

# Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing

**Thursday, April 25, 2013**

10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

State Courts Building

1501 W. Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Conference Room 106

**Approved: 9/12/13**

---

**Present:** Justice Robert Brutinel-*Chair*, Mr. Kent Batty, Judge Peter Cahill, Judge Jill Davis, Judge Richard Fields-*telephonically*, Judge Pamela Frasher Gates, Mr. Don Jacobson, Judge Eric L Jeffery, Judge Kenton Jones, Ms. Sandra Markham, Ms. Michelle Matiski *telephonically*, Judge Steven McMurry, Judge Rosa Mroz, Ms. Jane Nicoletti-Jones, Judge John Rea, Judge Antonio "Tony" Riojas, Mr. John W Rogers, Judge Sally Simmons-*telephonically*

**Absent/Excused:** Mr. James Haas, Judge Mark Moran, Mr. William "Bill" Verdini

**Presenters/Guests:** Patrick McGrath, AOC

**Staff:** Amy Wood, Cindy Cook, Jerri Medina, Kelly Gray

---

## **I. Regular Business**

### **A. Welcome and Opening Remarks**

The April 25, 2013 meeting of the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards was called to order by Chair, Honorable Robert Brutinel at 10:02 a.m.

### **B. Approval of January 24, 2013 Minutes**

The chair called for any omissions or corrections to the minutes from the January 24, 2013, meeting; there were none.

- The draft minutes from the October 24, 2012, meeting of the Steering Committee on Arizona Case Processing Standards were presented for approval.
  - Motion approved by Mr. Kent Batty.
  - Motion was seconded by Mr. Donald Jacobson and passed unanimously.

## **II. Proposed Arizona Case Processing Standards: Workgroup Updates**

The Steering Committee discussed the revisions to be made to the Arizona Case Processing Standards Preliminary Recommendations document. There were 103

views but only 5 comments received online through the comment forum from February 19, 2013 to March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013. We will address the comments during our review of the recommendations. Most of the revisions made to the standards were to the language for excluded time in civil and family law cases. The revised language will read as follows “*The following may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed will be excluded from measurement: special actions/appeals, bankruptcy and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.* The Steering Committee also needs to discuss and recommend case processing standards for probate administration of estates cases and probate guardianship/conservatorship cases.

## **A. Superior Court Civil Workgroup: Judge John Rea, Chair**

### **1. Superior Court Civil Cases**

Discussion: No change to the standard. The following language for excluded time will be revised for all civil and family law case types.

- Motion made by Judge McMurry to revise the measurement to read as follows: “*The following may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed will be excluded from measurement: special actions/appeals, bankruptcy and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act*”.
- Seconded by Judge Pamela Gates. Motion passed unanimously.

## **B. Justice Court Civil Cases Workgroup: Judge Jill Davis, Chair**

### **1. Justice Court Civil Cases**

Discussion: During the comment phase 2 comments were received regarding an increase in the number of days needed to process justice court civil cases. The courts expressed a concern that 75% of the cases cannot be disposed of within 120 days because of Rule 113(i), Justice Court Rules of Civil Procedure (JCRCP) which states “the action will be dismissed without prejudice if summons and complaint not served within 120 days of filing of complaint.” (These dismissals will take longer than 120 days to dispose and the judges will be hesitant to grant an extension of service). The workgroup had originally estimated that service on the defendant would occur within 30 days, this was deemed unrealistic by the courts and the workgroup determined that 60 days would be a more realistic estimate of the time needed for service. A determination was made that the time allowed for service on the defendant is out of the court’s control and the standards should be increased. Currently some of the larger courts are processing 40% of their cases within 210 days. Based on the current percentages the new proposed standard of 180 days would still be an aspirational but achievable goal that would encourage the courts to improve. The Steering Committee also noted that if the standard for justice courts is to be lowered in the future, Rule 113(i), JCRCP will need to be amended. The time allowed for service on the defendant is the same in both the superior and justice courts. Justice court cases are less complex and usually involve fewer defendants so the number of days needed for service could be reduced.

- Motion by Judge Steven McMurry to change the standard as follows:
  - 75% within **180 days** instead of 120 days
  - 90% within **270 days** instead of 180 days
  - 98% within **365 days** instead of 270 days
 and to revise the measurement to read as follows: “The following “*may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed* will be excluded from measurement: special actions/appeals, bankruptcy *and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act*”.
- Seconded by Judge Jill Davis. Motion passed unanimously.

## 2. Justice Court Eviction Actions

Discussion: No change to the standard. A determination was made by the Steering Committee that commercial evictions should be specifically included in the standard. In the AZTEC case management system there are no special designations for commercial evictions versus residential evictions so it would be easier to write the time to disposition reports if commercial evictions are included in the standard. Same revisions will be made to excluded time.

- Motion made by Judge Antonio Riojas to include commercial evictions in the standard and to revise the measurement to read as follows: “The following “*may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed* will be excluded from measurement: special actions/appeals, bankruptcy *and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act*”.
- Seconded by Mr. Don Jacobsen. Motion passed unanimously.

## 3. Civil Small Claims

Discussion: Received 1 comment to increase the number of days needed to process a small claims case, but no changes were made to the standard. There is no right to appeal in small claims cases so the Steering Committee agreed to remove “special actions/appeals” from excluded time. Same revisions will be made to excluded time.

- Motion made by Judge Antonio Riojas to remove special actions/appeals from excluded time and to revise the measurement to read as follows: “The following “*may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed* will be excluded from measurement: bankruptcy *and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act*”.
- Seconded by Mr. Kent Batty. Motion passed unanimously.

## 4. Civil Local Ordinances

Discussion: No change to the standard, same revisions will be made to excluded time.

- Motion made by Judge John Rea to revise the measurement to read as follows: “The following “*may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed* will be excluded from measurement: special actions/appeals, bankruptcy *and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act*”.
- Seconded by Judge Antonio Riojas. Motion passed unanimously.

## **C. Municipal and Justice Court Workgroup: Judge Antonio Riojas, Chair**

### **1. Civil Traffic**

Discussion: No change to the standard and same revisions will be made to excluded time. In addition Servicemembers Civil Relief Act will be added to the list of exclusions. The Steering Committee also recommends that parking tickets be excluded from the standard because a statewide designation would be difficult. Every city or county can designate a parking ticket as something different (e.g., petty offense, civil local ordinance violation or civil traffic).

- Motion made by Mr. Don Jacobson to exclude parking tickets from the standard and to revise the measurement to read as follows: “The following *“may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed will be excluded from measurement: diversion, special actions/appeals, and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act”*”.
- Seconded by Mr. Kent Batty. Motion passed unanimously.

### **2. Protection Orders**

Discussion: Received 1 comment requesting a case processing standard of 14 days to conduct a pre-issuance hearing. No change was made to the standard. The Steering Committee had previously decided not to have an intermediate standard for pre-issuance hearings. The pre-issuance hearings will fall into the category of the 1% of ex parte hearings not held within 24 hours. Based on the removal of the intermediate standard for pre-issuance hearings, the Steering Committee recommends that the language “or a pre-issuance hearing is set” be removed from the Ex Parte Hearing measurement. The setting of a pre-issuance hearing is not a final disposition. A hearing will still need to be held and the order will need to be issued or denied. If the measurement is stopped at the setting of the pre-issuance hearing, the cases will not be tracked to see if the order was issued or denied, and these cases will just fall off the radar. The Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence in the Courts (CIDVC) had some concerns that the 99% for ex parte hearings could not be met because individuals file the petition and leave before the hearing is held. The larger jurisdictions may leave the case open for as long as 30 days in case the petitioner returns. The members of CIDVC did not want to lower the percentage to 98% with 24 hours. We do not have any data on how many cases fall into these categories. The Steering Committee recommends that the standard and measurement be left alone and this issue will be revisited after we have more data.

- Motion made by Mr. Kent Batty to remove “or a pre-issuance hearing is

set” from the Ex Parte Hearing measurement and change the language as follows: “The date the petition for protective order is filed to the date the protective order is issued *or* denied”.

- Seconded by Mr. Don Jacobson. Motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Criminal Misdemeanor**

Discussion: No change to the standard. A determination was made by the Steering Committee that petty offenses should be specifically included in the standard. The Steering Committee also recommends that the case processing standards for all criminal cases be applied when the case is initiated (e.g., filing of original charges) not at the time of disposition (e.g. dismissal or judgment and sentencing). In a criminal case, the case processing standard for the most severe offense listed on the charging document will be applied

- Motion made by Mr. Kent Batty to include petty offenses in the standard and to apply the case processing standards when the complaint is filed not when the case is disposed.
- Seconded by Mr. Don Jacobson. Motion passed unanimously.

### **4. Criminal DUI Misdemeanor**

Discussion: Received 1 comment requesting that the standard be lowered. No change was made to the existing Arizona standard. The DUI standard will be applied when the complaint includes a DUI charge.

- Motion made by Mr. Kent Batty to adopt the existing standard
- Seconded by Judge Eric Jefferies. Motion passed unanimously.

## **D. Criminal Workgroup: Judge Richard Fields, Chair**

### **1. Criminal Felony**

Discussion: The Steering Committee recommends that the case processing standards for all criminal cases be applied when the first charging document is filed in superior court, not at the time of disposition (e.g. dismissal, acquittal or judgment and sentencing). In a criminal case, the case processing standard for the most severe offense listed on the charging document will be applied.

- Motion made by Judge Antonio Riojas to apply the case processing standards when the first charging document is filed not when the case is disposed.
- Seconded by Mr. Kent Batty. Motion passed unanimously.

### **2. Criminal Post-Conviction Relief**

Discussion: The Steering Committee recommends that the standard for post conviction relief be applied to the superior court only. The standard will not be applied to the justice and municipal courts. There are a small number of petitions filed in the justice and municipal courts and the petitions filed are unpredictable. If the number of filings increases the Steering Committee can

review the adoption of the superior court standard for the justice and municipal courts.

- No revisions made to the preliminary recommendation.

## **E. Family Law Workgroup: Judge Pam Gates, Chair**

### **1. Family Law- Dissolution/Divorce/Allocation of Parental Responsibility Cases**

Discussion: No change to the standard and same revisions will be made to excluded time. In addition appeals will be added to the list of exclusions. The Steering Committee also discussed the exclusion of time for pending juvenile cases. The example given was Child Protection Services (CPS) will stay the family law case until the juvenile case is resolved. The calculation of the excluded time would be the same as conciliation court or bankruptcy. The time would stop when the stay is granted in the family law case and start again when the juvenile case is resolved and an order lifting the stay is entered in the family law case.

- Motion made by Judge Pamela Gates to revise the measurement to read as follows: “The following “*may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed* will be excluded from measurement: special actions/*appeals*, bankruptcy, conciliation court, pending juvenile cases *and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act*”.
- Seconded by Honorable Rosa Mroz. Motion passed unanimously.

### **2. Family Law Post-Judgment Motions**

Discussion: No change to the standard and same revisions will be made to excluded time.

- Motion made by Judge Pamela Gates to revise the measurement to read as follows: “The following “*may result in a stay of proceedings and the time elapsed* will be excluded from measurement: pending juvenile cases *and stays granted pursuant to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act*”.
- Seconded by Mr. Kent Batty. Motion passed unanimously.

## **F. Probate Workgroup: Judge Rosa Mroz, Chair**

### **1. Probate Administration of Estates & Probate Guardianship/Conservator**

Discussion: After the last meeting, the Steering Committee sent this standard back to the workgroup for further discussion on the measurement and standard to be adopted. After review of the time to disposition reports available from the AJACS case management system and further discussion the Steering Committee is recommending the following standards:

**50% within 360 days**, instead of 75%

**75% within 540 days**, instead of 90%

**95% within 720 days**, instead of 98%

The Steering Committee recommends that formal probate cases, informal probate cases and the *affidavit of succession to real property* cases be included in the standard. The *affidavit of succession to real property* cases are handled by the probate registrar in one to three days. According to §14-1307 the presiding judge of the county can designate the clerk of court, court commissioner or a judge as probate registrar. It is typically the clerk of court in most counties. The affidavits are being included in the standard because currently the CMS systems are tracking these cases and they account for a large number of the filings.

Finally, the Steering Committee recommends that the following language be adopted for the measurement: *Filing of application/petition for appointment of personal representative or probate of a will through closing of the decedent's estate (e.g. filing of closing statement, complete settlement or order approving final distribution or accounting). The following time will be excluded from measurement: stay for special actions/appeals and bankruptcy.* (See Preliminary Recommendations document).

- Motion was made by Judge John Rea to approve the above standard and measurement.
- Seconded by Mr. Kent Batty. Motion passed unanimously.

## **2. Probate Guardianship/ Conservatorship**

Discussion: After the last meeting, the Steering Committee sent this standard back to the workgroup for further discussion on the measurement and standard to be adopted. The Steering Committee was unable to obtain statistical information from the courts regarding the average time to disposition. The time to disposition reports available in AJACS stop measuring when the guardianship is terminated not when the order appointing fiduciary is signed. The Steering Committee would like to note in the Executive Summary that there were several case types in which statistical data was not available or the data available was not verifiable. The Steering Committee still recommends the adoption of standards but the Steering Committee does not want to report on the court's progress until the case management systems have developed reports that will allow for the measurement of these standards. Currently, in the AJACS case management system there are event codes for the order of appointment for a guardian/conservator but a report has not been written that will count and total the event codes.

The Steering Committee made the determination that the appointment of the guardian can be accomplished within 90 days for the uncontested cases. The Steering Committee recommends that a second tier be added to the standard for contested cases. These are the cases where there is a disagreement as to whether a guardian/ conservator should be appointed or a disagreement as to who should be appointed as guardian/conservator. Many of these contested cases expand into issues of who is exploiting the

ward, and may manifest into complex civil cases regarding nursing home abuse, medical malpractice and vulnerable adult cases.

The Steering Committee recommends the following standard:

**80% within 90 days**, instead of 98%

**98% within 365 days**

The Steering Committee recommends that Title 14 guardianship/ conservatorship of a minor and elder abuse cases be excluded from the standard. The timelines for minor guardianships are set out by rule and statute in Arizona and no standard needs to be established. Finally, the Steering Committee recommends that the following language be adopted for the measurement: *Filing of petition for appointment of guardian/conservator through denial of the petition or issuance of a court order appointing a fiduciary on a non-temporary basis.* (See Preliminary Recommendations document).

- Motion was made by Mr. Kent Batty to approve the above standard and measurement.
- Seconded by Ms. Sandra Markham. Motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Mental Health Cases**

- No revisions made to the preliminary recommendation.

## **G. Juvenile Workgroup: Judge Peter Cahill, Chair**

### **1. Delinquency and Status Offense, Neglect and Abuse, and Termination of Parental Rights**

- No revisions made to the preliminary recommendation.

### **2. Juvenile Neglect and Abuse**

- No revisions made to the preliminary recommendation.

### **3. Juvenile Termination of Parental Rights**

- No revisions made to the preliminary recommendation.

## **III. Executive Summary**

The Executive Summary is a brief overview of the case processing standards recommended for Arizona. It explains how the standards were developed, defines terms, identifies future reports that need to be developed and addresses overarching principles and concerns of the workgroups and Steering Committee when developing case processing standards. The Steering Committee discussed the following revisions to the Executive Summary:

Judge John Rea, Judge Kenton Jones and Judge Sally Simmons are to revise Paragraph 2 and 5 under Guiding Principles in the Executive Summary. The revisions are to address the concern that the standards are intended to apply to the system as a whole and not to any particular judicial calendar or assignment. An individual judge should not be penalized for failure to comply with the case processing standards when

the judge recently inherited the cases through recusals, rotation on to a different calendar or reassignments.

The following language was proposed: The Steering Committee does not intend for case processing standards to be used as a basis for disciplining an individual judge for failure to comply with the standards. It would be misleading and unfair to base the performance of any individual judge on case processing standards when the time-to-disposition reports run for case processing standards do not reflect how long a case has been assigned to a particular judge or the complexity of the case assigned. Rather, the standards are being developed as a management tool for the courts to determine how efficiently the cases are being processed through the system as a whole and identify where improvements can be made.

The time to disposition reports would not capture when the judge was assigned to a case. A separate judge history assignment report can be run in the AJACS case management system if the courts need data on when a case was assigned to a particular judge. The Steering Committee also suggested that the CourTools reports may provide some useful information or background on drafting the measurements.

Justice Brutinel and Cindy Cook agreed to draft a new paragraph in the Executive Summary that will address the concerns of the Steering Committee that the courts were unable to run accurate reports through the case management systems and the case processing standards were based on a limited amount of data. The Steering Committee studied the rules, statutes and business processes of the courts to try and develop realistic standards for Arizona courts. The Steering Committee recognizes that courts will be unable to measure their progress and that a final determination of whether the proposed standards are realistic cannot be made, until accurate time-to-disposition reports are developed. Therefore, it is recommended that these preliminary reports remain inaccessible to the public until the data has been validated and the standards have been revisited.

On page six of the Executive Summary under Future Considerations the second sentence in the second paragraph added "accurate" to the sentence. It reads as follows: "The development of an accurate time to disposition report will enable Arizona courts to define the concept of backlog and to identify a case "in backlog" as any case older than the case processing standard." The Steering Committee also expressed concerns that the AJACS CourTools reports for the general jurisdiction courts are not accurate and do not exclude time.

The Summary of Recommendations chart in the Executive Summary included a column with the national model time standards as compared to the case processing standards being recommended for Arizona. The Steering Committee members recommended that the column with the national model time standards be removed and that only the Arizona case processing standards be included. A few of the Steering Committee members disagreed with the removal of the national standard because the Arizona case processing standards were initially derived from the national model. The final report will need to provide more details on how the Arizona case processing

standards compare to the national model time standards and why there are differences.

- Motion was made by Judge Pamela Gates to delete the column on pages 3 – 5, that includes the national model from the Executive Summary.
- Seconded by Judge Rosa Mroz. Motion passed 12-3-0.

The Executive Summary will be presented to the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) along with the Final Report. The Executive Summary will be useful as a quick reference and will not contain all the details included in the Final Report. The Executive Summary will be helpful when providing information to the media and when presenting to other Committees. If the Executive Summary is to be utilized as a quick reference we need the media and other agencies or groups to focus on the standards that were developed for Arizona and not focus on the difference between Arizona and the national model.

The Conclusion in the Executive Summary should reference that the details on the development of case processing standards are located in the Final Report.

Once the new or revised paragraphs have been added to the Executive Summary, the Executive Summary will be e-mailed to all the Steering Committee members for review and approval.

#### **IV. Future of Steering Committee**

Justice Brutinel spoke with the Chief Justice and the Vice Chief Justice and they have agreed to extend the term of the Steering Committee so that reports can be developed, the data can be validated and cleaned up, and training can be completed. Once the data has been validated the Steering Committee will revisit the case processing standards to determine if any revisions need to be made.

#### **V. Overview of Report Concepts**

Amy Wood, Caseflow Management Manager within the Court Services Division at the AOC discussed the following stages of software development:

Click on attached link to view PowerPoint presentation:

<http://www.azcourts.gov/Portals/74/CaseProcessing/MeetingMinutes/CaseProcessingStandardsPresentation42513.pdf>

- Scope –
- Requirements
- Design
- Programming
- Testing
- Pilot
- Release

The scope of the project is to develop statistical reports that will measure case processing standards. The first step is to identify all the case types and differentiate between limited and general jurisdiction case types. The next step is to identify what will be measured for each case type and what qualifies as excluded time. The specific

reports to be created are the summary and detail reports for time to disposition and pending active cases.

The requirements for the reports will be based on the recommendations of the Steering Committee and the recommendations will not be final until the case processing standards have been adopted by the AJC. The final requirements will be shared with all non-ACAP CMS developers.

The AOC has developed CourTool time to disposition reports for the general jurisdiction courts. These reports will have to be modified so the information needed to measure case processing standards is captured.

The limited jurisdiction courts are on the cusp of transitioning from AZTEC to a new case management system and it would not be cost effective to create the reports in AZTEC. The AOC will utilize the Consolidated Case Index (CCI). The CCI replaces the data warehouse and has increased intelligence and more frequent updates. All the limited jurisdiction courts data can be fed into the CCI and the time to disposition reports can be generated from the CCI for ACAP and non-ACAP courts.

The business requirements will lay out what the case management systems should capture so that the same comparisons are being consistently made across the state. The measurements and exclusions recommended by the Steering Committee will also be utilized for the business requirements.

## **VI. AJACS Reports**

Pat McGrath, Automation Services Manager within the Court Services Division at the AOC gave a demonstration of the Measure 3 time to disposition and Measure 4 age of active pending cases CourTool reports that have been created in the AJACS case management system. He discussed modifications to the reports that will occur in the next release of the software and he showed the exclusion of time based on event codes entered in the CMS system. There will need to be some modifications made to the CourTool reports to produce reports that will measure the standards for case processing. (See handout in materials)

The age of active pending cases report shows all cases that have an open or re-open status and can be shown by judge. It will default into today's date; it gives a "snap shot" of what cases are pending right now. The time to disposition report shows the number of days that will be counted during the pendency of a case. For most case types, this is based on the time between the date on which the case is filed through the entry of the final dispositional order (e.g., a dismissal, judgment, and sentence) minus any excluded time.

The CourTools reports for AJACS could be utilized for other case types such as probate if the fields for case status are being utilized. For those case types where the existing reports cannot be modified new reports will have to be created. The first step in the creation or modification of existing reports will be the development of business

requirements. Once the business requirements are finalized the AOC can establish a time frame for implementation. Currently, we have in-house developers vs. hiring out as we have done in the past. Once we take the business requirements to the developer, then the developer will be able to review and let us know how long it will take to program. Once programmed, then we will go into the testing and pilot phase of implementation.

The Steering Committee members were concerned that reports would not be released upon completion but the courts would have to wait until there is a new enhancement release for the case management system. Most reports are not dependent on data changes in the case management system. Therefore, the reports can be produced without a new release.

The Steering Committee recommends that a workgroup be created to modify the existing CourTool reports for the general jurisdiction courts. The workgroup should include 5 or 6 members from the GJCMS reports workgroup plus an additional member from Pima County and Laurie Allen from Maricopa County.

The Steering Committee recommends that a separate workgroup be created to develop new time to disposition reports for the limited jurisdiction courts. The workgroup should include members from the LJ AJACS workgroup and additional members from the Tucson, Mesa Project and Jennifer Gilbertson from Maricopa County.

Justice Brutinel has requested that a timeline for the development of reports be created once the user/business requirements group has met. The business requirements developed by the user groups will be available to all the courts so that standard reports can be created statewide. The Steering Committee will want to ensure that all the courts are measuring the standards in the same manner.

## **VII. Next Steps**

The preliminary recommendations for probate cases will be posted on the website and the link will be emailed to judges, clerks, court administrators and probate attorneys for comment. The final recommendations for the other case types will be presented at the standing committees. Justice Brutinel expressed his appreciation to those members who have agreed to present the standards to the standing committees. In October Justice Brutinel will present the final recommendations to the AJC for approval.

The Final Report will include the discussions and decisions made by the workgroups and Steering Committee. The members of each workgroup will review the case types assigned to them (e.g., the criminal felony workgroup will review the criminal felony and criminal post-conviction relief case types). The members of each workgroup will forward their comments to Cindy Cook and the Final Report will be discussed at the next meeting

Include the following on the September 12, 2013 meeting agenda:

Once the standards are approved by the AJC, what is the plan for distributing the case processing standards to the courts,? Should we present the standards at the judicial conference? What are the next steps?

## **VIII. Call to Public**

### **A. Good of the Order/Call to the Public**

No one came forward to address the Steering Committee at this time.

## **IX. Adjourn**

### **A. Motion: To adjourn at 12:38pm.**

- Motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

### **B. Next Steering Committee Meeting Date:**

Thursday, September 12, 2013

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

State Courts Building, Room 230

1501 W. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ 85007