#### BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

- 1			
2		STATE OF NEVADA	28.0
3			Standing dissolition and regularity works are a vice of the same of the same destination of the same d
4			MAY 1 7 2013
5	In the Matter of the		NEVADA COMMISSION DY JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE
6	HONORABLE TERRY GRAHAM, Justice of the Peace,	ĺ	Contract Con
7	Wadsworth Justice Court, County of Washoe, State of Nevada,	Case	No. 1202-1083
8	Respondent.		
Q.		<b>\</b>	

## FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND IMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINE

Pursuant to prior written notice, the above-entitled matter came on for public (formal) hearing in Reno, Nevada, pursuant to NRS§1.467(3)(c) and Interim Commission Rule 18 (hereinafter referred to as "the hearing") on December 5, 2012, before the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").<sup>1</sup>

Attorneys Thomas C. Bradley and Mary Boetsch acted as the Special Counsel and prosecuted the case against Respondent. The Respondent was present and represented by Counsel David Grundy and Tammy Riggs.

After being fully advised of its obligations and duties, the Commission specifically finds that the hearing was conducted according to the statutes, rules, and procedures required by law. The Commission hereby issues the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Imposition of Discipline pursuant to Rules 27 and 28, and NRS§1.4673 and §1.4677.

### A. PREFACE

On December 5, 2012, Special Prosecutors, Thomas C. Bradley, Esq. and Mary E. Boetsch, Esq., and the Respondent through his Counsel Tammy Riggs, Esq. and David Grundy, Esq., entered into a written Admission and Stipulation which was filed with the Commission. In that Admission and Stipulation, the Respondent admitted to the factual allegations contained in Counts One and Two

The following Commissioners participated in the hearing: Chairman Doug Jones, Judge Rodney Burr, Judge Janiece Marshall, Karl Armstrong, Wayne Chimarusti, Mary Lau, and Gary Vause.

of the Amended Statement of Formal Charges which was filed contemporaneously with the Admission and Stipulation. The Amended Statement of Formal Charges alleged:

#### **COUNT ONE**

1. That in June 2008, Kamee Copeland was your court clerk at Wadsworth Justice Court, Wadsworth Township, Washoe County, Nevada.

2. That during that time frame Kamee Copeland was involved in a personal relationship with Gary Raines who was separated from his wife, Sharon Raines; that the Raines were in the process of divorcing; and that the divorce action had been filed in the Second Judicial District Court.

3. That a restraining order in the Raines' divorce case was issued by The Honorable Frances Doherty, Department 12, the Second Judicial District Court, on October 31 2007, which, in pertinent part, prohibited either party in the divorce from transferring, encumbering, hypothecating, concealing or in any way disposing of any property, real or personal, whether community or separate, except in the usual course of business or for the necessities of life.

4. That on or about June 20, 2008, while this restraining order was in effect, you purchased two pieces of Caterpillar heavy construction equipment, namely Cat-Track Skid-Steers, that belonged to the marital estate of Sharon and Gary Raines, by paying off the balance owing to Caterpillar Finance and that this equipment was covered by the restraining order.

5. That, thereafter, on or about January 30, 2009, you went to the adjacent lot next to the Raines' marital residence located at 995 Mesa Drive, Fernley, Nevada, to obtain and remove one of the two Cat-Track Skid-Steers; that prior to this date you learned that the restraining order described herein was in effect.

6. That your conduct as described herein constitutes violations of one or more of the following, then applicable, Canons of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct -- former Canon 1 A, former Canon 2A and former Canon 4A.

#### **COUNT TWO**

7. That the allegations in paragraphs one through six are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth herein.

8. That when you purchased the equipment described in Count One, you

did so by paying off the outstanding debt owed against the heavy equipment.

9. That Investigator Bob Schmidt of the Advantage Group, performed an investigation into this matter at the direction of the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline; that on January 13, 2011, he interviewed you; that during that interview you stated that you paid off the remaining balance owed to Caterpillar Finance for the equipment; that you falsely told Investigator Schmidt that you obtained part of the money from some cash you kept at home and the rest came from the bank; that, thereafter, later in the interview when you were told that Kamee Copeland's credit card statement showed a cash advance in the exact amount of the loan pay-off to Caterpillar made the day the pay-off was made, you then advised Investigator Schmidt that you had borrowed the funds from Kamee Copeland to pay off the outstanding obligation because you could not get the money together that quickly.

10. That your conduct as described herein constitutes violations of Current

Rule 2.16 of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct.

In the Admission and Stipulation, the Respondent specifically acknowledged that his conduct as set forth in the Amended Statement of Formal Charges constituted clear and convincing evidence that he violated those named provisions of the Code, past and current, and the evidence supported

10 11

13

12

15

1718

19 20

21

2324

2526

27

28 /////

/////

the imposition of discipline by the Commission.

The Respondent further agreed in the Admission and Stipulation that by accepting the terms of this agreement, he waived his right to appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court, pursuant to Rule 3D of the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure all issues, save and except that he was permitted to appeal the propriety of any discipline imposed which is more severe than the form of discipline proposed by the prosecutors and accepted by Respondent as stated herein.

After hearing testimony from Respondent and receiving documentary evidence regarding whether a violation or violations occurred, as well as evidence in extenuation and mitigation of punishment, the Commission deliberated in private.

### B. FINDINGS OF FACT

The Commission finds that the Admission and Stipulation together with the evidence presented at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing proof of each of the following facts.

- 1. The Respondent was, at all times applicable to the events in this case, the Wadsworth Justice of the Peace, County of Washoe, State of Nevada. He still serves in that capacity. Therefore, the Respondent was and is a judicial officer whose conduct was and is subject to the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct.
- 2. The Commission finds that The Special Counsel had established the existence of a willful violation of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct. Specifically, Respondent violated former Canon 1A, former Canon 2A, Former Canon 4A, and current Rule 2.16 of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct.
- 3. The Commission also announced on the record that the Respondent would be subject to public reprimand for his conduct in violating the above-described violations. The vote as to the violation was unanimous.
- 4. The Respondent waived his right to appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court because the discipline imposed by the Commission was not more severe than the form of discipline proposed by the prosecutors and accepted by Respondent.

### C. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Commission has both personal jurisdiction over the Respondent and subject matter jurisdiction over the violations of Code at issue in this case.
- 2. The Commission unanimously concludes that the Admission and Stipulation together with the evidence presented at the hearing suffices as proof of the violations stated above.
- 3. The Commission also concludes that Respondent has waived his right to appeal to the Nevada Supreme Court.

#### D. <u>IMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINE</u>

The Commission concludes that the appropriate discipline under Commission Rule 28 as to said violations shall be as follows:

By unanimous vote of the Commission, pursuant to subsections 5(a) and (b) of Article 6, Section 21 of the Constitution of the State of Nevada, the version of NRS 1.4653(2) in effect on the dates in question, and Commission Rule 28, the Respondent shall be and hereby is publicly reprimanded for having committed the acts as specified in the Admission and Stipulation, and fully set forth above.

#### E. ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED by unanimous vote of Commissioners Chairman Doug Jones, Judge Rodney Burr, Judge Janiece Marshall, Karl Armstrong, Wayne Chimarusti, Mary Lau, and Gary Vause that the Respondent should be and hereby is publicly reprimanded for violations of former Canon 1A, former Canon 2A, former Canon 4A, and Current Rule 2.16 of the Nevada Code of Judicial Conduct.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED by unanimous vote that the chairman is authorized to sign this document on behalf of all voting commissioners.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED pursuant to the consent of the Respondent, that the Executive Director of the Judicial Discipline Commission take the necessary steps to file this document in the appropriate records of the Commission and with the Clerk of the Nevada Supreme Court.

27 /////

28 1////

1	TERCHEDEDY ODDEDED 4 -4 4 - Cl. 12 - C. 4 - CM-12 - C. 4 - CM-12 - C. 4 - L. 11		
1	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk's Certificate of Mailing, found below, shall		
2	constitute the notice of entry of this document pursuant to Commission Rule 34; and the clerk shall		
3	promptly serve it on the Respondent's counsel and the Special Counsel.		
4	IT IS SO ODDEDED		
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
6 7	DATED this 17th day of May, 2013.		
8	NEVADA COMMISSION ON		
9	JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE P.O. Box 48 P.O. Box 48		
10	Carson City, NV 89702		
11			
12	By: fongles W. foner  Doug Jones, Chairman		
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

# **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** I hereby certify taht I am an employee of the Nevada Commission on Judicial Discipline and that on the 17th day of May, 2013, I placed a copy of the FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND IMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINE in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the following persons: Thomas C. Bradley, Esq. Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney, Boetsch, Bradley & Pace 448 Hill Street Reno, NV 89501 Special Counsel Mary E. Boetsch, Esq. Sinai, Schroeder, Mooney, Boetsch, Bradley & Pace 448 Hill Street Reno, NV 89501 Special Counsel 12 David R. Grundy, Esq. 13 Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg 6005 Plumas Street Reno, NV 89519 Counsel for Respondent 15 Tammy M. Riggs, Esq. Law Office of Tammy M. Riggs 17 556 California Avenue Reno, NV 89509 Counsel for Respondent 18 19 20 DANEEN ISENBERG, Commission Clerk 21 22 23 24

25

26

27

28