

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 06-280

---

Complainant: No. 1297110463A

Judge: No. 1297110463B

---

**ORDER**

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. There is no evidence of a social relationship with the attorney for the children or any knowledge of that attorney's financial situation.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: January 26, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on January 26, 2007.

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

CJC-06-280

NOV 08 2006

CONFIDENTIAL  
State of Arizona  
Commission on Judicial Conduct  
1501 W. Washington Ste 229  
Phoenix AZ 85007

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE



Re: HON. [redacted] Arizona Superior Court [redacted]  
Willful Misconduct in Office

Complainant was counsel of record before this judge before he and his client stipulated to his withdrawal due to the ruling of the court [redacted]



Re: Complaint against Hon. [redacted] Judge, Arizona Superior Court [redacted]  
[redacted] Family Law Court, for her actions as trial judge in [redacted]

If this complaint is properly the providence of another State Commission, please forward.

I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the allegations contained in the attached statement of facts are true.



11/7/06  
Date

As the [redacted] of Family Law Court, Judge [redacted] granted a Notice of Change of Judge filed by Respondent's counsel, and assigned the case of Dissolution of Marriage to herself. During the course of the proceedings, she forbade the Petitioner/custodial parent from filing any more interim Motions or Petitions, after denying her a hearing on her Request to Enforce child support/spousal maintenance. Yet three weeks later she granted a hearing to Respondent on factual matters that had not been admitted before the Court; she had only just castigated Petitioner for alleging factual matters that were not before the Court. The child support was ordered to be paid by wage assignment on [redacted] but the Judge failed to enter an Order of Assignment until [redacted]

So far as counsel is aware, in practice the hearing on a Request to Enforce Child support is granted as a ministerial matter.

During the entire course of the proceedings, the Respondent has been engaged in an extramarital affair that ripped apart two families, and has deeply affected the emotional well-being of the [redacted] children involved. Judge [redacted] has refused to consider any aspect of this behavior, even on visitation now that Respondent is exposing two of the children to his paramour's presence. Further, Respondent had squandered community income and assets on his lover; in spite of the provisions of A.R.S. Sections 25-318 and 25-319, Judge [redacted] has refused to hear any testimony to this effect, although the correspondent is a woman of proven low character.

At the [redacted] hearing on Respondent's Motion for Sanctions, Judge [redacted] joked that there has been no proof that Respondent has engaged in an affair; since the Judge would not receive any evidence thereof, the reason is obvious. The Judge concluded by awarding Respondent attorneys fees. This award was made to a party who has openly defied every Order of the Court, and was smirking with contempt that he could get away with anything before Judge [redacted]

Judge [redacted] assigned credit card accounts to Respondent to pay; he has refused to pay anything on these accounts. They have all gone into delinquency. He has refused to pay half of the home mortgage as ordered. Judge [redacted] refuses to give Petitioner a hearing on any of these issues.

Judge [redacted] pal, [redacted] was having a hard time with the bills attendant on her [redacted] so the Judge awarded her [redacted] to represent the [redacted] children. So far, she has seen the children and made recommendations to the Judge, but the children feel betrayed by her. Rather than represent their stated interest, [redacted] has substituted her judgment for what is best for the [redacted] youngest children; she does not bother the [redacted] who refused to attend the last session with [redacted] That was all right, since she had the [redacted] to browbeat, which she did for half an hour, giving the [redacted] 5 minutes

The [redacted] hates going to his father's (or Father's lover's) place. When the father was ordered to obtain beds and bedding for his children, he bought two air mattresses, which he placed on the floor. When the Judge criticized him for his accommodations, he bought a large-screen lcd television.

Being in a hearing on this case, I had the distinct feeling that the three professional females feel a prejudice toward Petitioner, who is young, good-looking, and a three-time mother. In similar fashion they display antipathy toward the [redacted] simply because he is masculine. By the end of the case, Judge [redacted] reliance on [redacted] pop psychology rather than the input of the two professional counselors seeing the children is mistaken.