

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 18-122

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge had a financial interest in a court-ordered service, was not adequately prepared for a hearing, used abusive and offensive language, and gave legal advice to one party.

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 an advisory letter to be mindful of Rules 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.6(A) when issuing orders that affect non-parties to the litigation. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Commission member Art Hinshaw did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: August 15, 2018

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Louis Frank Dominguez  
Hon. Louis Frank Dominguez  
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 15, 2018.

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

Court Case:

The purpose of this correspondence is to report the gross violations of a judge in the \_\_\_\_\_, and to seek immediate remedies, which will protect the public and instill greater confidence in the judiciary against these improper, unethical, and biased actions displayed in her courtroom without consequence and/or recourse.

Unfortunately, as you will observe reviewing my case, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ gross misconduct as it pertains to the use of her authority to support the narratives she concocts in each situation does not serve the best interests of the families, particularly \_\_\_\_\_ is on the bench to protect and serve. Furthermore, it appears she uses these narratives as justifications to sanction the very people coming to her courtroom for fair, legal, sound judgment, which raises some very serious ethical questions and suspicions as to what the nature of her financial interest is with the \_\_\_\_\_ that she seems to \_\_\_\_\_ of the proceedings.

For reference, listed below are the areas in the AZ ST Code of Jud. Admin, § 1-303: Code of Conduct for Judicial Employees, which have been violated in my particular court case:

- 1. Rule 1.1 Compliance with the Law**
- 2. Rule 1.2. Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary**
- 3. Rule 1.3. Abuse of Power**
- 4. Rule 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness**
- 5. Rule 2.3. Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment**
- 6. Rule 2.4. External Influences on Court Duties**
- 7. Rule 2.5. Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation**
- 8. Rule 2.6. Assistance to Litigants**
- 9. Rule 2.8. Professionalism**
- 10. Rule 2.11. Personal Interests**

There are some strong ethical questions and considerations to be entertained with the outcome of my court proceeding, which demonstrate increased potentiality that further violations may exist. For reference, I have listed below potential ethical violations, which this writer strongly recommends an independent investigation into the possible involvement of Judge \_\_\_\_\_ and the \_\_\_\_\_, which she \_\_\_\_\_ with threats of \_\_\_\_\_ for contempt violations \_\_\_\_\_:

- 11. Canon 1. Rule 2.4. External Influences on Court Duties**
- 12. Rule 2.11. Personal Interests**
- 13. Canon 3. Outside Activities – Rule 3.3. Solicitation for Outside Activities**
- 14. Rule 3.4. Gifts and Extra Compensation**

Ultimately, if a financial interest is established in the due-diligence process into the nature of the judge’s outside activities and supported by courtroom decisions in terms of violations which exist, it is strongly recommended sanctions be levied for these violations, retribution be paid to those subjected to these abuses in power

Let me first start by giving a few details about the person making this assertion. I am a \_\_\_\_\_ in the community

\_\_\_\_\_ with precise \_\_\_\_\_ to all of humankind. In fact, this writer was \_\_\_\_\_ by the \_\_\_\_\_), thereby evidencing my strong, \_\_\_\_\_. My professional experience includes an extensive background working with \_\_\_\_\_ to this situation, with \_\_\_\_\_ of working directly in \_\_\_\_\_, including with \_\_\_\_\_. I’ve taken my responsibility very seriously to serve \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ tools and resources \_\_\_\_\_ when necessary to ensure the best \_\_\_\_\_. In this particular case, I sought the aid of the legal system as it pertains to my own, \_\_\_\_\_.

Please be reminded, at the age of \_\_\_\_\_ if desired could \_\_\_\_\_, yet this writer watched helplessly as my \_\_\_\_\_ wants and needs were completely disregarded by the legal system, mainly as she “\_\_\_\_\_” what is “\_\_\_\_\_” without taking \_\_\_\_\_ wants and needs into consideration by her own report in the Minute Entry. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ did not allow \_\_\_\_\_ to testify, even though there was no objection for \_\_\_\_\_ to do so nor allowed admitting \_\_\_\_\_ notarized statement of \_\_\_\_\_ wants and needs to live exclusively with his \_\_\_\_\_), which \_\_\_\_\_ had been \_\_\_\_\_ since the physical incident

occurred between . It was not the intention of this Petitioner to seek full custody by proving domestic violence and “ ” the other party; this Petitioner merely offered the explanation to the court for reasons why the chose to live with his over due to an extreme violation in trust, which occurred. Due to the age of ), wishes should have been honored without the burden of “ ” domestic violence. However, Judge did not honor the wishes and ” the reasons, when perhaps it wasn’t even her place to do so. Furthermore, Judge ordered into a dangerous situation in which he does not feel safe with no real explanation, except that it appears to be out of spite for the Petitioner. Please also consider the additional cost, time, and use of the legal system, which are required for to rectify the dangerous situation Judge created when she failed to do what was in best interest, honor wishes to live with , and address fear of and possible retaliation for bringing the matter to court.

Emancipation should not be the only avenue for to ensure safety against when there are countless examples when typical and older can choose which parent they choose to reside with predominantly, yet Judge states in the Minute Entry following the case time of the court proceedings.

Shame on the legal system and those involved with it, who are not passionate about serving the public and community with honor, but instead with self-serving agendas and inflated egos of power placing in dangerous situations.

For the remainder of this correspondence, this writer cites the rule violations with explanation as they pertain to the court proceedings of .

In the interest of including all relevant points and keeping this correspondence succinct, not all details have been recounted here. A formal review of the proceedings and correspondence in the case are encouraged to get a complete, overview of the violations perpetrated by Judge

**AZ ST Code of Jud. Admin, § 1-303: Code of Conduct for Judicial Employees**

- 1. Canon 1. Canon 1. A Judicial Employee Shall Uphold and Promote the Independence, Integrity, and Impartiality of**

**the Judiciary and Shall Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety, Section (A) A judicial employee shall comply with the Law.**

**Rule 1.1 Compliance with the Law**

This writer sought the legal reconciliation of the court, when attempts to agree between parties were unsuccessful in revising the [redacted] old, outdated, parenting plan in place. Prior to [redacted] the hearing to Modifying Legal Decision Making (Custody), Parenting Time and Child Support ([redacted] after being requested), the Petitioner (this writer) sought a hearing for the contended issues of the Parenting Agreement. However, despite repeated attempts to bring awareness to Judge [redacted] citing the reasons why “ [redacted] ” was not appropriate in this case, apparently angered the judge resulting in a scathing [redacted] ,” which accused the Petitioner of “ [redacted] ,” even though the Petitioner quoted the instructions on a [redacted] (as recommended by [redacted] of Judge [redacted] ) of why mediation is inappropriate. The instructions on the mediation form state “

[redacted] .” Yet, the Petitioner had to proceed with mediation, even though deemed inappropriate in this case and pay the additional monies for this service, thereby exhausting court resources in a case when it was clearly not applicable.

Furthermore, in the scathing ruling issued by Judge [redacted] states the “ [redacted] ,” which further demonstrates she never read any of the documents requested and supplied to the court as part of the order Modifying Legal Decision Making (Custody), Parenting Time and Child Support as the forms require the last [redacted] of tax returns, which apparently were largely ignored by Judge [redacted] when entering her ruling.

If I were to [redacted] looking at the [redacted] , do you know how reckless [redacted] ? Thus, Judge [redacted] has a moral/social obligation to review all documents associated with a case before issuing judgment, or that judgment will be biased without accounting for all the facts in the case. It is clear that she did not exercise this judicial duty.

Furthermore, when the hearing did occur, Judge [redacted] did not act on any of the motions before [redacted] to modify the existing parenting plan, instead, [redacted] ordered both parties to [redacted] and [redacted] , failing to address relevant costs associated with raising a [redacted] vs. [redacted] , which are still areas of disagreement between the parties and never

addressed by the court, even though specifically before the court asking Judge [redacted] to rule upon these matters.

Throughout the entire court hearing, Judge [redacted] was not sensitive to the matters before the court and “ [redacted] ” as stipulated by law discounting domestic violence claims with no real reason for doing so. Furthermore, Judge [redacted] demonstrated behaviors, which violate the laws as they pertain to Harassment in Arizona defined by A.R.S. § 13-2921, specifically disorderly conduct, harassment, with threatening and intimidating verbal abuse toward my son and this Petitioner. Thus, no “ [redacted] ” was exercised to protect [redacted] rights when [redacted] faced [redacted] in the courtroom admitting abuse as shared with Judge [redacted] why he did not want to live with [redacted] any longer.

During the proceedings, Judge [redacted], called [redacted] into the courtroom, but not to testify, as requested. Judge [redacted]

language calling [redacted] “ [redacted] ” simply because [redacted] while on the stand. This writer does not speak to [redacted] this way, yet Judge [redacted] had no issues speaking this way to [redacted] in a deliberate, condescending manner. During this dialogue, [redacted] admitted to Judge [redacted]

“ [redacted] ”. Yet, instead of following “ [redacted] ” as stipulated by law to promote the search of the truth and exercising common sense sensitivity to the needs of [redacted], understanding development issues [redacted], and recognizing the cycle of domestic violence demonstrated by the Defendant, Judge [redacted] accused [redacted] of also “ [redacted] ”, since it appears this is the narrative Judge [redacted] chose to believe in the situation, possibly before the hearing began. How can a judge be expected to discern when domestic violence happens and how it impacts a family dynamic, when she practices harassment in her own courtroom without consequence?

When this Petitioner voiced concerns in the courtroom following Judge [redacted] flagrant neglect of [redacted] vulnerable admission and fear [redacted], she called this writer “ [redacted] ”. Why has she made this about her ego and not about what is right for [redacted]? Isn't that her job? What is wrong with holding a judge accountable for their responsibility to protect [redacted]? Judge [redacted] even violates her own “ [redacted] ” listed on [redacted] judicial profile located on [redacted] under the “ [redacted] ” section, which states “ [redacted] ”.

**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.**