

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 22-009

Judges:

Complainant:

ORDER

October 20, 2022

The Complainant alleged two superior court judges failed to rule on motions filed in his family court case within 60 sixty days of filing.

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 Colleen E. Concannon 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 20, 2022.

To: [Commission on Judicial Conduct](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Rule 91 (e) and Section 21. Article VI of the Arizona Constitution. Have been violated by both Judge

The violations occurred from no responses to motions dated

Judge failed to respond to,
MOT-TO CHANGE DIVORCE TO ANNULMENT.

And by my calculations for working days would be or if the Judge couldn't respond to the original date because of Conciliation services then the new start date should have been when Conciliation was terminated which would make business days to . However if it is calendar days then a decision or response should have been made prior to no matter which start date. The Judge never made a timely decision or response and it wasn't until the trial date the next year that it was answered and by that point a form of undue duress had already been done by the lack of response.

Judge also has made a similar violation by not responding to the motion dated - Motion to deny attorney fees and judgement. I tried to get the second judge to look at the case again with that motion to deny on , which is why I mentioned my and I was trying to state the above issues to the second Judge , but he too has failed to respond thus far.

Even if a motion is pointless or "moot" with the Judges Ruling dated , any motion no matter how "moot" must be responded to. And if it's not responded to then there is an implicit bias that both judges have that directly or indirectly caused these two judges to violate Rule 91 (e) and Section 21. Article VI of the Arizona Constitution, by not responding to motions in a timely manner.