

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 21-324

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

June 10, 2022

The Complainant alleged that a superior court judge violated Rules 1.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

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 members Colleen E. Concannon and Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on June 10, 2022.

I am writing this affidavit to express my shock at the level of bias of Judge _____ as it pertains to
case number _____ involving the divorce and custody settlement of _____ and

I have attended their hearing on _____ in-person and by phone on _____ and I have been
dismayed by the overt discriminatory inclinations of judge _____ which are inconsistent with the
impartiality required from a judge. During the in-person hearing of _____ told
_____ That he could sense Mr. _____ frustration beneath his mask. Yet, he could not understand
or empathized with the pain of a disabled mother with stage four cancer who desperately wants her
right to see her 4-year-old daughter restored.

Furthermore, Judge _____ ruled that _____ post a bond to be able to see her daughter. This
decision seems to have been for no reason other than the prejudicial and unfounded concern that
_____ who also live in the US full-time, may take her
child out of the country! However, this judge has not been concerned that Mr. _____ a dual
citizen of _____ and the _____ may take their child out of the United States. So, in the
absence of a sound rationale, the presumption and subsequent ruling of Judge _____ can be
interpreted as acts of racism, misogyny, or both. In addition, this judge's deadline for _____ to
post the bond the same day of the hearing, knowing that she is seriously ill, on disability, and in
chemotherapy, points to the lack of basic humanity and consideration expected from a person in his
position.

On the day of _____ The Judge essentially stalled on taking action, leaving me to wonder if he
is trying to pass the precious time, which _____ and her daughter _____ cannot afford to lose.

Therefore for the observations mentioned above, I believe it will be in the best interest of the four-
year-old _____ that a more impartial judge presides over this case. A judge who can rule fairly and in a
more timely fashion.

Sincerely,