

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 15-231

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner displayed religious bias, engaged in inappropriate courtroom demeanor, and denied a patient the right to be heard in a civil commitment proceeding.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioner 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.

The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the commissioner's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the commissioner did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Commission members Anna Mary Glaab and J. Tyrrell Taber did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: February 5, 2016

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the commissioner on February 5, 2016.

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

### Complaint – Arizona Judge

This our started to experience occasional side-effects when administered his (after having been on for and We kept in close communication with his and also tried to obtain assistance from other to have this evaluated. His felt this was likely , as they can have and can be caused by the (which can be caused by the ) An is required to diagnose this, and is best done when the individual is experiencing the symptoms. He was denied a medical evaluation to determine if as he exhibited the . He was also denied this when he entered

Our has been at , although he was illegally held for prior to the involuntary evaluation (rather than the permitted by law.) was held illegally rather than prior to petitioning for involuntary evaluation. He was denied any attorney involvement during this illegal hold – even though by law this was a clear violation of all rights. He was denied movement for which required which could cause his death. The failed to properly care for his needs and sent him into while at the which means he was on the verge of ; (while under their care). There had previously been a hearing for a yet this was denied even though all of our rights had been violated for prior to his move to , including his near death due to the and . We filed a number of detailed reports to to report the abuse that he had experienced with his continuous life-threatening experiences in their care.

1. was involved in rubber-stamping an evaluation on without a legitimate or honest evaluation. She actively committed religious persecution against and with lies and deception. She also is actively involved in retaliation against the family to harm an innocent victim (

2. We filed a complaint regarding with the and also filed a complaint with other agencies due to the seriousness of this matter. We have included a copy of the complaint for background in the case.

This report was for benefit so she does not continue to harm people. We reported this so the other (who may not have family who will speak up) are not also victimized. It is also for the benefit of the workers, as many have stated that

Some of these workers have even stated that

The actions that she committed come against Jesus and the Word.

3. We had rescheduled the hearing with a number of times to ensure a fair , who had been denied the right to have a full medical evaluation (including the ) prior to the We were planning to conduct the full medical evaluation (including the ) once he is have now passed. (It was extremely difficult to find qualified evaluators that would become involved in the Court Hearings.) We delayed the process and spent over in legal fees with the belief that once this was done, he would be provided a fair and impartial hearing with the judicial system and court.

4. Even though we did have who provided clear evidence at the hearing that our was not this information was totally disregarded entirely by in the hearing. The one submitted a and sent directly to the court. (A copy of this has been included.) He also offered to testify through telecommunication. The other

The other had entirely different findings than . The other is both an and also : . The other is an stated that answered all 30 out of 30 questions with . He saw no evidence whatsoever to support . The found him to be very . They both stated that he was not . They both stated that he with flying colors. They also stated that he is unbelievably skills and general knowledge (way beyond that of .) The licenses in also him in the area of . and stated that he was also not . Extensive time was spent by reviewing records and with the interviews of . The conducted by was extremely simplistic, rather than extensive as is generally conducted by and also conducted in the school systems prior to . The did also state that had average ability. (At least he provided information from tests, which is factual data based information.) entirely disregarded the data based facts in her decisions. (This is a clear violation of Rule 2.4 – Judges must decide cases based on facts and the law, not on bias, friends, or political reasons.)

The prosecutor ( ) also agreed that they would drop the label (prior to the hearing) if we agreed to place a . (A copy of this email is included.) This clearly indicated that they did not feel he was yet had an ulterior motive. **This was not agreed upon by the family, unless the family took on the themselves.** This shows that continued in court to falsify the need to keep these labels on him even though the information clearly does not warrant this. Labeling an individual in a manner that is never to be done out of retaliation. Assigning is only to be a very last resort when someone is so and there is no one available to assist them.

This clearly has been done out of retaliation. We have repeatedly been told by \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ that they saw \_\_\_\_\_ or the need for \_\_\_\_\_

This also demonstrates that a false label was placed on \_\_\_\_\_ only to take away all of his rights in order that they can hold him and control his life.

\_\_\_\_\_ falsely ruled on this label in order to place \_\_\_\_\_ on him or he would have already been released to his family. (This is a clear violation of Rule 2.4 – Judges must decide cases based on facts and the law.) The fact they agreed to remove the label if they could place \_\_\_\_\_ shows they knew he was not \_\_\_\_\_. This is also a clear violation of Rule 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary – Conduct that reflects adversely on the Judges honesty, impartiality).

5. \_\_\_\_\_ (at \_\_\_\_\_) we experienced an unjust court setting and judge ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) who demonstrated a number of extreme violations to our legal court systems. According to the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, this includes violations in Rule 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary – honesty, impartiality), Rule 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness), Rule 2.3 (Bias Prejudice, and Harassment, Rule 2.4 (External Influences on Judicial Conduct), Rule 2.6 (Ensuring the Rights to be Heard), Rule 2.8 (Decorum, Demeanor, and Communication with Court staff, officials, and others subject to the Judge’s direction and Control), Rule 2.9 (Ex Parte Communication), and Rule 2.16 (as it relates to retaliation).

\_\_\_\_\_ attorneys did make comments that they had never seen or heard of anyone winning a case in that court before, as it is quite unjust. \_\_\_\_\_ attorney clearly stated she \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ in any hearings

\_\_\_\_\_ Another attorney stated that \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ We observed this corruption first hand.

6. In court, \_\_\_\_\_ retaliated and provided false statements which contain elements of the continued falsification of information, as well as the extreme acts and testimony of religious persecution. The prosecutor \_\_\_\_\_ encouraged this type of false testimony with continuous religious persecution. \_\_\_\_\_ also permitted it and even added comments without even knowing \_\_\_\_\_.

7. There was a continuous attack on Christianity by \_\_\_\_\_ permitted this. She repeatedly attacked the parents with no actual facts. She correlated Christianity and praying as people who do not believe in medications and were not providing insulin. Examples include:

- \_\_\_\_\_ in court stated that \_\_\_\_\_ were praying for \_\_\_\_\_ healing (as reported by \_\_\_\_\_) and used this example to state that as Christians we did not believe in medication. (She acted like we believed only in faith healing, not medication.) No facts were presented only the assumption and testimony against prayer and an assumption about Christianity from a non-Christian. It was harassment and negative stereotyping that was permitted in court by the \_\_\_\_\_. There was at no time any objection made by \_\_\_\_\_ regarding the harassing, degrading, and stereotyping testimony, rather than providing facts to the court.

This testimony with no facts was permitted, yet when [redacted] testified in the [redacted] hearing, a different judge placed an objection with testimony regarding [redacted] symptoms when [redacted] related symptoms to the same symptoms that are stated in research data (such as documents provided by [redacted]). So research data (and information provided by a specialist in the area) could not be related to symptoms, yet bias, prejudice and harassment, and stereotyping Christians was permitted to be used by the judge

As background, when we did attend the [redacted] Hearing on the judge (a different [redacted]) proceeded to just disregard the fact he had been illegally held for [redacted] rather than [redacted] hours. This is after [redacted] was almost killed by [redacted] and [redacted] negligence during the [redacted] of illegally being held. The failure of the [redacted] to provide him [redacted] – (which is required for a [redacted]) caused him to go into [redacted]. This means he was on the verge of [redacted] and his life was placed in great danger [redacted]. The statement made from the beginning on [redacted] is [redacted]!” This same statement is also being expressed at [redacted] by their continued actions.

- [redacted] in court and in her evaluation of [redacted] stated that [redacted]. This was stated without ever speaking to [redacted] (The attorney asked her about this in court.) There was [redacted] in court regarding the use of these statements of bias against a Christian. It was permitted by [redacted] and actually was utilized to form the outcome of the hearing.
- There was no factual basis for [redacted] making the ruling of the [redacted] at any time. In fact, [redacted] presented clear evidence to the contrary. The [redacted] also provided clear evidence that he did not need [redacted].
- [redacted] rambled on in court about how they were [redacted] and [redacted] that it might be something dangerous. We asked his attorney what she was referring to, and his response was “ [redacted] ”

Again [redacted] permitted this mud throwing to persecute and harass a Christian, without any facts. She did not stop this testimony or require her to state facts, as she had no facts (just prejudice and bias in her testimony.) It was clearly harassment against the Christian faith by a non-Christian. To any impartial observer, the doctor actually appeared [redacted] and had a [redacted] toward Christianity and the Christian

Another [redacted] even reported [redacted] that [redacted]. He clearly felt there were [redacted] even stated it appeared like [redacted] " rather than a fair justice system.

8. [redacted] is an [redacted] (with [redacted] for [redacted], as required) for the past [redacted] years. She actually [redacted]

His [redacted] is a former [redacted] and now a [redacted]. Even though [redacted] are highly qualified and have cared for [redacted] for the past [redacted] years ( [redacted] years with the challenge of [redacted] [redacted] has repeatedly denied [redacted] involvement in his care even though [redacted] has requested this continued support through [redacted]

9. In court, again the judge permitted [redacted] related to Christianity, as she permitted [redacted] personality and relate this to his [redacted]. They failed to disregard and are hiding the fact that he had been entirely [redacted] and [redacted] yet they don't want to take responsibility for the [redacted] and want to again relate this to [redacted] and [redacted]

10. After the lying in the hearing, [redacted] himself even told [redacted] "[redacted]" He does not want to speak with the individuals that he saw permitted to falsify and lie throughout the hearing. He also asked, "[redacted]" He previously was [redacted] to hear the truth in court so he could [redacted], and was [redacted] by what he heard.

11. At the end of the hearing, the judge asked [redacted] (after the vicious lies and attacks he heard in court) what he had to say. He chose not to make a comment and she looked at him in an intimidating manner and showed complete denigration toward him by making the cruel comment directly to him "[redacted]!" This was totally unacceptable and vicious! He is a very [redacted] who has been [redacted] (which has caused him harm.) She stated this in such a cruel way without even knowing him. This is after he has been [redacted] and isolated by [redacted] and the system. He almost [redacted] so they are actively trying to cover up and keep him locked up so he is not a witness to the illegal acts that have been committed [redacted]. This left him no dignity and demonstrated the judge's total lack of courtesy toward him. She demonstrated total disgust in her comment toward a [redacted] who has been victimized by this vicious system. This was clear evidence of violations in rule 2.3 (Bias, intimidation, denigration, and harassment).

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS  
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE  
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED  
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE  
REMAINDER OF THE  
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,  
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST  
IN WRITING TO THE  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL  
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE  
THE COMMISSION CASE  
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**