## State of Arizona

### COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 21-349
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.

# **Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct**

'Case

Re: On behalf of

My concern is regarding Judge ADA violations and deprivation of medical care and attention to a cancer patient with federal accommodations. I am extremely outraged by how Judge of the County Superior Courthouse had negligently ordered my former patient, , despite numerous warnings to the court , to be forced to attend a public facility identical to a school setting with unvaccinated children as the only means for her to have parenting time with her child last Her primary oncologist and her PCP, had already warned the court that cannot be exposed to public facilities during the pandemic as a fourth stage cancer patient, as she would never recover if she were to contract the virus. Both her Dr. even warned the court of the negative effects of exposing a cancer patient to stressful situations that could impair her current treatment options. Regrettably, since all of our words of caution went unheeded, the patient is now suffering a dismal prognosis due to courtinduced trauma, being tormented, exploited, separated from her child, and forced to endure dangerous levels of emotional distress. On , despite Dr. letters and objections, this judge to attend a facility with unvaccinated children to see her daughter as ordered proposed by the opposing counsel while completely ignoring health condition as a fourth stage cancer patient undergoing treatment. Judge also made apathetic comments such as, "Well, you could've seen your child, but you didn't, as he referenced supervised parenting facilities frequented by children in closed public settings during the height of COVID. Despite COVID concerns and being immunocompromised and immunosuppressed as a patient treated for and is this is extremely both disturbing, hostile, disrespectful, and ruthless. I am confident that there were other alternative options for isolated facilities at a psychologist's office including private practices and/or any outdoor community setting. These options were ignored and denied by this judge, instead, he made the decision directed by opposing counsel to attend a center named However, in the beginning, he stated it could be with anyone, even a security guard, and then, turns a blind eye that this is a stage four cancer patient, denies her demand for isolated facilities, even a private practice or residence, and opts to cater to the demands of opposing counsel, irrespective of health concerns as a cancer patient undergoing active treatment. This is negligence.

I have originally written this letter on when an order was made by this judge for to attend a public facility for parenting time. He later had to change his order when this facility was closed due to the holidays. However, what prompted me to send this letter was that on she was requested by this same judge to attend a hearing in person, instead of telephonically to a live hearing, once again, despite Covid concerns and absolute disregard for human life knowing this is a fourth stage cancer patient

On this same judge demands to host his hearing for the same case on only now, due to COVID concerns of the safety of his staff members and himself for fear of COVID variants. Apparently, this message conveys to any member of the public, especially a cancer patient undergoing treatments as that ONLY the health of his staff members and himself are of utmost concern. However, declining health continues to be ignored as it's become blatantly discriminatory.

Neither Judge nor his counterpart, are in the medical field, but his arrogance is excessively profound and surpasses that of a top notch, world -renowned surgeon. This is not only discriminatory and contrary to (Rule 2.3), but a complete utter disregard of human life. His orders are negligent and appear as though he's acting with impunity towards the law. I question his moral standards, integrity, ethics, and competency as a judicial officer. I also question whether this judge has any conscience. He's a disservice to all the staunch taxpayers of this county and undermines the confidence of the judiciary. The voting public will expel him after learning of this case because one of every three people in the county is fighting cancer, or knows a colleague close who is.

On he made comments that he wasn't aware is ADA, nor have I seen anything! Implying, that s a liar and a false reporter!!! Her advocate had disclosed HIPAA protected medical documentation to his chambers and via email on and again, after the hearing on (See Attachments).

As a judge, is supposed to avoid the appearance of impropriety, but enables and tolerates opposing lawyer to make all the orders and decisions surrounding this case as every motion, order, and request, are always granted. However, requests, motions, proposals, and demands by are clearly tossed under a rug. Even, when they are a potential danger to any cancer patient as the majority on treatment become neutropenic.

These examples and plenty more echo partiality towards one party. Further, equal enforcement of the law is nonexistent with this judge. He is excessively partial towards the other party. I am extremely repulsed by this case and his passive behavior, arrogance, demeanor, and lack of regard for human life. These deliberate delays for a divorce involving zero assets, but primarily, copyrights (her request for a hearing were denied by this judge) and only one child, should not linger in the courts for three years. Her basic rights as a have all gone ignored.

I am a witness to the destruction of a valuable human being by a heartless and unethical judge behaving above the law. One who clearly lacks the competency in his duties to serve as a judicial officer (Incapable of making timely rulings) (No appearance of impropriety in his court, but extreme discrimination, bias, and incompetence).
Attachments:
1.) Judge Minute Entry
Email to JA from ADA Advocate,     AFTER she submitted HIPAA documents directly in person to Judge's Chambers due to them being protected
3.) Order for Supervised Visitation at
4.) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Email to JA from ADA advocate with comment (handwritten by This was resubmitted on after Judge made the comment, " At the hearing on

Esq. counsel for Petitioner

(

ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT.

COUNTY

HON.

CASE NO.

COURT REPORTER:

Digitally Recorded

DATE:

Courtroom -

Petitioner

(appearing telephonically)

and

In Proper Person

Respondent

## MINUTE ENTRY

# RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO SET A STATUS CONFERENCE RE: ADA REQUESTS

Both parties are present, appearing telephonically.

ADA advocate is present, appearing telephonically.

The Court, counsel, and

confer regarding the Respondent's request for ADA

accommodations.

THE COURT FINDS as follows:

- 1. In this case, the Respondent has requested to be able to attend all future hearings telephonically.
- 2. The Respondent is requesting that an ADA advocate be present at all hearings.
- 3. Under the current Administrative Orders, all hearings are presumed to be telephonic at this time.

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- 1. Future hearings in this matter shall be telephonic.
- 2. In the event that the Respondent is requesting a hearing, or is responding to a hearing request from the Petitioner, she shall do so as follows:
  - a. If the Respondent has any particular requests for ADA accommodation with respect to that hearing (including the length of hearing, or breaks during the hearing), the specific ADA requests shall be specified and directed toward the Court.

-	01.1	
Deputy	Clerk	

Date:

Case No.:

The Court notes that the Respondent has filed a Motion to Disqualify the Petitioner's counsel. This Motion was not accompanied by a notice of hearing.

IT IS ORDERED that the Respondent shall file a Notice of Hearing in regards to her Motion to Disqualify.

indicates she will file a Motion outlining the pending matters in this case along with a Notice of Hearing

In the event there are more than exhibits, counsel/parties shall make arrangements with the Clerk's Office to have them pre-marked one week prior to hearing by calling

If you are appearing telephonically and have less than fifteen exhibits, all exhibits shall be submitted to the Clerk's Office no less than three (3) business days prior to the hearing.

The Court signs the minute entry in lieu of a more formal order.

cc: Hon.

Esq.

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.