State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

| Disposition of Complaint 13-276 | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Judge: | No. 1003414792A |
| Complainant: | No. 1003414792B |

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge improperly failed to recuse himself and was biased.

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. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: February 3, 2014.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on February 3, 2014.

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: Judges Name

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper fo the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

I would like to start by thanking the Commission on Judicial Conduct (CJC) for reviewing my matter. I cannot fully explain the harm and damage Judge rulings have caused.

 To begin, additional activity to my Case #
 in Superior Court of
 began on

 when the
 Court Administrator reassigned our case from Judge

 in
 Arizona, to Judge
 in

 Arizona.
 The case was reassigned to Judge
 who professionally works in the same court as the

 Petitioner in Case
 Image: Court Administration reassigned to Judge
 Image: Court Administration reassigned to Judge

Judgemade his first ruling in the matter on, denying the Petitioner's request formodification of child support as the Arizona Child Support Guidelines did not support a 15% change fromthe previous order. The Court failed to notify the Respondent of theruling and thusthe Respondent could not properly defend himself.

the Petitioner, mailed a certified letter (attached) to my On Agency. The letter, which was accepted by the Arizona, Sector employer, the Agency, did not reach the Respondent until The letter receptionist of the to the east coast. advised the Respondent that she was going to relocate our Petitioner's letter NEVER stated that she was "only considering it." Upon investigating my rights, and to respond to the certified Pursuant to Arizona Revised Statute (ARS), the Respondent had for letter. Therefore, the Respondent retained the Law Office of , on to contest the relocation of our

On and the Respondent filed a Motion Requesting a Hearing RE: Child Support/Arrears. It was DENIED on

In response to Petitioners threatening letter of relocating to the east coast with our child, the Respondent filed a Petition to Prevent Relocation of Minor Child pursuant to the ARS. In that petition, the Respondent respectfully requested Judge to order Petitioner be responsible for court costs and attorney's fees should the matter proceed to trial.

 On
 Judge
 issued an Order to Appear to the parties.
 IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT

 AS OF
 JUDGE
 HAD REVIEWED COURT PLEADINGS WITH THE PETITIONERS

 NAME ON IT; HIS FIRST INDICATION THAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THIS CASE AS

 HE COULD NOT POSSIBLY RENDER DECISIONS THAT WOULD BE FAIR AND IMPARTIAL AS JUDGE

 AND THE PETITIONER WORK TOGETHER.

On

the Petitioner's attorney of record,

filed pursuant to Rule 42(f) a Notice of Change of Judge. The notice was timely, the petitioner had not waived her right to change of judge in this matter under subsection (42)(f)(1)(D) of the rule, and had not previously been granted a change of judge. <u>It is</u> <u>the Respondent's belief that Ms.</u> <u>requested the change of Judge as her client had an</u> <u>established professional working relationship as one of Judge</u> <u>employees.</u>

Judgeand Petitioner have: (1) had extensive personal and professional contact. Petitioner is aJuvenile Probation Officer inCounty and has appeared in Judgecourt, in performance ofher duties, BEFORE AND AFTER our case was reassigned to him. Petitioner has been in Judgechambers to advise course of action on the Petitioner's caseload (i.e. presentence reports, revocationhearings, etc.); and (2) Judgeand the Petitioner have, more than likely, individually attended socialcourt events while employed at theCounty Superior Court.

The Respondent believes the above relationship exists due to the fact that the Respondent experienced that type of professional working relationships with all staff while employed as a Courtroom Deputy/Court Reporter at the U.S. District Court, District of Arizona, Division, from

As I worked as an employee of the court during the years mentioned above, the Respondent routinely attended events (i.e. birthdays, retirements, Christmas Events, etc.) with MOST Federal Courthouse Employees in attendance. The following agencies would also attend (Federal Public Defenders Office, Assistant U.S. Attorney's Office, U.S. Marshal Service, Clerk's Office, U.S. Probation and Parole, the Bar, and the U.S. Pretrial Services Agency). <u>Petitioner's attorney</u>,

should be asked why she was requesting the change of judge. It's logical it was because of the appearance of bias and the appearance that Judge could not be fair and impartial.

JudgeREFUSED TO RECUSE HIMSELF as indicated on his order datedeven though hecould not be fair and impartial, and had to have known the Petitioner was an employee of the Courtthat worked for him.

AS JUDGE IS PRESIDING JUDGE OF COCHISE COUNTY IN DIVISION 1, HE IS WELL AWARE OF THE AGREEMENT COCHISE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT HAS WITH GRAHAM/GREENLEE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA FOR CASE REASSIGNMENT WHEN A JUDGE HAS TO RECUSE HIMSELF DUE TO THE SLIGHTEST OF BIASES BEING EVIDENT. On Petitioner files a Response To Petition For Order To Appear To Prevent Relocation Of A Minor Child. Said petition now states, "Petitioner has no plans to relocate and is withdrawing her notification to Respondent of any intent to do so." The petition states, contrary to Petitioner's personally typed letter which she sent certified mail, that "Petitioner had originally informed Respondent that she was "considering" moving to the east coast..." Respondent agreed and stipulated to not relocating our child, however, the Respondent, filed a Motion For Attorney's Fees as Respondent felt the Petitioner/Mother acted in bad faith and asked Judge to file sanctions against the Petitioner for her actions. Respondent requested attorney's fees in an appropriate amount as the Judge deems just be awarded in favor of the Respondent. The Petitioner's response dated

again stated, "Petitioner had intended to relocate to the east coast." JUDGEBIASRULING IN FAVOR OF PETITIONER DATEDSTATED, "NO FINDING OF BAD FAITH"ON PART OF PETITIONER AND RESPONDENT'S REQUEST WAS DENIED. JUDGERULED THATATTORNEY'S FEES SHOULD BE APPLIED TO CHILD SUPPORT MODIFICATION, HOWEVER, RESPONDENTDIDN'T ASK FOR THAT. RESPONDENT WANTED THEDIDN'T ASK FOR THAT. RESPONDENT WANTED THERETAINER TO BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OFTHE PETITIONER. ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HOW JUDGEAND THE PETITIONER'S WORKINGRELATIONSHIP RESULTED IN A BIASED RULING.RESPONDENT

On the Respondent filed a petition for Modification of Child Support. The petition advised Judge that Respondent resigned his position with the due to his ex-wife's The threat of relocating our to the east coast via her letter dated Department Store that indicated he Respondent provided Judge with pay stubs from hour. RESPONDENT FURTHER ADVISED JUDGE earned THAT RESPONDENT HAD FATHERED AN ADDITIONAL CHILD AND THAT RESPONDENT SHOULD RECEIVE CREDIT FOR SAME ON THE CHILD SUPPORT ORDER MODIFICATION; HOWEVER, JUDGE DENIED IT AND ADVISED THE **RESPONDENT THAT HIS OTHER CHILD WOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED.**

On Judge set an Evidentiary Hearing for

Assistant Attorney General (AAG) filed a Motion as State's Entry of Appearance on

On Judge continued the Evidentiary Hearing to

On Petitioner's attorney, withdraws as attorney of record. <u>OBVIOUSLY</u>, <u>THIS WAS DONE BECAUSE THE AAG WAS NOW REPRESENTING PETITIONER, WHICH MS.</u>

PLEADING BY STATING, FILES STIPULATED ADMITS TO IN HER MOTION TO WITHDRAW, IN ORDER TO PERMIT COUNSEL TO BE WITHDRAWN AS COUNSEL OF RECORD PURSUANT TO RULE 5.1(a) (2)....DO NOT WARRANT PETITIONER HAVING TWO ATTORNEYS ON HER BEHALF, AS THEY CAN BE HANDLED BY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE. IT'S CLEARLY OUTLINED; JUDGE STATEMENTS BY APPROVED AGREED TO MS. JUDGE **NEVER DISAGREED THAT MS.** WAS HER WITHDRAWL ON NOT THE ATTORNEY FOR THE PETITIONER AS MS. STATED IN HER ON THE STATE SHE IS THE PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY. MOTION. COURT PLEADINGS WRITTEN BY

On rules in favor of Petitioner. Even though Judge is advised of Judge Respondent fathering another child, Judge chose NOT TO ADDRESS IT AND GIVE THE PROPER CREDIT TO THE RESPONDENT even though ARS states he has to consider it. Judge willfully does not consider Petitioner's threat letter as a reason for Respondent to resign his position with the addressed occurred after I had already resigned The stipulation to not relocate that Judge with the Pursuant to ARS, the Respondent only had to respond to the certified **RULING FAVORED THE PETITIONER,** letter threatening to relocate to the east coast. JUDGE WHO IS SOMEONE WHO WORKS FOR HIM. Judge continued the Evidentiary Hearing to

In addition, Judge LIED to the Respondent by stating on the Court Record that he will not remove himself from this case because he only hears Family Law cases and <u>NOT</u> Criminal Law cases in County. For that reason, he will not recuse himself from this case. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT ON <u>THE RESPONDENT CONTACTED THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF COCHISE COUNTY, AND</u> WHEN ASKED IF JUDGE SAT IN ON CRIMINAL CASES. THE COCHISE COUNTY CLERK ADVISED THAT JUDGE "CURRENTLY" DOES HAVE CRIMINAL CASES ASSIGNED TO HIM! JUDGE COMMENTS ARE PART OF THE OFFICIAL COURT RECORD AND SHOULD BE REVIEWED.

On Judge AGAIN ruled in favor of Petitioner, advising he could not award petitioner retroactive credit for the time the Petitioner and Respondent had reconciled. Not even Petitioner's written admission dated was considered. Judge considered Respondents ability to be gainly employed but is not employed as part of his punitive ruling against the Respondent. How many Americans can be gainly employed but are not employed through no fault of ruled that I have the ability to earn between their own? Judge to in salary: however, his biased rulings damaged the Respondent's Financial Credit Profile which in turn prevented the Respondent from obtaining decent employment. Again, Judge favoritism toward the Petitioner has enhanced the Petitioner's chances of fully succeeding on any type of hearing while in

On Respondent timely filed an appeal to Judge and rulings in The appeal was dismissed by the Arizona Office due to the expense and lack of documentation preparation experience by the Respondent.

On another arrear hearing took place before Judge Judge ruled that Respondent had accrued additional arrears. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE ARREARS IN THIS HEARING WERE CREATED BY JUDGE JUDGE WOULD NOT MODIFY THE CHILD SUPPORT AMOUNT BASED ON: (1) THE RESPONDENT'S CURRENT WAGE EARNINGS; and (2) JUDGE WOULD NOT CONSIDER A CHILD CREDIT FOR THE RESPONDENT'S SECOND CHILD. Judge ruled the Respondent has or he would issue a warrant for non-payment. ANOTHER to pay BEING BIASED TOWARDS PETITIONER IS THAT PETITIONER WAS GRANTED EXAMPLE OF JUDGE RETROACTIVE CREDIT FOR MEDICAL INSURANCE PAID BY HER, YET RESPONDENT CANNOT BE CONSIDERED FOR ANY RETROACTIVE CREDIT EVEN THOUGH JUDGE COULD CONSIDER IT.

NOTE: The Warrant of Arrest issued for Respondent's inability to pay is issued by the Judge

IN CONCLUSION:

It is the Respondent's belief that Judge , for obvious reasons, **SHOULD HAVE RECUSED** himself from this case and reassigned it pursuant to the reassignment agreement Court has with Counties both within the State of Arizona. Based on the fact the Petitioner can be construed as Judge employee as he typically follows juvenile probation officers recommendations in court, and the fact Judge and the Petitioner have an established professional working relationship, as well as a possible platonic relationship outside of their working environment. It can be said that ALL of Judge rulings have been skewed in favor of the Petitioner, and it is the Respondents belief it is **DEFINITELY** due to their professional working relationship.

Judgerulings have NOT BEEN FAIR AND IMPARTIAL, and has caused CONSIDERABLE DAMAGE tothe Respondent.Respondent intends to file motions askingCounty to reopen my appeal case,and will possibly pursue a lawsuit against Judgefor damages and neglect of his judicial duties.

 FURTHERMORE, IT IS VERY POSSIBLE THE
 IN THIS CASE, MS.
 AND THE PETITIONER,

 KNOW EACH OTHER AS WELL. MS.
 AND THE PETITIONER BOTH REPORT TO JUDGE

 EXTENSIVELY, AND THE THREE EXHIBITED AN EXTREMELY FRIENDLY RELATIONSHIP BEFORE, DURING,

 AND AFTER COURT HEARINGS.