

> ALL RISE.  
HEAR YE, HEAR YE, HEAR YE, THE  
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA IS NOW  
IN SESSION.  
ALL WHO HAVE CAUSE TO PLEAD,  
DRAW NEAR, GIVE ATTENTION, AND  
YOU SHALL BE HEARD.  
GOD SAVE THESE UNITED STATES,  
THE GREAT STATE OF FLORIDA, AND  
THIS HONORABLE COURT.  
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE  
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA.  
PLEASE BE SEATED.  
>> GOOD MORNING.  
WELCOME TO THE FLORIDA SUPREME  
COURT.  
THE FIRST CASE ON THE DOCKET  
TODAY IS THE REPRIMAND OF JUDGE  
HOLDER.  
JUDGE HOLDER, WE HAVE SUMMONED  
YOU HERE TODAY BECAUSE OF  
CONDUCT WHICH THIS COURT HAS  
DETERMINED TO BE IN VIOLATION OF  
THE CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND  
WHICH NOW REQUIRES US TO IMPOSE  
APPROPRIATE DISCIPLINE.  
AS TO PREAMBLE TO THE CODE OF  
JUDICIAL CONDUCT RECOGNIZES  
JUDGES INDIVIDUALLY AND  
COLLECTIVELY MUST RESPECT AND  
HONOR THE JUDICIAL OFFICE AS A  
PUBLIC TRUST.  
AND STRIFE TO ENHANCE AND  
MAINTAIN CONFIDENCE IN OUR LEGAL  
SYSTEM.  
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUR  
JUDICIARY RESTS ULTIMATELY ON  
THE TRUST AND CONFIDENCE THAT  
PEOPLE CONFER UPON JUDGES.  
AS A RESULT ONE OF THIS COURT'S  
MOST IMPORTANT DUTIES TO CARRY  
OUT THE RESPONSIBILITY GIVEN TO  
US IN THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION  
OF DISCIPLINING JUDGES FOR  
MISCONDUCT.  
THIS IS NOT A TASK I ENJOY BUT  
CERTAIN ONE THAT WE AS A COURT  
REGARD AS VITALLY NECESSARY.  
YOU HAVE BEEN FOUND GUILTY OF  
VIOLATING CANNONS 1, 2-A, 2-B,  
3-B-7 AND 3-B-9 OF THE CODE OF  
JUDICIAL CONDUCT THE CHARGES  
FILED AGAINST YOU ARISE FROM YOU  
PRESIDING OVER THE 13th

CIRCUIT VETERANS COURT IN THE  
CRIMINAL CASE OF STATE OF  
FLORIDA VERSUS CLAY ALLRED.  
MR. ALLRED'S CASE AROSE FROM  
2004 CONFRONTATION WITH A  
CONVENIENCE CLERK THAT RESULTED  
IN MR. ALLRED'S BEING CHARGED  
WITH TWO FELONY COUNTS,  
DISCHARGING A FIREARM FROM A  
VEHICLE AND AGGRAVATED ASSAULT  
WITH A DEADLY WEAPON AS WELL AS  
ONE COUNT OF CRIMINAL MISCHIEF  
AND A MISDEMEANOR.

THROUGHOUT THE PERIOD OF TIME  
THAT YOU PRESIDED OVER THE CASE  
MR. ALLRED'S WAS REPRESENTED BY  
PRIVATE COUNSEL.

ON MARCH 27, 2015, YOU ACCEPTED  
A NO CONTEST PLEA BY MR.  
ALLRED'S AND SENTENCED HIM TO 24  
MONTHS OF COMMUNITY CONTROL TO  
BE FOLLOWED BY 36 MONTHS OF  
PROBATION.

AS A CONSEQUENCE OF HIS ARREST,  
IN SUBSEQUENT CONVICTION OF  
FELONIES, MR. ALLRED'S WAS  
EXPELLED FROM AND LATER DENIED  
ADMISSION TO UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH  
FLORIDA.

HE WAS WORKING THERE TO COMPLETE  
HIS UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE, THE  
COMPLETION OF WHICH WAS  
RECOMMENDED BY THE DEFENDANTS VA  
MEDICAL CENTER STAFF  
PSYCHOLOGIST.

ON NOVEMBER 13th, 2015, YOU  
SENT A LETTER TO THE UNIVERSITY  
OF SOUTH FLORIDA PRESIDENT  
DR. JUDY GENSHAFT.

YOUR LETTER, WRITTEN ON YOUR  
JUDICIAL LETTERHEAD SERVED AS  
BOTH A LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION  
FOR MR. ALLRED'S, AND A REQUEST  
THAT MR. ALLRED'S BE ADMITTED  
INTO AN ONLINE ONLY PROGRAM AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA.  
YOU OFFERED DR. GENSHAFT TO  
MODIFY THE CONDITIONS OF  
MR. ALLRED'S COMMUNITY CONTROL  
TO PROHIBIT HIM FROM ENTERING  
THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS.

YOU ALSO REQUESTED THAT HE BE  
ADMITTED TO TAKE HIS COURSES  
ONLY AS AN ONLINE STUDENT.

HOWEVER, NO SUCH ONLINE PROGRAM  
EXISTED AND YOUR REQUEST WAS  
DENIED.

YOU THEN CALLED THE STATE  
ATTORNEY AND SUGGESTED, AMONG  
OTHER THINGS, THAT HE REVIEW THE  
EVIDENCE AND PERMIT THE  
DEFENDANT TO HAVE A ADJUDICATION  
WITHHELD.

THE STATE ATTORNEY DECLINED TO  
DO SO.

SPEAKING TO YOU, THE STATE  
ATTORNEY CALLED MR. ALLRED'S  
COUNSEL AND INFORMED HIM OF YOUR  
CALL AND REQUEST.

COINCIDENTALLY, ON  
NOVEMBER 20th, 2015,  
MR. ALLRED'S ATTORNEY FILED A  
PLEADING STYLED, MOTION TO  
MODIFY COMMUNITY CONTROL TO  
PROBATION IN WHICH MR. ALLRED'S  
THROUGH HIS COUNSEL REQUESTED A  
MODIFICATION OF HIS SENTENCE SO  
THAT A 24-MONTHS OF COMMUNITY  
CONTROL, HIS HOUSE ARREST, COULD  
BE CONVERTED INTO THE LESS  
RESTRICTIVE REGULATION, REGULAR  
PROBATION.

THE MOTION EXPLAINS THAT THE  
CONDITIONS OF MR. ALLRED'S  
COMMUNITY CONTROL AS WELL AS HIS  
EXTENSIVE TREATMENT REGIMEN WERE  
PREVENTING THE COMPLETION OF HIS  
UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE.

JUDGE HOLD EXXON  
JANUARY 8th, 2016, YOU  
CONDUCTED A HEARING ON THIS  
MOTION AND YOU GRANTED OVER THE  
STATE'S OBJECTION MR. ALLRED'S  
REQUEST TO MODIFY HIS SENTENCE.  
FOLLOWING AN INVESTIGATIVE  
HEARING, YOU ENTERED INTO A  
FACTUAL STIPULATION WITH A  
JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS  
COMMISSION ADMITTING TO THE  
CHARGES, APOLOGIZING FOR YOUR  
IMPROPER CONDUCT, AND ACCEPTING  
A PUBLIC REPRIMAND AND SIX  
ADDITIONAL HOURS OF CONTINUING  
JUDICIAL EDUCATION TRAINING AS  
RECOMMENDED BY THE PANEL.

JUDGE HOLDER, CANNON 2-B  
SPECIFICALLY STATES THAT A JUDGE  
SHALL NOT ALLOW FAMILY, SOCIAL,

POLITICAL, OR OTHER  
RELATIONSHIPS TO INFLUENCE THE  
JUDGE'S JUDICIAL CONDUCT OR  
JUDGMENT.

WHATEVER FEELINGS YOU HARBORED  
FOR MR. ALLRED'S, YOU WENT FAR  
BEYOND WHAT JUDGES ARE PERMITTED  
UNDER THE CODE OF JUDICIAL  
CONDUCT.

YOU PLACED YOURSELF IN TWO  
GROSSLY INCONSISTENT POSITIONS.  
ONE, AS A GRUDGE PRESIDING OVER  
A-- JUDGE PRESIDING OVER A  
CRIMINAL CASE, TWO, AS ADVOCATE  
OF THE INTERESTS OF VERY  
DEFENDANT APPEARING BEFORE YOUR  
COURT.

YOU MADE TRANSPARENT EFFORTS TO  
PROVIDE BENEFITS TO THAT  
DEFENDANT DESPITE THE OBJECTIONS  
OF THE STATE ATTORNEY WHO WAS  
THE PEOPLE'S REPRESENTATIVE IN  
CRIMINAL MATTERS.

WE THEREFORE PUBLICLY REPRIMAND  
YOU FOR YOUR MISCONDUCT, JUDGE  
HOLDER.

THE CONDUCT YOU HAVE EXHIBITED  
CAN NOT AND WILL NOT BE  
TOLERATED.

BY OUR ACTIONS TODAY, WE  
ADMONISH YOU TO CORRECT WHATEVER  
MAY HAVE CAUSED YOU TO COMMIT  
THIS SINGLE BREACH AND WE ADVISE  
YOU TO REMEMBER WHAT OUR PRIOR  
CASES HAVE CONSISTENTLY HELD, A  
SECOND ETHICAL BREACH BY A JUDGE  
WILL BE VIEWED FAR MORE HARSHLY.  
YOUR PUBLIC REPRIMAND IS  
CONCLUDED.