

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMISSION
STATE OF GEORGIA

In re: Inquiry Concerning
Judge Robert Reeves

)
)
)
)
)
)

Complaint Nos. 2022-075, 2022-456

FORMAL CHARGES

The Judicial Qualifications Commission (“JQC”) Investigative Panel (“IP”) initiated and conducted Full Investigations regarding allegations of misconduct against Judge Robert Reeves (“Judge Reeves”), Chief Judge for the Middle Judicial Circuit Superior Court. Pursuant to JQC Rule 17, the IP concluded that Formal Charges should be filed for the purpose of determining whether Judge Reeves has violated the Code of Judicial Conduct, and if so, whether he has committed willful misconduct in office, exhibited habitual intemperance, and whether his conduct is prejudicial to the administration of justice such that it brings the judicial office into disrepute.

Accordingly, Director Charles Boring (“the Director”) files the below Formal Charges with the JQC Hearing Panel pursuant to JQC Rule 19 and requests that proceedings be instituted for the purpose of determining whether Judge Reeves’s conduct constitutes violations of the Code of Judicial Conduct, and if so, the appropriate discipline.

I. JURISDICTION

1.

Judge Reeves was elected to the Superior Court of the Middle Judicial Circuit in 2007. Judge Reeves was named Chief Judge of the Middle Judicial Circuit in 2020. At all times pertinent to these charges, Judge Reeves was subject to the Canons and Rules of the Code of Judicial Conduct and the laws of the State of Georgia.

2.

The Middle Judicial Circuit is comprised of Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Toombs, and Washington counties.

II. FACTS

COMPLAINT NO. 22-456

Improper and Intemperate Comments

3.

In and around 2021, Judge Reeves, while excusing court attendees for a lunch break in Toombs County, asked court attendees to remain seated until he finished his instructions. While Judge Reeves was talking to attendees, an African-American male started to leave the courtroom. Judge Reeves then stated to the male, “[s]ir you’re walking and I’m telling you to be still. Are you really that

retarded?” This occurred in open court with members of the public, members of the bar, and other court personnel present.

4.

Between May 2021 and July 2021, Middle Judicial Circuit Public Defender’s Office Investigator Stuart Fagler (“Investigator Fagler”) was talking to Ms. Hannah McNeal (“Ms. McNeal”) regarding her son’s drug-related case outside of an Emanuel County courtroom, as the son was appearing before Judge Reeves for sentencing that day. Judge Reeves overheard Investigator Fagler speaking with Ms. McNeal while walking to his office, stopped, and stated to Ms. McNeal words to the effect of, “I don’t know why you are talking to him [Investigator] about drugs. He’s the biggest drug dealer in Emanuel County.” Ms. McNeal was shocked and taken aback. Ms. McNeal and her son had known Judge Reeves for years and her son previously had cases before Judge Reeves.

5.

On and about March 18, 2022, while Judge Reeves was presiding over a criminal calendar in Toombs County, a jailer asked Judge Reeves when the court would recess for lunch. Judge Reeves responded with words to the effect of, “[g]et the people [inmates] fed? You mean we have to feed these people [inmates]?” Several supporters of the inmates were present in the courtroom, and some became visibly upset after Judge Reeves made the comment.

6.

In and around 2019, during a proceeding in open court in Toombs County involving a criminal defendant whose first name was similar to the word “innocence,” Judge Reeves called the defendant’s name and stated words to the effect of, “I guess that name didn’t take.”

7.

In and around late 2020 and 2021, while in the Jefferson County courthouse, Judge Reeves commented about another Superior Court Judge being too lenient and stated that he would have to “double up” (or words to that effect) on his sentencing to make up the difference. Judge Reeves also stated that he would have to do what he could to make sure that same Superior Court Judge was not assigned important cases.

8.

On and about June 21, 2022, Judge Reeves was presiding over a criminal calendar involving B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office, and other attorneys. At that time, B.P.’s office was experiencing extreme staffing shortages. During the court proceedings that day, Judge Reeves repeatedly chastised B.P. and other attorneys for not having paperwork prepared properly. The level of rebuke from Judge Reeves reached a point at which B.P. left the courthouse crying. After B.P. left the courthouse,

Judge Reeves remarked, in open court, words to the effect of, “[i]f you can’t stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.”

**Improper Comments Manifesting Bias, Prejudice, and Sexual Harassment
Based Upon Gender**

9.

From at least 2016 through 2022, Judge Reeves engaged in a pattern of improper behavior that, at a minimum, gave the appearance of constituting sexual harassment and/or bias based upon the gender of various females involved in the Middle Judicial Circuit court system.

“J.C.”

10.

On an occasion in and around 2020 or 2021, while J.C., a female employee of the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office, was walking down a one-way street outside her office, Judge Reeves whistled at J.C. and drove his car the wrong direction down the street to approach her. Upon approaching J.C., Judge Reeves stated words to the effect of, “[w]hat’s a pretty girl like you doing walking alone?” J.C. warned Judge Reeves that the police ticketed wrong-way drivers on that street.

11.

Judge Reeves regularly calls J.C. “Miss America.”

12.

Judge Reeves regularly touches J.C.'s shoulders, rubs her back, and attempts to hug her, and does so in a manner that often makes her uncomfortable.

13.

On multiple occasions when J.C. has presented documents to Judge Reeves for his signature, Judge Reeves has stated to J.C. words to the effect of "if you smile, I'll sign it."

14.

As a result of Judge Reeves's behavior toward J.C., J.C. began having Investigator Fagler accompany her when she would have to have contact with Judge Reeves. On some occasions, Judge Reeves stated to Investigator Fagler and J.C. words to the effect that J.C. was a "big girl" and did not need Investigator Fagler to accompany her.

15.

Judge Reeves's behavior toward, and treatment of, J.C. has become common knowledge in the Middle Judicial Circuit's legal community. As a result, when a Public Defender's Office employee's request is turned down by Judge Reeves, members of the court system joke that if J.C. were to have brought the request to Judge Reeves, Judge Reeves would reconsider.

“B.P.”

16.

On and about July 17, 2021, Judge Reeves told B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office, that another Assistant Public Defender (“S.P.”) needed to decide if she wanted to be a full-time mother or a full-time attorney as she couldn’t be both. Additionally, Judge Reeves previously commented to B.P. years earlier that B.P. needed her husband to be the primary breadwinner in the family so that B.P. could be a better attorney.

17.

On or about April 11, 2016, B.P. returned from a family vacation and was discussing her vacation with an investigator in the hallway of the Emanuel County courthouse. During that conversation, B.P. mentioned that her husband’s back was injured during vacation. Judge Reeves walked by them, overheard the conversation, and stated words to the effect of, “if you didn’t do the stuff you see on TV...you know one foot on the nightstand and one foot way over here, he wouldn’t hurt his back.” While making the statement, Judge Reeves raised one of his legs up in the air and, to stabilize himself, placed one of his hands on B.P.’s shoulder. Judge Reeves also squeezed B.P.’s shoulder before walking away.

“C.P.”

18.

Days after learning that C.P., then a female Assistant District Attorney in the Middle Judicial Circuit, had run in a local race, Judge Reeves stated to C.P. words to the effect of, “I knew you would have to be doing something to keep in shape, or you would have started gaining weight.”

19.

On and around 2020, during a virtual meeting with the Jefferson County Drug Court staff in which C.P. was present, Judge Reeves commented that he expected women to wear bathrobes and bathing suits during virtual hearings.

20.

Between 2015 and 2020, during C.P.’s time working in the Middle Judicial Circuit, C.P. witnessed several occasions in which Judge Reeves inappropriately commented on the dress and appearance of other female attorneys.

21.

On and around 2020, C.P. witnessed Judge Reeves make negative comments about another Assistant District Attorney “L.K.” taking maternity leave.

“M.B.”

22.

In and around early June 2022, Judge Reeves passed a female Middle Judicial Circuit Superior Court employee, M.B., in the Emanuel County courthouse parking lot. Judge Reeves made a sound to get M.B.’s attention. M.B. waved at Judge Reeves and he waved back, and stated words to the effect of, “You have really nice legs!” At this time, Judge Reeves and M.B. had only spoken on approximately two prior occasions.

Other Improper Contact with Court Personnel

23.

In and around 2019, Judge Reeves contacted then-Jefferson County Municipal Court Judge Michael Howard (“Judge Howard”) about a traffic citation pending before Judge Howard. The citation involved a defendant who was an acquaintance of Judge Reeves. Judge Reeves asked Judge Howard to reduce the traffic offenses involving his acquaintance.

24.

In early 2020, Judge Reeves called Michael Howard (“Solicitor Howard”), who was then the Washington County Solicitor, about a misdemeanor case that Solicitor Howard was prosecuting. The case involved approximately 20 college

students trespassing on a company's private property. Judge Reeves told Solicitor Howard that he was calling on behalf of a "friend of a friend" and engaged in discussions about the cases of two of the college students and the appropriate resolution of the cases.

25.

On and around 2020, during the time that C.P. was an Assistant District Attorney in the Middle Judicial Circuit, Judge Reeves had multiple ex parte communications with C.P. in which he told her to either dismiss or add charges on cases she was prosecuting. Two of these communications involved serious motor vehicle accidents. Specifically, one of the motor vehicle accident cases involved a defendant in Emanuel County who left the scene of an accident and later contacted a law enforcement officer that he knew to assist in turning himself in. Judge Reeves told C.P. that the officer waited too long to relay that information and that she should also charge the law enforcement officer with a crime.

Fundraising and Promotion of Advocacy Center

COMPLAINT NO. 22-075

26.

The Sunshine House is a regional children's advocacy center.

27.

The Sunshine House serves Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Toombs and Washington counties.

28.

The Sunshine House's employees regularly testify in the Superior Court of the Middle Judicial Circuit in cases involving child victims, including but not limited to, child sexual and physical abuse cases.

29.

In 2015, Judge Reeves appeared and participated in a promotional video for The Sunshine House.

30.

In the promotional video, which remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's public website in June 2022, Judge Reeves is identified as "Judge Bobby Reeves, Superior Court Judge." Judge Reeves makes multiple statements regarding The Sunshine House's work during the video, including the following:

- "The Sunshine House makes a huge difference in affecting justice in our area because it does help immensely with the prosecution of those who have molested and abused children."

- “People need to understand if they give a donation to The Sunshine House it’s going to have a lasting effect on the life of that child. But then they’re going to get long term treatment and it’s going to help them for the rest of their lives.”
- “It does help in getting people prosecuted. It does help in getting people convicted when they abuse children.”

31.

In December 2020, Judge Reeves co-hosted The Sunshine House’s Facebook Give-A-Thon fundraiser. The fundraiser was broadcasted live on Facebook. The Facebook live video remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House’s public website in June 2022 and on YouTube.

32.

At the beginning of the Facebook live video, Judge Reeves is identified by his judicial title. Throughout the two-hour fundraiser, Judge Reeves:

- Discussed the different ways to donate to The Sunshine House, gave a general overview of the organization, identified the counties the organization serves, and urged viewers to donate.
- Stated “[i]f you’re a teacher, call in and challenge all other teachers to match your donation. If you’re a lawyer, call your lawyer friends.”

- Stated “[m]ost important part of this is to raise money for The Sunshine House to be able to do its job to help children in our community.”
- Stated “[w]e want every penny of that \$5,000 matched.”
- Stood in front of the fundraising thermometer and urged viewers to donate in order to meet the \$80,000 goal.
- Announced that \$11,225 had been donated and stated, “that’s pretty great for the first 15 minutes.”
- Interviewed the organization’s director and stated “we [used] to get some money from the state to help.”
- Stated “[k]eep calling your friends, keep calling your neighbors...and tell them to watch.”
- Made a \$500 donation and challenged “every other judge and lawyer out there to at least match that donation.”
- Stated “I told y’all some names to call. Call those judges in every county to get them on board. They all know how important The Sunshine House is. Each one of them ought to be willing to make that donation.”
- Introduced the District Attorney-Elect and discussed the importance of The Sunshine House’s work in prosecuting cases with the District Attorney’s Office.

- Stated “we need to challenge the law enforcement out there—the sheriffs, the investigators, the deputy sheriffs, the police officers—folks you know how important this is. We need to be hearing from law enforcement. You’ve been challenged. Come on!”
- Discussed The Sunshine House’s methods of getting children to talk, the correct manner of questioning a child, and the admissibility of child victims’ statements.
- Stated “like I said, normal investigators aren’t trained to do that [question child victims]. And they would fall back in their normal way of interrogating and asking a question and that would throw out the child’s testimony. So, it’s very important the way that the forensic interviewers are trained and it’s very important that we have them to interview alleged victims and people who have revealed to their mama, or their teachers or grandma. The only way to do this is to have specially trained interviewers and The Sunshine House has those. They have 2, maybe 3, I don’t know how many they have. I see them in court. That is a crucial function of The Sunshine House. Another critical function is after the case is over, is a special counseling that The Sunshine House gives to these children to overcome the impact. Let me tell you folks, you cannot imagine the impact that child molestation has on the children for the rest of his or her life. I could stand here tonight and talk

to you for hours about people I have seen, friends even, that were molested as children, and I saw what happened to them throughout their lives...it has a lasting impact. That's why this counseling that The Sunshine House does with its victims is so very important to help them overcome what has happened to them, to heal psychologically, to get their self-worth back. It is imperative that we have this for our young people here."

- States "[t]here's only one reason we made this goal. It's because you chose to give to support The Sunshine House and to help kids that have been abused, help kids that have been molested, help kids that have been neglected, to help them find peace. And that is an important part. We thank you."

IV. RULES OF THE GEORGIA CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT IMPLICATED BY JUDGE REEVES'S CONDUCT

Rule 1.1

33.

Rule 1.1 of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

Judges shall respect and comply with the *law*.

Rule 1.2 (A)

34.

Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

Judges shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary.

Rule 1.2 (B)

35.

Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

An independent and honorable judiciary is indispensable to justice in our society. Judges shall participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing high standards of conduct, and shall personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved. The provisions of this Code should be construed and applied to further that objective.

Rule 1.3

36.

Rule 1.3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

Judges shall not lend the prestige of their office to advance the private interests of the judge or others.

Rule 2.3 (B)

37.

Rule 2.3 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct manifest bias or prejudice, or engage in harassment, including but not limited to bias, prejudice, or harassment based upon age, disability, ethnicity, gender or sex, marital status, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic status. Judges shall not permit court staff, court officials, or others subject to the judge's direction and control to do so.

Rule 2.4 (C)

38.

Rule 2.4 (C) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

Judges shall not convey or enable others to convey the impression that any person or organization is in a position to influence the judge.

Rule 2.8 (B)

39.

Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

Judges shall be patient, dignified, and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, and others with whom they deal in their official capacity, and shall require similar conduct of all persons subject to their direction and control.

Rule 2.9 (A)

40.

Rule 2.9 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states, in pertinent part, that:

Judges 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*. Judges shall not initiate, permit, or consider other communications made to them outside the presence of the parties, or their lawyers, concerning a *pending proceeding* or *impending matter*

Rule 3.1 (C)

41.

Rule 3.1 (C) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

Judges may engage in extra-judicial activities, provided that doing so will not interfere with proper performance of judicial duties or cast doubt on their capacity to impartially decide any issue.

Rule 3.7 (A)(3)

42.

Rule 3.7 (A) (3) of the Code of Judicial Conduct states:

(A) Judges may engage in activities concerning the *law*, the legal system, and the administration of justice, provided that doing so will not interfere with the performance of their official duties or cast doubt on their capacity to *impartially* decide any issue

(3) Judges may assist such organizations in raising funds, and may make recommendations to public and private fund-granting agencies on projects

and programs concerning the *law*, the legal system, and the administration of justice, but judges shall not personally solicit funds during public fundraising activities.

IV. VIOLATIONS OF THE CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Improper and Intemperate Comments

COUNT ONE

43.

In and about 2021, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating to a court attendee “[s]ir you’re walking and I’m telling you to be still. Are you really that retarded?”

COUNT TWO

44.

In and about 2021, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating to a court attendee “[s]ir you’re walking and I’m telling you to be still. Are you really that retarded?”

COUNT THREE

45.

In and about 2021, Judge Reeves failed to be patient, dignified, and courteous to a person with whom Judge Reeves dealt with in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating to a court attendee “[s]ir you’re walking and I’m telling you to be still. Are you really that retarded?”

COUNT FOUR

46.

Between May 2021 and July 2021, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by interjecting in a conversation between a Public Defender’s Office Investigator and a criminal defendant’s mother and stating to the mother words to the effect of, “I don’t know why you are talking to him [Investigator] about drugs. He’s the biggest drug dealer in Emanuel County.”

COUNT FIVE

47.

Between May 2021 and July 2021, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such

standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by interjecting in a conversation between a Public Defender's Office Investigator and a criminal defendant's mother and stating to the mother words to the effect of, "I don't know why you are talking to him [Investigator] about drugs. He's the biggest drug dealer in Emanuel County."

COUNT SIX

48.

Between May 2021 and July 2021, Judge Reeves failed to be dignified and courteous to people with whom he dealt with in his official capacity in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by interjecting in a conversation between a Public Defender's Office Investigator and a criminal defendant's mother and stating to the mother words to the effect of, "I don't know why you are talking to him [Investigator] about drugs. He's the biggest drug dealer in Emanuel County."

COUNT SEVEN

49.

On and about March 18, 2022, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating

words to the effect of, “[g]et the people [inmates] fed? You mean we have to feed these people [inmates]?” Judge Reeves made this comment while he was presiding over a criminal calendar in Toombs County in response to a jailer asking Judge Reeves when the court would recess for lunch.

COUNT EIGHT

50.

On and about March 18, 2022, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating words to the effect of, “[g]et the people [inmates] fed? You mean we have to feed these people [inmates]?” Judge Reeves made this comment while he was presiding over a criminal calendar in Toombs County in response to a jailer asking Judge Reeves when the court would recess for lunch.

COUNT NINE

51.

On and about March 18, 2022, Judge Reeves failed to be patient, dignified, and courteous to people with whom he dealt with in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating words to the effect of, “[g]et the people [inmates] fed? You mean we have to feed these people

[inmates]?” Judge Reeves made this comment while he was presiding over a criminal calendar in Toombs County in response to a jailer asking Judge Reeves when the court would recess for lunch.

COUNT TEN

52.

In and around 2018 or 2019, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by presiding over a case involving a criminal defendant whose first name was similar to the word “innocence,” calling the defendant’s name and then stating words to the effect of, “I guess that name didn’t take.”

COUNT ELEVEN

53.

In and around 2018 or 2019, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by presiding over a case involving a criminal defendant whose first name was similar to the word “innocence,” calling the defendant’s name and then stating words to the effect of, “I guess that name didn’t take.”

COUNT TWELVE

54.

In and around 2018 or 2019, Judge Reeves failed to be patient, dignified, and courteous to a person with whom he dealt with in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by presiding over a case involving a criminal defendant whose first name was similar to the word “innocence,” calling the defendant’s name and then stating words to the effect of, “I guess that name didn’t take.”

COUNT THIRTEEN

55.

In and around 2020 or early 2021, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by commenting about another Superior Court Judge being too lenient, stating that he would have to “double up” (or words to that effect) on his sentencing to make up the difference. Judge Reeves also stated that he would have to do what he could to make sure that same Superior Court Judge was not assigned important cases.

COUNT FOURTEEN

56.

In and around 2020 or early 2021, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by commenting about another Superior Court Judge being too lenient, stating that he would have to “double up” (or words to that effect) on his sentencing to make up the difference. Judge Reeves also stated that he would have to do what he could to make sure that same Superior Court Judge was not assigned important cases.

COUNT FIFTEEN

57.

On and about June 21, 2022, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by remarking about attorney B.P. in open court words to the effect of “[i]f you can’t stand the heat, get out of the kitchen” after B.P. left the courthouse upset about how Judge Reeves had treated her in court.

COUNT SIXTEEN

58.

On and about June 21 2022, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by remarking about attorney B.P. in open court words to the effect of “[i]f you can’t stand the heat, get out of the kitchen” after B.P. left the courthouse upset about how Judge Reeves had treated her in court.

COUNT SEVENTEEN

59.

On and about June 21, 2022, Judge Reeves failed to be patient, dignified, and courteous to individuals with whom he deals in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by remarking about attorney B.P. in open court words to the effect of “[i]f you can’t stand the heat, get out of the kitchen” after B.P. left the courthouse upset about how Judge Reeves had treated her in court.

**Improper Comments Manifesting Bias, Prejudice, and Sexual Harassment
Based Upon Gender**

COUNT EIGHTEEN

60.

Between 2020 and 2022, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward J.C., a female employee of the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office:

- Whistling at J.C. as she was walking down a one-way street near the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office and driving his car the wrong direction to approach her. Upon approaching J.C., Judge Reeves stated words to the effect of, "[w]hat's a pretty girl like you doing walking alone?"
- Regularly calling and referring to J.C. as "Miss America".
- Regularly touching J.C.'s shoulders, rubbing her back, and attempting to hug her, and doing so in a manner that made her uncomfortable.
- Stating to J.C. words to the effect of, "If you smile, I'll sign it," on multiple occasions when J.C. presented documents to Judge Reeves for his signature.

- Stating to Investigator Fagler and J.C., on multiple occasions, words to the effect that J.C. was a “big girl” and did not need Investigator Fagler to accompany her.

COUNT NINETEEN

61.

Between 2020 and 2022, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward J.C., a female employee of the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office:

- Whistling at J.C. as she was walking down a one-way street near the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office and driving his car the wrong direction to approach her. Upon approaching J.C., Judge Reeves stated words to the effect of, “[w]hat’s a pretty girl like you doing walking alone?”
- Regularly calling and referring to J.C. as “Miss America”.
- Regularly touching J.C.’s shoulders, rubbing her back, and attempting to hug her, and doing so in a manner that made her uncomfortable.
- Stating to J.C. words to the effect of, “If you smile, I’ll sign it,” on multiple occasions when J.C. presented documents to Judge Reeves for his signature.

- Stating to Investigator Fagler and J.C., on multiple occasions, words to the effect that J.C. was a “big girl” and did not need Investigator Fagler to accompany her.

COUNT TWENTY

62.

Between 2020 and 2022, Judge Reeves did, in the performance of his judicial duties, by words and conduct manifest bias and prejudice and engage in harassment, based upon gender, in violation of Rule 2.3 (B) of the Georgia Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward J.C., a female employee of the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office:

- Whistling at J.C. as she was walking down a one-way street near the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office and driving his car the wrong direction to approach her. Upon approaching J.C., Judge Reeves stated words to the effect of, “[w]hat’s a pretty girl like you doing walking alone?”
- Regularly calling and referring to J.C. as “Miss America”.
- Regularly touching J.C.’s shoulders, rubbing her back, and attempting to hug her, and doing so in a manner that made her uncomfortable.
- Stating to J.C. words to the effect of, “If you smile, I’ll sign it,” on multiple occasions when J.C. presented documents to Judge Reeves for his signature.

- Stating to Investigator Fagler and J.C., on multiple occasions, words to the effect that J.C. was a “big girl” and did not need Investigator Fagler to accompany her.

COUNT TWENTY-ONE

63.

Between 2020 and 2022, Judge Reeves failed to be dignified and courteous toward a person with whom he deals in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward J.C., a female employee of the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office:

- Whistling at J.C. as she was walking down a one-way street near the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office and driving his car the wrong direction to approach her. Upon approaching J.C., Judge Reeves stated words to the effect of, “[w]hat’s a pretty girl like you doing walking alone?”
- Regularly calling and referring to J.C. as “Miss America”.
- Regularly touching J.C.’s shoulders, rubbing her back, and attempting to hug her, and doing so in a manner that made her uncomfortable.
- Stating to J.C. words to the effect of, “If you smile, I’ll sign it,” on multiple occasions when J.C. presented documents to Judge Reeves for his signature.

- Stating to Investigator Fagler and J.C., on multiple occasions, words to the effect that J.C. was a “big girl” and did not need Investigator Fagler to accompany her.

COUNT TWENTY-TWO

64.

On or about April 11, 2016, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by acting inappropriately toward B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit’s Public Defender’s Office. Specifically, Judge Reeves interjected himself into a conversation between B.P. and a Public Defender’s Office Investigator regarding an injury B.P.’s husband sustained during a vacation. Judge Reeves stated, “if you didn’t do the stuff you see on TV...you know one foot on the nightstand and one foot way over here, he wouldn’t hurt his back.” While making the statement, Judge Reeves raised one of his legs up in the air and, to stabilize himself, placed one of his hands on B.P.’s shoulder. Judge Reeves also squeezed B.P.’s shoulder before walking away.

COUNT TWENTY-THREE

65.

On or about April 11, 2016, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by acting inappropriately toward B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office. Specifically, Judge Reeves interjected himself into a conversation between B.P. and a Public Defender's Office Investigator regarding an injury B.P.'s husband sustained during a vacation. Judge Reeves stated, "if you didn't do the stuff you see on TV...you know one foot on the nightstand and one foot way over here, he wouldn't hurt his back." While making the statement, Judge Reeves raised one of his legs up in the air and, to stabilize himself, placed one of his hands on B.P.'s shoulder. Judge Reeves also squeezed B.P.'s shoulder before walking away.

COUNT TWENTY-FOUR

66.

On and about April 11, 2016, Judge Reeves did, in the performance of his judicial duties, by words and conduct manifest bias and prejudice and engage in harassment, based upon gender, in violation of Rule 2.3 (B) of the Code of Judicial

Conduct, by acting inappropriately toward B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office. Specifically, Judge Reeves interjected himself into a conversation between B.P. and a Public Defender's Office Investigator regarding an injury B.P.'s husband sustained during a vacation. Judge Reeves stated, "if you didn't do the stuff you see on TV...you know one foot on the nightstand and one foot way over here, he wouldn't hurt his back." While making the statement, Judge Reeves raised one of his legs up in the air and, to stabilize himself, placed one of his hands on B.P.'s shoulder. Judge Reeves also squeezed B.P.'s shoulder before walking away.

COUNT TWENTY-FIVE

67.

On and about April 11, 2016, Judge Reeves failed to be dignified and courteous toward a person with whom he deals in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by acting inappropriately toward B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office. Specifically, Judge Reeves interjected himself into a conversation between B.P. and a Public Defender's Office Investigator regarding an injury B.P.'s husband sustained during a vacation. Judge Reeves stated, "if you didn't do the stuff you see on TV...you know one foot on the nightstand and one foot way over here, he wouldn't hurt his back." While making the statement, Judge Reeves raised one of

his legs up in the air and, to stabilize himself, placed one of his hands on B.P.'s shoulder. Judge Reeves also squeezed B.P.'s shoulder before walking away.

COUNT TWENTY-SIX

68.

On and about July 17, 2021, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary, in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by telling B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office, that another Assistant Public Defender ("S.P.") needed to decide if she wanted to be a full-time mother or a full-time attorney as she couldn't be both. Additionally, Judge Reeves had previously commented to B.P. that B.P. needed her husband to be the primary breadwinner in the family so that B.P. could be a better lawyer.

COUNT TWENTY-SEVEN

69.

On or about July 17, 2021, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by telling B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office, that another Assistant Public Defender ("S.P.") needed to decide if she wanted to

be a full-time mother or a full-time attorney as she couldn't be both. Additionally, Judge Reeves had previously commented to B.P. that B.P. needed her husband to be the primary breadwinner in the family so that B.P. could be a better lawyer.

COUNT TWENTY-EIGHT

70.

On or about July 17, 2021, Judge Reeves did, in the performance of his judicial duties, by words and conduct manifest bias and prejudice and engage in harassment, based upon gender, in violation of Rule 2.3 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by telling B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office, that another Assistant Public Defender ("S.P.") needed to decide if she wanted to be a full-time mother or a full-time attorney as she couldn't be both. Additionally, Judge Reeves had previously commented to B.P. that B.P. needed her husband to be the primary breadwinner in the family so that B.P. could be a better lawyer.

COUNT TWENTY-NINE

71.

On or about July 17, 2021, Judge Reeves failed to be dignified and courteous to lawyers with whom he deals in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by telling B.P., a female attorney for the Middle Judicial Circuit's Public Defender's Office, that another Assistant Public Defender

(“S.P.”) needed to decide if she wanted to be a full-time mother or a full-time attorney as she couldn’t be both. Additionally, Judge Reeves had previously commented to B.P. that B.P. needed her husband to be the primary breadwinner in the family so that B.P. could be a better lawyer.

COUNT THIRTY

72.

Between 2015 and 2020, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward, and in the presence of, C.P., a female Assistant District Attorney in the Middle Judicial Circuit:

- C.P. had run in a local race, and after learning about this, a few days later Judge Reeves stated to C.P. words to the effect of, “I knew you would have to be doing something to keep in shape, or you would have started gaining weight.”
- During a virtual meeting with the Jefferson County Drug Court staff in which C.P. was present, Judge Reeves commented that he expected women to wear bathrobes and bathing suits during virtual hearings.
- C.P. witnessed Judge Reeves make negative comments about another Assistant District Attorney “L.C.” taking maternity leave.

- C.P. witnessed several occasions in which Judge Reeves inappropriately commented on the dress and appearance of other female attorneys.

COUNT THIRTY-ONE

73.

Between 2015 and 2020, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward, and in the presence of, C.P., a female Assistant District Attorney in the Middle Judicial Circuit:

- C.P. had run in a local race, and after learning about this, a few days later Judge Reeves stated to C.P. words to the effect of, “I knew you would have to be doing something to keep in shape, or you would have started gaining weight.”
- During a virtual meeting with the Jefferson County Drug Court staff in which C.P. was present, Judge Reeves commented that he expected women to wear bathrobes and bathing suits during virtual hearings.
- C.P. witnessed Judge Reeves make negative comments about another Assistant District Attorney “L.C.” taking maternity leave.

- C.P. witnessed several occasions in which Judge Reeves inappropriately commented on the dress and appearance of other female attorneys.

COUNT THIRTY-TWO

74.

Between 2015 and 2020, Judge Reeves did, in the performance of his judicial duties, by words and conduct manifest bias and prejudice and engage in harassment, based upon gender, in violation of Rule 2.3 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward and in the presence of C.P., a female Assistant District Attorney in the Middle Judicial Circuit:

- C.P. had run in a local race, and after learning about this, a few days later Judge Reeves stated to C.P. words to the effect of, “I knew you would have to be doing something to keep in shape, or you would have started gaining weight.”
- During a virtual meeting with the Jefferson County Drug Court staff in which C.P. was present, Judge Reeves commented that he expected women to wear bathrobes and bathing suits during virtual hearings.
- C.P. witnessed Judge Reeves make negative comments about another Assistant District Attorney “L.C.” taking maternity leave.
- C.P. witnessed several occasions in which Judge Reeves inappropriately commented on the dress and appearance of other female attorneys.

COUNT THIRTY-THREE

75.

Between 2015 and 2020, Judge Reeves failed to be dignified and courteous toward a person with whom he deals in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by engaging in the following conduct toward and in the presence of C.P., a female Assistant District Attorney in the Middle Judicial Circuit:

- C.P. had run in a local race, and after learning about this, a few days later Judge Reeves stated to C.P. words to the effect of, “I knew you would have to be doing something to keep in shape, or you would have started gaining weight.”
- During a virtual meeting with the Jefferson County Drug Court staff in which C.P. was present, Judge Reeves commented that he expected women to wear bathrobes and bathing suits during virtual hearings.
- C.P. witnessed Judge Reeves make negative comments about another Assistant District Attorney “L.C.” taking maternity leave.
- C.P. witnessed several occasions in which Judge Reeves inappropriately commented on the dress and appearance of other female attorneys.

COUNT THIRTY-FOUR

76.

In and around early June 2022, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating to M.B., a female courthouse employee, “[y]ou have really nice legs!” after waving to M.B. in the Emanuel County Courthouse parking lot.

COUNT THIRTY-FIVE

77.

In and around early June 2022, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating to M.B., a female courthouse employee, “[y]ou have really nice legs!” after waving to M.B. in the Emanuel County Courthouse parking lot.

COUNT THIRTY-SIX

78.

In and around early June 2022, Judge Reeves did, in the performance of his judicial duties, by words and conduct manifest bias and prejudice and engage in harassment, based upon gender, in violation of Rule 2.3 (B) of the Code of Judicial

Conduct, by stating to M.B., a female courthouse employee, “[y]ou have really nice legs!” after waving to M.B. in the Emanuel County Courthouse parking lot.

COUNT THIRTY-SEVEN

79.

In and around early June 2022, Judge Reeves failed to be dignified, and courteous to individuals with whom he deals in his official capacity, in violation of Rule 2.8 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by stating to M.B., a female courthouse employee, “[y]ou have really nice legs!” after waving to M.B. in the Emanuel County Courthouse parking lot.

Other Improper Contact with Court Personnel

COUNT THIRTY-EIGHT

80.

In and around 2020, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by having multiple ex parte communications with C.P. in which he told her to either dismiss or add charges on cases she was prosecuting. On one occasion, Judge Reeves contacted C.P., ex parte, and told her that she should add charges against an officer involved in a serious motor vehicle accident investigation that C.P. was prosecuting.

COUNT THIRTY-NINE

81.

In and around 2019, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by having multiple ex parte communications with C.P. in which he told her to either dismiss or add charges on cases she was prosecuting. On one occasion, Judge Reeves contacted C.P., ex parte, and told her that she should add charges against an officer involved in a serious motor vehicle accident investigation that C.P. was prosecuting.

COUNT FORTY

82.

In and around 2019, Judge Reeves initiated and engage in ex parte communications made outside the presence of parties and their lawyers concerning a pending and impending matter in violation of Rule 2.9 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by having multiple ex parte communications with C.P. in which he told her to either dismiss or add charges on cases she was prosecuting. On one occasion, Judge Reeves contacted C.P., ex parte, and told her that she should add charges against an officer involved in the serious motor vehicle accident investigation that C.P. was prosecuting.

COUNT FORTY-ONE

83.

In and around 2019, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by contacting Jefferson County Municipal Court Judge Howard on behalf of an acquaintance of Judge Reeves and asking Judge Howard to reduce the traffic offenses over which Judge Howard was presiding.

COUNT FORTY-TWO

84.

In and around 2019, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by contacting Jefferson County Municipal Court Judge Howard on behalf of an acquaintance of Judge Reeves and asking Judge Howard to reduce the traffic offenses over which Judge Howard was presiding.

COUNT FORTY-THREE

85.

In and around 2019, Judge Reeves lent the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others, in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by contacting Jefferson County Municipal Court Judge Howard on behalf of an acquaintance of Judge Reeves and asking Judge Howard to reduce the traffic offenses over which Judge Howard was presiding.

COUNT FORTY-FOUR

86.

In and around 2019, Judge Reeves initiated ex parte communications made outside the presence of parties and their lawyers concerning a pending and impending matter in violation of Rule 2.9 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by contacting Jefferson County Municipal Court Judge Howard on behalf of an acquaintance of Judge Reeves and asking Judge Howard to reduce the traffic offenses over which Judge Howard was presiding.

COUNT FORTY-FIVE

87.

In and around 2020, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by contacting

Solicitor Howard regarding a case that he was prosecuting involving approximately 20 college students trespassing on a company's private property. Judge Reeves stated that he was calling on behalf of a "friend of a friend" and engaged in discussions about the cases of two of the college students and the appropriate resolution of the cases.

COUNT FORTY-SIX

88.

In and around 2020, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by contacting Solicitor Howard regarding a case that he was prosecuting involving approximately 20 college students trespassing on a company's private property. Judge Reeves stated that he was calling on behalf of a "friend of a friend" and engaged in discussions about the cases of two of the college students and the appropriate resolution of the cases.

COUNT FORTY-SEVEN

89.

In and around 2020, Judge Reeves lent the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others, in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Code of Judicial

Conduct, by contacting Solicitor Howard regarding a case that he was prosecuting involving approximately 20 college students trespassing on a company's private property. Judge Reeves stated that he was calling on behalf of a "friend of a friend" and engaged in discussions about the cases of two of the college students and the appropriate resolution of the cases.

Fundraising and Promotion of Advocacy Center

COUNT FORTY-EIGHT

90.

In and between 2015 and 2022, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by appearing in The Sunshine House's promotional video. In the promotional video, which remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022, Judge Reeves is identified as "Judge Bobby Reeves, Superior Court Judge." Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 29-30 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FORTY-NINE

91.

In and between 2015 and 2022, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by appearing in The Sunshine House's promotional video. In the promotional video, which remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022, Judge Reeves is identified as "Judge Bobby Reeves, Superior Court Judge." Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 29-30 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY

92.

In and between 2015 and 2022, Judge Reeves lent the prestige of his office to advance the private interest of others, in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by appearing in The Sunshine House's promotional video. In the promotional video, which remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022, Judge Reeves is identified as "Judge Bobby Reeves,

Superior Court Judge.” Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House’s work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 29-30 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-ONE

93.

In and between 2015 and 2022, Judge Reeves conveyed and enabled others to convey the impression that an organization was in a position to influence him, in violation of Rule 2.4 (C) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by appearing in The Sunshine House’s promotional video. The Sunshine House serves counties encompassing the Middle Judicial Circuit in cases and matters involving child victims. As such, The Sunshine House’s volunteers and employees regularly testify in criminal cases in the Middle Judicial Circuit. In the promotional video, which remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House’s website in June 2022, Judge Reeves is identified as “Judge Bobby Reeves, Superior Court Judge.” Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House’s work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 29-30 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-TWO

94.

In and between 2015 and 2022, Judge Reeves engaged in extra-judicial activities that cast doubt on his capacity to impartially decide issues, in violation of Rule 3.1 (C) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by appearing in The Sunshine House's promotional video. The Sunshine House serves counties encompassing the Middle Judicial Circuit in cases and matters involving child victims. As such, The Sunshine House's volunteers and employees regularly testify in criminal cases in the Middle Judicial Circuit. In the promotional video, which remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022, Judge Reeves is identified as "Judge Bobby Reeves, Superior Court Judge." Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 29-30 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-THREE

95.

In and between December 2020 and June 2022, Judge Reeves failed to act in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary in violation of Rule 1.2 (A) of the Code of Judicial

Conduct, by co-hosting The Sunshine House's Facebook Give-A-Thon fundraiser. The Sunshine House is a child advocacy center that serves the Middle Judicial Circuit, and as such regularly appears in cases involving child victims. The fundraiser was broadcasted on Facebook live and remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022. At the beginning of the fundraiser, Judge Reeves is identified by his judicial title. Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 31-32 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-FOUR

96.

In and between December 2020 and June 2022, Judge Reeves failed to establish, maintain, and enforce high standards of conduct, and to personally observe such standards of conduct so that the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary may be preserved, in violation of Rule 1.2 (B) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by co-hosting The Sunshine House's Facebook Give-A-Thon fundraiser. The Sunshine House is a child advocacy center that serves the Middle Judicial Circuit, and as such regularly appears in cases involving child victims. The fundraiser was broadcasted on Facebook live and remained posted

and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022. At the beginning of the fundraiser, Judge Reeves is identified by his judicial title. Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 31-32 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-FIVE

97.

On and between December 2020 and June 2022, Judge Reeves lent the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others, in violation of Rule 1.3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by co-hosting The Sunshine House's Facebook Give-A-Thon fundraiser. The Sunshine House is a child advocacy center that serves the Middle Judicial Circuit, and as such regularly appears in cases involving child victims. The fundraiser was broadcasted on Facebook live and remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022. At the beginning of the fundraiser, Judge Reeves is identified by his judicial title. Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 31-32 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-SIX

98.

On and between December 2020 and June 2022, Judge Reeves conveyed and enabled others to convey the impression that an organization was in the position to influence him, in violation of Rule 2.4 (C) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by co-hosting The Sunshine House's Facebook Give-A-Thon fundraiser. The Sunshine House is a child advocacy center that serves the Middle Judicial Circuit, and as such regularly appears in cases involving child victims. The fundraiser was broadcasted on Facebook live and remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022. At the beginning of the fundraiser, Judge Reeves is identified by his judicial title. Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 31-32 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-SEVEN

99.

In and between December 2020 and June 2022, Judge Reeves engaged in extra-judicial activities that cast doubt on his capacity to impartially decide issues, in violation of Rule 3.1 (C) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by co-hosting The

Sunshine House's Facebook Give-A-Thon fundraiser. The Sunshine House is a child advocacy center that serves the Middle Judicial Circuit, and as such regularly appears in cases involving child victims. The fundraiser was broadcasted on Facebook live and remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022. At the beginning of the fundraiser, Judge Reeves is identified by his judicial title. Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 31-32 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

COUNT FIFTY-EIGHT

100.

In and between December 2020 and June 2022, Judge Reeves engaged in activities concerning an organization concerning the law, the legal system, and the administration of justice for which he personally solicited funds during public fundraising activities in violation of Rule 3.7 (A) (3) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, by co-hosting The Sunshine House's Facebook Give-A-Thon fundraiser. The Sunshine House is a child advocacy center that serves the Middle Judicial Circuit, and as such regularly appears in cases involving child victims. The fundraiser was broadcasted on Facebook live and remained posted and viewable on The Sunshine House's website in June 2022. At the beginning of the fundraiser,

Judge Reeves is identified by his judicial title. Judge Reeves makes multiple statements publicly supporting The Sunshine House's work. These statements, alleged in paragraphs 31-32 above, include publicly soliciting funds for the organization and statements supportive of assisting the prosecution of criminal defendants.

IV. CONCLUSION

101.

Violations of the Georgia Code of Judicial Conduct support discipline when they amount to "willful misconduct in office," "habitual intemperance," or "conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice which brings the judicial office into disrepute." Ga. Const. of 1983, Art. VI, Sec. VII, Par. VII (a); JQC Rule 6 (A) (5). Judge Reeves's conduct as alleged above amounts to willful misconduct in office, habitual intemperance, and is prejudicial to the administration of justice bringing the judicial office into disrepute. Therefore, the Director hereby seeks disciplinary action for the above-stated violations of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

Respectfully submitted this 16th day of November, 2022.

s:\CHARLES P. BORING
Charles P. Boring, Director
Judicial Qualifications Commission
1995 North Park Place SE, Suite 570
Atlanta, GA 30339
Georgia Bar No. 065131
cboring@gajqc.gov

NOTICE OF FORMAL CHARGES

Pursuant to JQC Rules 13, 19, and 20, and by filing these Formal Charges with the Hearing Panel, Judge Reeves is hereby notified of alleged misconduct and is required to file a verified answer to these charges with the Clerk of the Supreme Court and serve a copy of the verified answer on the Director. The answer shall be filed within thirty (30) days after service of these charges. Failure to answer the formal charges shall constitute an admission of the factual allegations pursuant to JQC Rule 21 (A).

Respectfully submitted this 16th day of November, 2022.

s:\CHARLES P. BORING
Charles P. Boring, Director
Judicial Qualifications Commission
1995 North Park Place SE, Suite 325
Atlanta, GA 30339
Georgia Bar No. 065131
cboring@gajqc.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to JQC Rule 13, the Director certifies that he has this day served the following **Formal Charges** upon counsel for Judge Reeves by placing a true and correct copy of the same in the United States mail and sending certified in an envelope properly addressed with adequate postage thereon, and by electronic transmission, upon the following:

Lester S. Tate, III
Akin & Tate PC
11 West Public Square
P.O. Box 878
Cartersville, GA 30120
lester@akin-tate.com

This 16th day of November, 2022.

s:\CHARLES P. BORING
Charles P. Boring, Director
Judicial Qualifications Commission
1995 North Park Place SE, Suite 325
Atlanta, GA 30339
Georgia Bar No. 065131
cboring@gajqc.gov