


IN THE ALABAMA COURT OF THE JUDICIARY

IN THE MATTER OF:)
CHRISTOPHER M. KAMINSKI,) Court of the
District Judge,) Judiciary
Coffee County) Case No. 52
)



COMPLAINT

1. Christopher M. Kaminski ("Judge Kaminski") is the District Judge for Coffee County. He was appointed to his seat on May 14, 2015, and won election to a full term on November 8, 2016. In his capacity as District Judge, Judge Kaminski presides over district-court criminal, civil, and juvenile matters.

2. This Complaint charges Judge Kaminski with certain conduct relating to his romantic relationship with an attorney who regularly practiced before him ("the attorney"), as violating the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics and severely undermining the public's and the Bar's confidence in the integrity, independence, and impartiality of the judiciary.

3. Judge Kaminski and the attorney began a romantic relationship at the latest by June 1, 2017. Upon information and belief, that relationship continues to this day.

4. During a period of their romantic relationship, Judge Kaminski engaged in a pattern and practice of 1) appointing the attorney to cases; 2) taking judicial actions in cases in which the attorney was an attorney of record, even after their relationship was publicly acknowledged; 3) entering attorney's-fee-declaration orders for the attorney's benefit; and, 4) failing to disqualify himself from cases in which the attorney was an attorney of record, even after their relationship was publicly acknowledged.

5. Despite the clear evidence that Judge Kaminski and the attorney were in a romantic relationship during a period in which she practiced before him, Judge Kaminski's response, submitted by his counsel at the time, failed to be forthright and candid with the Commission as to this fact in the November 28, 2018 response to the Commission.

6. On or about June 14, 2018, Judge Kaminski used the prestige of the judicial office to gain access to courtroom-security footage, and he permitted the attorney to post it on social media to refute accusations concerning them.

7. The Coffee County legal community, including attorneys who regularly practiced before Judge Kaminski, began hearing rumors of an affair between Judge Kaminski and the attorney as early as summer 2017. Thereafter, the affair became well-known throughout the general community.

8. Judge Kaminski filed for divorce on December 21, 2017, and the final divorce decree incorporating the parties' settlement agreement was entered on February 26, 2018. Judge Kaminski and the attorney engaged openly in their romantic relationship shortly after.

Judicial Actions while Disqualified

9. The following tables illustrate a number of cases in which Judge Kaminski, during the pendency of his romantic relationship with the attorney, a) appointed the attorney; b) took judicial actions in cases in which the attorney was an attorney of record; c) entered attorney's-fee-declaration orders for the attorney's benefit; and/or d) failed to disqualify from cases in which the attorney appeared.

10. The table below illustrates a number of Judge Kaminski's appointments to the attorney after June 1, 2017,

i.e., the latest date their romantic relationship commenced.

Judge Kaminski's Appointing of the Attorney After June 1, 2017		
Case	Date Appointed	Appointment
19-DC-2016-208; -209; & -210 (State v. Hughes)	Oct. 18, 2017	Defense Attorney
19-DC-2017-254 & -255 (State v. Hooks)	Oct. 6, 2017	Defense Attorney
71-DC-2017-514 & -515 (State v. Reynolds)	Aug. 25, 2017	Defense Attorney
71-JU-2014-128.09	June 8, 2017	GAL ¹
19-JU-2014-155.02	Dec. 5, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-293.02	Nov. 30, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-294.02	Nov. 30, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2014-202.04	June 7, 2017	Father's Attorney
71-JU-2015-15.06	June 9, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2015-168.04	Oct. 2, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2015-236.03	Sept. 1, 2017	GAL

¹ Guardian ad litem.

71-JU-2007-231.06; 71-JU-2015-12.05; 71-JU-2015-235.03; & 71-JU-2015-236.03	Sept. 1, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-43.02	Nov. 20, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-85.01	June 20, 2017	GAL
19-JU-2017-107.01	July 26, 2017	GAL
19-JU-2017-110.01	June 1, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-178.01	June 6, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-179.01	June 6, 2017	Mother's Attorney
71-JU-2017-197.01	Aug. 25, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-235.03	Oct. 12, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-246.01	Sept. 13, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-262.01	Oct. 11, 2017	Mother's Attorney
71-JU-2017-293.02	Nov. 30, 2017	GAL
71-JU-2017-298.01	Nov. 17, 2017	GAL

11. The table below illustrates a number of appearances by the attorney before Judge Kaminski after June 1, 2017, i.e., the latest date their romantic relationship commenced.

The Attorney's Appearances before Judge Kaminski after June 1, 2017		
Case	Appearance Date	Notes
19-DC-2017-120; -121; & -122 (State v. Ellender)	June 8, 2017	The attorney's client waived prelims.

19-DC-2016-242 & -243; 19-DC-2017-109, -110, -111, -112, -133, -134, & -135 (State v. McClasin)	June 8, 2017 July 13, 2017	Following the hearing, Judge Kaminski granted the attorney's motion and released her client from incarceration to attend a rehab program.
71-JU-2006-324.03	Jan. 8, 2018	Motions Hearing
19-JU-2011-22.02	Oct. 4, 2017	Permanency Hearing
19-JU-2011-69.04	Sept. 14, 2017 Feb. 7, 2018	Permanency Hearing Review Hearing
71-JU-2012-76.01	July 24, 2017 Dec. 4, 2017	Permanency Hearing Review Hearing
19-JU-2013-147.06	June 6, 2017 Nov. 7, 2017	Status Hearing Review Hearing
19-JU-2013-118.01	Aug. 8, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2014-128.07	Sept. 5, 2017 Feb. 5, 2018	Permanency Hearing Final Hearing
19-JU-2014-155.02	Feb. 7, 2018	Final Hearing
71-JU-2014-128.09	July 5, 2017 July 24, 2017	Probation Revocation Adjudicatory Hearing
71-JU-2014-202.04	Oct. 17, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2014-284.02 & .03	July 28, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2015-15.06	July 24, 2017 Nov. 20, 2017	Review Hearing Final Hearing
71-JU-2007-231.04 & .05; 71-JU-2015-12.03 & .04; 71-JU-2015-235.01 & .02; 71-JU-2015-236.01 & .02	June 5, 2017 Dec. 4, 2017	Motions Hearing Permanency Hearing

71-JU-2007-231.06; 71-JU-2015-12.05; 71-JU-2015-235.03; 71-JU-2015-236.03	Nov. 29, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2016-101.01	Oct. 4, 2017 Nov. 7, 2017	Motions Hearing Final Hearing
71-JU-2016-145.01	July 24, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2016-161.01	Dec. 5, 2017	Shelter-Care Hearing
71-JU-2017-39.01	July 28, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2017-43.02	Nov. 20, 2017 Dec. 4, 2017	72-Hour Hearing Final Hearing
71-JU-2017-85.01	Sept. 5, 2017 Feb. 5, 2018	Status Hearings
19-JU-2017-107.01	Sept. 28, 2017 Nov. 30, 2017	Trial
71-JU-2017-151.01	Oct. 18, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2017-165.01	June 7, 2017 July 26, 2017	Review Hearings
71-JU-2017-178.01	June 7, 2017 July 24, 2017 Oct. 17, 2017	Shelter-Care Hearing Dependency Hearing Trial
71-JU-2017-179.01	June 8, 2017 July 24, 2017 Oct. 18, 2017	Shelter-Care Hearing Dependency Hearing Final Hearing
71-JU-2017-197.01	Oct. 2, 2017	Status Hearing
71-JU-2017-235.03	Nov. 6, 2017	Final Hearing
71-JU-2017-246.01	Oct. 2, 2017 Jan. 8, 2018	Status Hearing Dependency Hearing
71-JU-2017-262.01	Nov. 6, 2017	Status Hearing
71-JU-2017-293.02	Jan. 8, 2018 Feb. 6, 2018	Review Hearing Final Hearing

71-JU-2017-298.01	Dec. 1, 2017 Jan. 10, 2018	Status Hearing Dependency Hearing
-------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------

12. The table below illustrates a number of actions by Judge Kaminski in cases in which the attorney was appearing at the time of the action, but after June 1, 2017, i.e., the latest date their romantic relationship commenced.

Judge Kaminski's Actions after June 1, 2017 While The Attorney in Case		
Case	Date of Action	Action
71-DV-2017-28 (Helgeson v. Helgeson)	June 19, 2017	Order decreeing judgment in favor of the attorney's client was satisfied.
19-DC-2016-208; -209; & -210 (State v. Hughes)	March 2, 2018	Granted State's motion nolle prosequing cases against the attorney's client.
19-DC-2017-105 & -106 (State v. Pridgen)	June 8, 2017	Judgment on the attorney's client's guilty plea, suspended 6-month sentence, and 24 months' unsupervised probation.
19-DC-2017-121 (State v. Ellender)	Aug. 16, 2017	Granted State's motion nolle prosequing case against the attorney's client.
19-DC-2017-120 & -122 (State v. Ellender)	Nov. 6, 2018	Granted State's motion nolle prosequing cases against the attorney's client.

19-DC-2017-254 & -255 (State v. Hooks)	Oct. 17, 2017	Denied the attorney's Oct. 16, 2017 motion for a preliminary hearing; granted the attorney's Oct. 16, 2017 discovery motions.
19-DC-2016-242 & -243 (State v. McClasin)	June 8, 2017	Revoked the attorney's client's bond.
19-DC-2016-242 & -243; 19-DC-2017-109, -110, -111, -112, -133, -134, & -135 (State v. McClasin)	July 13, 2017 Feb. 16, 2018	Granted the attorney's motion to release her client from incarceration to attend a rehab program. Set hearing on the attorney's motion for release from custody.
71-JU-2014-128.09	Jan. 22, 2018	Discharged child, represented by the attorney as GAL, from probation upon release from the Ala. Dept. of Youth Services.
71-JU-2014-202.04	Aug. 29, 2017	Granted the attorney's Aug. 21, 2017 motion to continue.
71-JU-2014-284.02 & -.03	June 7, 2017	Granted the attorney's June 5, 2017 motion to continue.
71-JU-2015-168.03	July 17, 2017	Following Apr. 4, 2017 hearing in which the attorney was GAL, entered order terminating the father's parental rights.

13. The table below is a list of attorney's-fee-declaration orders² issued by Judge Kaminski for the attorney's benefit, after June 1, 2017, i.e., the latest date their romantic relationship commenced.

Judge Kaminski's Attorney's-Fee-Declaration Orders for The Attorney after June 1, 2017	
Case	Date of Order
19-DC-2016-242 & -243; 19-DC-2017-109, -110, -111, -112, -133, -134, & -135 (State v. McClasin)	March 19, 2018 ³
71-DC-2017-514 (State v. Reynolds)	Dec. 4, 2017
CS-2015-900063.01 (State v. Donaldson)	Dec. 4, 2017
71-JU-2006-324.03	Nov. 2, 2017 March 26, 2018
71-JU-2017-12.01	June 29, 2017
71-JU-2010-16.05	March 28, 2018
71-JU-2007-231.06	Jan. 19, 2018
19-JU-2011-22.02	June 26, 2017 Jan. 19, 2018
19-JU-2011-22.03	June 28, 2017

² A judicial order certifying that the attorney presenting a claim to the Office of Indigent Services for work rendered provided legal representation in the matter; that the matter is concluded; and that, to the best of the judge's knowledge, the bill is reasonable.

³ The attorney submitted an invoice for, and Judge Kaminski entered an attorney's-fee-declaration order for only 19-DC-2016-242, but this encompassed all accompanying cases.

19-JU-2011-69.04	Sept. 19, 2017 March 22, 2018
19-JU-2013-118.01	Aug. 9, 2017
19-JU-2013-147.06	March 22, 2018
71-JU-2012-76.01	March 26, 2018
71-JU-2014-128.07	Feb. 16, 2018
71-JU-2014-128.09	Aug. 9, 2017
19-JU-2014-155.02	Feb. 16, 2018
71-JU-2014-202.04	Nov. 8, 2017
71-JU-2014-284.02	Aug. 29, 2017
71-JU-2015-15.06	March 26, 2018
71-JU-2015-12.03	March 26, 2018
71-JU-2015-31.04	March 26, 2018
71-JU-2015-21.04	Nov. 21, 2017
71-JU-2015-168.01	March 23, 2018
71-JU-2015-168.02	Aug. 29, 2017
71-JU-2015-168.04	March 19, 2018
71-JU-2016-59.01	Aug. 9, 2017
71-JU-2015-236.02	Nov. 9, 2017
71-JU-2016-101.01	Nov. 9, 2017
71-JU-2016-59.01	Aug. 9, 2017
71-JU-2016-145.01	Aug. 9, 2017
71-JU-2016-161.01	March 23, 2018
71-JU-2017-12.01	June 29, 2017
71-JU-2017-39.01	Aug. 25, 2017

19-JU-2017-107.01	Dec. 4, 2017
71-JU-2017-43.02	Jan. 1, 2018
71-JU-2017-85.01	March 28, 2018
19-JU-2017-110.01	June 29, 2017
71-JU-2017-151.01	Nov. 2, 2017
71-JU-2017-165.01	March 19, 2018
71-JU-2017-178.01	Nov. 2, 2017
71-JU-2017-179.01	Nov. 2, 2017
71-JU-2017-197.01	Jan. 30, 2018
71-JU-2017-235.03	Nov. 8, 2017
71-JU-2017-246.01	Feb. 6, 2018
71-JU-2017-262.01	March 26, 2018
71-JU-2017-293.02	March 19, 2018
71-JU-2017-298.01	March 19, 2018

14. In many of the cases pending after Judge Kaminski and the attorney discontinued attempting to keep their relationship secret, Judge Kaminski still did not disqualify. Instead, the attorney filed motions to withdraw and, although Judge Kaminski was plainly disqualified from taking any action in each case, he granted her motions and continued to preside in those cases despite being disqualified.

15. For example, in State v. McClasin, 19-DC-2016-242 and -243 and 19-DC-2017-109, -110, -111, -112, -133, -134, and -135, the following occurred:

- a. October 5, 2016: Judge Kaminski appointed the attorney to represent the defendant on two criminal charges.
- b. May 11, 2017: After the defendant was charged with seven new criminal offenses (19-DC-2017-109, -110, -111, -112, -133, -134, and -135) Judge Kaminski appointed the attorney to represent him on those new charges.
- c. June 8, 2017: A hearing was held. The attorney attended. The defendant's bond on 19-DC-2016-242 and -243 was revoked, and he was remanded to jail.
- d. June 30, 2017: The attorney filed a motion to allow the defendant to attend a rehabilitation program. Judge Kaminski scheduled a hearing for July 13, 2017.
- e. July 13, 2017: A hearing was held. The attorney attended. Judge Kaminski granted the attorney's motion and released the defendant from incarceration to attend the program.

f. February 16, 2018: The attorney filed a motion for the defendant's release from custody upon successful graduation from the rehab facility, noting the defendant was scheduled to graduate on February 24, 2018. Judge Kaminski scheduled a hearing for March 15, 2018.

g. March 15, 2018: A hearing was held. The attorney did not attend as the defendant was represented by different counsel. Judge Kaminski ordered the defendant to be released upon posting a \$1,000 recognizance bond.

h. March 19, 2018: Judge Kaminski entered an attorney's-fee-declaration order for the attorney's work on the cases.

i. March 20, 2018: The attorney filed a motion to withdraw "for reasons known to the court." Judge Kaminski granted her motion that day.

16. As further example, in In the Matter of E.L., 71-JU-2007-000047.03, a dependency matter, the following occurred:

a. May 1, 2017: Judge Kaminski appointed the attorney as a GAL.

b. October 18, 2017: Judge Kaminski held an adjudicatory hearing. The attorney attended. Judge Kaminski adjudicated the child dependent.

c. November 20, 2017: Judge Kaminski held a dispositional hearing. The attorney attended.

d. February 22, 2018: Judge Kaminski issued an order vesting custody of the child with the Department of Human Resources ("DHR") and giving DHR discretion in planning and placement, "with the concurrence of the GAL [the attorney]." A review hearing was set for April 9, 2018.

e. April 6, 2018: The attorney filed a motion to withdraw "for reasons known to the court." Judge Kaminski granted her motion three days later.

17. In addition, in In the Matter of L.B., 71-JU-2015-000168.04, a petition for termination of parental rights ("TPR") of the mother, the following occurred:

a. October 2, 2017: Judge Kaminski appointed the attorney as GAL.

b. October 31, 2017: Judge Kaminski set the trial for November 29, 2017.

- c. January 19, 2018: After several continuances, the mother filed a motion to dismiss.
- d. January 25, 2018: Judge Kaminski denied the mother's motion to dismiss and granted DHR's motion to continue, resetting the trial for February 27, 2018.
- e. February 26, 2018: Judge Kaminski granted the mother's motion to continue, resetting the trial for March 8, 2018.
- f. March 7, 2018: Judge Kaminski granted the mother's motion to continue, resetting the trial for March 26, 2018.
- g. March 19, 2018: Judge Kaminski issued an Attorney's-Fee-Declaration Order for the attorney.
- h. March 20, 2018: The attorney filed a motion to withdraw "for reasons known to the Court." Judge Kaminski granted the motion that day and appointed a new GAL.
- i. March 28, 2018: Judge Kaminski dismissed the petition against the mother.

Lack of Candor with the Commission

18. On November 28, 2018, Judge Kaminski's counsel submitted a response to the Commission regarding the allegations under investigation. The response was not fully forthright and candid with the Commission, as the Canons require.⁴

19. The response acknowledged that there were rumors in the community that Judge Kaminski was having an affair with the attorney, but he "steadfastly denied these rumors then *and denies them now*." This is a misrepresentation—at the latest, by June 1, 2017, Judge Kaminski was engaged in a relationship with the attorney, and, upon information and belief, it continues to the date of the filing of this Complaint.

20. The response again relied on semantics when it disingenuously read Judge Kaminski "did not date [the attorney] until after his divorce, and their relationship did not become steady until sometime thereafter." This statement is purportedly a direct response to the

⁴ On December 14, 2018, Judge Kaminski's counsel withdrew Judge Kaminski's November 28, 2018 response, with no explanation.

allegation that "[w]hile you were in a romantic and/or intimate relationship with [the attorney], you presided in cases in which [the attorney] was an attorney of record or a guardian ad litem."⁵ This response obfuscated the plain issue: whether he and the attorney had any relationship that resulted in Canon violations. The evidence clearly and convincingly proves they did.

**Improper Use of the Prestige of the Judicial Office to
Advance Private Interests**

21. On or about June 14, 2018, Coffee County Circuit Clerk Amy Reeves held a gathering in the courthouse to celebrate her recent appointment. Judge Kaminski and the attorney attended along with many members of the community, including Judge Kaminski's ex-wife. Following the gathering, a rumor began circulating around the community that Judge Kaminski and the attorney engaged in inappropriate behavior in the presence of Judge Kaminski's ex-wife.

22. In response, shortly thereafter Judge Kaminski contacted Coffee County Deputy Sheriff Craig Victor regarding courthouse-surveillance footage. Deputy Victor is

⁵ Sept. 25, 2018 Investigation Letter, Exhibit 1.

the supervisor of courthouse security for Coffee County and deals with Judge Kaminski frequently. In that capacity, Deputy Victor manages access to the building's surveillance system. Judge Kaminski asked Deputy Victor for permission to enter the courthouse-security office and access the surveillance system. Deputy Victor consented. Shortly thereafter, Deputy Victor informed his direct supervisor and also the Sheriff to inform them of Judge Kaminski's request.

23. Upon gaining access to the surveillance footage, Judge Kaminski made a copy of the footage he deemed relevant to rebut the "malicious rumor."

24. Judge Kaminski shared the copied surveillance footage with the attorney, who then disseminated it via social media.

CHARGES

COUNT I

Charge 1

25. On numerous occasions, by appointing the attorney to cases while they were engaged in a romantic relationship, Judge Kaminski violated the following provisions of the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics:

- Canon 1 A judge should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary.
- A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing, and should himself observe, high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.
- Canon 2 A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.
- Canon 2A A judge should respect and comply with the law.
- A judge should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.
- Canon 2B A judge should at all times avoid conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice which brings the judicial office into disrepute.

Charge 2

26. On numerous occasions, by entering attorney's fee declarations orders for the benefit of the attorney while they were engaged in a romantic relationship, Judge Kaminski violated the following provisions of the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics:

- Canon 1 A judge should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary.
- A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing, and should

himself observe, high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.

Canon 2 A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.

Canon 2A A judge should respect and comply with the law.

A judge should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

Canon 2B A judge should at all times avoid conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice which brings the judicial office into disrepute.

Charge 3

27. On numerous occasions, by taking judicial actions (in addition to the appointments and attorney's fee declarations) in cases in which the attorney was an attorney of record while they were engaged in a romantic relationship, Judge Kaminski violated the following provisions of the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics:

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

A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing, and should himself observe, high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.

Canon 2 A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.

Canon 2A A judge should respect and comply with the law.

A judge should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

Canon 2B A judge should at all times avoid conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice which brings the judicial office into disrepute.

Charge 4

28. On numerous occasions, by failing to timely/immediately disqualify himself from cases in which the attorney was an attorney of record while they were engaged in a romantic relationship, and even after they publicly acknowledged the relationship, Judge Kaminski violated the following provisions of the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics:

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

A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing, and should himself observe, high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.

- Canon 2 A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.
- Canon 2A A judge should respect and comply with the law.
- A judge should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.
- Canon 2B A judge should at all times avoid conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice which brings the judicial office into disrepute.
- Canon 3C(1) A judge should disqualify himself in a proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

COUNT II

Charge 1

29. By using the prestige of his office to gain access to courtroom-security footage to advance the private interests of the attorney and himself, Judge Kaminski violated the following provisions of the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics:

- Canon 1 A judge should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary.
- A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing, and should himself observe, high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.

- Canon 2 A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.
- Canon 2A A judge should respect and comply with the law.
- A judge should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.
- Canon 2B A judge should at all times avoid conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice which brings the judicial office into disrepute.
- Canon 2C A judge should not lend the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others.

Charge 2

30. By supplying the footage to the attorney that she shared on social media, Judge Kaminski violated the following provisions of the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics:

- Canon 1 A judge should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary.
- A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing, and should himself observe, high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.
- Canon 2 A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.

Canon 2A A judge should respect and comply with the law.

A judge should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

Canon 2C A judge should not convey or permit others to convey the impression that they are in a special position to influence him.

COUNT III

31. By failing to be completely forthright and truthful during the Commission's investigation, Judge Kaminski violated the following provisions of the Alabama Canons of Judicial Ethics:

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

A judge should participate in establishing, maintaining, and enforcing, and should himself observe, high standards of conduct so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved.

Canon 2 A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all his activities.

Canon 2A A judge should respect and comply with the law.

A judge should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

Canon 2B A judge should at all times avoid conduct
prejudicial to the administration of
justice which brings the judicial office
into disrepute.

Done this 16th day of July, 2019.

THE JUDICIAL INQUIRY COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "By C. Bedsole", written over a horizontal line.

Billy C. Bedsole
Chairman

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION



Judicial Inquiry Commission

TELEPHONE (334) 242-4089 FAX (334) 353-4043

MAILING ADDRESS:
POST OFFICE BOX 303400
MONTGOMERY, AL 36130-3400

STREET ADDRESS:
401 ADAMS AVENUE, SUITE 720
MONTGOMERY, AL 36104

September 25, 2018

CERTIFIED MAIL

Personal & Confidential

Honorable Chris Kaminski
District Judge
P.O. Box 311244
Enterprise, AL 36331

Re: Complaint by [REDACTED]


Dear Judge Kaminski:

As required by Rule 6C, Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Inquiry Commission, adopted by the Alabama Supreme Court, you will find enclosed a copy of the complaint filed against you by [REDACTED]


[REDACTED] A copy of all material accompanying the complaint and accumulated or received by the Commission as of this date is also enclosed.

In addition, as required by Rule 6C, this is to advise you the Commission has decided to investigate the following allegations in [REDACTED] complaint:

1. While you were in a romantic and/or intimate relationship with Attorney [REDACTED] you presided in cases in which [REDACTED] was an attorney of record or a guardian ad litem.



Judge Kaminski
September 25, 2018
Page 2



The Commission does not request a response from you at this time.



Sincerely,

JUDICIAL INQUIRY COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Billy C. Bedsole", is written over the typed name.

Billy C. Bedsole
Chairman

Attachment: Complaint