

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-172

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a municipal court judge failed to be available to hear protective order proceedings.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if a judicial officer 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 judicial officer did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission members Gus Aragón, Peter J. Eckerstrom and George H. Foster, Jr., did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: September 17, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on September 17, 2018.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

Comp

2018-172

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT
1501 W. Washington, Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Re: Honorable

Dear members of the commission:

Recently, separate petitions for an Order of Protection were sought in my court after allegedly being rejected by the

The first case, , was issued on

Plaintiff:

came into the a before and related the following: stated he had gone to the Court, different times during , requesting an Order of Protection, defendant a , who had allegedly been posting threats against him, one being a of one of his she was in possession of, indicating which defendant had allegedly

alleged he had been told to come back to the court different times during the day, the " " was not available. alleges he reported the time, after and was told by an unknown clerk in the Court that it was " " to hear a request for a protective order and he should travel to the CGJC to "see if a judge was in."

The second case, , was issued on , allegedly after being rejected by the

Plaintiff:

: entered the , at approximately , emotionally distraught, seeking an Order of Protection against her : alleged that her : is estranged from the defendant and he blames believing the plaintiff influenced her to disengage from the defendant. : alleged there had been several phone calls threatening physical harm, driving up and stopping in front of her residence and influencing to also threaten the plaintiff.

: alleged that she was turned away from the Court, by the “ ” who allegedly stated, “ ”

I did not engage in any investigative follow-up and I'm not requesting to be notified of any action that may be taken by the Commission on Judicial Conduct, but only bring this to your attention to ensure compliance of my judicial reporting obligations under Rule 2.15, Judicial Cannons, Rule 81 of the Arizona Supreme Court Rules.

Sincerely,