#### State of Arizona

#### COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

### Disposition of Complaint 20-183

Judge:

Complainant:

### ORDER

#### October 1, 2020

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased against him, delayed resolution of his family law matter, improperly referred him for contempt, and forced him to disclose private medical information

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 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 members Louis Frank Dominguez and J. Tyrrell Taber did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 1, 2020.

I understand the commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge to a case.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the facts I have provided upon which my allegations of judicial misconduct are based are true and correct.

Signature:

Date:

#### INSTRUCTIONS

Use the following space or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint. Explain why you believe what the judge did constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list the names, dates, times, and places relevant to your allegations. Additional pages may be used and relevant copies of documents may be sent with your complaint (please do not send original documents). Use one side of each page only and write legibly or type your complaint. Please keep a copy of your complaint for your records.

It seddens me to have to file this comptaint with the Commission of Judicial Conduct. It saddens me because not only am I a Victim of prolonged emotional abuse and parental alientation from my (now-ex)-wife of years, but she has "passed the tonth" to these judges in A2 Family Court. Our justice system is supposed to be impartial, and have the perspective and wisdom to examine both sides of the story and "see" the truth. Further, when substantiated silegations of spousal abuse and perental alientation are raised, appropriate care and dispense to be store and under the perspective and wisdom to examine both sides of the story and "see" the truth. Further, when substantiated silegations of spousal abuse and perental alientation are raised, appropriate care and dispense to protect all penies should be taken. Further, all lidgants are to be treated lairy, whether they are represented by an alterney or not. Unfortunately, this case reveals that this is not the case. Frenkly, Judge has never had a court delay that he didn't like. He has been assigned to this case, an her tays, for years - that and (FARS - and her has accomplishe ALMOST NOTHING in this case. A Petition to Nodely parenting time has was submitted in and has found reason after reason after reason to needlessly delay the case. Unnacessary delays may be wilcome or understood is criticinal or composite court, but in Fanky Court, every delay after at least thirds of this door, and in this case, parent's rights being stomped upon. To stall a parenting time for in the fund counting) is judicious, and highly disrespective to the chadren who are being abused. rEARS - and he has accomplished Further background on this incident: Petition to Modify filed. scheduled a "return hearing" in The "retwom neering" was completely useless casually and non-chalanily scheduled an evidentiary hearing that was no less than KONTH s best interests was at stake). made no attempt to advance the case along, such as ordening a child interview, or appointing a child advocate. MONTHS LATER, M he was interested in (Again, a child's best interests was at stake). doing is create another delay. Father forced a temporary orders hearing, but again, the Court detayed requesting a citild interview until the hearing look place. conducted a hour evidentiary hearing. Yet, despite having the results of the child interview in front of him in which the annotation of hid AGAIN requested to have equal parenting time with both permets, the judge related a grant equal parenting time, even a "temporary proters". He only granted "yours per to coing so, also ignored an additional afforts the units delay to have more time with his Faffer. These presents are delay by taking a hall taky to fasse to fasting, be created an additional "nonths delay, scheduling ANOTHER evidentiary hearing. This, after we had just completed a hour evidentiary hearing on the same topic, just a tays earlier. ig, he created Father had submitted subpoens for evidentiary "discovery" because the opposing party was withhelding information. Father also requested additional information impeded my ability to argue my case by demying my subpoenas. When I expressed my frustration at the constit evacuary searing to allow him to present this additional information. Inpeded my ability to argue my case by demying my subpoenas. When (expressed my trustration at the constant delays, and the repeated prejudice against ma as a "pro per", realed an additional delay in this case by attempting to refer me for a contempt bearing. Ind planned to violate my/Father's 5/H and 6/b amendment rights by claining he could imparisally preside over family court evidenciary hearing, which had been scheduled for when he had already referred one of the parties for contempt. HOW CAN A JUDGE PRESUME TO BE IMPARTIAL AT A HEARING WHEN HE HAD REFERRED A PARTY FOR CONTEMPTY Yet, that's EXACTLY what tid. Father had to file a pleading with the count to get the hearing rescheduled twice before the criminal contempt had no file a pleading with the count to get the hearing rescheduled twice before the criminal contempt hearing was held. A previous CJC compliant has been filed against to file a conflict of interest at that point, and should have recused timself (in ind this time). er yet ANOTHER court delay, this time due to the pandemic and a Status Conference to introduce yet another court delay in these proceedings. Not only do and yet Nor Hill Court was in violation of Famer's he decline to existing temporary orders, he rescheduled the evidentiary hearing for In doing so, he refused to acknowledge that the Court was in violation of Famer's Constitutional Rights to parenting time, as documented in Father's motion, "RESPONDENT FATHER'S VERIFIED EXPEDITED MOTION FOR TEMPORARY OR FINAL ORDER RE. Consulutional Rights to parenting time, as documented in Father's motion, "RESPONDENT PARMENT MODIFICATION OF PARENTING TIME". A copy of this filing will be included with this CJC submission. Evidentiary hearing. During this hearing, forced newFather to disclose Private Medical Information (PMI). There was no HiPAA release requested for this information, forced newFather to disclose that I have branef. This is four that is which use ranky cancer patients out there who are parents. Carnet di ta person has it could father that person's ability hospion, heishe would newful to have assistance, but that is which the rights of the parent. This is no different than if a parent had any other lineas This should NVER be a factor in determing perenting time/ristation rights! When father declined to disclose the PMI, diling HIPAA protection. To be parent. This is no different the who are parents and there are parents and the set of a crocked smite in disput. Clearly these ladges have no respect for the law, or respect for the parvey rights of litigants. A person's physical health has no beering on their abilities as a parent, especially when the judge can clearly see that the parent before them is in excellent health. Finally, also in the bearing, Judge nebustad that because Faiher has a non-family member roommate sharing his house that it could be a factor in a parenting time decir Judge titil seamed unconvined avon though my son, would have his even private bedrown it a compatie apposite pan of my home. When a judge takes the Ostin of Office in Arizona, he/she swears to "administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and and the rich, and I will faihtuty and impartable deciro efforts or dubes normbent upon me as Dounty Superior Court Judge, under the Consiliusion and laws of the United States, So help me God." Faiher has hod triands share his home at times noemby to help officed in thing expenses. The individuals were all Faiher's filtereds prior to rowing in, they were not strangers. The bottom times, was prejudiced against Faiher because the has to share his home with a commande. IT DOES NOT KATTER IF my child shares a bedroom with violated his sweare soft to be only help to the poor, and the not." Throughout these proceedings, has ignored Father's rights to due process, prevented me from presenting evidence pertinent to the case, unreasonably restricted my time to present evidence, presumed to violate my 5th amendment rights, How, he is prejudice against me because I cannot afford to five is my home without a roommake. AZ CJC COMPLAINT FORM 2

I respectfully ask the CJC... Father needs help. Please, open your minds, and open your hearts - if not for Father's sake, for the Children's sake. PLEASE let these judges know that their conduct is both inappropriate and illegal. They have allowed themselves to be manipulated by a master manipulator, and have been conned into abusing their unchecked power in vindication against Father. They have siphoned off s of Father's income, making it impossible for his to hire another attorney. What is more important, the lives of the Children, or the egos of these judges? Regardless, I respectfully ask that you pray for the Children (if that is in your nature); they (and Father) have endured a LOT. They need help too.

Regards,

## AZ CJC COMPLAINT FORM 3

| 1  |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  |  |  |
| 3  |  |  |
| 4  |  |  |
| 5  | Attorney for Respondent Father   |  |
| 6  |  |  |
| 7  | IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  |  |
| 8  | IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF   |  |
| 9  | IN RE THE MATTER OF  | Case No.   |
| 10 |  | <b>RESPONDENT FATHER'S VERIFIED</b>                  |
| 11 | Petitioner,  | EXPEDITED MOTION FOR<br>TEMPORARY OR FINAL ORDER RE: |
| 12 | V.   | MODIFICATION OF PARENTING<br>TIME                    |
| 13 |  | (Assigned to Hon.                                    |
| 14 | Respondent.  | (Assigned to from                                    |
| 15 | Respondent.  |  |
| 16 |  |  |
| 17 | Respondent Father,   | ("Father"), by and through                           |
| 18 | undersigned counsel, hereby moves the Court pursuant to Rule 47.2(a), <i>Ariz.R.Fam.L.</i>   |  |
| 19 | <i>Proc. ("ARFLP")</i> for an expedited ruling <i>at or prior to</i> the presently scheduled |  |
| 20 | telephonic status conference granting a temporary or staged modification to the              |  |
| 21 |  |  |
| 22 | previously issued temporary orders for parenting time that continue to severely restrict     |  |
| 23 | Father's parenting time to effectively not more thanper. Father's                            |  |
| 24 | <i>Expedited Motion for Temporary Order Modification</i> is brought based upon Father's      |  |
| 25 | demonstrated compliance with the requirements imposed by the Court after                     |  |
| 26 |  |  |
| 27 | evidentiary hearing on a permanent modification. Father seeks expedited and immediate        |  |
| 28 |  |  |
|    |  |  |

relief, at least on a temporary basis, based upon Mother's unreasonable refusal to allow 1 2 Father any additional parenting time despite the recent Holiday and the recent and 3 unanticipated extended " break" arising from 4 The expedited circumstances further include the urgent considerations that accompany the 5 required restoration of the important and fundamental parental interests at stake, that have 6 been severely curtailed by prior orders of the Court, essentially as a default and other 7 8 "sanctions" resulting from Father's conduct in the dissolution proceedings, that has since 9 been cured and/or remedied by Father's more recent compliance with the "purge" 10 conditions as set in the Final Decree, and later clarified by this Court in its ruling 11 following the evidentiary hearing on permanent modification. 12 13 The Court's more recent findings and rulings make clear that there are definite 14 changed circumstances supporting a permanent modification granting Father equal or 15 substantially more parenting time with the parties' remaining minor son. Such immediate 16 relief is warranted because Father has sufficiently remedied has past noncompliance such 17 18 that continuance of the unreasonably severe parenting time sanctions are no longer 19 necessary nor appropriate, and clearly no longer in the best interests of the teenage child, 20 , who unequivocally desires more parenting time with his Dad. 21 Thus, Father respectfully submits that based upon the present circumstances 22 23 described herein, a temporary or permanent modification granting equal or at least 24 substantial additional parenting time is long overdue, and that continuing imposition of the 25 present severe limitations on his parenting time, which are tantamount to near termination 26 of his rights, serves only to cause continuing irreparable harm to the Father/Child 27 28 -2relationship, without present just cause or reason for doing so. In further support of this verified *Motion*, Father supplements the testimony and evidence previously received by the Court. *See, Exh.A, Father's Decl. ("Father's Decl.") and Attachments thereto.* 

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

# I. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT AND SUMMARY OF MATERIAL FACTS

A. Jurisdictional Statement

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 The parenting time restrictions at issue upon this *Motion* have a long and tortured 9 procedural history that requires some brief summary to fully appreciate the cumulative and 10 continuing detrimental impacts upon the respective rights and interests of both the minor 11 son and Father. The Court initially entered a contested Decree of Dissolution by Minute 12 13 *Entry* filed on ("Final Decree") in which Petitioner Mother was granted 14 sole decision-making authority and primary residential custody of the parents' 15 children (aged and respectively). Father's parenting time was severely restricted 16 to supervised visitation at a designated supervised visitation facility for each 17 18 until further order of the Court. See, Final Decree at pp. . The Court 19 further specifically suspended Father's access to or visitation with the children outside of 20 this severe restriction, which effectively constituted nearly a *de facto termination* of his 21 parental rights. *Final Decree* at p. 14; *Father's Decl.*, ¶ The severity of the 22 23 restrictions, and the conditions imposed for lifting them, strongly suggested that the Court 24 did not intend the restrictions to be a permanent and final "parenting plan" but rather more 25 tantamount to imposition of sanctions imposed to coerce Father into compliance with 26 certain then-pending Court Orders and punish him for his past uncooperative and 27 28

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.