

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-360

Complainant:	No. 0308100378A
Judge:	No. 0308100378B

ORDER

A superior court judge voluntarily reported that she inadvertently delayed ruling on a matter taken under advisement.

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 matters taken under advisement. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Dated: February 27, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Louis Dominguez

Louis Frank Dominguez
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on February 27, 2013.

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

DEC 27 2012

December 18, 2012

Mr. Keith Stott, Jr.
Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington St. Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Regarding:

Dear Mr. Stott and Members of the Commission:

During a hearing which I held this morning, I discovered that an Under Advisement Ruling which I intended to be made on August 28, 2012 was not included in the August 28, 2012 Minute Entry Order, which I have included with this letter.

have an extremely contentious relationship regarding finances and parenting time issues concerning their 16 year old twin son and daughter. I schedule a Review Hearing with the parties at the end of each quarter to address any issues which have arisen and rule accordingly. At the end of the August 28, 2012 hearing, after waiting for the parties to leave the courtroom, I asked my courtroom clerk to add a "Later In Chambers" ruling denying the Respondent's Petition regarding child support. I did not realize until this morning that the additional ruling had not been included in the Minute Entry Order.

I have attached a copy of the Ruling which I entered which details the situation and the ruling which I made. I regret the oversight and will be more vigilant in ensuring that "Later In Chambers" rulings are added to the Minute Entry Orders when made.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding the above. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,