

PUBLIC SANCTIONS

FY 2012

Last Updated: April 16, 2012

The following are public sanctions (reproduced in their entirety) which were issued by the Commission during fiscal year 2012. The public records for these cases are available for inspection at the Commission's offices located at 300 W. 15th Street, Suite 415, Austin, Texas.



BEFORE THE STATE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

CJC No. 10-1018-JP

PUBLIC ADMONITION

**HONORABLE JEFF COX
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 1
HEMPHILL, SABINE COUNTY, TEXAS**

During its meeting on August 18, 2011, the State Commission on Judicial Conduct concluded a review of the allegations against the Honorable Jeff Cox, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 1, Hemphill, Sabine County, Texas. Judge Cox was advised by letter of the Commission's concerns and provided a written response. After considering the evidence before it, the Commission entered the following Findings and Conclusions.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. At all times relevant hereto, the Honorable Jeff Cox was Justice of the Peace for Precinct 1 in Hemphill, Sabine County, Texas.
2. On November 24, 2009, Texas Park and Wildlife Game Warden Randy Button (“Button”) cited Nathan Ener (“Ener”) for failing to complete the harvest log on the back of his hunting license after killing a buck white-tail deer.
3. On November 25, 2009, Judge Cox and Button met outside the judge’s house to discuss the Ener citation.
4. Without the judge’s knowledge, Button recorded their conversation using his truck’s dash cam and a lapel microphone.
5. Based on the recording provided to the Commission, the following discussion occurred outside the judge’s home:
 - a Judge Cox and Button exchanged pleasantries and discussed Button’s struggles with a local automobile dealer;
 - b Judge Cox then initiated a conversation about the citation by asking Button to “tell me about your deal with Ener;”
 - c After Button discussed the circumstances leading to the issuance of the citation, Judge Cox informed Button that he was going to dismiss the citation to avoid a potential official oppression lawsuit from being filed against Button and other county officials by Ener;
 - d Judge Cox went on to explain that Ener and others wanted to “stir up stuff” about the Sheriff, and that the citation issued by Button “will open up a shit storm.”
 - e Judge Cox informed Button that he had learned of Ener’s plans through private conversations with Ener;
 - f Judge Cox advised Button that the dismissal would prevent Ener from “muddy[ing] your [Button’s] name for bullshit;” and
 - g Judge Cox told Button, “a \$160 ticket ain’t worth that.”
6. On or about December 8, 2009, Ener appeared in Judge Cox’s court, entered a plea of not guilty, and requested a bench trial. Thereafter, Ener filed motions to obtain discovery from the State, as well as a motion to dismiss.
7. On March 4, 2010, Judge Cox granted Ener’s motion and dismissed the case against Ener with prejudice. There is no evidence that the prosecutor was involved in this process.
8. In his written responses to the Commission’s inquiry, Judge Cox acknowledged having the conversation with Button about the Ener citation, stating that, “I was off work and thought I was visiting with a friend.” Judge Cox added that he did not know he was being recorded by Button and did not believe he was performing any official duties at the time.

9. Judge Cox explained that he told Button the citation had no merit and would only serve as a catalyst for Ener to make trouble for the county.
10. Judge Cox admitted that he unilaterally dismissed the citation against Ener, and that the prosecutor played no part in the process.
11. Judge Cox stated that his decision was based on his belief that “justice would be served” by dismissing the citation.
12. The November 25, 2009 meeting and conversation between Judge Cox and Button gained local media attention.

RELEVANT STANDARDS

1. Canon 2A of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part: “A judge shall comply with the law and should act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.”
2. Canon 3B(2) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part: “A judge shall not be swayed by partisan interests, public clamor, or fear of criticism.”
3. Canon 6C(2) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part, that a judge, “except as authorized by law, shall not directly or indirectly initiate, permit, nor consider *ex parte* or other communications concerning the merits of a pending judicial proceeding.”
4. Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution states in pertinent part that a judge may be disciplined for “willful or persistent conduct that is clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of his duties or casts public discredit upon the judiciary or administration of justice.”

CONCLUSION

The Commission concludes from the facts and evidence presented that Judge Cox failed to comply with the law by unilaterally dismissing a criminal case without the consent of the State and was swayed to dismiss the criminal case based on improper *ex parte* communications with the defendant and the fear of a potential lawsuit. This conduct was clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of the judge’s duties and cast public discredit upon the judiciary and the administration of justice, in violation of Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution. The Commission concludes that Judge Cox’s conduct, as described herein, constituted willful or persistent violations of Canons 2A, 3B(2) and 6C(2) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct and Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution.

In condemnation of the conduct described above that violated Canons 2A, 3B(2) and 6C(2) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct, and Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution, it is the Commission’s decision to issue a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** to the Honorable Jeff Cox, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 1, Hemphill, Sabine County, Texas.

Pursuant to the authority contained in Article V, §1-a(8) of the Texas Constitution, it is ordered that the actions described above be made the subject of a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** by the Commission.

The Commission has taken this action in a continuing effort to protect public confidence in the judicial system and to assist the state's judiciary in its efforts to embody the principles and values set forth in the Texas Constitution and the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct.

Issued this 8th day of September, 2011.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Honorable Jorge C. Rangel, Chair
State Commission on Judicial Conduct

**JUDGE HAS APPEALED SANCTION BELOW TO
SPECIAL COURT OF REVIEW
APPOINTED BY TEXAS SUPREME COURT ON 04/09/12**



**BEFORE THE
STATE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT**

CJC No. 09-1028-JP

PUBLIC ADMONITION

**HONORABLE J. KENT ADAMS
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 4, PLACE 1
SPRING, HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS**

During its meeting on October 13, 2011, the State Commission on Judicial Conduct concluded a review of the allegations against the Honorable J. Kent Adams, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 4, Place 1, Spring, Harris County, Texas. Judge Adams

was advised by letter of the Commission's concerns and provided a written response. Judge Adams appeared with counsel before the Commission on August 13, 2010, and gave testimony. The Commission tabled the matter pending further investigation. After considering the evidence before it, the Commission entered the following Findings and Conclusion:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. At all times relevant hereto, the Honorable J. Kent Adams was Justice of the Peace for Precinct 4, Place 1, in Spring, Harris County, Texas.
2. Mary K. Martin ("Martin") had a 17-year old son who was charged with Failure to Attend School.
3. On or about June 26, 2009, Martin appeared in Judge Adams' court on the charge of Parent Contributing to Nonattendance.
4. According to Martin, she observed Judge Adams use unprofessional and offensive comments toward defendants and their parents in court.
5. Martin also observed that Judge Adams asked only the Hispanic parents and their children whether they were born in Mexico, if they were United States citizens, and why they had not learned English.
6. In his testimony before the Commission, Judge Adams acknowledged that he had used a term that is considered by many to be vulgar. Judge Adams stated that he was unaware until he received the complaint that the term was vulgar, but he has stopped using the term in court.
7. Judge Adams also acknowledged that he has asked the parents of certain students if their child was born in the United States. According to the judge, if the parents respond, "no," and confirm their status as illegal immigrants, he contacts Immigration and Customs Enforcement.
8. Judge Adams confirmed that he does not ask the question in order to ascertain the need for a translator.
9. Judge Adams also confirmed that he does not ask the question of non-Hispanic parents or students.

RELEVANT STANDARDS

1. Canon 3B(4) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part: "A judge shall be patient, dignified and courteous to litigants,...and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity..."
2. Canon 3B(5) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states that "A judge shall perform judicial duties without bias or prejudice."
3. Canon 3B(6) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part: "A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct

manifest bias or prejudice, including but not limited to bias or prejudice based upon race, sex, religion, natural origin, disability, age sexual orientation or socioeconomic status...”

CONCLUSION

The Commission concludes based on the facts and evidence before it that Judge Adams’ use of a vulgar term while interacting with litigants in court constituted undignified and discourteous treatment of those litigants. Additionally, his gratuitous inquiry into immigration matters for purposes unrelated to the matters pending in his court, combined with the fact that he singled out Hispanic parents and their children for questioning about their immigration status, manifested bias or prejudice on the basis of natural origin, race, and socioeconomic status. When deciding the truancy matters pending before him, Judge Adams is required to ensure and demonstrate that he is impartial, fair and neutral, and that his decisions and actions are not influenced by a particular defendant’s immigration status. The Commission concludes that Judge Adams’ conduct in this matter constituted willful violations of Canons 3B(4), 3B(5) and 3B(6) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct.

In condemnation of the conduct described above that violated Canons 3B(4), 3B(5) and 3B(6) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct, it is the Commission’s decision to issue a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** to the Honorable J. Kent Adams, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 4, Place 1, Spring, Harris County, Texas.

Pursuant to the authority contained in Article V, § 1-a(8) of the Texas Constitution, it is ordered that the conduct described above be made the subject of a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** by the State Commission on Judicial Conduct.

The Commission takes this action in a continuing effort to protect public confidence in the judicial system, and to assist the state judiciary in its efforts to embody the principles and values set forth in the Texas Constitution and the Code of Judicial Conduct.

Issued this 20th day of October, 2011.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Honorable Jorge C. Rangel, Chair
State Commission on Judicial Conduct





**BEFORE THE
STATE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT**

CJC No. 12-0048-JP

PUBLIC ADMONITION

**HONORABLE BOBBY R. NICHOLDS
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 3
TRINITY, TRINITY COUNTY, TEXAS**

During its meeting on December 7-8, 2011, the State Commission on Judicial Conduct concluded a review of allegations against the Honorable Bobby R. Nicholds, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 3, Trinity, Trinity County, Texas. Judge Nicholds was advised by letter of the Commission's concerns and provided written responses. After considering the evidence before it, the Commission entered the following Findings and Conclusion:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. At all times relevant hereto, the Honorable Bobby R. Nicholds was Justice of the Peace, Precinct 3, Trinity, Trinity County, Texas.
2. On or about April 22, 2011, a defendant was arrested following a grand jury indictment charging her with one count of burglary of a habitation.
3. Following the arrest, Justice of the Peace Bernie Beard magistrated the defendant and set bond at \$50,000.00 (hereinafter the "first bond").
4. While out on bond, the defendant was indicted on three separate counts of burglary of a habitation.
5. On June 7, 2011, Judge Beard magistrated the defendant on the new burglary charges and set an additional bond of \$35,000.00 (hereinafter the "second bond").
6. At the time of the arrests, Judge Nicholds was living with the defendant's mother.
7. After the second bond was set, Judge Nicholds immediately telephoned Judge Beard to express his opinion that an additional bond should not have been set and that the defendant should have been released from custody under the first bond.

8. When the defendant was placed in a patrol car, Judge Nicholds approached the vehicle to speak to the deputy constables before they transported her to the county jail.
9. During the conversation, Judge Nicholds made several comments indicating that he was a “good friend” of the defendant’s mother; that the defendant’s mother lived with him; and that the defendant’s mother could not afford to post a second bond.
10. Judge Nicholds repeatedly expressed his dissatisfaction that a second bond had been set, and stated (referring to Judge Beard): “I’m going to try to get that man’s job. That’s what I’m going to do. He’s just picking on people . . . Damn Bastard.”
11. Judge Nicholds also told the deputies that he thought the constable’s office was “picking on” the defendant.
12. The entire conversation was recorded on the patrol car’s dash-cam video.
13. Shortly thereafter, Judge Nicholds contacted the district attorney who was prosecuting the defendant’s case. In that conversation, Judge Nicholds expressed frustration that Judge Beard had set an additional bond in the case, and stated his opinion that the defendant should have been released on the first bond.
14. Judge Nicholds subsequently spoke with the district judge in whose court the defendant’s cases were pending, and again expressed his opinion that Judge Beard should not have set a second bond in the case.
15. Thereafter, the district judge, upon agreement with the district attorney, discharged the second bond, and released the defendant from custody under the first bond.
16. Shortly after the defendant was released, a deputy constable observed what he believed to be suspicious activities at an apartment that the defendant shared with her boyfriend, and reported his suspicions to the defendant’s landlord.
17. When Judge Nicholds learned about the deputy’s report, he contacted the landlord and advised him that he believed the defendant was not doing anything “wrong” and that “everything was okay” at the apartment.
18. Judge Nicholds also spoke with the deputy constable who made the report and accused him of harassing the defendant.
19. Shortly thereafter, Judge Nicholds contacted the constable’s office and spoke with a constable about the deputy’s report. During the conversation, which the constable recorded, Judge Nicholds informed him that the defendant’s mother was his “good friend,” and that, in his opinion, the defendant was “not doing anything wrong.”
20. Judge Nicholds also advised the constable that he had already spoken to the defendant’s landlord about the situation, explaining that he did not want the defendant to “lose her place.”

21. Throughout the conversation, Judge Nicholds accused the constable's office of "harassing" and "picking on" the defendant, and complained that the constable's deputies "ke[pt] going by" the defendant's apartment.
22. Judge Nicholds also repeatedly requested that the constable's office leave the defendant and him alone.
23. Judge Nicholds assured the constable that he was not trying to tell him "how to do his job," but stated that he would "protect anybody" that he believed the constable's office was harassing.

RELEVANT STANDARD

Canon 2B of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part: "A judge shall not allow any relationship to influence judicial conduct or judgment. A judge shall not lend the prestige of judicial office to advance the private interests of the judge or others; nor shall a judge convey or permit others to convey the impression that they are in a special position to influence the judge."

CONCLUSION

The Commission concludes based on the facts and evidence before it that Judge Nicholds allowed his relationship with a criminal defendant and her mother to influence his conduct and judgment, causing him to repeatedly intercede in a pending criminal matter on behalf of the defendant. The judge's activities on behalf of the defendant lent the prestige of his judicial office to advance her and her mother's private interests, particularly when he (1) contacted the prosecutor and the district judge in an attempt to influence them to discharge the second bond and to release her from custody on her first bond; and (2) attempted to influence law enforcement officials to curtail any investigation into possible on-going criminal activities by the defendant. The Commission concludes that Judge Nicholds' conduct in this matter constituted willful and/or persistent violations of Canon 2B of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct.

In condemnation of the conduct described above that violated Canon 2B of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct, it is the Commission's decision to issue a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** to the Honorable Bobby R. Nicholds, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 3, Trinity, Trinity County, Texas.

Pursuant to the authority contained in Article V, §1-a(8) of the Texas Constitution, it is ordered that the actions described above be made the subject of a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** by the Commission.

The Commission has taken this action in a continuing effort to protect the public confidence in the judicial system and to assist the state's judiciary in its efforts to embody the principles and values set forth in the Texas Constitution and the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct.

Issued this the 3rd day of January, 2012.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Tom Cunningham, Chair
State Commission on Judicial Conduct

**JUDGE HAS APPEALED
SANCTION BELOW TO
SPECIAL COURT OF REVIEW
APPOINTED BY TEXAS
SUPREME COURT ON 04/16/12**



**BEFORE THE
STATE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT**

CJC Nos. 11-0141-JP and 11-0514-JP

PUBLIC ADMONITION

**HONORABLE J. KENT ADAMS
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, PRECINCT 4, PLACE 1
SPRING, HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS**

During its meeting on February 16, 2012, the State Commission on Judicial Conduct concluded its review of the allegations against the Honorable J. Kent Adams, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 4, Place 1, Spring, Harris County, Texas. Judge Adams was advised by letter of the Commission's concerns and provided a written response. Judge Adams appeared before the Commission, with counsel, on February 16, 2012, and

provided testimony. After considering the evidence before it, the Commission entered the following Findings and Conclusions.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. At all times relevant hereto, the Honorable J. Kent Adams was Justice of the Peace for Precinct 4, Place 1 in Spring, Harris County, Texas.

CJC No. 11-0141-JP

2. Attorney Henry Nguyen (“Nguyen”) was hired to represent Drew Zardeneta, who had been cited for Disorderly Conduct. The case was filed in Judge Adams’ court.
3. In preparation for trial, Nguyen filed subpoenas and subpoenas *duces tecum* seeking various school records. The prosecutor filed motions to quash the subpoenas and requested a hearing.
4. On December 9, 2009, Nguyen and prosecutor Kristin Brown (“Brown”) were escorted to Judge Adams’ chambers, where the judge convened the hearing.
5. After Brown presented arguments in favor of quashing the subpoenas, Nguyen attempted to explain why he needed the records from the school, but was interrupted by the judge.
6. As the conversation between Judge Adams and Nguyen became more contentious, Judge Adams became impatient with Nguyen and used an expletive to express his frustration.
7. According to Nguyen, Judge Adams called him “boy” and told him that “those records are none of your goddamn business.”
8. Nguyen also reported that Judge Adams referred to Nguyen’s client as a “little brat nosed, punk ass kid with a foul mouth and bad attitude” and further remarked that the “Kid has money to go and hire an attorney to file all of these motions and asking for this and that.”
9. Judge Adams disputes Nguyen’s version of events, but acknowledges using the expletive “goddamn” in the course of this heated conversation.
10. Believing that Judge Adams would not be fair and impartial while presiding over his client’s case following this exchange, Nguyen filed a Motion to Recuse the judge. Nguyen attached an affidavit to the motion reciting the above facts in support thereof.
11. According to Nguyen, after Judge Adams received the Motion to Recuse, the judge contacted Brown’s supervisor, Johanna Craft (“Craft”), and had her relay a message to Nguyen that the judge wanted an apology.
12. Nguyen advised Craft that he would not be apologizing for stating the truth in his affidavit.

13. Nguyen was later contacted by Rich Schmidt, Judge Adams' head clerk, who advised Nguyen that if he filed a "plain vanilla" motion to recuse, Judge Adams would sign it and recuse from the case. Nguyen agreed to this offer.
14. On February 9, 2010, Nguyen filed what he believed to be the "plain vanilla" motion requested by the judge; however, although the motion was entitled "Amended Motion to Recuse," and contained no affidavit, it contained essentially the same allegations of bias as he had previously filed.
15. Shortly thereafter, Craft contacted Nguyen and advised him that Judge Adams was not willing to sign the "plain vanilla" motion to recuse.
16. According to Nguyen, Craft also told him that Judge Adams had called Brown into his office in an unsuccessful attempt to persuade her to sign an affidavit stating that the allegations in Nguyen's affidavit were false. This was later confirmed to Nguyen by Brown. Judge Adams was also unsuccessful in his attempt to persuade Craft to file perjury charges against Nguyen.
17. Judge Adams eventually forwarded the Motion to Recuse to the presiding administrative judge, and shortly thereafter, on May 13, 2010, that judge conducted a hearing on the matter.
18. Following the hearing, Judge Adams was recused from the case, which was then assigned to another court.

CJC No. 11-0514-JP

19. On February 1, 2011, Carol Knudson's ("Knudson") and her 13-year old son appeared in Judge Adams' court after her son was charged with Disrupting School Transportation.
20. According to Knudson, while waiting for her son's case to be called, she observed Judge Adams exhibiting poor judicial demeanor towards certain defendants and their parents in court.
21. Specifically, Knudson claimed that Judge Adams:
 - a. told a defendant that he would "throw his twat in jail;"
 - b. asked an African-American parent "if she was on welfare and expected the government to pay her fine;"
 - c. asked a Hispanic parent "if she had 6 or 7 kids;"
 - d. told a Pakistani parent that her son should be "stoned to death."
22. Knudson went on to describe how Judge Adams yelled at her son because his hair was long and fell over his eye.
23. Knudson stated that the experience in Judge Adams' court was so traumatic that she decided to pay her son's fine rather than have to appear again in front of this judge.

24. In his testimony before the Commission, Judge Adams stated that he did not recall using the word “twat,” but if he did, it slipped out inadvertently. The judge added that he had only recently learned that the term was offensive.
25. The judge acknowledged having discussions with the African-American, Hispanic, and Pakistani parents identified by Knudson, but attempted to place his statements in context.
26. Judge Adams went on to surmise that Knudson may have misunderstood that there would have been valid reasons for a judge to have made these inquiries and comments in connection with the facts and evidence before him at the time.
27. For example, with regard to the Pakistani parent, Judge Adams explained that he had been advised in previous court appearances involving this defendant that the parents wanted to send their son to Pakistan to live with an uncle. At the February 1st court appearance, Judge Adams reminded the defendant that he was fortunate to be living in the United States rather than Pakistan, where being stoned to death is a punishment for certain criminal behaviors.
28. According to the judge, the inquiry of the African-American parent was to determine if she was indigent, and the question posed to the Hispanic parent was to determine if she qualified for special services at MHMR.

RELEVANT STANDARDS

1. Canon 2A of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states that “[a] judge shall comply with the law and should act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.”
2. Canon 3B(2) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part, that “[a] judge shall maintain professional competence in [the law.]”
3. Canon 3B(4) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part: “A judge shall be patient, dignified and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity...”
4. Canon 3B(5) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part: “A judge shall perform judicial duties without bias or prejudice.”
5. Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution states, in part, that a judge may be disciplined for “willful or persistent violation of rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of Texas, incompetence in performing the duties of the office, willful violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct, or willful or persistent conduct that is clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of his duties or casts public discredit upon the judiciary or administration of justice.”

CONCLUSION

Regarding CJC No. 11-0141-JP, the Commission concludes from the facts and evidence presented that Judge Adams failed to comply with the law and demonstrated a lack of professional competence in the law by failing to promptly forward the Motion to Recuse to the presiding administrative judge for resolution. While Nguyen’s allegations

of bias may have offended the judge, who disputed the events described in Nguyen's affidavit, the judge's attempts to negotiate the contents of the motion with Nguyen, coupled with his efforts to have Nguyen prosecuted for perjury, created such a perception of bias and partiality as to warrant Judge Adams' recusal. In addition, the judge acknowledged being angry and impatient with Nguyen, and using an expletive during a hearing to express his frustration with Nguyen, demonstrating a lack of patience, dignity and courtesy expected of a judicial officer. The Commission concludes that Judge Adams' conduct, as described herein, constituted willful or persistent violations of Canons 2A, 3B(2), 3B(4) and 3B(5) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct, and Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution.

Regarding CJC No. 11-0514-JP, the Commission concludes from the facts and evidence presented that Judge Adams demonstrated a lack of patience, dignity and courtesy expected of a judicial officer when interacting and communicating with certain defendants and their parents in court, and that some of the discussions were perceived by litigants to have demonstrated bias and prejudice on the part of the judge. The Commission concludes that Judge Adams' conduct, as described herein, constituted willful or persistent violations of Canons 3B(4) and 3B(5) of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct, and Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution.

In condemnation of the conduct described above that violated 2A, 3B(2), 3B(4), and 3B(5) and of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct, and Article V, §1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution, it is the Commission's decision to issue a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** to the Honorable J. Kent Adams, Justice of the Peace, Precinct 4, Place 1, Spring, Harris County, Texas.

Pursuant to the authority contained in Article V, §1-a(8) of the Texas Constitution, it is ordered that the actions described above be made the subject of a **PUBLIC ADMONITION** by the Commission.

The Commission has taken this action in a continuing effort to protect public confidence in the judicial system and to assist the state's judiciary in its efforts to embody the principles and values set forth in the Texas Constitution and the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct.

Issued this 28th day of March, 2012.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Tom Cunningham, Chair
State Commission on Judicial Conduct

