# State of Arizona

# COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

# Disposition of Complaint 18-081

Judges:

Complainants:1

## ORDER

The complainants alleged two justices of the peace tampered with witnesses and made an improper comment about a pending matter in connection with a disciplinary proceeding before this commission in 2011-2012.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After review, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

///

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1}$  In addition to those named, the commission received thirty-five complaints that are identical to those listed above.

Commission members George H. Foster, Jr. and Art Hinshaw did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: May 10, 2018

# FOR THE COMMISSION

<u>/s/ Margaret H. Downie</u> Margaret H. Downie Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 10, 2018.

**CONFIDENTIAL** Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Name:

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2018-081

## COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Judge's Name.

**Instructions**: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

On or about the State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct began formal disciplinary proceedings against Judge On/about requested that the Judge be reassigned; this request subsequently lead to a motion by disciplinary counsel to amend and enhance charges on or about . Amended charges were filed on or about . On or about disciplinary counsel entered into a stipulated to dicipline the Judge. The stipulated agreement was entered by agreement to a Judge . Sometime between on. and engaged in misconduct that lead to a notice of changed and circumstances by disciplinary counsel again affecting the outcome. The misconduct was as follows: intimidated and influenced witnesses in relationship with the Arizona and Commission on Judicial Conduct proceedings in relationship to the pending case. This includes intimidating the judicial assistant into making false testimony in front of the Commission on Judicial Conduct. On or about a formal request for records was served on the Custodian of Records to the t to deliver: Any and all Judge and Judge email deleted files, sent and received from through in electronic format CD or electronic file. On or about under the direction of Judges and denied the information request, and claimed the request was a violation of Arizona Supreme Court Rule 123. A subsequent more narrow request was issued for production of the following: and any emails dating from to from the county computer accounts of Judae ١, and Judge , asking for public information only, unrelated to any court information. On or about sent another reply that denied the records request submitted, and claimed that County did not maintain was not the records custodian for emails, and that the other portions of the request were in violation of Arizona Supreme Court Rule 123. To the extent that any emails from Judges and were available, only to inspect them on a county computer. No further correspondence was received from On or about it was learned that these individuals listed in the public information request from and others not listed in the Public Information request had induced other persons to sign an Amicus Brief in order to influence the Commission on Judicial Conduct to increase the sanction and influence the outcome of a case. The Amicus Brief, drafted by and , submitted to the Commission contained several false, misleading, and inaccurate statements. During the recent course of litigation in against and

, the acknowledged drafting the above referenced Amicus Brief. and
knew or should have known the statements contained in the Amicus Brief were false.
During the course of the Commission's investigation, wrote a letter to the of
without investigation or evidence, that suggested the Judge under commission investigation was

a threat to other persons and that the Judge should be transferred to another court. Furthermore,

i filed additional claims with the Commission on Judicial Conduct that claimed the judge currently

CONFIDENTIAL Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

### FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

### COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: \_\_\_\_

Judge's Name:

**Instructions:** Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

# under investigation with the commission performed incorrect jail arrangements, although the same Judge was mentored by and performed in the manner instructed by

and both violated Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.10(A) by making public statements designed to affect the commission's investigation. "

"Both and made false public statements, whether to third parties, or to the media in an attempt to influence how the ultimately decided the outcome on a ruling.