## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 22-015
Judge:	
Complainant:	

## **ORDER**

August 10, 2022

A superior court judge self-reported a delayed ruling.

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. Accordingly, the Commission's file in this matter has been closed, pursuant to Commission Rules 16(a) and 23.

Commission members Roger D. Barton, Joseph C. Kreamer, Delia R. Neal, and Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

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

To: Subject: Date: Attachments:	Commission on Judicial Conduct self-report 60-day violation
•	myself for violating the 6 ng the time period the r

I need to report myself for violating the 60-day ruling deadline. I also signed at least one 60-day certification during the time period the ruling was late, unaware that a ruling was pending.

I am attaching what I hope are the relevant documents but if you need additional information please let me know.

On I received a Petition for Expungement in a criminal matter. See "Petition," attached.

On we sent out our stock Notice that provides Response and Reply deadlines to both the as well as the Defendant. See " Initial Expunge ME," attached.

In that minute entry, we also set an Internal file review date of County is transitioning from paper to electronic files in the and while paper files are still being used to some extent, paperwork and filings contained in those files is not always up to date. There is also some inconsistency in whether a paper file will be brought to a judicial division for internal file reviews or not. However, when an Internal Review date is set on a minute entry, the Clerk's Office does calendar that date for an in-chambers review and the case should appear on the judicial division's weekly calendar.

Because we have no

, each division has had to develop their own system to ensure that deadlines are being met. In my division, we created a shared task list in Outlook that allows both my JA and I to calendar pending rulings, make notes on those reviews and change deadlines depending on requests from parties. It's not the most sophisticated tool, but it's better than nothing and generally works very well with both of us keeping an eye on deadlines.

As an additional safety measure, we also set these types of cases for Internal Reviews to ensure that either the file will be brought to our divisions or that the matter will appear on our Weekly Calendars.

On shortly after we sent out our Initial Expungement Minute Entry, I rotated case assignments to the Division and Judge took over my caseload.

Exceptions to reassignment should include matters like the case as it was pending a decision from me.

The did not file a response in this matter.

After we sent out the Notice in my JA simply forgot to add the case to the Task List. Ordinarily, although problematic, this would not have been a catastrophe as the case would have appeared on my Weekly Calendar that is automatically generated in and that our JAs check every week to ensure that we have all pending matters for review. However, since Judge took over my case assignment, it appears that the Clerk's Office automatically reassigned the case to him and added it to his weekly calendar for review on that due date. See the attached screenshot of labeled "

I do not know whether the file was brought up to Judge division or not. Between staff and judicial vacations, sick time and quarantines, the months of and were rather chaotic. Regardless, the file was not brought to my division nor did the internal review appear on my Weekly Calendar during the week of

On , my JA alerted me to the late ruling and told me she had simply forgotten to add the case to our task list. I issued a ruling immediately. See "Expunge Order," attached.

After the ruling was late, which would have been on , I signed one 60-day certification on I believe we signed our certifications on the week of so I think I was also in violation of the rule when I signed the one for the pay period ending

I have discussed remedies with my JA. In the absence of a more sophisticated, automatic tickle system, we do believe our task list is our least-worst option, but human error is always going to be our weakness. Here, several things occurred at the same time creating a perfect storm in which the ruling was simply not addressed within time limits. Regardless of whether she neglected to add the case to our task list, it is ultimately my responsibility alone to ensure that everything is calendared appropriately and rulings are handled on-time.

I should also mention that while our local rule 6.2(b) does alert litigants of their "duty" to file a notice of impending time limits in cases where a decision is not forthcoming after 45 days, in no way does that rule obviate our obligations under Rule 2.5.

Since this occurred, we are reviewing the remainder of the criminal items on our task list to confirm that the matters pending decision from me have not been inadvertently reassigned to Judge

. My JA is in regular contact with Judge

JA to make sure that she is aware of the matters that we still have pending in the event the files are brought to their division, or in case the matter is calendared for him instead of me.

In short, I hope this information satisfies the commission. I am extremely embarrassed that this has occurred — — and I will gladly undertake any other remedial efforts the commission thinks appropriate. I understand how important timely rulings are to all individuals who find themselves before the court, but particularly the expungements when the court's ruling may have a significant impact on the litigant's life.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or if you need additional information.

Thank you for your time
<b>I</b> This e-mail, including attachments, is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC, sections 2510-2521. It is

This e-mail, including attachments, is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC, sections 2510-2521. It is confidential and privileged. If you are not the intended recipient any retention, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please reply to the sender if you have received this message in error and then delete it. Thank you.

-	<b>✓</b> .	$A_{ij}^{(i)} = A_{ij}^{(i)}$
Person Filing:		
Address (if not protected):		
City, State, Zip Code:		
Telephone: Email Address (Required)		¥
Lawyer's Bar Number:		
Representing Self, without a Lawye	er or Represented by Attorney	
A Representing Sen, without a 22wye	is of in Represented by Commission	
cribico	RIOR COURT OF ARI	ZONA
SOFER	COUNTY	20142
	COUNTI	
State of Arizona	Case Number	:
vs.	Dusision to Fra	punge Marijuana-Related Offense
	Records and R	estore Civil Rights, Including
	Firearm Right	s, Pursuant to ARS § 36-2862
Defendant	HONORABL	E:
Date of Birth:		
The above-named Petitioner, pursuant Petitioner's criminal history records. As	to ARS § 36-2862, hereby requests grounds for this petition, Petitioner	that the Court order expungement of states as follows:
	A. REQUIRED INFORMATION	
1. Eligible Charge. I hereby request under ARS § 36-2862, be expunged (character) number, file a separate potition for each offense	hoose from the following; if you had more to	records for the following offense, eligible hun one eligible offense under more than one case
Possessing, consuming, or transp than twelve and one-half grams	porting two and one-half ounces or le was in the form of marijuana concer	ess of marijuana, of which not more ntrate.
[ ] Possessing, transporting, cultive residence for personal use.	vating, or processing not more than	n six marijuana plants at my primary
[   Possessing, using, or transport consumption of marijuana.	ting paraphernalia related to the cu	hivation, manufacture, processing, or
2. Name of citing or arresting law enfo	preement agency: THE STAT	EOF
3. Superior court case number:		
4. My name at the time of arrest was (	if different):	·

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.