

(No. 74 CC 3.—Complaint dismissed.)

*In re* ASSOCIATE JUDGE GEORGE H. BUNGE of the  
Eighteenth Judicial Circuit, Respondent.

*Order entered July 24, 1974.*

SYLLABUS

On May 3, 1974, the Judicial Inquiry Board filed a single count complaint with the Courts Commission, charging the respondent with conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice and conduct that brings the judicial office into disrepute. In summary form, Count I alleged that the respondent improperly and repeatedly used judicial process, including writs of body attachment and the power of contempt, for collection of civil judgments. In answer to the respondent's demand for a bill of particulars, the Judicial Inquiry Board on June 28, 1974, stated, in summary form, that the respondent issued writs of body attachment to compel payment of debts rather than to secure attendance of the party before the court; that he ordered the issuance of said writs to coerce payment of judgment debts; that he "entered orders for the issuance of writs of attachment for contempt for the purpose of compelling defendants to satisfy judgments that had been entered against them;" and that he issued "writs of attachment for a purpose other than for which such writs were intended."

*Held:* Complaint dismissed.

William J. Scott, Attorney General, of Springfield,  
for Judicial Inquiry Board.

Reid, Ochsenschlager, Murphy and Hupp, of  
Aurora, for respondent.

Before the COURTS COMMISSION: SCHAEFER,  
J., chairman, and EBERSPACHER, STAMOS, DUNNE  
and FORBES, JJ., commissioners. ALL CONCUR.

ORDER

The Complaint filed by the Judicial Inquiry Board in  
this matter is as follows:

"Respondent has improperly and repeatedly used  
judicial process, including writs of body attachment

and his powers of contempt, for the collection of civil judgments. Such cases include, *inter alia*, *Madigan Bros. v. Columbus T. Anderson*, No. SC 73-23; *Montgomery Ward v. Herbert Hasche*, No. SC 73-142; *Bernard M. Enfield v. Thomas Hoist Co.*, No. SC 73-258; *Sandra Dispensa v. Linda H. Starzyk*, No. SC 73-397; *DuPage Crown Finance v. Larry Johnson*, No. SC 73-730; *Moore-O-Matic Central v. L. D. Chocola*, No. SC 73-739; and *Joyce Dudkowski v. Elizabeth Wilhite*, No. SC 73-1083.”

The conduct with which the Commission is concerned in this case occurred in the course of litigated cases and the question before us is the propriety of that conduct. The Commission has carefully considered the evidence and has unanimously concluded that it does not show an improper use of judicial process. The Complaint is therefore dismissed.

*Complaint dismissed.*

---