

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 20-036

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

May 21, 2020

The Complainant alleged that a superior court judge accepted perjured testimony, ignored evidence, allowed the opposing party to speak out of turn, and issued erroneous rulings.

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 Commission 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 May 21, 2020.

**From:****Sent:****To:** Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>**Subject:**

ON [REDACTED] AT [REDACTED] COURT UNDER SURVEILLANCE JUDGE [REDACTED] WAS COMPLETELY 100% IMPARTIAL. THE PETITIONER SWORE UNDER OATH AND LIED AT LEAST [REDACTED] TIMES, JUDGE [REDACTED] IGNORED THAT. I BROUGHT IN IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS JUSTIFYING MY SIDE JUDGE [REDACTED] IGNORED THAT TOO. I MENTIONED THE PETITIONER HAS A CRIMINAL RECORD [REDACTED] ITEMS LONG WITH ITEMS INCLUDING BURGLARY DOMESTIC BATTERY TRESPASSING POSSESSION OF ALCOHOL BY MINOR CONTEMPT OF COURT, AS I HAVE A CLEAR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND, HOW THE PETITIONER HAS ONLY PAID CHILD SUPPORT ABOUT [REDACTED] OUT OF [REDACTED] YEARS AND THAT [REDACTED] OF [REDACTED] SAID THEY WILL BE PURSUING COLLECTIONS. JUDGE [REDACTED] RESPONSE WAS STOP THREATENING [REDACTED] THE PETITIONER AND THAT STUFF ON HIS CRIMINAL RECORD IS OLD. JUDGE [REDACTED] LET [REDACTED] SPEAK FIRST WHEN IT WAS MY TURN TO SPEAK I WAS ONLY ALLOWED THEN TO REMEMBER EVERYTHING AND RESPOND, ON THE SPOT. WHEN I ASKED TO ADD MORE RESPONSES I WAS TOLD TIME WAS UP. THE PETITIONER LIED SAYING I HAVE ABUSED ADERRAL, NOT I THINK SHE HAS ABUSED ADDERAL, THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN PROVEN FALSE BY DRUG TEST AND MEDICAL RECORDS. THE PETITIONER LIED SAYING I DID NOT CONTACT MY [REDACTED] YEAR OLD DAUGHTER [REDACTED] TIME, NOT I THINK SHE HAS NOT CONTACTED [REDACTED] TIME, THAT CAN BE PROVEN BY PHONE AND TEXT RECORD.

IN AN OTHER CASE JUDGE [REDACTED] HAS SIGNED OFF ON ME MOVING OUT OF MY HOME FOR [REDACTED] MONTHS NOT BEING ALLOWED TO BE NEAR MY NEW BABY WHILE COMPLETING REQUIREMENTS, BASED OFF A "PRESUMPTIVE" POSITIVE DRUG TEST RESULT THAT WAS ONLY SUPPOSE TO TAKE [REDACTED] DAYS FOR RESULTS TO BE DONE BUT TOOK [REDACTED] MONTHS AND IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY, SIDING WITH [REDACTED] IN A DEPENDENCY CASE. MY HOUSE WAS EVEN IMMACULATE JUST LIKE MY [REDACTED] MONTH OLD BABY WAS WHEN DCS REMOVED HIM

UNLAWFULLY WITHOUT COURT ORDER OR WARRANT.