

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-075

Judge:	No. 1101014614
Complainant:	No. 1101014614

ORDER

The complainants alleged a superior court judge was biased, sarcastic, and made erroneous rulings.

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 reviewing the information provided by the complainants, the recordings of several hearings, and the judge's response, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: June 18, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainants and the judge on June 18, 2013.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2013-075

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

Judge's name:

: 4-5-13

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

1-14-2013
accusing did Judge "Attorney"
Judge ordered and advised CPS to place
in Judge declined
to hear evidence of allegations of sexual abuse against
Judge placed and
without hearing any evidence from other
attorneys. Judge stated "My decision is children
as with and will still stay the same." AAG
objected along with
CPS case manager to the Placement, Judge refused
to hear them acting very condescending to them. Judge
continued to hear objections from AAG and CPS
case manager and refused to hear them. Judge
would not allow to return home and to say
good-bye to children or let them know what was happening.
Judge never took time to find out what was
best for children. If Judge took the time to
look at the evidence, he would have seen that no evidence
of mental illness, that the fathers of children were living
to courts on the dependency petition. Judge did
require a psychological evaluation of but not
the fathers.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

Judge [redacted] did hear from all attorneys.

Attorney presented the evaluation, that showed that there was no mental illness. Judge [redacted] asked myself:

what I [redacted] have seen and give my evaluation of behavior towards children. After my testimony

to Judge [redacted], he stated in court, "I guess I was given misinformation in this decision". His tone was very sarcastic when making the retraction. If Judge [redacted] would have read the information and allow AAG and CPS to speak at the 1-14-13 hearing, he would have never allowed the children to go to [redacted]. Evidence was presented

that [redacted] was mentally stable and not a threat to herself or children. Judge [redacted] did order the children to be placed with maternal grandmother and allow [redacted] in the home. Judge [redacted] seemed to always allow Attorney [redacted] to run the courtroom,

Attorney [redacted] in which her client has never been a part of [redacted]

the father [redacted] life was presenting more lies. AAG had a 134 page motion proving that [redacted] lies. Judge [redacted] still let Attorney [redacted] run his courtroom.

3-11-13

2013-075

Judge did hear motions from all
Attorneys. seemed distant and
uncaring on the matter. To ~~some~~^{sum}-up the matter
of his behavior to this case, this was his most
disturbing comment was:

"I can't wait for this to be out of his
court room, so Judge could have
fun with this case."

In retrospect I feel Judge only favored
one Attorney in this manor, that Attorney is

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name:

Judge's Name: |

Date: 3/20/2013

I am writing in regards to a court hearing I attended on March 11, 2013 at the Court in
n front of Judge

My first concern is how he made a joke of this case. I cannot quote his exact words, but he stated he could not wait for this case to leave his courtroom so Judge | family court could "have some fun" in family court. In my view, that is completely uncalled for and this case is in regards to two children who deserve respect from a judge. His ruling from the first court date on January 14, 2013, put both children in danger and has severely traumatized the four year old girl and has put significant fear in the one year old child. This dependency action is based upon lies from a father that has never been a part of his daughter's life, which brings up my second concern.

It was clearly evident in court that day the judge had not read any of the information presented to him and he even commented to that effect. It was brought up on several occasions by the AAG and the Attorney for the mother that if all parties present in the courtroom actually read through all the information presented, the discussions being had would not be taking place. I find this very disturbing because there is a reason disclosures are being made and motion's are being presented to the court. I will say this again that this case is in regards to the best interest of these two children and a judge who ultimately has the final say should be reading everything presented to him in depth so he can make a well informed decision, instead of making a comment well I guess I did not see/read that or letting one attorney in particular run his courtroom.

Another concern is that the judge seems to let one attorney run his courtroom which is Attorney for Father She is the one who filed the private dependency petition to begin with based on lies, which have all been proved lies in the 134 page motion written by the AAG for the State of Arizona representing CPS. In my mind, if she wrote a dependency petition based on lies, why is he giving any credit to a dishonest attorney.

Finally, the way the judge addresses the mother seems to be very condescending. He addresses the fathers as and but when it comes to the mother of both children, he simply refers to her as "mother" in a sarcastic way, instead of

Thank you for your time in hearing my concerns regarding Judge |

With Respect,