### STATE OF MINNESOTA

IN SUPREME COURT

HEARING ON PROPOSED
AMENDMENTS TO THE
CODE OF JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND STANDARDS
RELATING TO JUDICIAL
DISCIPLINE AND
DISABILITY RETIREMENT

48868

ORDEF

Whereas the Supreme Court has the authority pursuant to

M. S. 490.16, Subd. 5 to promulgate rules governing Judicial Discipline;

Whereas the American Bar Association at its February 1978 meeting

adopted Standards Relating to Judicial Discipline and Disability

Retirement;

Whereas the Supreme Court is considering amending the present Come of Judicial Conduct and adopting the A.B.A. Standards Relating to Judicial Discipline and Disability Retirement as guidelines;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a hearing shall be held in the chambers of the Minnesota Supreme Court, State Capitol, Saint Paul, Minnesota on June 29, 1978 at 9:30 a.m. to afford the court an opportunity to hear comments on the proposed amendments to the Code of Judicial Conduct and Standards Relating to Judicial Discipline and Disability Retirement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that true and correct copies of the proposed amendments and standards be made available after May 5, 1978, upon request to persons who have registered their names with the Clerk of the Supreme Court for the purpose of receiving such copies and who have paid a fee of \$15.00 to defray the expense of providing the copies.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that advance notice of the hearing be given by the publication of this order once in the Supreme Court edition of Finance and Commerce, the St. Paul Legal Ledger, Bench and Bar, and the Hennepin Lawyer.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that interested persons show cause, if any they have, why the proposed amendments should not be adopted. All persons desiring to be heard shall file briefs or petitions setting

forth their objections, and shall also notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court, in writing, on or before Friday, June 23, 1978, of their desire to be heard on the proposed amendments.

Dated: April 25, 1978

BY THE COURT

Robert J. Sheran, Chief Justice Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota

FILED

APR 2 5 1978

JOHN McCARTHY



## State of Minnesota Hennepin County Municipal Court Hennepin County Covernment Center Minnespolis, Minnesota 55487



CHAMBERS
JAMES D. ROGERS
JUDGE

June 26, 1978

Mr. John McCarthy Clerk of Court Supreme Court of Minnesota State Capitol Building St. Paul, Minnesota, 55155

48868

Re: Hearing on Proposed Rules of the Board of Judicial Standards

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

Pursuant to the notice that was mailed dated May 15, 1978 to all judges of the State of Minnesota and the hearings that were set forth in this notice to be held on June 29, 1978, I wish to make the proposed change with respect to the Rules, as follows:

I propose a change to Rule 6 (F)(2) that the language that appears in the proposed rule be stricken and that the following language be substituted:

When a file has been closed for any reason, it may not be reopened or used by the Board in subsequent proceedings.

I would like the opportunity to appear at the hearing and orally submit my reasons for this particular change, or in any event, be given an opportunity to submit a written basis for substantiating this particular change.

Yours very truly,

James D. Rogers

JDR/rc

6-27 -- copy given to all Justice

## MINNESOTA BOARD ON JUDICIAL STANDARDS

202 MINNESOTA STATE BANK BUILDING 200 SOUTH ROBERT STREET ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55107

GEORGE C. KING CHAIRMAN

DAVID J. COLEMAN
RUBY HUNT
HON. ROBERT F. JOHNSON
HON. GORDON L. MC RAE
JOHN W. PADDEN
HON. SEWELL SAWYER
HARVEY A. STEGEMOELLER
JUANITA H. YOUNG

June 22, 1978

GEORGE J. KURVERS EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

612-296-3999

Mr. John C. McCarthy Clerk of Supreme Court Supreme Court State Capitol St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

> Re: Hearing on Proposed Amendments to the Code of Discipline and Disability Retirement

No. 48868

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

I enclose herewith an original and 15 copies of a short brief on behalf of the Minnesota Board on Judicial Standards. I will attend the hearing at 9:30 a.m. on June 29, 1978, and will be available for questions by the Court as to the position of the Board.

Very truly yours,

George C. King

Chairman

GCK/jlr Enc.

cc: George J. Kurvers

NO. \$8868

STATE OF MINNESOTA IN SUPREME COURT

SUPREME COURT FILED JUN 2 3 1976 JOHN McCARTHY

HEARING ON PROPOSED
AMENDMENTS TO THE
CODE OF JUDICIAL
DISCIPLINE AND
DISABILITY RETIREMENT

BRIEF OF MINNESOTA BOARD ON JUDICIAL STANDARDS

## STATE OF MINNESOTA IN SUPREME COURT

HEARING ON PROPOSED
AMENDMENTS TO THE
CODE OF JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND STANDARDS
RELATING TO JUDICIAL
DISCIPLINE AND
DISABILITY RETIREMENT
No. 48868

BRIEF OF MINNESOTA BOARD ON JUDICIAL STANDARDS

The Minnesota Board on Judicial Standards has considered the proposed amendments to the Code of Judicial Conduct and Standards Relating to Judicial Discipline and Disability Retirement. It makes the following comments and suggestions to the Court concerning the proposed amendments to the rules:

- 1. Rule 1(i)(2). This should be changed to conform to M.S.A. Section 15.0575, which provides compensation of \$35.00 per day.
- 2. Rule 2(a). Chapter 455 of the Laws of 1977 imposes upon the Board a duty to review compliance with M.S.A. Section 546.27.
- 3. Rule 7(a). Subparagraph (b) and (d) provide that the suspension of a judge is with pay. Subparagraph (a) is silent. The Board assumes that the suspension under subparagraph (a) is with pay and suggests that it would be better to say so in so many words.
- 4. Rule 6(g)(2)(iii). In the view of the Board, this rule is of somewhat doubtful validity since it contemplates making an order controlling the conduct of a judge without the due process type hearing.

5. Rule 1(a). While the Board realizes that this rule simply reiterates the statute as enacted by the last legislature, the Board -- as well as two members whose terms have just expired -- wishes publicly to call attention to this very bad legislation.

In a state where almost all judges are initially selected by appointment of the Governor; where efforts at achieving merit selection of judges have been rejected; it would seem too obvious for debate that the Board created to see to the discipline of judges should not be selected by the same Governor who picks the judges.

Dated: June 22, 1978.

Respectfully submitted,

George C. King, Chairman Minnesota Board on Judicial

Standards.

#### STATE OF MINNESOTA FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT HENNEPIN COUNTY

CHAMBERS OF
WILLIAM B. CHRISTENSEN
ASSISTANT CHIEF JUDGE
DISTRICT COURT
PROBATE COURT
MUNICIPAL COURT
7TH FLOOR COURTS TOWER
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55487

June 22, 1978



Mr. John McCarthy Clerk of Supreme Court State Capitol St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

RE: The Proposed Rules File 48868

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

I understand your Court has scheduled a hearing for June 29, 1978, at 9:30 A.M. concerning the adoption of Rules for the Board on Judicial Standards. Myself or another judge representing the County Judges Association would like the opportunity to present the comments outlined in the attached letter. Please let me know if we can be scheduled to present these comments.

Sincerely,

William B. Christensen

WBC:1j

Enc.

# STATE OF MINNESOTA FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT HENNEPIN COUNTY

CHAMBERS OF
WILLIAM B. CHRISTENSEN
ASSISTANT CHIEF JUDGE
DISTRICT COURT
PROBATE COURT
MUNICIPAL COURT
7TH FLOOR COURTS TOWER
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55487

June 22, 1978



TO: Justices of the Supreme Court

RE: Proposed Rules File 48868

On behalf of the County Court Judges Association I would like to express certain comments concerning the Proposed Rules for the Board on Judicial Standards.

At a meeting held on June 21, 1978 in St. Paul, the County Court Judges expressed their strong support for the good work done by the Board on Judicial Standards.

However, the Judges would respectfully suggest to the Court in adopting the Rules which will guide the Board on Judicial Standards, that you consider the following principles: (1) That judges be given a written notice of a complaint within 60 days after the filing of such complaint, (This will enable the judge to collect evidence while it is still available and fresh in the minds of the persons involved), and (2) that if the Judicial Council fails to notify the judge within the 60 day period, the complaint cannot be used against the judge for any purpose, now or in the future.

"However, if the judge is not notified within 60 days after the filing of the complaint, then the complaint shall be dropped and the matter closed".

Or in the alternative ask that Proposed Rule 6 (d) be amended as follows:

"No action shall be taken on any complaint in which the judge is not notified within 60 days after the filing of such complaint, and if not notified the complaint cannot be used against the judge".

Respectfully submitted.

William B. Christensen

WBC:1j