## **MODIFICATION REQUEST COVER SHEET**

Name of Filer	ELIZABETH PIKE MARTIN
Reporting Period	<ul><li>☒ Annual report – calendar year 2017</li><li>☐ Candidate/Appointee report</li></ul>
Type of Request	<ul> <li>□ New</li> <li>☑ Renewal with No Change – <u>original granted on June 24, 2010</u></li> <li>☑ Full Commission Approval – <u>May 28, 2015</u></li> <li>□ Renewal with Change</li> </ul>
Office Held/Sought & Term	Superior Court Judge, Pierce County Current term expires December, 2020
Application Rule(s)	<ul> <li>☐ Income &amp; Ownership Interest: WAC 390-28-100(b)</li> <li>☑ Personal Residence: WAC 390-28-100(d)</li> <li>☐ Attorney: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(i))</li> <li>☐ Judge / Judicial Candidate: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(ii))</li> <li>☑ Spousal: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(iv))</li> <li>☐ Other: WAC 390-28-100(1)(a)(c)</li> </ul>
Explanation of Rule(s)	Personal residence - Real property. Regarding reporting the information otherwise required by RCW 42.17A.710 (1)(h) through (k):  (i) Under WAC 390-24-200, the filer shall list the street address of each parcel, the assessor's parcel number, the abbreviated legal description appearing on property tax statements, or the complete legal description. Each property description shall be followed by the name of the county in which the property is located.  (ii) No modification will be necessary if the filer describes the real property using one of the alternatives in WAC 390-24-200, plus the name of the county.  (iii) A modification will be required if the filer seeks some other means to describe reportable real property including the personal residence of the filer. The commission may consider a modification, for example, when the filer or his or her immediate family member has received a threat, has a no contact order, or presents a similar personal safety concern.  A prospective modification to allow nondisclosure of a residential address may be granted if the applicant or an immediate family member has received a threat, been issued a no contact order or presents a similar personal safety concern.  Applicants whose spouse or registered domestic partner creates a reporting obligation for the applicant. When an applicant is required to report the activities of an entity solely because the applicant's spouse or registered domestic partner held an office, directorship, general partnership or ownership interest in the entity and the applicant does not have direct knowledge of the information that must be reported, the applicant may be allowed to satisfy the disclosure requirements of RCW 42.17A.710 (1)(g)(ii) and WAC 390-24-020 by disclosing reportable customers from whom

compensation in excess of the disclosure threshold established under RCW 42.17A.710 (1)(g)(ii) has been received as follows: (A) All payments made by the agency or jurisdiction in which the applicant seeks or holds office to the entity: (B) The business and other governmental customers or clients of the applicant's spouse/domestic partner and of the entity of which the applicant is aware; and (C) Any other business and other governmental customers or clients of the entity whose identities are known to the applicant and whose interests are significantly affected by the agency or jurisdiction in which the applicant seeks or holds office. The commission may apply (e)(i) through (iii) of this subsection when the applicant's spouse/domestic partner is a lawyer, judge, or motor vehicle dealer. □ Current F-1 (filed March 28, 2018) Supporting **Documents** (attached) ☑ Prior order (if renewal) – August 23, 2017 Reason(s) for Personal Residential Address Modification • Judge Martin is requesting a renewal of a reporting modification that (as stated by filer) would exempt her from disclosing her personal residential address information, including street address, parcel number, or legal description, on her Personal Financial Affairs Statement for 2017. Judge Martin stated that in her current position, she presides over felony criminal, civil and family law matters, many of which are highly volatile and/or involve high risk litigants. She is requesting this modification regarding her personal residence as a matter of personal safety for herself and her family. Gordon Thomas Honeywell, LLP Judge Martin is requesting a renewal of a reporting modification that would exempt her from disclosing the reportable business customers of the law firm, Gordon Thomas Honeywell, LLP, that paid \$12,000 or more during 2017, for which her spouse, Warren E. Martin, is a partner. Judge Martin stated that Gordon Thomas Honeywell, LLP is a Tacoma law firm with approximately 50 total lawyers and over 1,000 clients. Her spouse's ownership interest of 7.5399%. Judge Martin said she does not have access to the client base or compensation information of Gordon Thomas Honeywell. • Judge Martin stated that, pursuant to Code of Judicial Conduct, Cannon 3(d), she has, and will continue to, recuse herself from all matters in which

	(1) a Gordon Thomas Honeywell lawyer represents a party; (2) involve a party which Judge Martin or Mr. Martin previously represented, or (3) involve a party personally known by Judge Martin to be a client of the firm.
Other Issues	Judge Martin provided a list of reportable business clients known to her and a list of reportable governmental clients of her spouse's firm, Gordon Thomas Honeywell.
Staff Recommendations	Approve renewal of the reporting modification with no change.