State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 21-357

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

April 13, 2022

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner improperly denied her and another person access to a hearing in a criminal case.

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 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 April 13, 2022.

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

21-357

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 the morning of , Commissioner presided as judge over the case against Ms. at around in Courtroom , in the Court Building at

However, no one is above the law. The law declares that that Court is open to observers, rather than shrouded in secrecy, and furthermore Title II gives the Disabled the right to have an Advocate present. Yet, although the law declares that judges must act in accordance with those Court Rules, Commissioner directly violated those very rules:

The hearing was not live-streamed, although online court watchers went to the website to view the case. In-Person, both I (the indemnitor for her bail loan) and also - her ADA Advocate, who also holds her power of attorney, and carried her medication which she even needs today) were DENIED access to the courtroom.

The judge ordered, and the security guard of course enforced, that the accused and the public defenders would be the only ones allowed in the courtroom, to the exclusion of the ADA Advocate (an illegal exclusion).

In this secret setting, behind closed doors, in that very courtroom right then, was arrested and taken into custody for who-knows-what charge. She still does not even have her medication for today, which was being held by her Advocate.