

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 12-336

---

Judge:	No. 10997 1749A
Complainant:	No. 10997 1749B

---

**ORDER**

An anonymous complainant alleged a justice of the peace routinely engages in improper procedures and commentary while on the bench, sometimes in clear violation of litigants' rights.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge 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 judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission approved sending the judge a private advisory letter regarding accommodations for self-represented litigants. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Dated: August 21, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Louis Frank Dominguez

---

Louis Frank Dominguez  
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on August 21, 2013.

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

DEC 10 2012

December 5, 2012

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

**ANONYMOUS COMPLAINT AGAINST.**

I WILL NOT RELEASE MY NAME OR CONTACT INFORMATION AT THIS POINT DUE TO THE FEAR OF RETALIATION CONSIDERING I AM A CURRENT COURT EMPLOYEE.

THIS JUDGE SERIOUSLY NEEDS TO BE LOOKED AT FOR IMPROPER CONDUCT. I AM GOING TO OUTLINE AN EXAMPLE OF AN EVENT THAT HAPPENED TODAY, DECEMBER 5 2012.

AT APPROX 10:15 AM, A DEFENDANT BY THE NAME OF [REDACTED] APPEARED FOR HIS ARRAIGNMENT. HE WAS ADVISED OF HIS RIGHTS, WAIVED HIS RIGHT TO AN ATTORNEY AND DECIDED TO PROCEED WITH A GUILTY PLEA. HE WAS CHARGED WITH A MINOR IN POSSESSION OR CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL. AFTER HE ENTERED HIS GUILTY PLEA, [REDACTED] ASKED HIM ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED THAT EVENING. THE DEFENDANT PROCEEDED TO TELL HER WHAT HE HAD DONE THAT EVENING AND SHE EVEN ASKED HIM A FEW QUESTIONS. IT WAS AT THAT POINT THAT SHE TOLD THE DEFENDANT THAT HE HAD NO PRIOR CONVICTIONS OF THE SAME CHARGE AND THAT SHE WAS GOING TO ENTER A "NOT GUILTY" PLEA ON HIS BEHALF, ON THE COURTS OWN MOTION. THE DEFENDANT AGREED TO THIS AND ASKED "SO I CAN GET DIVERSION" AND THE JUDGE RESPONDED IN A POSITIVE MANNER. THIS WAS AFTER, ON THE RECORDING, HE GAVE TESTIMONY AND THE JUDGE EVEN ASKED QUESTIONS OF THE DEFENDANT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE DEFENDANT LEFT WITH A DATE FOR A PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE. IF THE STATE WANTED TO, I AM ASSUMING THEY COULD USE THIS ADMISSION OF GUILTY AGAINST THE DEFENDANT. DID THIS DEFENDANT SELF INCRIMINATE HIMSELF AT THE HANDS OF THE JUDGE?? THIS ALL OCCURRED ON THE RECORD AND IS AVAILABLE FOR YOU TO VIEW ON THE FTR SYSTEM.

ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4 2012, A DEFENDANT CAME INTO THE COURT FOR OUR WALK-IN ARRAIGNMENTS. HE HAD AN OUTSTANDING WARRANT FOR FAILURE TO COMPLETE COMMUNITY SERVICE HOURS. WHEN HE WAS CALLED TO THE BENCH, HE HAD ONE OF [REDACTED] BUSINESS CARDS WITH HER PERSONAL EMAIL ADDRESS ON IT. THE DEFENDANT STATED THAT HE WAS TOLD BY THE JUDGE THE ONCE HIS COMMUNITY SERVICE WAS COMPLETED, HE COULD EMAIL HER THE COMPLIANCE. WE NEVER RECEIVED THE COMPLIANCE AND A WARRANT WAS ISSUED. THE JUDGE HAS SINCE SAID THAT SHE IS GOING TO GO THROUGH HER EMAILS TO SEE IF THERE ARE ANY EMAILS FROM DEFENDANTS REGARDING COMPLIANCE. SINCE WHEN DO THE COURTS, SPECIFICALLY THE JUDGE, GIVE OUT PERSONAL EMAIL ADDRESSES TO COMMUNICATE WITH DEFENDANTS?

OUR ARRAIGNMENT DAY OCCURS ON TUESDAYS AT 1:30 PM. I CANNOT BEGIN TO TELL YOU HOW MANY DEFENDANTS PLEA GUILTY AND THEN ARE COERCED INTO CHANGING THEIR PLEAS TO NOT GUILTY. THE COURTS ARE SUPPOSED TO BE NEUTRAL; HOWEVER, OUR COURT HAS A VERY PRO-DEFENDANT IMAGE. THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON EVER SINCE SHE WAS ELECTED TO THE BENCH.

I REALIZE THE JUDGE HAS SOME ONGOING HEALTH ISSUES THAT SHE IS DEALING WITH AND ACCOMODATIONS ARE BEING MADE FOR HER, BUT WHEN I HEAR STORIES OF HER HELPING TO HANG "LARGE, HEAVY" MIRRORS AND PAINTING A HOUSE, I REALLY BEGIN TO DOUBT THE TRUTHFULLNESS BEHIND ALL OF THIS. ALSO, PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED ARTICLE. IT LOOKS AWEFULLY FAMILIAR TO WHAT IS GOING ON NOW.

I FEEL OUR COURT LOOKS LIKE A JOKE AT THIS POINT-THERE IS NO CONSISTANCY, THERE ARE CONSTANT PERSONAL STORIES TOLD ON THE BENCH TO ANYONE WHO WILL LISTEN. BELIEVE ME WHEN I TELL YOU THAT IT IS BAD. THIS IS NOT THE FIRST JUDGE THAT I HAVE WORKED FOR.

THESE ARE ONLY A FEW OF THE EVENTS THAT HAVE HAPPENED IN THE LAST TWO YEARS. I BELIEVE SHE HAS CROSSED THE LINE OF NEUTRALITY TO THE POINT WHERE IT IS UNACCEPTABLE.