

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 17-206

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge ruled against her in a family law case for corrupt reasons.

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.

The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. In addition, 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(a).

Dated: October 4, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 4, 2017.

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

2017-206

I am writing to you today in hopes that my case will be able to help others in exposing the judicial abuse in the \_\_\_\_\_, specifically Judge \_\_\_\_\_

On \_\_\_\_\_ I \_\_\_\_\_ I was not married \_\_\_\_\_, and I did \_\_\_\_\_ . Let me back up and also clarify that I was working as a \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_ at the time, and \_\_\_\_\_ is \_\_\_\_\_ and works as a \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ and gave up my career to raise \_\_\_\_\_

Moving forward – there was a domestic violence incident in \_\_\_\_\_ with my \_\_\_\_\_, in which reports were filed, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_ . Trust me, this matters.

Since I was unsure about the \_\_\_\_\_, I \_\_\_\_\_ the acknowledgment \_\_\_\_\_ which was my legal right in the state of \_\_\_\_\_ I also changed \_\_\_\_\_ to my last name since his alleged \_\_\_\_\_ said \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ after my \_\_\_\_\_, the company I was working for transferred me to \_\_\_\_\_ after the \_\_\_\_\_ due to ongoing domestic violence, and \_\_\_\_\_ admitted to committing verbal domestic violence, which continues \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ was already long-gone from our lives citing that he left to attend \_\_\_\_\_ . There is no record of \_\_\_\_\_ ever attending \_\_\_\_\_ didn't want to be \_\_\_\_\_ and stated that. Which I had on a recording. I told him we were moving to \_\_\_\_\_ and had no problem.

In \_\_\_\_\_, at \_\_\_\_\_ I was cornered and screamed at, and sworn at, all while holding my \_\_\_\_\_ and trying to get \_\_\_\_\_ the car – I had no idea what was going on and feared for \_\_\_\_\_. I was harassed by \_\_\_\_\_; who threw papers at me and said “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” This is the beginning of a \_\_\_\_\_ battle that was ruled on in a way that logically and legally makes no sense to anyone with a brain.

On \_\_\_\_\_, the Court detailed via Minute Entry that based upon both parties' testimony regarding domestic violence both physical and verbal and other allegations regarding \_\_\_\_\_ threat to abscond with the child, as well as the child's age and \_\_\_\_\_ upcoming \_\_\_\_\_ that it was in the child's best interests that \_\_\_\_\_ should have supervised parenting time with the child.

\_\_\_\_\_ left \_\_\_\_\_ to vacation in the \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ instead of being with \_\_\_\_\_ orders scheduled \_\_\_\_\_; \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_ or later. In \_\_\_\_\_ vacationed in \_\_\_\_\_ and then \_\_\_\_\_ left in \_\_\_\_\_

In the [redacted] spent a total of [redacted] with [redacted] In [redacted] was absent from [redacted] for over [redacted] In [redacted] left [redacted] for work the day after the [redacted] temporary orders hearing on [redacted]. [redacted] was gone from [redacted] through [redacted]. Then [redacted] left again on [redacted], and returned on [redacted]. Indeed, [redacted] schedule has [redacted] leaving again from [redacted] through [redacted] as it stands currently, however [redacted] is inconsistent with return dates so another future date for [redacted] to return to [redacted] and exercise parenting time after [redacted] is likely. [redacted] has only exercised [redacted] parenting time approximately [redacted] as of [redacted]. [redacted] left again [redacted] and has been gone since. Being in [redacted] for only [redacted] of the [redacted].

When [redacted] moved to [redacted], [redacted] did not ignore [redacted]. Indeed, [redacted] spoke to [redacted] on [redacted] filed his Petition to Establish and Motion for Temporary Orders, [redacted] only [redacted] after the hearing for vacation. This is a common theme for [redacted] wherein [redacted] filed with this Court requesting expanded parenting time, only to leave right after the hearing and barely exercise the parenting time. [redacted] could certainly have stayed in [redacted] prior to [redacted]: in [redacted] to exercise as much parenting time as possible before leaving. Instead, [redacted] chose to visit the [redacted] and travel around [redacted] in [redacted] prior to [redacted] scheduled for [redacted] choice meant [redacted].

[redacted] has previously offered [redacted] settlement throughout this case regarding parenting time which included more frequent and unsupervised time. [redacted] chose to decline those offers. [redacted] continued to offer [redacted] settlement scenarios that included more frequent, meaningful, and continued contact with the child while keeping the child's best interests in mind and how the child will be affected by [redacted]; need to continually leave [redacted] and not exercise parenting time for [redacted].

I am sure by now you are asking “

I also hired a [redacted] because I had concerns about this case and the [redacted] ability to parent, verbal and physical abuse, alcoholism, abuse of steroids etc. from the beginning, and the abuse I endured. Regardless of the evidence, regardless of [redacted] never being present, regardless of my concerns and the evidence that was submitted [redacted] became infatuated with the [redacted] because he is “ [redacted] ” and [redacted] flat out stated that [redacted] wasn't going to ruin [redacted] career regardless of evidence. Regardless of the letters the the [redacted] wrote impersonating a Doctor stating [redacted] had [redacted] and needed an [redacted].

2017-206

gave the phone numbers of his other [redacted] to pretend to be [redacted].  
The [redacted] is a professional at this – it is his job and When I brought up that [redacted] is never  
around and [redacted] and how coming and going out of [redacted] life is  
going to affect him, [redacted] wanted to know how much more money I would pay him before  
he answered our questions. I already paid him \$ [redacted]

This is why it matters:

- REGARDLESS of all the evidence that was submitted by us, REGARDLESS of all the settlement offers we sent REGARDLESS of [redacted] not ever being around.
- JUDGE [redacted] ruled that
  - o [redacted] was the one who would provide more frequent & meaningful contact?! Based on what? He is never in [redacted]
  - o Regardless of whether [redacted] was present or not, [redacted] ruled that [redacted] have [redacted] parenting time and increased the schedule immediately regardless of if [redacted] is present or not.
  - o Even though [redacted], and out of contact [redacted] ruled that [redacted] has joint legal decision making
  - o [redacted] also ruled that the supervised visitation that [redacted] ordered at the beginning of the case, that I reimburse him for that. So about \$ [redacted]
  - o [redacted] also ruled that even though I was [redacted] from [redacted], and I make significantly less [redacted] makes over \$ [redacted], [redacted] that I pay [redacted] attorney fees in the amount of \$ [redacted] by [redacted]
  - o [redacted] also ruled that I need to change [redacted] name back to [redacted] because it will help those two bond. I asked for it to be hyphenated, since everything else she ruled on is [redacted] denied my request.

I don't have the funds to appeal my case, and I am trying to raise funds to pay for this egregious amount that [redacted] ordered me to pay, without any explanation whatsoever.

Anyone with a brain can not wrap their head around what just happened in this case. Either [redacted] was in collusion with the [redacted], who is dating Judge [redacted] and how much that relationship grossly influenced the outcome in this case or [redacted] was paid off, as well as [redacted] being paid off for [redacted] outrageous report.

I am asking for this to be investigated, be reported on whatever needs to be done because logically and legally this is injustice at it's finest – especially for a [redacted], and myself to have to pay \$ [redacted] while [redacted] is making \$ [redacted]

**2017-206**

I appreciate your time in reading this and I hope I hear from you soon.

Thank You,