



Judicial Discipline & Disability Commission

JUDGE LEON N. JAMISON
CHAIRMAN

323 Center Street • Suite 1060
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 682-1050 • Fax: (501) 682-1049
E-Mail: jddc@arkansas.gov

DAVID A. STEWART
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

P R E S S R E L E A S E

POINT OF CONTACT: DAVID Stewart

PHONE: 501-682-1050

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 19, 2010

The Arkansas Judicial Discipline & Disability Commission met today in Executive Session to consider the Findings and Recommendations of the three member hearing panel in Commission cases #06260 and 05123 against Judge L. T. Simes.

The following document contains the full Commission's final decision in the matter. The Commission's Recommendations will be forwarded to the Arkansas Supreme Court for final decision.



Judicial Discipline & Disability Commission

JUDGE LEON N. JAMISON
CHAIRMAN

323 Center Street • Suite 1060
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 682-1050 • Fax: (501) 682-1049
E-Mail: jddc@arkansas.gov

DAVID A. STEWART
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

November 19, 2010

George Hairston
Attorney at Law
64 Fulton Street, Suite 502
New York, NY 10038

Sent by Email, Fax & Surface Mail

RE: Cases 06260 and 05123

Dear Mr. Hairston:

The Judicial Discipline & Disability Commission met in Executive Session today at its regularly scheduled meeting to consider recommendations of the three member panel in cases 06260 and 05123. A majority of the Commission members voted to adopt the panel findings and recommend that your client, Judge L. T. Simes be removed from his position as the Circuit Judge of the First Judicial District.

A copy of the Final Decision and Recommendation is enclosed with this letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David A. Stewart".

David A. Stewart
Executive Director

Enclosure as stated

RECEIVED

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE AND DISABILITY

JUL 29 AM 10:51
JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE
AND
DISABILITY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF L. T. SIMES,
Circuit Judge, First Judicial District Case No. 06-260/05-123

ARKANSAS JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE AND DISABILITY COMMISSION'S
FINAL DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The matter of the allegations against Circuit Judge L. T. Simes was heard before a three-person panel of the Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission (the "JDDC") on Thursday, July 28, 2010 and continued on Friday, July 29, 2010. The Commission was represented by David Sachar, the Associate Director of the Commission. Judge L. T. Simes was represented by George Hairston, Attorney at Law, New York, New York. Each party presented documentary evidence, oral testimony of witnesses, and made oral argument to this three-person panel.

The three-person panel was composed of H. William Allen, Chris E. Williams and Reginald D. Hamman.

Following the conclusion of the hearing, each party submitted proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and the three-person panel's report and recommendation was presented to a majority of all members of the Commission for decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Judge L. T. Simes is a full-time Circuit Court Judge elected in 1996, and has continuously served in this position since January 1, 1997 until his recent suspension on November 9, 2009, without pay, for the remainder of his term, by order of the Arkansas Supreme Court in the case of *Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission v. Simes*, 2009 Ark. 543 (2009) (the "Chandler Case");

2. The relevant timeline is as follows:

- (a) Case No. 06-260 case was referred to the JDDC by the Supreme Court of Arkansas on June 29, 2006 in the conclusion of its decision in *Weaver v. City of West Helena*, 367 Ark. 159 (2006). As stated by the Court:

“In summation, the procedural requirements for the imposition of sanctions under Rule 11 were disregarded by Judge Simes, and the appellant was subjected to a de facto Rule 11 hearing of which he was given no notice. That hearing occurred before the court attempted to establish the falsity of the allegations in the motion for recusal, and the court ultimately failed to establish that the allegations were false. Judge Simes relied on improper bases in his order imposing the sanctions. For the foregoing reasons, we conclude that Judge Simes abused his discretion by imposing sanctions upon the appellant under Rule 11. Based on the record before us, it appears that Judge Simes has violated the Arkansas Code of Judicial Conduct. Accordingly, we direct the clerk of this court to forward a copy of this opinion to the Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission.”

367 Ark. at 165;

- (b) A Notice of Complaint to Judge Simes was sent by the JDDC on July 7, 2006 to which Judge Simes did not respond¹;
- (c) A second Notice of Complaint was sent to Judge Simes on August 7, 2006 to which Judge Simes did not respond²;
- (d) On November 14, 2006, a letter from Johnny Weaver was sent to the JDDC requesting that his complaint (Case No. 05-112) against Judge Simes be dismissed;

¹ The letter from the Director of the JDDC providing the Notice of Complaint expressly stated, “While there is no requirement that you respond to the allegations in this complaint, please note that at this time the Commission only has information from one side of the issue. The Commission asks that you let it have your comments within 30 days of the date of this letter.” Notice of Complaint Letter dated July 7, 2006.

² The letter from the Director of the JDDC providing the Notice of Complaint expressly stated, “Before determining whether a preliminary investigation will be instituted, the Commission has authorized me to write you and ask that you let it have your comments within 30 days of the date of this letter. By Supreme Court rule you are not required to provide a written response to the complaint at this time. If you elect the option of not responding, it is requested that you so inform this Commission.” Notice of Complaint Letter dated August 7, 2006.

- (e) Inaction on this case between August 7, 2006 and July 18, 2008, during the term of the JDDC's previous Director, is unexplained;
- (f) During the pendency of this case other complaints have been filed against Judge Simes, which resulted in dismissals;
- (g) During the pendency of this case more serious complaints have resulted in public discipline;
- (h) On August 26, 2008, Judge Simes's request for additional time in which to respond to this case was granted;
- (i) A scheduling and discovery teleconference between the parties was held regarding the case on November 5, 2008;
- (j) Documents requested by Judge Simes were mailed by the JDDC on November 5, 2008;
- (k) Judge Simes requested and was granted a continuance in the related cases 05-112/123 on January 12, 2009;
- (l) Judge Simes requested additional time to respond and the hearing was delayed until he filed his response on February 4, 2009;
- (m) The JDDC filed the Notice of Initial Consideration on May 21, 2009;
- (n) Judge Simes requested on June 30, 2009 that the JDDC suspend further consideration of Case No. 06-260 until the Supreme Court takes action on the pending Chandler matter;
- (o) On December 3, 2009, the case was placed back on the JDDC docket after the disposition of the Chandler matter;

- (p) On February 19, 2010, Judge Simes was served with the Probable Cause Disposition;
- (q) On March 19, 2010, pursuant to a motion to dismiss Case Nos. 05-112 and 05-123 filed by the Executive Director of the JDDC, the JDDC (1) dismissed only those allegations in those cases which the Arkansas Supreme Court found to be moot in the appellate case³, and (2) denied the motion as to those allegations, which formed the basis of the Arkansas Supreme Court's reversal of the Respondent's imposition of Rule 11 sanctions in the *Weaver* Case. The JDDC, thereafter, merged what remained of Case Nos. 05-112 and 05-123 with Case No. 06-260;
- (r) On March 23, 2009 Judge Simes was served with the Notice of Formal Disciplinary Hearing with Statement of Allegations included; and
- (s) The hearing date was rescheduled to July 28, 2010, pursuant to Judge Simes's request for a continuance;

3. The latter part of 2004, the Helena Chief of Police, Vincent Bell, was terminated by Mayor Johnny Weaver. The Civil Service Commission conducted a hearing related to the termination. The Civil Service Commission affirmed the termination of Chief Bell and he appealed the decision to Circuit Court. The case was assigned to Judge Harvey Yates, Circuit Case No. 04-398 (the "Yates case");

³ The Arkansas Supreme Court took "judicial notice of the fact that City of West Helena no longer exists as a corporate legal entity. On January 1, 2006, the adjoining cities of Helena and West Helena merged to form the new city of Helena-West Helena. Thus, the particular governmental positions and relationships at issue in the present case [*Weaver* case] are extinct, and our decision would have no practical effect upon the legal controversy here. For the foregoing reasons, we conclude that the points on appeal raised by the appellant, with the exception of the Rule 11 issue which represents an extant monetary obligation, are moot." *Weaver* at 162.

4. In early January 2005, the City Council filed a lawsuit against Mayor Weaver, *City of West Helena v. Johnny Weaver*, No. CV-2005-04 (the “Weaver Case”), seeking a temporary restraining order to prevent Mayor Weaver from interfering in the day-to-day operations of the police department. This case was assigned to Judge Simes;

5. Mayor Weaver retained attorney Todd Murray to represent him in the Weaver Case;

6. Judge Simes granted the City Council’s request for a temporary restraining order, ex parte, and set a hearing for January 6, 2005;

7. On January 6, 2005, the day of the hearing on the temporary restraining order, Mr. Murray filed a motion for recusal or, in the alternative, a motion to transfer or consolidate, alleging: (1) Judge Simes, prior to the filing of the Weaver Case, initiated personal contact with Mayor Weaver, expressed his dissatisfaction with the Mayor’s decision to suspend/terminate Vincent Bell as police chief, and asked the Mayor to “help” Chief Bell, evidencing a personal interest or bias in the matter in controversy; (2) Judge Simes failed to disclose to all parties his ex parte communications; (3) Judge Simes entered his ex parte order in violation of ARCP 65, which requires notice and an opportunity to be heard absent an emergency and/or threat of imminent irreparable harm, and without any facts to support the order; (4) Judge Simes entered his ex parte order despite knowing that another proceeding was pending before another Circuit Judge involving the same question of whether or not Bell should be reinstated as police chief (the Yates Case); (5) Judge Simes made findings in his order having reason to know that one or more of the findings were incorrect or unsupported by the law; (6) Judge Simes, or a member of the Judge’s family, has an economic interest with one or more of the parties to this proceeding. (Motion for Recusal, Jan. 06, 2005);

8. The allegations in the motion for recusal were based on Mayor Weaver's complaint to the JDDC dated January 5, 2005;

9. Prior to taking up the temporary restraining order issue on January 6, 2005, Judge Simes addressed the motion for recusal. Judge Simes began the hearing on the motion for recusal by quoting the Model Rules of Professional Conduct to Mr. Murray. The motion for recusal disturbed Judge Simes, and he testified before the three-member Panel that he thought he was being personally attacked and that Mr. Murray was trying to provoke him. Tr. 26, July 29, 2010;

10. Mr. Murray testified before the three-member Panel that he was worried that Judge Simes was going to hold him in contempt of court for some reason, that he might be put in jail, assessed money sanctions, which would imperil his professional license. Tr. 85, 86, 93, July 28, 2010;

11. Mr. Murray also stated for the record during the Weaver Case that Judge Simes's "demeanor and your facial expressions toward me are very hostile at this point. . . ." During the hearing before the three-member Panel, Mr. Murray testified that Judge Simes raised his voice to him several times. Weaver Case Tr. 24; Hearing Tr. 139;

12. Although Judge Simes mentioned Rule 11 and read Model Rules of Professional Conduct 3.1 several times in the January 6 hearing, he did not give Mr. Murray notice that he was going to conduct a Rule 11 proceeding the following day;

13. During the hearing on the motion for recusal, Judge Simes never denied the allegation that he had initiated a conversation with Mayor Weaver regarding Chief Bell. Although he stated at the JDDC Panel hearing that he knew the allegation was false, he later

testified that “[he] had no recollection of ever having that conversation [the conversation with Mayor Weaver regarding Chief Bell] with Mr. Weaver.” Tr. 28, July 29, 2010;

14. The hearing on the motion to recuse commenced for a second day on January 7, 2005, and Judge Simes began the hearing by reading Rule 11 of the Arkansas Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 3.1 of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct into the record;

15. Despite the fact that Judge Simes stated twice that he was there to hear a motion on recusal, he proceeded to initiate a Rule 11 proceeding, *sua sponte*, without giving notice to Mr. Murray or Mayor Weaver;

16. Judge Simes required Mr. Murray to be a witness in the proceeding without allowing Mr. Murray to be represented by counsel. Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver were sworn in and questioned by Judge Simes;

17. Prior to examining Mr. Murray, at the direction of Judge Simes, Mayor Weaver, a party in the motion for recusal and the subject of a potential contempt order under Rule 11, was escorted from the courtroom by the Sheriff and was not permitted to return until he was called to the stand also to be questioned by the Court. Tr. 88, July 28, 2010;

18. Judge Simes misrepresented the testimony of Mr. Murray in his Order when he found that Mr. Murray had admitted to “judge shopping” when he responded to Judge Simes’s statement that there is an issue in this case about judge shopping by saying, “Yes, sir, there is, I think on both sides.” Despite Mr. Murray’s statement several times that he was not admitting to “judge shopping,” Judge Simes found that he had made such an admission. The Supreme Court characterized this as “a significant misrepresentation.” *Weaver*, 367 Ark. at 164;

19. Judge Simes based his Rule 11 sanctions against Mr. Murray not only on the written motion for recusal, but also on oral statements Mr. Murray and opposing counsel, Bill

Lewellen, made during the hearing, e.g., the “judge shopping” statement and Mr. Lewellen’s statement that Mayor Weaver had made inconsistent statements during his testimony;

20. Judge Simes, in an Order dated April 26, 2005, found that Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver had violated Rule 11 and issued sanctions against them;

21. Prior to the issuance of Judge Simes’s sanction order, Mr. Murray withdrew from the motion for recusal the allegation that Judge Simes knew that a related case had been filed and assigned to Judge Yates. Nevertheless, Judge Simes improperly considered the withdrawn allegation in rendering his Rule 11 sanctions against Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver. Further, on this issue, while Murray had no proof that Judge Simes knew of the Yates case when he took the *Weaver* Case, Judge Simes was on notice once he saw the allegations in the motion for recusal that there was a potential related case in his circuit. Judge Simes testified at the July 28, 2010 hearing before the Panel that while he may have looked at the pleadings in the Yates case, he didn’t make a decision on the simple alternative to recusal by transferring the *Weaver* Case to Judge Yates, as a related case. The Panel finds that the testimony of Judge Simes established that he had a strong interest in retaining the matter in his court;

22. Judge Simes issued his denial of the motion for recusal at a January 26, 2005 hearing;

23. Judge Simes conducted the Rule 11 proceeding prior to deciding the motion for recusal;

24. The statement made by Executive Director David Stewart on November 5, 2009, after the disposition of the Chandler Case by the Arkansas Supreme Court, that since the Court did not bar Simes from running for judge again, the Commission would move forward with two outstanding cases having to do with misconduct (*Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, “Justices Suspend

Simes,” November 6, 2009) is not evidence of any retaliatory motive by the JDDC in disposing of the pending cases against Judge Simes;

25. Judge Simes’s actions resulting in a finding of abuse of discretion by the Arkansas Supreme Court were taken in bad faith and are cause for discipline under the Code of Judicial Conduct;

26. Judge Simes has four prior public action letters from the JDDC: a public informal adjustment (03-178), a letter of admonishment (04-206), a letter of reprimand (07-259), and a suspension from office (without pay) for the rest of his term (06-171). Judge Simes has had numerous complaints filed against him, which have resulted in dismissals for various reasons; and

27. The facts establish that there are no circumstances that mitigate the degree of any discipline or eliminate the cause for discipline completely.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Viewed in the totality of circumstances, despite the unexplained reasons for the initial delay in processing the case, Judge Simes’s failure to respond timely to the notices of complaint, his requests for additional time in which to respond to the complaint, and his requests for suspension of the proceedings and continuances, Judge L. T. Simes was afforded due process and basic fairness in the disposition of this case. Further, any delay in the initial processing of Case No. 06-260 by the JDDC was subsequently waived by Judge Simes by his subsequent requests for additional time in which to respond to the complaint, request for suspension of the proceedings in this case until the disposition of the *Chandler* Case, and his requests for other continuances. At the hearing of this matter on July 28-29, 2010, Judge Simes was afforded the opportunity to call and cross-examine witnesses and to make oral argument. Judge Simes has

failed to demonstrate any prejudice to him as a consequence of the initial delay of the processing of this case.

2. Due to the personal nature of the allegations in the motion for recusal, which resulted in the court-initiated Rule 11 sanctions, and the fact that Judge Simes viewed the motion for recusal as a personal attack by Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver, Judge Simes should have recused from the Rule 11 proceedings or explored the alternative of transferring the *Weaver* Case to Judge Yates.

In *Allen v. Rutledge*, 355 Ark. 392 (2003), the Arkansas Supreme Court found that a circuit judge should have recused from a Rule 11 sanction because he was personally embroiled in the dispute. The Court in making its finding cites *Clark v. State*, 287 Ark. 221, 697 S.W.2d 895 (1985), in which the court held:

These remarks indicate that the judge became “embroiled in a personal dispute”, *Meyer, supra*, with the appellant. Even though the judge’s objectivity may not have been affected by the appellant’s attack, “justice must satisfy the appearance of justice.” *Offutt v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11 (1954). Accordingly, the trial judge under these circumstances should have recused from hearing the contempt charge. As stated by Chief Justice Taft in *Cooker v. United States*, 267 U.S. 517, 539 (1925):

[A]ll of such cases . . . present difficult questions for the judge. All we can say on the whole matter is that where conditions do not make it impracticable, or where the delay may not injure public or private rights, a judge called upon to act in a case of contempt by personal attack upon him, may, without flinching from his duty, properly ask that one of his fellow judges take his place.

By our holding we do not intend that all contempts not committed in the immediate view and presence of the court, must be tried by a third party. But where direct personal attack is made on a judge which is the subject of a contempt charge by that judge, or contemptuous conduct occurs which necessitates a factual hearing on the allegations made against the judge (as seems to have been contemplated in this case), to ensure a fair and impartial hearing the judge must recuse.

Allen v. Rutledge at 403.

Judge Simes's failure to recuse from conducting the Rule 11 proceedings against Mr.

Murray and Mayor Weaver violates:

Canon 2. A judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all of the judge's activities.

A. A judge shall respect and comply with the law and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

Commentary

Public confidence in the judiciary is eroded by irresponsible or improper conduct by judges.

Canon 3. A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently.

B. *Adjudicative Responsibilities.*

(1) A judge shall hear and decide matters assigned to the judge except those in which disqualification is required.

3. Judge Simes subjected Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver to a *de facto* Rule 11 hearing of which they were given no notice in violation of:

Canon 2. A judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all of the judge's activities.

A. A judge shall respect and comply with the law and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary;

Canon 3: A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently.

B. *Adjudicative Responsibilities.*

(2) A judge shall be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it.

4. Judge Simes conducted the Rule 11 proceedings before the court attempted to establish the falsity of the allegations in the motion for recusal, and the court ultimately failed to

establish the allegations were false. Judge Simes proceeded to court-initiated Rule 11 sanctions before the falsity of the motion for recusal allegations was established. Because Judge Simes was the subject of the allegations, it was improper for him to conduct the Rule 11 proceedings in violation of:

Canon 2. A judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all of the judge's activities.

A. A judge shall respect and comply with the law and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary

Canon 3. A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently.

B. *Adjudicative Responsibilities.*

(2) A judge shall be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it;

(7) A judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law.

...

Commentary:

A judge must not independently investigate facts in a case and must consider only the evidence presented.

5. In his conduct of the hearing on the motion for recusal, which the following day became a Rule 11 proceeding, Judge Simes's facial expression and body language toward Mr. Murray gave an appearance of judicial bias in violation of:

Canon 3. A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently.

B. *Adjudicative Responsibilities.*

(5) A judge shall perform judicial duties without bias or prejudice. A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct manifest bias or prejudice. . . .

Commentary:

A judge must perform judicial duties impartially and fairly. A judge who manifests bias on any basis in a proceeding impairs the fairness of the proceeding and brings the judiciary into disrepute. Facial expression and body language, in addition to oral communication, can give to parties or lawyers in the proceeding, jurors, the media and others an appearance of judicial bias. A judge must be alert to avoid behavior that may be perceived as prejudicial.

6. Judge Simes relied on improper bases in his order imposing the sanctions. Ark. R. Civ. P. 11 applies only to assertions contained in papers filed with or submitted to the court. Judge Simes not only used written allegations that Mr. Murray had withdrawn prior to his decision on sanctions, but also considered oral statements made by Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver in making his determination on Rule 11 sanctions. Further, Judge Simes misrepresented the testimony of Mr. Murray in his Order when he found that Mr. Murray had admitted to “judge shopping” when he responded to Judge Simes’s statement that there was an issue in this case about judge shopping. Judge Simes’s conduct violates:

Canon 1. A judge shall uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary.

An independent and honorable judiciary is indispensable to justice in our society. A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining and enforcing high standards of conduct, and shall personally observe those standards so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary will be preserved;

Canon 3. A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently.

B. Adjudicative Responsibilities.

(2) A judge shall be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it.

7. In determining the appropriate sanctions, the Arkansas Supreme Court set forth in *Judicial Discipline and Disability Comm. v. Morris W. Thompson*, 341 Ark. 253, 278 (2000), several factors to be considered:

(a) whether the misconduct is an isolated instance or evidences a pattern of conduct:

This is not an isolated instance; Judge Simes has four other complaints that resulted in public discipline action;

(b) the nature, extent and frequency of occurrence of the acts of misconduct:

The nature of Judge Simes's conduct in this matter is egregious in that the Bar should not be afraid to file good faith pleadings, motions, or other papers in the court, including motions of recusal; Judge Simes's failure to recuse from the Rule 11 proceedings was a willful and wanton disregard of his judicial duties; Judge Simes's initiating Rule 11 sanctions against Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver without notice was a blatant disregard for due process; Judge Simes's intentional misrepresentation of Mr. Murray's testimony in support of Rule 11 sanctions causes harm to the public's confidence in the integrity and independence of judges;

The nature of Judge Simes's misconduct shows an overall bad faith in the carrying out of his judicial duties, and could have a chilling effect upon the members of the Bar who practice in his judicial district;

(c) whether the misconduct occurred in or out of the courtroom:

The misconduct that is the subject of this matter occurred in the courtroom while Judge Simes was presiding over the *Weaver Case*;

(d) whether the misconduct occurred in the judge's official capacity or in his private life;

The misconduct occurred in the judge's official capacity.

(e) whether the judge has acknowledged or recognized that the acts occurred;

Judge Simes has acknowledged that he presided over the Rule 11 proceeding, but maintains a different view of the facts and interpretation of the law.

(f) whether the judge has evidenced an effort to change or modify his conduct;

Judge Simes, based upon his demeanor before the three-member Panel, does not appear to understand the seriousness of his misconduct. He has been a circuit judge for over 13 years; he has been publicly disciplined four times. The last discipline resulted in his suspension without pay for the remainder of his term. Judge Simes appears to have a proclivity for making decisions that result in negatively affecting the integrity of the judiciary.

(g) the length of time on the bench;

Judge Simes has served as a circuit judge since January 1, 1997.

(h) whether there have been prior complaints about this judge;

As stated above, there have been four complaints, which have resulted in public discipline, with each complaint resulting in more serious discipline, leading to the most recent discipline of suspension for the remainder of his term without pay.

(i) the effect the misconduct has upon the integrity of and respect for the judiciary;

The integrity and respect for the judiciary is harmed when a judge acts as prosecutor and judge in a matter that involves him personally. The integrity and respect for the judiciary is harmed when a judge misrepresents the testimony of a witness, in order to support his findings and sanctions. The integrity and respect for the judiciary is harmed when a judge removes a party to a legal action from court proceedings in which the party is subject to potential sanctions by the judge. Rule 11 is not intended to chill an attorney's enthusiasm or creativity in pursuing factual or legal theories. Members of the Bar should not be in fear that if they file pleadings or papers with the court, in good faith, including moving for the recusal of a judge, that they will be subjected to court-initiated Rule 11 sanctions, and without appropriate notice.

(j) the extent to which the judge exploited his position to satisfy his personal desires.

The evidence reflects that Judge Simes was motivated to keep this case and punish the parties out of a personal interest, which takes his actions beyond merely making an error of law as found by the Supreme Court and subjects him to discipline.

RECOMMENDATION

Consistent with the Rules of Procedure of this Commission, a majority of all members of the Commission adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth herein, and pursuant

to the factors enumerated by the Arkansas Supreme Court in *Judicial Discipline and Disability Comm. v. Morris W. Thompson*, 341 Ark. 253, 278 (2000), recommend that Circuit Judge L. T. Simes be removed from his position as the Circuit Judge of the First Judicial District.

Respectfully submitted this 19th day of November 2010.



JOHN EVERETT, VICE-CHAIR

RECEIVED

IN THE ARKANSAS JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE AND DISABILITY COMMISSION

10 NOV 19 AM 10: 51

IN RE: CIRCUIT JUDGE L. T. SIMES
CASE # 06-260, 05-123

JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE
AND
DISABILITY COMMISSION

DISSENT: JUDGE LEON N. JAMISON

Leon N. Jamison, a judicial member of the Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission, states for his dissent the following:

1. Findings of Fact 2(b)&(c) are irrelevant to this proceeding. Judge Simes had no obligation to respond to the letters. These two facts leave the impression that Judges Simes' lack of a response caused a delay in the processing of the case.

2. Finding of Fact 13 is incorrect. During the hearing of July 29, 2010, Judge Simes testified as follows:

At the time that I signed the TRO I had never spoken to Mr. Weaver in my car, at the radio station, and never asked him to help Chief Bell. July 29 Tr. p. 26, lines 9, 10, & 11.

3. The first sentence of Finding of Fact 16 is incorrect. Mr. Murray never requested counsel. Mr. Murray's right to counsel, as an issue, was never before Judge Simes. Moreover, the record showed that attorneys were willing to represent Mr. Murray, but Mr. Murray did not want representation.

4. I disagree with Finding of Fact 21. The finding that "Judge Simes's had a strong interest in retaining the matter in his court is conclusory. This finding is not supported by clear and convincing evidence. Moreover, the proof did not show that Judge Yates' case was a companion case. Judge Simes was "clothed" with the presumption of impartiality. The proof never overcame that presumption.

5. Finding of Fact 25 is incorrect. The finding of bad faith is conclusory. Judge Simes engaged in mere legal error. The evidence did not support a finding of bad faith. See Gray, *The Line Between Legal Error and Judicial Misconduct: Balancing Judicial Independence and Accountability*, Hofstra Law Review, 1245, 1279. Bad Faith has been defined as acts within the lawful power of a judge which nevertheless are committed for a corrupt purpose, i.e. for any purpose other than the faithful discharge of judicial duties. Gray, *The Line Between Legal Error and Judicial Misconduct: Balancing Judicial Independence and Accountability*, Hofstra Law Review, 1245, 1265.

6. The record did not establish by clear and convincing evidence that Judge Simes should be subjected to discipline because of the manner in which he conducted the Rule 11 proceeding in *Weaver v. City of West Helena*, 367 Ark. 159 (2006). Judge Simes' actions during this Rule 11 proceeding were mere legal error. Judge Simes' error was corrected on appeal.

7. Rule 9B of the Rules of Procedure of the Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission (1989) says:

In the absence of fraud, corrupt motive, or bad faith, the Commission shall not take action against a judge for making findings of fact, reaching a legal conclusion or applying the law as he understands it.

8. Judge Simes testified that he followed Rule 11 as he understood it. The record seems to show that Judge Simes had used Rule 11 infrequently. Judge Simes testified:

If my memory serves me correctly, this is the first instance wherein I felt it was appropriate to sanction the attorney and the client. If my memory serves me correct, I've never done it before and I wouldn't have done it in this instance unless I thought it was appropriate. July 28 Tr. p. 33, lines 1 thru 8.

9. Rule 11 may be confusing for judges and lawyers. See the colloquy between Chairman Allen and Mr. Sachar. July 28 Tr. p. 39, lines 18 thru 40, & p. 40 lines 1 thru 20. Rule 11(a) provides that if this rule is violated, the court, upon motion or its own initiative, shall impose an appropriate sanction. There is no “safe harbor” provision in Rule 11(a). Judge Simes should not be disciplined, because at the time Judge Simes imposed sanctions against Mr. Murray and Mayor Weaver, the law might not have been well settled regarding Rule 11(a) and Rule 11(b). See Gray, *The Line Between Legal Error and Judicial Misconduct: Balancing Judicial Independence and Accountability*, Hofstra Law Review, 1245, 1259.

Although I think the Court should dismiss this case, I recommend a reprimand if the Court disagrees. My reasons are:

1. This matter is before the commission because of a referral by the Court in *Weaver v. City of West Helena*, 367 Ark. 159 (2006). The date of the Court’s opinion is June 29, 2006. The Court, in *Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission vs. Simes*, 2009 Ark. 543, suspended Judge Simes on November 9, 2009 for the remainder of his term without pay. Contrary to the recommendation of the commission, the Court did not remove Judge Simes from office. His removal would have barred Judge Simes from running for a judicial office again. Judge Simes was reelected in May 2010.

2. Mayor Weaver initiated his complaint against Judge Simes on January 10, 2005. Mayor Weaver requested a withdrawal of the complaint. By letter of November 14, 2006, Mayor Weaver wrote, among other things, that Judge Simes was an honorable man and that he would testify for

Judge Simes as it related to Judge Simes' overall fitness to hold this public office. More important, Mayor Weaver wrote contradictory letters to Mr. Badami. Because of Mayor Weaver's correspondence with Mr. Badami, Mayor Weaver raised the issue of his on credibility. See Respondent's Exhibits 18 & 19. Any finding of bad faith concerning the Rule 11 proceeding has to be inextricably linked to what Mayor Weaver told Mr. Murray. As stated earlier, Judge Simes should not be removed from office for mere legal error. Moreover, the commission should have heard Mayor Weaver's testimony. Judge Simes should not be removed from office on the sole testimony of Mr. Murray.

3. The Commission took no action regarding the Court's referral for approximately two years (June 30, 2006 to July 18, 2008). I would dismiss this proceeding because it has been pending for more than four years. Moreover, I cannot recommend Judge Simes's removal from office because of the staleness of this case.

4. In *Chandler*, the Court decided not to remove Judge Simes from office. If removal had happened, Judge Simes could not have run unopposed for the office of circuit judge in May 2010. Judge Simes is scheduled to take office on January 1, 2011. During the pendency of *Chandler*, Judge Simes had been disciplined three times. Nevertheless, the Court did not find it appropriate to permanently bar Judge Simes from holding judicial office.

5. Judge Simes has been reelected. Judge Simes was reelected although he had been disciplined four times at the time of the election. Judge Simes' reelection to a six-year term should not be overturned by Judge Simes's removal from office.

6. Judge Simes's disciplinary actions were initiated between 2003 and 2007. Since 2007,

Judge Simes' complaints have been dismissed because of no merit. It would appear that Judge Simes is on track to avoid disciplinary proceedings in the future. Consequently, Judge Simes should not be removed from office.

Respectfully,



Leon N. Jamison, Chair

Dated this 19th day of November, 2010.