

STATEMENT OF  
ROBERT H. TEMBECKJIAN  
ADMINISTRATOR AND COUNSEL  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

TO THE

JOINT LEGISLATIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE HEARING  
ON THE  
2013-14 EXECUTIVE BUDGET



Albany, New York  
February 6, 2013

New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct  
61 Broadway ♦ New York, New York 10006  
(646) 386-4800 (ph) ♦ (646) 458-0037 (fax)  
tembeckjian@cjc.ny.gov ♦ www.cjc.ny.gov

Members of the Legislature:

My name is Robert H. Tembeckjian, and I am the Administrator and Counsel to the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct.

I thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Commission's budget for the coming fiscal year, as proposed in the Executive Budget.

Like most agencies in this time of prolonged economic stress and sacrifice, the Commission has struggled to manage its resources in a way that does not compromise its ability to execute its core constitutional responsibilities while confronting the unrelenting reality that for the foreseeable future, more must be done with less.

As a result, the Commission is again asking for less money than it would need simply to meet our mandated, contractual obligations. Our current fiscal year budget is just under \$5.4 million. That is the same dollar amount we have received every year since 2008. We have remained "flat," notwithstanding that the average annual increase in our expenditures over the last five years, largely dictated by such contractual obligations as rent and legislatively mandated salary increases, has been approximately 7%. Yet like everyone else, we have made economies in order to offset those increases.

For example, we reduced our authorized staff by 9%, from 55 full-time employees to 50. We suspended stenographic services and produce all our

transcripts in-house. In three of the last four years, we suspended our valuable annual training and education programs, and we will suspend it again this year. We gave up certain physical assets, such as an agency automobile, and periodical subscriptions, in order to save even relatively small amounts of money. We defer the hiring of replacement staff and we hire replacements at lower salaries than their predecessors.

At the same time, we are maintaining a very active professional pace. We handle an average of around 1,900 complaints per year (far more than any other state's judicial disciplinary agency and about three times as many as in our early years), conduct 600 or more preliminary and full-scale inquiries per year and publicly discipline an average of 19 judges per year (as calculated over the last five years).

For FY 2013-14, in consultation and cooperation with the Governor's Office, we are again asking for a "flat" budget of \$5.384 million. This is the fifth fiscal year in a row that our budget has been the same, requiring us to continue making serious economies, which we believe we can accomplish without compromising our core constitutional mission. However, it is becoming increasingly difficult.

## **The Commission's Constitutional Authority and Independence**

The Commission was created in 1978 in the Judiciary Article of the Constitution (Article 6, Section 22). Its enabling statute is the Judiciary Law (Article 2-A, Sections 40-48). The Commission's 11 members are appointed by six different officers of government, none of whom commands a majority: four (4) by the Governor, four (4) by the leaders of the Legislature and three (3) by the Chief Judge of the State of New York. The Commission elects its own Chair and appoints its own chief executive officer (the Administrator, who in law is the agency head). It was purposely designed in such a fashion so as to work cooperatively with all three branches of government but not to be dominated or controlled by any one of them.

Although the Commission is not a gubernatorial agency, historically its budget request has been submitted to the Legislature by the Executive, as have the budget requests of other independent officers of state government: the Attorney General (Department of Law) and the Comptroller (Department of Audit and Control).

Notwithstanding its constitutional independence, my office continues to enjoy mutually respectful and cooperative relations with the Governor, the Legislature, the Attorney General, the Comptroller and the Office of Court Administration.

## **Mission and Recent History**

The Commission is the sole state agency responsible for receiving, initiating, investigating and conducting evidentiary trials with respect to complaints of misconduct or disability against judges and justices of the New York State Unified Court System, which is comprised of approximately 3,500 judges and justices. Where appropriate, at the end of such proceedings, the Commission has authority to render disciplinary decisions of confidential caution, public admonition, public censure, removal or retirement from office.

The Commission was originally created legislatively in 1974, began operations in January 1975 and expanded its authority as a result of constitutional and statutory amendments that took effect in April 1978 and remain in effect to the present.

The agency has only one program, *i.e.* its core constitutional mission. With their varying responsibilities, all agency staff – lawyers, investigators, administrative – are deployed and devoted to fulfilling the agency’s sole and core mission: disposing of complaints that judges have engaged in misconduct.

The agency also handles its own appellate caseload. By law, disciplined judges have the right of review in the New York State Court of Appeals. In addition, the agency handles much of its own outside litigation, either in conjunction with the Attorney General’s Office or on its own, such as when

complainants or judges commence lawsuits attempting to compel or enjoin the Commission from investigating or prosecuting complaints.

The September 2008 Report by the Special Commission on the Future of the New York State Courts highlights the unique and critical role played by the Judicial Conduct Commission in enforcing disciplinary rules among the far-flung statewide network of approximately 2,300 justices in approximately 1,250 town and village courts.

The Commission, which provides the only forum for complaints of misconduct against the 3,500 judges and justices in the state Unified Court System, undertakes comprehensive and efficient investigations of such complaints; exonerates those judges who have been falsely accused; takes appropriate disciplinary action against those who have violated the high standards of conduct applicable to judges; and, by its presence and actions, makes the judiciary more sensitive to ethics standards and less likely to commit misconduct.

This mission is of vital importance in protecting both the public and judges from potential abuse. Every judge wields considerable power and as such must follow high standards of ethical conduct. If a judge fails to follow these standards, it is in the public interest to provide the appropriate discipline, expeditiously yet with careful regard to due process; but if a judge is falsely accused, he or she should not be subject to prolonged procedures. Undue delay

detracts from the Commission's mission and accomplishments and could inhibit the independence of the judiciary.

### **Continued Sacrifice in the Coming Year**

For the past four fiscal years, in light of the significant financial situation constraining all of state government, the Commission, like many agencies, undertook its share of sacrifice. At the same time, the Governor and the Commission propose to follow through on the extraordinary commitment the Legislature made in 2007 when, for the first time in more than a generation, after a downward budgetary trend of nearly 30 years, the Commission's resources were enhanced to reflect both the importance of its constitutional mission and the unrelenting burden of its case load.

Since then, my office has worked cooperatively and successfully on a range of matters with the Governor, the Attorney General, the State Comptroller, the Office of Court Administration, the Office of General Services and the Division of Budget (DOB), to devise and implement strategies to make the best possible use of our resources.

Nevertheless, given the harsh realities of diminishing resources throughout state government, we will operate for the fifth year in a row on a budget of just under \$5.4 million. While it will require continued and additional sacrifice, we believe this proposed level of funding would permit the Commission

to live up to its constitutional and legislative mandates to render discipline where appropriate, and dismiss unsubstantiated complaints, as fairly and promptly as possible. I thank the Governor for proposing this figure, I thank the Legislative leaders, committee chairs and staff who consulted with and advised me in this process, and I respectfully request that the Legislature adopt the proposed budget as it relates to the Commission.

A properly-funded and prudently-managed Commission is so important to the public interest because neither the judiciary nor the public would otherwise be appropriately protected. The prompt and effective enforcement of judicial ethics is essential in promoting public confidence in the administration of justice. If the public is to have any assurance that judges are accountable for their behavior, without encroachment on their fundamental independence to call cases as they see them, the Commission must function efficiently as well as fairly. The resources allocated to the Commission appropriately reflect its significant responsibility. I thank the Legislature for making that happen in 2007 and sticking with it in the years since. I thank the Governor for reaffirming this mandate in his current fiscal year budget proposal, even though we all agree that some sacrifice is unavoidable. And I respectfully request that both the Governor and Legislature continue this welcome and cooperative relationship, letting it serve as a template for all your efforts on behalf of the people of New York.