

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 22-131

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

February 16, 2023

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge admitted false evidence and made improper rulings in a dependency 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 member Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 16, 2023.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

22-131

**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.

i am filing this complaint because my children were wrongly removed from my custody and adopted out for false allegation for neglect and Medical neglect because my children has special needs and they are using my mental health against me my rights were violated |



[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Decision of the Court

[REDACTED] court's order for abuse of discretion and will not disturb the ruling if the factual findings upon which it is based are supported by reasonable evidence). We view the evidence in the light most favorable to upholding the [REDACTED] court's ruling. See *Christy C. v. Ariz. Dep't of Econ. Sec.*, 214 Ariz. 445, ¶ 12 (App. 2007). [REDACTED] has not established any basis in law for disturbing the ruling. We therefore affirm the court's order terminating [REDACTED] parental rights to her [REDACTED] children.



MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge [REDACTED]  
Judge [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding  
and Judge [REDACTED] concurred.

Judge:

¶1

[REDACTED] the mother of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] born in [REDACTED], respectively, appeals from the order terminating her parental rights to the children on the grounds of [REDACTED] illness and length of time in court-ordered care. See A.R.S. § 8-533(B)(3), (8)(c). Appointed counsel filed an affidavit pursuant to Rule 106(G)(1), Ariz. R. P. [REDACTED], avowing she had reviewed the record and had found no non-frivolous issue to raise on appeal. We granted her request to permit [REDACTED] to proceed in propria persona and file a pro se brief. We regard the two letters she has filed to be her opening brief and her reply to the Department of [REDACTED] (DCS) answering brief. We affirm the court's order.

¶2

In [REDACTED] commenced an in-home dependency proceeding, filing a petition in which it alleged [REDACTED] had neglected the children, who have special needs, and was unable to care for them. Although [REDACTED] did not remove the children initially, about [REDACTED] after it filed the dependency petition, [REDACTED] filed a motion to remove them from [REDACTED] custody. That motion alleged she was unable to care for them, failed to engage in services, engaged in [REDACTED] with the children's father, and displayed cognitive limitations. The court adjudicated the children dependent and ordered that they be returned to [REDACTED] care. She thereafter absconded with them and the court ordered that they be removed. They have remained in court-ordered care since [REDACTED]

¶3

[REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] a plethora of services tailored for her mental health and other issues over the next year and a half. After a

---

<sup>1</sup> Because the children's first and last initials are the same, we distinguish them by using the initials of their first and middle names. The children had the same father, whose rights were also terminated. He is not a party to this appeal.