

ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
ON STANDARDS OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT

OPINION NO. 13 - 2017

RE: Propriety of a municipal court housing a customer service kiosk.

FACTS

The City in which the municipal court judge is located has recently purchased two “Happy or Not” kiosks to enhance customer service initiatives of the City. One kiosk is located at City Hall and the other in the lobby of the municipal court. The question on both kiosks is “Was our staff professional and courteous?” Users can select one of four “smiley” faces to indicate their level of satisfaction. The purpose of the kiosks is to provide feedback to City employees and to increase awareness by City employees of their interactions with the public. The municipal court judge inquires as to whether housing one of the kiosks would violate any of the Canons.

CONCLUSIONS

A municipal court judge may house a customer service kiosk.

OPINION

Canon 3 governs the duties of judicial office and requires judges to act diligently and impartially. Canon 3B(4) states that a judge “shall be patient, dignified and courteous to litigants, jurors and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity, and shall require similar conduct of lawyers, and of staff, court officials and others subject to the judge’s direction and control.”

Here, the kiosks allow those that have business with the municipal court to provide feedback as to whether the judge and other court employees have acted with courtesy as required by Canon 3. The kiosks would not interfere with the judge’s duty to act diligently and impartially.

Thus, there is no prohibition in the Canons preventing the municipal judge from housing one of the kiosks.

S/ A. CAMDEN LEWIS  
A. CAMDEN LEWIS, CHAIRMAN

CATE\_\_\_\_\_

S/ JOCELYN B.  
JOCELYN B. CATE

S/ LETITIA H. VERDIN  
LETITIA H. VERDIN

September 5, 2017.