

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 19-234

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

October 9, 2019

The Complainant alleged a small claims hearing officer made an unsound judgment.

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. The Commission reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission member Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 9, 2019.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

**2019-234**

**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Judge's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that 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.

On \_\_\_\_\_ heard case number \_\_\_\_\_  
vs. \_\_\_\_\_ During the hearing, the Hearing Officer was presented sufficient evidence to substantiate  
claim against the Defendant. In addition, the Defendant admitted to all allegations and amounts  
owed to the Plaintiff. The amount was never disputed by the Defendant nor was it ever requested to reduce the  
amount of the claim. The Hearing Officer made the decision to reduce \_\_\_\_\_ claim from \_\_\_\_\_ to  
\_\_\_\_\_ for no other reason than he felt our annual interest rate was " \_\_\_\_\_ " \_\_\_\_\_ has had  
many cases previously heard by Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ and has never had our rates questioned. In addition, our rates are set  
by industry professionals and regulated by \_\_\_\_\_ It was explained to the Court that the Plaintiff made every  
attempt to settle the matter prior to the hearing, however the ruling would not be reconsidered. It is  
\_\_\_\_\_ belief that the Hearing Officer made an unsound Judgment and did not fully consider all of the facts prior to  
sympathizing with the Defendant due to a physical impairment, rather than making sound Judgment based on facts  
and law.