

# Justice Karofsky: Decries weaponization of disciplinary process by anti-democracy forces

Posted on Saturday, Feb 11, 2023

>> **WisPolitics is now on the State Affairs network. Get custom keyword notifications, bill tracking and all WisPolitics content. [Get the app or access via desktop.](#)**

Contact: Sachin Chheda, [sachin@nation-consulting.com](mailto:sachin@nation-consulting.com), 414-412-6099

*Physical threats accompany frivolous complaints in effort to intimidate judges and other public officials*

MADISON, WI—Wisconsin Supreme Court Justice Jill Karofsky today voluntarily disclosed she faced a frivolous disciplinary complaint, alongside previously disclosed physical threats, in the wake of oral argument in Trump v Biden. The complaint was recently dismissed by the Wisconsin Judicial Commission approximately 18 months after first being filed. The disclosure happened in an interview on the *Amicus* podcast hosted by Dahlia Lithwick of Slate which was posted online this morning.

[The “Stop the Steal” Fight That Never Ended](https://www.slate.com/feature/the-stop-the-steal-fight-that-never-ended/)[slate.com](https://www.slate.com/feature/the-stop-the-steal-fight-that-never-ended/)

“This complaint was designed to intimidate, and I have waived my right to confidentiality because this campaign of harassment facing me and other public officials across the country, simply for standing up for the rule of law and for our democracy, must stop,” said Justice Karofsky. “Whether it’s facing physical threats, anti-semitic harassment, or weaponization of our systems of accountability, the pillars of our democracy are under siege.”

In addition to the interview on *Amicus*, Justice Karofsky is shining a light on the attempt to intimidate her into silence by releasing today all available documents

related to her disciplinary case. She has waived her right to confidentiality on this matter.

“I stand by these words from my initial response,” said Justice Karofsky.

“The Judicial Code requires judges to act with impartiality towards the parties, but it does not require a judge to turn a blind eye to dangerous, bad-faith conduct by a lawyer or litigant. It is beyond reason to read the Code to require judges to be mouse-like quiet when parties are arguing in favor of a slow-motion coup.

“The Code does not prohibit judges or Justices from speaking from the bench about arguments or positions they find abhorrent, frivolous, or even contrary to law in more mundane ways. That is what happened here. Justice Karofsky chose not to let the Court be used to spread falsehoods laced with racial animus to a national audience champing at the bit for confrontation. She maintained high standards of conduct in order to promote public confidence in the integrity of the judiciary.

“The Code and the Commission should not be weaponized to silence judges who rightfully push back against threats to our democracy. Nor should the Commission be part of a concerted campaign to intimidate judges and justices.”

“As I discuss in the interview, I believe both this complaint and the threats to me personally are part of a concerted campaign to intimidate those who are willing to do their jobs and stand up for democracy and justice,” said Justice Karofsky.