge to the length of a criminal sentence is a frequent complaint from prison inmates. Dismissed because this is a legal issue which should be addressed through an appeal or post-conviction relief action.
- 21) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge is blocking access to the courts by denying Complainant's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* as plaintiff in a personal injury lawsuit. Complainant challenges the validity of the underlying ruling which is a legal issue addressed through a motion in the trial court or an appeal.
- 22) Complainant alleges Family Court Judge ruled improperly when Judge dismissed Complainant's case for failing to appear. The legal issue is properly addressed through motion or on appeal.
- 23) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge did not have probable cause to sign warrant for Complainant's arrest. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.

- 24) Complainant's relative is facing several debt issues, including foreclosure, in County One. Complainant believes a Guardian ad Litem (GAL) was improperly appointed for Complainant's relative, because Complainant claims to have a power of attorney. Appointed GAL filed paperwork in County Two because this was where Complainant's relative was located at the time of the action. This complaint involves the Probate Court Judge in County Two. Matters from County One and County Two were consolidated for consideration. Dismissed because all issues raised were legal issues addressed in on-going hearings or on appeal.
- 25) Complainant alleges Family Court Judge gave an inappropriate jail sentence for failure to pay child support. A request was sent for information to determine the proper name of the judge and if there were any allegations aside from the legal issue of sentencing. A response was received and properly identified Judge. However, the only allegation noted in the response is again the length of the sentence. Dismissed because an alleged inappropriate jail sentence presents only a legal issue and is properly addressed through a motion in the trial court or appeal.
- 26) Complainant appeared before Magistrate Court Judge to request a restraining order. A restraining order is an equitable remedy to be decided by the Judge. Judge denied the restraining order. Complainant alleges he was denied a jury trial to present his evidence. The right to a jury trial is provided by the Constitution or statute. The request for injunctive relief is equitable in nature and does not entail a right to a jury trial. Moreover, Section 16-3-1920 of the South Carolina Code gives the magistrate court jurisdiction to issue restraining orders but does not provide for the right to a jury trial. A challenge to the mere grant or denial of injunctive relief may only be addressed in the trial court or on appeal.
- 27) Complainant requests ODC to inquire as to why an unnamed Judge refuses to dismiss Complainant's tickets. Complaint only concerns a legal decision of Judge. Dismissed because the legal issue is properly addressed through appeal.
- 28) Complainant, a former court employee, alleges unfair treatment and being fired for no reason by the Magistrate Court Judge. No ethical misconduct noted. Complainant has not pursued the matter through a grievance or other channels in the County. Allegations of unfair treatment in the workplace should, in the first instance, be pursued through the grievance system established by the employer. Dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.
- 29) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge failed to consider all relevant evidence and disagrees with Judge's decision regarding summary judgment. Dismissed because legal issues are properly addressed through appeal.

- 30) Complainant's primary allegation is that the Probate Court Judge erred in committing Complainant for psychiatric treatment. Complainant makes other unsubstantiated claims related to Judge and Judge's personal life. Dismissed because the primary allegation is a legal issue, which is better addressed through other means and the other issues raised lacked specificity or were facially frivolous.
- 31) Complainant disagrees with Probate Judge's decision to grant an Order of Contempt and an Order Compelling Payment alleging it occurred at a "fraudulent hearing." There is no allegation of a violation of an ethical rule. Dismissed because the legal issues are properly addressed on appeal.
- 32) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge should have been recused from presiding at Complainant's criminal trial because Complainant filed a complaint against Judge prior to trial. Additionally, Complainant claimed Judge failed to properly advise of the right to an appeal. A judge is required to hear and decide matters assigned to the judge unless disqualification is required. Absent a basis for recusal, a judge has a duty to sit. We note the frequent attempt to forum/judge shop by preemptively filing a general, non-specific complaint of bias, and then invoking the filing of the complaint as a basis to remove the judge. The law is clear that the mere filing of a complaint by a party does not require automatic disqualification. Additionally, failure to recuse is a legal issue properly addressed through other means, such as an appeal.
- 33) Complainant alleges Family Court Judge erred in ruling Complainant was required to pay costs associated with mediation. Additionally, Complainant alleges Judge's determination of the custody arrangement for minor children was unfair. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 34) Complainant, a sovereign citizen, alleges he is not a citizen of the United States and is not subject to the laws of the United States. Complainant alleges two different Circuit Court Judges are "illegally practicing law by the authorization of state and United States Confederacy." Finally, Complainant alleges the two Judges violated various provisions of the South Carolina Constitution and statutory law by requiring Complainant to proceed through the criminal justice system. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 35) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge did not have probable cause to sign search warrant and that all information presented in the search warrant was the "fruit of the poisonous tree." Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.

- 36) Complainant, a family member of a litigant, alleges Family Court Judge's ruling was unfair and prejudicial to the family member. Complainant also alleges Judge did not properly consider the testimony of a witness in making their decision regarding visitation. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 37) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge is improperly continuing to hear matters related to a writ of ejectment, even though Complainant has filed various motions and an appeal with the circuit court. Complainant also asks ODC to intervene in the ongoing proceedings. Complaint provides no grounds on which the Magistrate is ethically prohibited from hearing the matter. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or during the ongoing appeal, and ODC is not allowed to intervene in court proceedings.
- 38) Complainant alleges Municipal Court Judge improperly denied him a jury trial for contempt of court. Complainant was not entitled to a jury trial because he was not subject to a sentence of greater than six months. Additionally, Complainant alleges he was entitled to discovery related to the contempt of court hearing. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 39) Complainant alleges Municipal Court Judge improperly issued arrest warrants, and Complainant was improperly arrested based on the arrest warrants intended for a different individual. Additionally, Complainant alleges a public defender has not been appointed. Finally, Complainant alleges he is entitled to release because he is being "warehoused" at the detention center and is suffering from poor conditions in the detention center. Dismissed because ODC jurisdiction is limited to ethical complaints, and the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 40) Complainant makes a general allegation that Circuit Court Judge failed to properly address issues with the sufficiency of his indictment. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 41) Complainant alleges Probate Court Judge improperly appointed a Guardian ad Litem and Conservator to represent a family member. Complainant alleges the appointment was unnecessary because he had a Power of Attorney for the relative. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 42) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge denied a motion for summary judgment "without reason" and only provided a Form 4 denial. Complainant asks ODC to review the motion

and provide “any suggestions.” Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues, and ODC may not review a judicial determination or provide legal advice.

- 43) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge improperly granted opposing party multiple continuances and, ultimately, improperly transferred the matter to another judge. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 44) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge improperly issued a restraining order against Complainant and, ultimately, an arrest warrant related to Complainant’s alleged violation of the restraining order. Complainant alleges there was no basis for the restraining order. Additionally, Complainant seeks reimbursement of all costs associated with filing an appeal from the restraining order. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed in Complainant’s appeal.
- 45) Complainant alleges Municipal Court Judge erred in issuing an arrest warrant without probable cause and without first watching all body camera and dashboard camera videos. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 46) Complainant alleges Family Court Judge issued a ruling from the bench that the Temporary Order would only address a single issue raised by the opposing party related to child support. Complainant alleges Judge issued a Temporary Order addressing the child support issue and all other issues raised by the opposing party. A review of hearing indicates Judge’s rulings were consistent with the issues addressed at the Temporary Hearing. Complainant further alleges the Temporary Order was in error. Dismissed after evaluation of available information and because the complaint raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or during the Final Hearing.
- 47) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge committed numerous trial related errors, including: admitting or precluding various evidence; improper rulings on prosecutorial objections; denying additional discovery; and issuing improper jury instructions and not putting the instructions in writing. Dismissed because the complaint only raised legal issues which should be addressed by motion or on appeal.
- 48) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge conspired to have her fired, in part because Complainant pointed out errors in Judge’s paperwork and several rulings. There is no indication Complainant has pursued the matter through a grievance or other channels in the County. Dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

DISMISSAL AFTER EVALUATION

The following matters were all dismissed during the initial evaluation performed by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) pursuant to Rule 19(a), RJDE. After reviewing all information available to ODC, including the information received from the complainant and publicly available information, ODC determined there was no evidence of ethical misconduct, demonstrating an incapacity, or demonstrating an inability of the judge to participate in the disciplinary process.

- 1) Complainant alleges a Family Court Judge did not allow Complainant to speak or present evidence and was biased towards Complainant. After review of the hearing, no evidence was found to support the allegations. Dismissed after evaluation of available information.
- 2) Complainant alleges a Family Court Judge continued to be involved in the case after recusal of Judge. Complainant specifically refers to an email that was sent by Judge's administrative assistant in Complainant's case after Judge's recusal. Complaint also pursued this complaint before the Judicial Merit Selection Commission; the Complainant included Judge's response to the JMSC. Judge responded to allegation. Judge denied the allegation and explained the role of a judge's administrative assistant in working with visiting judges on docketing and scheduling matters. Dismissed after evaluation of available public information including the JMSC response.
- 3) Complainant alleges a Magistrate Court Judge failed to maintain decorum in a hearing and was not impartial. A review of the hearing does not support the allegations; rather, the evidence demonstrates that Judge did not exhibit partiality. Judge exhibited control of the courtroom, and was polite, clear, and helpful. Dismissed after evaluation of available information.
- 4) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge did not allow Complainant the opportunity to be heard during the hearing. Complainant alleges that when she attempted to speak, she was "cut off and reprimanded." A review of the hearing demonstrated all parties were allowed to present their evidence and argument regarding the matter in addition to being required to answer questions from Judge. No evidence was found to support Complainant's allegations.
- 5) Complainant is a *pro se* litigant in a family court matter involving DSS. Complainant alleges Complainant raises multiple allegations of misconduct against Family Court Judge.
 - 1) Complainant alleges Judge improperly proceeded with a hearing because Complainant's co-defendant's attorney was not present for the hearing. At the outset of the hearing, the

attorney for DSS and the Guardian Ad Litem indicated the matter should be continued, since it was already scheduled for trial. Judge asked Complainant if Complainant had any objection to the hearing being continued. Complainant had no objection to the continuance. The hearing did not occur because of the scheduled trial. Dismissed because the allegation was factually untrue, as the hearing did not go forward. 2) Complainant alleges Judge engaged in *ex parte* communication because Judge spoke with the co-defendant's attorney earlier that day about rescheduling the hearing. Judge informed everyone present for the hearing that Judge had spoken with the co-defendant's attorney prior to the hearing since the attorney was at court for other matters, and the attorney agreed the matter should be continued. Dismissed because Canon 3(B)(7)(a) allows communication for scheduling when a judge properly notifies all parties and the party does not gain a benefit from the communication. 3) Complainant makes a general allegation that Judge was not impartial. Dismissed because there was no evidence of bias or partiality found during the review of the transcript. 4) Complainant alleges Judge improperly required the minor child to remain with DSS. Judge addressed Complainant's objection, including taking testimony from a DSS employee. Dismissed because Judge made a legal determination, which should be reviewed during on-going hearings or on appeal.

- 6) Magistrate Court Judge self-reported a shortage of \$100 when payment for a traffic ticket was misplaced by a court employee. In the self-report, Judge provides a detailed explanation of Judge's investigation into the shortage. Judge explains that the employee who misplaced the \$100 is no longer handling money and was given a written warning. Dismissed because there is no indication of misconduct on the part of Judge.
- 7) Complainant alleges during a hearing on a restraining order, Magistrate Court Judge admitted to *ex parte* communication with a witness, exhibited signs of bias against Complainant, and displayed inappropriate behavior. Dismissed because a review of the hearing refutes Complainant's allegations.
- 8) Complainant alleges Probate Court Judge would not respond to Complainant's *ex parte* requests to discuss the case and for status updates. Judge refused to communicate *ex parte* with Complainant about Complainant's pending matter. Additionally, Complainant requested ODC "look into" the probate matter. No evidence of misconduct because Judge properly chose not to engage in *ex parte* communications with Complainant.
- 9) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge provided false information in the Return to Circuit Court in Complainant's appeal of his conviction for disorderly conduct. A review of the Magistrate Court hearing and relevant documentation, including filings in Circuit Court and the Circuit Court's Order affirming Judge's decision, demonstrated no evidence of misconduct.

- 10) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge demonstrated bias, hostility, racial prejudice, and unprofessional demeanor during multiple hearings in which Complainant appeared *pro se*. A review of the hearing demonstrated Judge acted appropriately, did not display any hostility or bias against Complainant, attempted to patiently explain the law and Judge's rulings, and did not demonstrate any evidence of racial prejudice. Dismissed after evaluation of all available information because no evidence of misconduct was discovered.
- 11) Complainant alleges Master-In-Equity was biased and refused to allow Complainant a continuance or present all information Complainant wished to admit. A review of the hearings indicated Complainant's evidence was not fully presented at the first two hearings, which were both continued based on consent of the parties. At the third hearing, all parties were able to present evidence. There was no indication of bias. Dismissed after evaluation of all available information because no evidence of misconduct was discovered.
- 12) Complainant, a sovereign citizen, alleges Magistrate Court Judge was biased against Complainant. Additionally, Complainant alleges Judge refused to allow Complainant the opportunity to be heard during a hearing. A review of the hearing did not indicate bias and demonstrated Judge allowed Complainant the opportunity to be heard. Dismissed after evaluation of all available information because no evidence of misconduct was discovered.
- 13) Complainant alleges Probate Court Judge is one of several judges involved in general corruption within the Probate Court. Complainant provided a copy of a transcript from a hearing to relieve counsel conducted by Judge as supporting documentation. A review of the transcript did not demonstrate any misconduct on the part of Judge, much less general corruption within the Probate Court. Dismissed after evaluation of all available information because no evidence of misconduct was discovered.

DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF SPECIFICITY

Rule 14(d)(2), RJDE, which became effective July 1, 2025, requires all complaints filed with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) to “be made against a specific judge and contain a clear statement of the details of each act of alleged misconduct or incapacity.” The following matters were dismissed because they failed to provide the name of the judge and the identity was not able to be easily determined by review of public records or the complaint failed to provide sufficient detail of the events to determine what allegations of ethical misconduct were being made by the Complainant.

- 1) Complainant refers to a May 2021 appearance before an unnamed judge. The unnamed judge ruled in favor of law enforcement regarding a traffic incident and against the Defendant requesting a restraining order. It was unclear if Complainant was also the Defendant in the matter referenced. There was no response to a letter requesting the name of the unnamed judge.
- 2) Complainant alleges court staff did not allow Complainant "to have a civil complaint." A request for more information was never answered, so ODC was unable to obtain sufficient detail to determine ethical misconduct or whether any judge was involved.
- 3) Complainant alleges a Family Court Judge was biased in a domestic/custody matter but did not provide any details of the ways in which the Judge was allegedly biased. Complainant did not respond to ODC’s request for specific allegations.
- 4) Complainant identified a specific Family Court Judge but failed to provide any specific allegations of misconduct. Judge ordered a competency evaluation of Complainant's son, who was facing criminal charges, but ODC was unable to determine from the information provided if Complainant was solely upset about the outcome or if there were other allegations.
- 5) Complainant identifies a specific Circuit Court Judge, but Complainant does not provide any allegations against Judge and did not respond to ODC’s request for specific allegations against Judge.
- 6) Complainant asks that ODC find out which Judge presided over Complainant’s hearing so that a complaint can be used against Judge as well as a Lawyer. The Complainant made no allegations against any specific judge. ODC sent a request for the name of the Judge and specific allegations but received no response.

- 7) Complainant states the complaint is being filed against Magistrate Court Judge and includes a Return on Appeal signed by Judge. However, the complaint only makes allegations against several lawyers and no misconduct appears to be related to the signed Return. Complainant failed to present a detailed factual description of the alleged misconduct by Judge.
- 8) In a complaint initially filed against a lawyer, Complainant vaguely alleges there was *ex parte* communication with a Family Court Judge. The original complaint failed to provide a clear statement of the details of each act of alleged misconduct. ODC sent Complainant a request for additional information. Complainant failed to respond to ODC's request for specific allegations so the matter was dismissed for lack of details related to the alleged misconduct.
- 9) Complainant, a sovereign citizen, purported to file a complaint against Magistrate Court Judge, but provided no allegations of misconduct by Judge. Instead, the complaint references only allegations of misconduct by various lay persons outside the jurisdiction of ODC. Dismissed as Complainant failed to present a detailed factual description of the alleged misconduct by Judge.
- 10) Complainant alleges an unnamed Judge fraudulently ruled against him in a landlord/tenant dispute. Dismissed as Complainant failed to properly name a judge as required.
- 11) Complainant filed a complaint against Probate Court Judge alleging various health issues and describing interactions with law enforcement. Complainant does not provide any allegations against Judge. Dismissed as Complainant failed to present a detailed factual description of the alleged misconduct by Judge.
- 12) Complainant made vague allegations against Probate Court Judge related to opening and closing a probate matter. ODC sought additional information from Complainant. Complainant failed to respond to ODC's request for specific allegations, so the matter was dismissed for lack of details related to the alleged misconduct by Judge.
- 13) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge "lied on the record" during his hearing. Complainant does not indicate the date or type of hearing or the Judge's purported falsehood. Dismissed as Complainant failed to present a detailed factual description of the alleged misconduct by Judge.
- 14) Complainant alleges Probate Court Judge violated the probate code as it relates to a mobile home, but provides no additional information related to the allegation. Complainant further alleges generally that Judge should be recused and that the probate matter should be further

along than it is now, but no additional information was provided by Complainant. Dismissed as Complainant failed to present a detailed factual description of the alleged misconduct by Judge.

- 15) Complainant made a general allegation Probate Court Judge was biased but provided no additional details. ODC sought additional information from Complainant regarding the nature of the allegations. Complainant failed to respond to ODC's request for specific allegations, so the matter was dismissed for lack of details related to the alleged misconduct by Judge.

FITSNEWS

DISMISSAL AFTER INVESTIGATION.¹

In the following matters, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC) opened an investigation into the underlying complaint and requested a return from the Judge. These matters were dismissed because the Office of Disciplinary Counsel could not find clear and convincing evidence to support the allegations of the complaint.

- 1) Complainant alleges a Probate Court Judge and clerks failed to provide Complainant proper assistance and information in completing necessary forms for the handling of their mother's estate. Complainant claims to have been provided with the wrong forms on more than one occasion and having to return to the office for a different form. Complainant also alleges Judge's clerk was rude to Complainant. Judge denies the allegations in the complaint. Judge specifically denied that Judge or the clerk's office mistreated Complainant, and it was Complainant who was rude when visiting the office. Judge explained there was confusion on some paperwork, but the issue was that the Complainant signed a form that needed to be signed by someone else, resulting in the paperwork having to be resubmitted. No clear and convincing evidence of misconduct was found after the investigation. Notice of intent to dismiss was sent to Complainant, and no request for review was received.
- 2) Complainant alleges a Magistrate Court Judge communicated *ex parte* with the opposing party. Complainant also alleges that Judge did not allow Complainant to be heard during the hearing and that Judge was biased. Judge explains the opposing party was in the courtroom with Judge prior to Complainant's case being called because the opposing party had two cases scheduled for hearings on that morning's docket. Judge denies the allegations in the complaint. No clear and convincing evidence of judicial misconduct was found after the investigation, including review of the hearing. Notice of intent to dismiss was sent to Complainant, and no request for review was received.
- 3) Complainant alleges a Magistrate Court Judge, who Complainant asserts attends the same church as Complainant and the opposing party, should have been recused instead of hearing the case. Complainant also alleges Judge was biased. Judge denies the allegations in the complaint. According to Judge's response, Judge is a member of the same denomination but attends a different church from the parties. No clear and convincing evidence of judicial misconduct was found after the investigation. Notice of intent to dismiss was sent to Complainant, and no request for review was received.

¹ One additional matter will be recorded as closed because it was determined to be a duplicate of a file previously opened and dismissed.

- 4) Complainant alleges that a Magistrate Court Judge stated on the record that the opposing party had not successfully proven their case. Instead of ruling in Complainant's favor, Complainant maintains Judge asked the opposing party what they desired as an outcome and, ultimately, ruled in the opposing party's favor. Judge provided a thorough background of the parties and the matters at issue. Judge denies the allegation and states that the evidence and testimony overwhelmingly supported the opposing party's case. No clear and convincing evidence of judicial misconduct was found after the investigation. Notice of intent to dismiss was sent to Complainant, and no request for review was received.
- 5) Complainant alleges a Master-In-Equity Judge engaged in *ex parte* communication when Judge came out to speak with Complainant the day before a status conference. Judge responds Complainant indicated they were unsure about what occurred at a status conference and wanted to discuss what was going on in their case. Judge explained to Complainant that their conversation needed to be limited to "scheduling type stuff," and concluded the discussion when it veered too much into substantive discussion without the plaintiff being present. Judge states that at the status conference, Judge summarized what was discussed with Complainant the day prior, and Judge reminded both parties that it was improper to unilaterally contact a judge about a pending case. No clear and convincing evidence of judicial misconduct was found after the investigation. Notice of intent to dismiss was sent to Complainant, and no request for review was received.
- 6) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge previously represented Complainant as counsel, and it was misconduct for Judge to preside over Complainant's hearing in 2024. Judge did represent Complainant in a 2010 matter as Complainant's lawyer, but the 2010 matter is unrelated to the current charges and sentence of Complainant. Judge further denies presiding over Complainant's guilty pleas in 2024. The public index confirms another Judge presided over Complainant's guilty pleas resulting in his incarceration. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss, and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review, but Complainant did not timely seek review.
- 7) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge was biased and engaged in prejudicial conduct. Complainant alleges Judge used "disapproving body language" (scowling) when his counsel spoke, but "approving body language" when the State argued. Judge denies any bias or prejudice. A review of the hearing demonstrated no evidence of bias or prejudice. ODC interviewed Complainant's counsel who did not provide any evidence to support Complainant's allegations. Complainant's counsel did not experience any bias or prejudice. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review, but Complainant did not seek review.

- 8) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge did not allow complainant to “file anything”; did not allow Complainant to view evidence; and did not want to hear from Complainant. Complainant was a defendant in an action for non-payment of a debt. ODC reviewed Judge’s response. A review of the hearing does not support the Complainant's allegations. Complainant, as the defendant, failed to answer the complaint; instead, only filing information. Despite being in default, however, Judge allowed Complainant to speak. Judge ruled in favor of the plaintiff, and Judge advised Complainant of the process to appeal to the Circuit Court. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss, and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review, but Complainant did not seek review.
- 9) Complainant alleges Municipal Court Judge, who is also a practicing lawyer, should have been recused from representing Complainant’s opposing party in a probate matter due to a conflict of interest. Complainant alleges Judge formerly represented Complainant as a lawyer in an unrelated domestic matter. During a later criminal matter involving Complainant, the Judge was recused and did not hear Complainant’s matter. In the underlying matter, Judge represented Complainant’s opposing party as a lawyer in a probate matter in which Complainant contested a will. Judge denies the allegations, stating his role in the probate matter was solely serving as a lawyer, not as a judge, and no conflict existed. Further, the judge hearing the probate matter denied Complainant's motion to disqualify Judge as his client's counsel. This matter was initially opened as a judicial matter because Judge’s role as a Municipal Court Judge appeared to form part of the basis of the allegation of a conflict of interest. After further review, the primary conflict and allegations were against Judge in his role as a lawyer and not as a judge. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss, and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review, but Complainant did not timely seek review.
- 10) Complainant alleges Magistrate Court Judge should have been recused because Judge was related to the arresting officer in Complainant’s case. Absent a basis for recusal, a judge has a duty to sit. Judge responded that there is no known familial relationship between Judge and arresting officer and indicated that his last name is common in the County. Allegation was dismissed because no evidence of a basis for recusal by the Judge existed. Complainant also alleged Judge approved a “fake warrant.” Dismissed because Judge found the warrant and affidavit valid, which is a legal determination to be made by the Judge. Complaint dismissed because no basis for the Judge to have recused himself and because challenging a warrant is a legal issue that should be challenged by motion or appeal. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review. Complainant timely requested review by the Commission on Lawyer Conduct. A panel of the Commission affirmed the dismissal.

- 11) Complainant raises multiple allegations against Family Court Judge. 1) Complainant alleges Judge did not allow Complainant to present evidence and ignored evidence presented. A review of the hearing indicates Complainant presented affidavits and other documents. 2) Complainant also alleges Judge erred in custody determination. Judge's decision on the award of custody at a Temporary Hearing is a legal determination to be addressed at a later hearing or on appeal. 3) Complainant further alleges Judge and opposing counsel acted as if they "were close acquaintances." The evidence does not support any allegation of bias in favor of opposing counsel or of any undue influence by opposing counsel. Judge responded that there is no existing relationship with opposing counsel, and opposing counsel did not receive special treatment. Judge noted she denied opposing counsel's request for attorney fees and several other requests for relief. Accordingly, no clear and convincing evidence of misconduct was found after an investigation. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss, and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review, but Complainant did not timely seek timely review.
- 12) Complainant alleges Circuit Court Judge was racially biased against him because of a scrivener's error in an Order. While the majority of the Order referred to Complainant by his name, at one point Judge referenced "Mr. Brown." Judge responded this was a scrivener's error and would have been corrected immediately if it was brought to Judge's attention. Judge provided an Amended Order making the correction. Accordingly, no clear and convincing evidence of misconduct was found after an investigation. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review. Complainant requested a timely review by the Commission on Lawyer Conduct. A panel of the Commission affirmed the dismissal.
- 13) Complainant raises multiple allegations against Municipal Court Judge. 1) Complainant alleges Judge engaged in *ex parte* communications with a Building Codes Officer but does not provide any information as to the substance of the alleged communications. Judge denies the allegation. No evidence of any *ex parte* communications was provided other than speculation. A review of all available information did not reveal any evidence of *ex parte* communications. 2) Complainant also alleges Judge was rude and insulting. A review of the hearing demonstrates Judge was not acting in a rude or insulting manner towards Complainant. 3) Finally, Complainant alleges Judge's rulings are in retaliation for Complainant's lawsuit against the city. Complainant does not provide any evidence Judge knew of the lawsuit, and Judge specifically denied knowledge of the lawsuit until this investigation. Accordingly, no clear and convincing evidence of misconduct was found after an investigation. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss, and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review, but Complainant did not seek timely review.

14) Complainant alleges Municipal Court Judge would not allow him to speak, was insulting, and acted unprofessional. Judge presented an extensive description of interactions with Complainant. A review of the hearing does not support the allegations and demonstrates Judge always acted appropriately. Accordingly, no clear and convincing evidence of misconduct was found after an investigation. ODC sent Complainant a Notice of Intent to Dismiss, and provided Complainant an opportunity to seek further review, but Complainant did not seek timely review.

LETTERS OF CAUTION – NONE

FITSNEWS