

Opinion Issued December 13, 2024



**DOCKET NO. SCR 24-0001**  
**SPECIAL COURT OF REVIEW**  
**IN RE INQUIRY CONCERNING HONORABLE URSULA HALL**

---

**OPINION**

Before this Review Tribunal<sup>1</sup> is an appeal from a Public Reprimand issued on April 15, 2024, by the Texas State Commission on Judicial Conduct against the Honorable Ursula Hall, judge of the 165th Judicial District Court in Houston, Harris County, Texas. The Commission’s Public Reprimand concluded that Judge Hall failed to: (1) comply with and maintain professional competence in the law; and (2) hear and decide matters assigned to her except those in which disqualification is required or recusal is appropriate, specifically she failed to perform her judicial duties in a timely manner with respect to setting, hearing, deciding, and signing orders in cases filed in her court. The Public Reprimand further concluded that “Judge Hall’s failure in these respects constituted willful and persistent conduct that is clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of her duties and cast[s] public discredit upon the judiciary or the administration of justice, in violation of Article V, Section 1-a(6)A of the Texas Constitution.”

Judge Hall timely appealed. *See* TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN. § 33.034 (providing procedure to appeal Commission sanctions).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Special Court of Review consists of the Honorable Gina M. Benavides, Justice of the Thirteenth Court of Appeals, presiding by appointment; the Honorable Robbie Partida-Kipness, Justice of the Fifth Court of Appeals, participating by appointment; and the Honorable Erin A. Nowell, Justice of the Fifth Court of Appeals, participating by appointment.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Judge Hall has been the presiding judge of the 165th District Court of Harris County since January 2017.<sup>2</sup> In October 2020, the Commission issued a Public Warning and Order of Additional Education based on her failure to timely rule on pending motions.

### A. Complaints against Judge Hall

Between September 2021 and July 2023, three complaints were filed against Judge Hall: one by the Honorable Tracy Christopher, Chief Justice of the Fourteenth Court of Appeals, and two by lawyers who appeared in Judge Hall's court.

#### 1. Chief Justice Christopher

Chief Justice Christopher filed a complaint in July 2023 after noting that lawyers repeatedly filed petitions for writs of mandamus asserting Judge Hall failed to timely rule on outstanding motions. In *In re Walsh*, No. 14-23-00455-CV, 2023 WL 4570459 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] July 18, 2023, no pet.) (mem. op.), the Court of Appeals took judicial notice that the First and Fourteenth Courts of Appeals were “repeatedly petitioned for mandamus relief against the Honorable Ursula A. Hall for failure to rule, including the more than thirty petitions set forth below, which were either granted, or dismissed as moot when the Honorable Ursula A. Hall ruled after the petition for writ of mandamus was filed.” *Id.* at \*2 (collecting cases).<sup>3</sup> With one exception,

---

<sup>2</sup> We take judicial notice of the Harris County Clerk's Official Results of the November 5, 2024 General and Special Elections showing Judge Hall was defeated in the election for District Judge of the 165th Judicial District of Harris County, Texas. Judge Hall's term will end on December 31, 2024.

<sup>3</sup> The cited cases are: *In re Wal-Mart Stores Tex., LLC*, No. 01-23-00340-CV, 2023 WL 3743089 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] June 1, 2023, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Hunter-Kelsey II, LLC*, No. 01-23-00276-CV, 2023 WL 3311468 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] May 9, 2023, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Intercontinental Terminals Co.*, No. 01-21-00610-CV, 2022 WL 3363950 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Aug. 16, 2022, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Prosperity Bank*, No. 01-22-00382-CV, 2022 WL 2919941 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] July 26, 2022, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Freeport LNG, LLC*, No. 01-21-00701-CV, 2022 WL 2251649 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] June 23, 2022, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Eagle Ship Mgmt., LLC*, No. 01-21-00427-CV 2022 WL 479926 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Feb. 17, 2022, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Hoffman*, No. 14-21-00697-CV, 2022 WL 288046 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Feb. 1, 2022, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Josefberg*, No. 01-21-00179-CV, 2021 WL 2149831 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] May 27, 2021, orig.

Judge Hall did not file responses to the petitions, and the Courts of Appeals did not request that she do so.

On one occasion, Judge Hall did not rule on an outstanding motion after the First Court of Appeals conditionally granted the petition for writ of mandamus and directed the trial court to rule on an outstanding motion. The Court of Appeals then issued the writ and Judge Hall was served; Chief Justice Christopher testified that “[a]lmost never” happens.

Explaining why she filed a complaint, Chief Justice Christopher testified: “I just thought the overwhelming number of mandamuses meant that Judge Hall was not doing her job” and “to me, it indicates an inability to handle her docket. . . . no other judge in Harris County, with the

---

proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Princeton Capital Corp.*, No. 01-20-00652-CV, 2021 WL 2006471 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] May 20, 2021, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Robbins*, 622 S.W.3d 600 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2021, orig. proceedings) (per curiam); *In re Advantage Cars.com*, No. 01-20-00863-CV, 2021 WL 1217326 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Apr. 1, 2021, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Estate of Burnett*, No. 14-20-00757-CV, 2020 WL 6878564 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Nov. 24, 2020, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re First Am. Title Ins. Co.*, No. 14-20-00563-CV, 2020 WL 5186622 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Sept. 1, 2020, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Nomarco, Inc.*, No. 14-20-00129-CV, 2020 WL 1181705 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Mar. 12, 2020, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re SMS Fin. XV, L.L.C.*, No. 01-19-00850-CV, 2020 WL 573247 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Feb. 6, 2020, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Maltz*, No. 01-19-00749-CV, 2019 WL 5792193 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Nov. 7, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re City of Houston*, No. 01-19-00700-CV, 2019 WL 4677367 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Sept. 26, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Elizon Master Participate Tr. I*, No. 14-19-00593-CV, 2019 WL 3727364 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Aug. 8, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Tomball Tex. Hosp. Co., LLC*, No. 01-19-00242-CV, 2019 WL 3418569 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] July 30, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Baylor Coll. of Med.*, No. 01-19-00105-CV, 2019 WL 3418504 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] July 30, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Univ. of Tex. MD Anderson Cancer Ctr.*, No. 01-19-00201-CV, 2019 WL 3418567 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] July 30, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Univ. of Tex. MD Anderson Cancer Ctr.*, No. 01-19-00202-CV, 2019 WL 3418568 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] July 30, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re ABC Assembly LLC*, No. 14-19-00419-CV, 2019 WL 2517865 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] June 18, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Harris Cnty Appraisal Dist.*, No. 14-19-00078-CV, 2019 WL 1716274 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Apr. 18, 2019, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Underwriters at Lloyds of London*, No. 01-18-00760-CV, 2018 WL 6318509 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Dec. 4, 2018, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Coffey*, No. 14-18-00124-CV, 2018 WL 1627592 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Apr. 5, 2018, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Socie*, No. 01-18-00414-CV, 2018 WL 3625443 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] July 31, 2018, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Underwriters at Lloyds of London*, No. 01-18-00196-CV, 2018 WL 1597480 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Apr. 3, 2018, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re Fiesta Mart, L.L.C.*, No. 14-18-00180-CV, 2018 WL 1476261 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Mar. 27, 2018, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.); *In re PDVSA Servs., Inc.*, No. 14-17-00824-CV, 2017 WL 6459227 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Dec. 19, 2017, orig. proceeding) (per curiam) (mem. op.).

Eighteen of these opinions issued before October 2020 when the Commission issued its Public Warning and Order of Additional Education.

same docket that she has, is subject to these kind of failure to rule mandamuses.” Chief Justice Christopher considers ruling on motions to be “the number one job of a trial judge” because, without a ruling, a “case comes to a standstill.” She testified that mandamus law requires a judge to rule in a “reasonable amount of time.” She agreed that a trial judge in Harris County does not have a duty to rule until the judge knows a motion is pending. She explained that a trial court judge becomes aware of a motion once it is properly set. However, if the lawyer or judge passes the submission date, then the motion is “just gone,” and the lawyer must ask that it be re-submitted.

Judge Hall’s statistics show she has a 90-100 percent clearance rate when comparing cases filed to cases resolved, and in some years, she exceeded 100 percent.

## 2. *Ramez Shamieh and Kim Spurlock*

Ramez Shamieh, a Dallas personal injury lawyer, filed a complaint against Judge Hall in April 2022 because he has “never been in a court that’s taken this long to rule on motions.” Specifically, Shamieh filed a motion to compel arbitration, and the motion was set for submission on October 23, 2017. The docket sheet shows that the motion was “passed” once and “re-set” once by one of Shamieh’s employees. Shamieh testified that, after numerous calls and emails from his office to the Court, Judge Hall denied the motion on April 16, 2019.

Shamieh also testified Judge Hall failed to rule on two motions to compel discovery that were filed in the case. Further, in November 2018, he filed a motion for leave to amend his pleadings, and he waited nine months for a ruling.

Shamieh’s client prevailed at trial. Shortly thereafter, his opposing counsel sent an email to the 165th Court thanking them for their “excellent work in providing everything needed for a smooth running trial. I feel like the 165th went above and beyond what I have normally experienced [in other] courts.” Shamieh replied to the email: “Our side definitely agrees. We already miss all of you.” Shamieh testified his email comments only related to his experience during the trial itself.

Kim Spurlock, an attorney who practices in Harris County, filed a complaint against Judge Hall in September 2021 because Judge Hall did not timely rule on motions for substituted service in five or six cases. Spurlock testified she had “to continually e-mail the Court for a status on these motions.”

In one case, Spurlock’s amended motion for substituted service was submitted on May 17, 2021, without a hearing. Her office contacted the court about one month later because she had not received an order, and they were told the motion would be brought to the judge’s attention. When the motion was not ruled on after another month, she unsuccessfully sought an oral hearing because she was “several years into having these issues with this particular court.” Her office followed up again on September 22, 2021, and was told the motion “was placed on the judge’s work page. We don’t have a ruling yet.” When Spurlock then threatened to seek a writ of mandamus, she received an email the same day from the clerk stating the motion was granted.

After contacting Judge Hall’s court about an outstanding motion for substituted service in another case, Spurlock “got a response from the Court telling me that I should file a brief with the Court explaining . . . why [Judge Hall] needed to rule on motions and what authority there was that she had to rule on motions. Then I got another e-mail from the Court one time vehemently apologizing for the failure of the Court, their words, not mine. And that they are, you know, working on, you know, fixing these issues.” She experienced “months’ long delays. I think one of them was nine months long delay. One of them actually had to file a motion to retain. And in my motion to retain, had to say, I need to retain this case on the docket because I’m waiting on the Court to make a ruling on my motion for substituted service.”

## **B. Judge Hall’s Testimony**

Judge Hall agrees she has a duty to timely rule on pending motions and doing so is one of her most important judicial duties. She testified she attempts “always to maintain my duties and docket and administrative and judicial responsibilities to the existing live cases.”

As to the mandamus petitions, Judge Hall explained:

Over time, I've come to believe that some litigants feel that it is an easy thing to mandamus me. If one actually looks at the content of many of the mandamus for time filings, they are very similar. About seven mandamuses in, very unusually. Not only did the Courts of Appeals in the First and Fourteenth start naming me as a judge, most appellate opinions don't name the judge. They also began reciting the prior mandamuses.

So, if you got one of those, some of which were sometimes in the news, because, you know, that's news, you would say, she's mandamused all the time, and that must be what you must do to get her to act. Or if you don't get what you want, try the mandamus, and many, I haven't not [sic] a doubt, think that's what they must do.

She testified: "I am never consciously not ruling. And a mandamus standard for analysis is supposed to be a refusal to rule."

Judge Hall did not respond to the mandamus petitions because she "was advised by our judicial council in Harris County that we could not give an answer to a mandamus absent an order or invitation," and she was never invited to respond. She also studied the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure "extensively to try to know what can I do for myself in this context. And I have been repeatedly advised by our appointed judicial counsel, I cannot respond."

As to the conditional writ on which Judge Hall failed to comply and subsequently was served, she testified she never received the conditional writ because "for a period we were not receiving electronic notices properly. So some sort of glitch, I assume." Further, she explained the outstanding motion on which she failed to rule was never properly set, and "as a result of not properly setting it, I didn't rule on it because I didn't know I was supposed to, and they mandamused me."

When Judge Hall assumed her bench in January 2017, she relied on a computer system to show her all outstanding task items, but she learned "[t]hat was a mistake." Over time, she developed a new system. For the submissions on which she does not rule immediately, Hall prints information about those submissions and places the papers into a binder "in an effort to keep up with them so that I can remove them once I've resolved them." After the submission date passes,

she can look at the papers in her binder and can also search the electronic systems for open settings. She runs electronic reports “all the time since 2020. I don’t think I even knew about it for the first year and a half or two of my service.” However, she does not believe the search results are “fully inclusive” of all open items.

When asked how she could have an outstanding motion for three months, Hall replied: “Because I have 3000 cases and multiple motions, and many things that interrupt my ability to do what I call homework. . . . So I try to keep them [in the binder] in reverse chronological order so that the first in becomes the first out. But it is true that some things are easier than others and there are all kinds of ways that something gets attention or doesn’t.” She also testified: “I have 3,400 cases on the docket. Every case has multiple motions. So right this minute today . . . there were probably 20 or more things added to my docket. And most of the things that are on witness submission are not what you have called, simple motions.”

Judge Hall perceives herself to be a “very thoughtful judge on all issues,” and she “confess[ed] that learning how to manage one’s time and not being too thoughtful, not being too patient, not being too involved is a difficult science that I have yet to master.” She seeks to give each litigant an “open and fair forum,” which requires her to listen, read, and research each issue carefully. She also attempts to hold trials “as often as I can,” and she conducts approximately twenty jury trials and twenty bench trials per year.

Judge Hall testified she regularly works twelve hours per day, six days per week, and she often is working at midnight. She is “always prepared for an oral hearing,” and her reversal rate is low. She clears about 1,200 cases annually and for four of the eight years she has been on the bench, her clearance rate has been over 100 percent, which is in the top five percent of judges in Harris County.

## CHARGES FILED BY THE COMMISSION

The Examiners' Charging Document, which was filed on May 28, 2024,<sup>4</sup> alleges:

### **Charge I: Cannons 2A, 3B(1) and 3B(2)**

Judge Hall failed to comply with the law and demonstrated professional incompetence in the law with respect to hearing and deciding in a timely manner matters assigned to her except those in which disqualification is required or recusal is appropriate. Specifically, Judge Hall failed to perform her judicial duties in a timely manner with respect to setting, hearing, deciding, and signing orders in cases filed in her court.

### **Charge II: Article V, Section 1-a(6)A**

Because her actions represented willful, persistent, and justifiable failure to timely execute the business of the court, Judge Hall's failure to comply with the law, maintain professional competence in the law, and hear and decide in a timely manner matters assigned to her court constituted willful and persistent conduct that is clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of her duties and cast public discredit upon the judiciary or the administration of justice.

## LAW & ANALYSIS

This special court of review conducted a trial de novo of the Commission's decision to publicly reprimand Judge Hall. *See In re Uzomba*, 694 S.W.3d 35, 45 (Tex. Spec. Ct. Rev. 2024) (per curiam) (special court of review conducts trial de novo). Our review is governed to the extent practicable by the rules of law, evidence, and procedure that apply to civil trials. *See* TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 33.034(f). The Commission bears the burden to prove the charges against Judge Hall by a preponderance of the evidence. *In re Uzomba*, 694 S.W.3d at 45; *In re Slaughter*, 480 S.W.3d 842, 845 (Tex. Spec. Ct. Rev. 2015) (per curiam).

The function of the Commission "is not to punish; instead, its purpose is to maintain the honor and dignity of the judiciary and to uphold the administration of justice for the benefit of the citizens of Texas." *In re Slaughter*, 480 S.W.3d at 845.

---

<sup>4</sup> In her post-submission brief, Judge Hall argues the de novo trial in this matter did not take place within the statutorily required time period. We need not resolve this complaint.



The Commission alleges that Judge Hall violated the following canons of the Texas Code of Judicial Conduct:

- Canon 2, titled “Avoiding Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in All of the Judge’s Activities,” provides in relevant part: “A judge shall comply with the law . . .” TEX. CODE JUD. CONDUCT, Canon 2A, *reprinted in* TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN., titl. 2, subtit. G, app C.
- Canon 3, titled “Performing the Duties of Judicial Office Impartially and Diligently,” provides in relevant part: “A judge shall hear and decide matters assigned to the judge except those in which disqualification is required or recusal is appropriate.” *Id.*, 3B(1).
- Canon 3B(2) provides in relevant part: “A judge should be faithful to the law and shall maintain professional competence in it, including by meeting all judicial education requirements set forth in governing statutes or rules.” *Id.*, Canon 3B(2).

The Commission also asserted Judge Hall violated Article V, Section 1-a(6)(A) of the Texas Constitution, which provides in relevant part that any judge may “be removed from office for willful or persistent violation of rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of Texas, incompetence in performing the duties of the office, willful violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct, or willful or persistent conduct that is clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of his duties.” TEX. CONST. art. V, § 1-a. For purposes of Article V, Section 1-a, “willful or persistent conduct that is clearly inconsistent with the proper performance of a judge’s duties” includes: “(1) willful, persistent, and unjustifiable failure to timely execute the business of the court, considering the quantity and complexity of the business; (2) willful violation of a provision of the Texas penal statutes or the Code of Judicial Conduct; (3) persistent or willful violation of the rules promulgated by the supreme court; [or] (4) incompetence in the performance of the duties

of the office.” TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN. § 33.001(b). To determine whether a judge has acted in a willful manner, the Commission must show an intentional or grossly indifferent misuse of the judicial office. *In re Uzomba*, 694 S.W.3d at 49. “This contemplates more than an error in judgment or lack of diligence.” *Id.* (quoting *In re Rangel*, 677 S.W.3d 918, 920 (Tex. Spec. Ct. Rev. 2023) (per curiam)). “Rather, it must evince moral turpitude, dishonesty, corruption, misuse of office, bad faith or the like.” *Id.* (quoting *In re Rangel*, 677 S.W.3d at 920).

In conducting our analysis, we remain cognizant that “[a] trial judge has the inherent power to control the manner of the disposition of cases on his or her docket.” *In re Uzomba*, 683 S.W.3d 358, 371 (Tex. Spec. Ct. Rev. 2024) (per curiam) (citing *Dow Chem. Co. v. Francis*, 46 S.W.3d 237, 240 (Tex. 2001) (per curiam)).

The basis for the Commission’s allegations is that Judge Hall failed to timely rule on motions that were properly submitted to the 165th District Court, as evidenced by the thirty mandamus petitions and the testimony of Chief Justice Christopher, Ramez Shamieh, and Kim Spurlock. The Commission’s evidence shows some lawyers, including those who filed petitions for writs of mandamus, believe Judge Hall does not timely rule on pending motions.

The “Commission has not pointed to any objective time standards that Respondent violated.” *In re Uzomba*, 683 S.W.3d at 371. For example, the Commission did not present evidence showing Judge Hall failed to timely rule on motions for which the Legislature or Texas Supreme Court mandates specific time frames such as motions to dismiss under rule 91a or the Texas Citizens Participation Act. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 91a.3 (requiring motions to dismiss be granted or denied within 45 days after motion is filed); *see also* TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 27.005(a) (court must rule on TCPA motion not later than 30th day following date of hearing on the motion concludes).

Instead, the evidence shows Judge Hall often works twelve hours per day, six days per week, and past midnight. She assumes a “thoughtful” approach to the issues before her and seeks to give each litigant an “open and fair forum,” which requires her to listen, read, and research each issue carefully; Judge Hall’s approach requires that she expend time on each matter before her rather than adopting a more efficient “rule and run” approach to managing motions. Judge Hall is “never consciously not ruling.” Judge Hall’s testimony about her efforts to manage her docket are supported by evidence that she rules promptly when outstanding motions are brought to her attention and has cleared 100 percent or more of her docket for many of the years she has served on the 165th District Court.

Judge Hall has more than 3,000 cases on her docket and conducts approximately forty trials per year. No evidence was presented showing the quantity or complexity of the business of the 165th District Court and whether, in light of the complexity of the docket, Judge Hall has failed to timely execute the business of the court. *See* TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN. § 33.001(b). Judge Hall does not have a reputation for being reversed by the courts of appeals, and she rarely is reversed on substantive legal issues. Notably, the Commission does not contend that Judge Hall is a poor judge who fails to follow the law. Nor would such a contention have been supported as the evidence shows Judge Hall complies with the law and is faithful to the law. *See* TEX. CODE JUD. CONDUCT, Canon 2A, 3B(2).

Notably, Judge Hall was not charged under the two canons that concern a judge’s timely performance of her duties. *See In re Uzomba*, 683 S.W.3d at 370 (discussing Canons 3(B)(9) and 3(C)(1) as the “two canons that concern a judge’s timely performance of his or her duties.”). Canon 3(B)(9) provides that “[a] judge should dispose of all judicial matters promptly, efficiently and fairly.” TEX. CODE JUD. CONDUCT, Canon 3(B)(9). Canon 3(C)(1) provides that “[a] judge should diligently and promptly discharge the judge’s administrative responsibilities.” *Id.*, Canon 3(C)(1). Since each of these canons uses the word “should” rather than “shall,” the Commission could not

charge Judge Hall with violating these two “timeliness” rules as a basis for discipline. *See In re Uzomba*, 683 S.W.3d at 370.

We conclude the evidence does not show that Judge Hall failed to comply with the law, *see* TEX. CODE JUD. CONDUCT, Canon 2A, failed to hear or decide matters assigned to her, *see id.*, Canon 3B(1), or failed to follow the law or maintain professional competence in it, *see id.*, Canon 3B(2). Finally, the Commission presented no evidence that Judge Hall violated Article V, Section 1-a(6)(A), of the Texas Constitution as charged; the evidence does not show Judge Hall willfully failed to rule on pending motions, as alleged, or perform any other duty of her office. Rather, the evidence shows Judge Hall manages a caseload of more than 3,000 pending cases, often has a 100 percent clearance rate, works long hours to fulfill her duties, and is rarely reversed on substantive legal issues. While some lawyers who appear in her court have submitted complaints that Judge Hall did not rule in a timely fashion, that evidence alone does not support the conclusion that Judge Hall fails to hear and decide matters assigned to her or fails to comply with the law. *See* TEX. CODE JUD. CONDUCT, Canon 2A, 3B(1).

#### CONCLUSION

The Commission bore the burden to prove the charges against Judge Hall by a preponderance of the evidence. *See In re Uzomba*, 683 S.W.3d at 370; TEX. GOV’T CODE ANN. § 33.034(f). We conclude it did not do so. We vacate the Commission’s Public Reprimand and dismiss all charges against Judge Hall without sanctions.

PER CURIAM