

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 22-163

---

Judge:           Jeremy M. Goodman

Complainant:   Cathy Riggs

---

**ORDER**

The Complainant alleged a delayed ruling by a justice of the peace pro tem hearing a civil case. The justice of the peace pro tem also failed to respond to the Commission's request for information.

Justice of the Peace Pro Tem Goodman was assigned to a civil case in the Maricopa County Justice Court, San Marcos Precinct. Justice of the Peace Pro Tem Goodman took a matter under advisement and failed to issue a ruling within 60 days, or at any time thereafter. Another judicial officer was appointed to complete the case. Justice of the Peace Pro Tem Goodman failed to respond to court staff regarding the overdue ruling, and later failed to respond to Commission staff to provide an explanation for his conduct.

Justice of the Peace Pro Tem Goodman's conduct violated of Rules 1.1, 2.5(A), 2.5(B), 2.7, and 2.16 of the Code, and Art. 2, §11 of the Arizona Constitution.

Accordingly, Justice of the Peace Pro Tem Jeremy M. Goodman is hereby publicly reprimanded for the conduct described above and pursuant to Commission Rule 17(a). The record in this case, consisting of the complaint, the judicial officer's response, and this order shall be made public as required by Commission Rule 9(a).

Commission members Roger D. Barton and Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: May 31, 2023

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Joseph C. Kreamer

Hon. Joseph C. Kreamer  
Commission Vice-chair

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 31, 2023.

Comp

April 14, 2022

2022-163

MAY 11 2022

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Re: MCJC Pro Tem Jeremy Goodman (AZ Bar ID #025859)

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am the Justice of the Peace for Desert Ridge Justice Court and the current Chairperson of the Pro Tem, Hearing Officer and Mediator Committee ("Committee") for the Maricopa County Justice Courts. Pursuant to Maricopa County Justice Courts Bench Policy 1.3.2, § 12.2.2, I am entrusted with the responsibility to forward any complaints demonstrating evidence of misconduct by a pro tem to this Commission. This is a responsibility that I take seriously, and it is one that, unfortunately, brings me to write to your Commission today.

Jeremy Goodman is a pro tem with our justice courts. In that capacity, PT Goodman presided over a matter in the San Marcos Justice Court (Westgate Enterprises, LLC v. Octane Designs, LLC, CC2019-146852RC). Plaintiff's attorney is Marshall Hunt and defendant's legal counsel is Scott Zwillinger.

On April 8, 2022, I received notice of a complaint against PT Goodman from our Administrative Pro Tem ("APT"), Taj Rahi-Loo. One of APT Rahi-Loo's job functions is to serve as a point of contact for the public and court staff regarding matters involving our pro tems and investigate any complaints of misconduct against that arise. I was informed by the APT that she had received a substantive complaint against PT Goodman in CC2019-146852RC from the San Marcos court. Apparently, PT Goodman has failed to issue a ruling on the above-referenced matter within the required sixty days and attempts by both court staff and our APT to get him to do so have been unsuccessful. I believe that this is a violation of the Arizona Code of Judicial Code 2.5(A).

Litigation in this case has been pending for a couple of years. PT Goodman recently held a garnishment hearing in this case on February 3, 2022. At the time of that hearing, the court had also received the defendant's application for attorney's fees which had been filed on January 24, 2022. PT Goodman discussed this application with the parties at the February 3 hearing and advised the parties that he'd take the matter under advisement and would subsequently issue a ruling. However, PT Goodman failed to issue a timely ruling on this matter within the 60 days required which has caused frustration to both the litigants and the court.

Court clerk, Daniel Mikeska initially communicated with PT Goodman about this matter on February 28. He then followed up with PT Goodman on April 5 inquiring about the status of the pending decision in the matter and reminding PT that the sixty days to make his decision had expired on April 4. PT Goodman responded, "I am sorry, I thought I delivered this almost a month ago. I will be in the office shortly and will send today." As of April 6, the San Marcos court had still not received a decision in the matter, so court clerk Mikeska again emailed PT Goodman informing him that he had not received any

correspondence from his office on the matter and asking about its status. After PT Goodman failed to respond to this inquiry or submit his ruling, San Marcos Justice Court manager, Jackie Paredes, contacted the APT seeking assistance in obtaining a ruling from PT Goodman as the court's efforts had been unsuccessful. APT then attempted to contact PT Goodman about when this ruling could be anticipated by the court. PT Goodman did not respond to repeated inquiries from APT by both email and phone message so, as Chair of the Committee, I was notified by APT of this problem.

Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.5(A) requires that a judge "shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently and promptly." Ariz. Code Judicial Conduct 2.5(A). Additionally, the Arizona State Constitution states, "Every matter submitted to a judge of the superior court for his decision shall be decided within sixty days from the date of submission thereof." Article VI § 21 Ariz. Const. Rule 91(e) states that "every matter submitted for determination to a judge of the superior court for decision shall be determined and a ruling made not later than sixty days from submission thereof..." Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 91(e). Finally, Arizona Revised Statute 11-424.02(A) provides support for the position that these rules and time requirements equally apply to justices of the peace and justices of the peace pro tem by establishing financial consequences for those who fail to meet these time requirements by prohibiting them from receiving a salary if a matter remains pending past the sixty days. These rules and statutes, along with Arizona Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee Advisory Opinion 06-02 (April 25, 2006), provide a framework to determine the standard by which a judge's responsibility to rule promptly should be assessed. Additionally, the facts in this case demonstrate that PT Goodman has been notified by both the San Marcos court and the APT about his delay in issuing a ruling and still, as of April 14, 2022, has yet to submit a ruling to the court or even respond. In light of the circumstances and in reviewing Rule 2.5(A) of the Arizona Judicial Code of Conduct and associated laws and statutes, it is my belief that PT Goodman is in violation of Canon 2.5(A), and I believe I am obligated to report this violation to the Commission for consideration.

S-62022

Hon. Cathy Riggs, Desert Ridge Justice of the Peace

## Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)

---

**From:** Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)  
**Sent:** Friday, April 8, 2022 4:06 PM  
**To:** Anna Huberman (MJC); Leonore Driggs (MJC); Cathy Riggs (MJC)  
**Subject:** FW: WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

Good afternoon,

On April 8, 2022, I received an email from San Marcos Court Manager, Jackie Paredes, asking for assistance in obtaining an untimely ruling from PT Jeremy Goodman. CM Paredes noted that PT Goodman had heard the matter on February 3 and taken it under advisement. However, the court's repeated inquiries about the status of the ruling have yet to be satisfied. Specifically, CM Paredes noted that PT Goodman responded to an April 5 inquiry from clerk Daniel Mikeska about the status of the ruling with the following statement, "I am sorry, I thought I delivered this almost a month ago. I will be in the office shortly and will send today." However, the ruling has yet to be received by the court. At this time, the 60 days allowed for a ruling have expired and, both, the parties and the court staff are extremely frustrated.

This is not the PT's first time that a delay in issuing a ruling in this same case has created a concern. In January, the San Marcos court had to contact APT to assist them in getting a ruling that had been outstanding for almost 60 days in this matter. Although in that instance, the ruling was eventually sent to the court on January 4, 2022, within the 60 day time period (the initial hearing was heard on November 19, 2021). However, in that instance, the PT had previously indicated to both parties and the court that he would issue the ruling at least a month earlier than he actually did. In that instance, PT also ignored multiple attempts by the court to try to get a determination of when they could anticipate the ruling. APT shared the details of this earlier incident with Presiding Justice of the Peace Huberman and PTHOM Committee Chair Riggs in an email discussion thread on January 3, 2022. Additionally, I should remind you that his response to my discussion with him the last time about this matter was that he intended to resign, upon the completion of his outstanding assignments, because he didn't feel that this was worth his hassle.

As to this most recent incident, on April 8, 2022, APT sent PT Goodman an email asking about this delay and inquiring when the PT anticipates having the ruling available for the court. APT also emailed Administrative and Executive Assistants, Riya Tingwa and Nicole Price, with instructions to advise me if they receive any timesheets for PT Goodman for any upcoming pay periods because he currently has a ruling outstanding beyond the 60 days permitted and, pursuant to ARS 11-424.02, it is my understanding that he is ineligible to receive a paycheck.

ARS 11-424.02 states, in pertinent part: *"A justice of the peace or a justice of the peace pro tempore shall not receive his salary unless such justice either certifies that no cause before such justice remains pending and undetermined for sixty days after it has been submitted for decision..."*

At this time, APT is awaiting a response from PT about this matter and will update you all upon receipt of that response in a complaint investigation summary. However, I wanted to let you know of the situation immediately, particularly since it appears to be a recurring problem.

---

**From:** Jackie Paredes (MJC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 7, 2022 5:23 PM  
**To:** Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)  
**Cc:** Jay Tibshraeny (MJC)

Brad Habros (MJC)

**Subject:** FW: WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

Good afternoon,

I would like to introduce myself first, my name is Jackie and I am the new Court Manager for San Marcos JC. I am forwarding you the following email correspondence my staff has had with Pro Tem Judge Jeremy Goodman regarding a case he heard on 2/3/22 for garnishment objection, there is also a ruling pending on a Judgment for this case to include supplemental application of attorney's fees. I was advised that the previous Supervisor had sent an email to you on 1/3/22 regarding a similar problem on this same case with Judge Goodman. As you can see staff has followed up with him a various occasions trying to get the ruling, a couple of days ago he responded stating he would be forwarding the ruling on the same afternoon and we have yet to receive anything. This is extremely frustrating to the parties involved as well as the staff that has to continuously follow up with him. Can you please assist with the matter? Not sure what else we are able to do now that the 60 days have expired. I greatly appreciate your response.

*Thank you,*



*Jackie Paredes  
Court Manager  
San Marcos Justice Court  
602-372-3451*

---

**From:** Daniel Mikeska (MJC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 6, 2022 2:57 PM  
**To:** Jeremy Goodman  
**Cc:** Jackie Paredes (MJC)

Brad Habros (MJC)

**Subject:** RE: WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

Good Afternoon Judge Goodman,

I did not receive any correspondence from your office regarding your decision on this case. Could you keep us informed on your thought process in making the decision on this case. As always if there is anything we can do to help let us know.

Respectfully,

Daniel Mikeska  
San Marcos Justice Court

---

**From:** Jeremy Goodman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 5, 2022 9:33 AM  
**To:** Daniel Mikeska (MJC)  
**Cc:** Jackie Paredes (MJC)

Brad Habros (MJC)

**Subject:** Re: WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

I am sorry, I thought I delivered this almost a month ago. I will be in the office shortly and will send today.

Please excuse typos as I am responding from my allegedly "smart" phone and my fat fingers have trouble with the itty bitty teeny weenie tiny little screen keyboard.

---

**From:** Daniel Mikeska (MJC)

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 5, 2022 10:16:31 AM

**To:** Jeremy Goodman

**Cc:** Jackie Paredes (MJC)

Brad Habros (MJC)

**Subject:** WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

Good Morning Judge,

The court has had several inquiries regarding the anticipation of your decision in this matter. The plaintiff and defendant were advised you had 60 day to make that decision which was 4/4/2022. If there is anything the court can do to help please let us know as soon as possible.

Thanks,  
Daniel Mikeska  
San Marcos Justice Court

-----Original Message-----

**From:** San Marcos Justice Court

**Sent:** Thursday, February 24, 2022 11:39 AM

**To:**

**Cc:** Amy Phillips (MJC)

**Subject:** CC2019 146852RC

Good Morning Judge Goodman,

Attached please find the Proposed Judgment and supporting documents for the Westgate vs Octane file. If there is anything the court can do to assist you, please let us know.

Thanks,  
Daniel Mikeska  
SMJC

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov) <[donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, February 24, 2022 8:11 AM

**To:** Daniel Mikeska (MJC)

**Subject:** Message from "RNP58387927BCCE"

This E-mail was sent from "RNP58387927BCCE" (MP 4055).

Scan Date: 02.24.2022 08:11:14 (-0700)  
Queries to: [donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov)

## Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)

---

**From:** Jackie Paredes (MJC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 7, 2022 5:23 PM  
**To:** Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)  
**Cc:** Jay Tibshraeny (MJC); Brad Habros (MJC)  
**Subject:** FW: WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

Good afternoon,

I would like to introduce myself first, my name is Jackie and I am the new Court Manager for San Marcos JC. I am forwarding you the following email correspondence my staff has had with Pro Tem Judge Jeremy Goodman regarding a case he heard on 2/3/22 for garnishment objection, there is also a ruling pending on a Judgment for this case to include supplemental application of attorney's fees. I was advised that the previous Supervisor had sent an email to you on 1/3/22 regarding a similar problem on this same case with Judge Goodman. As you can see staff has followed up with him a various occasions trying to get the ruling, a couple of days ago he responded stating he would be forwarding the ruling on the same afternoon and we have yet to receive anything. This is extremely frustrating to the parties involved as well as the staff that has to continuously follow up with him. Can you please assist with the matter? Not sure what else we are able to do now that the 60 days have expired. I greatly appreciate your response.

*Thank you,*



*Jackie Paredes  
Court Manager  
San Marcos Justice Court  
602-372-3451*

---

**From:** Daniel Mikeska (MJC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 6, 2022 2:57 PM  
**To:** Jeremy Goodman  
**Cc:** Jackie Paredes (MJC) Brad Habros (MJC)  
**Subject:** RE: WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

Good Afternoon Judge Goodman,

I did not receive any correspondence from your office regarding your decision on this case. Could you keep us informed on your thought process in making the decision on this case. As always if there is anything we can do to help let us know.

Respectfully,

Daniel Mikeska



San Marcos Justice Court

---

**From:** Jeremy Goodmar

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 5, 2022 9:33 AM

**To:** Daniel Mikeska (MJC)

**Cc:** Jackie Paredes (MJC)

Brad Habros (MJC)

**Subject:** Re: WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

I am sorry, I thought I delivered this almost a month ago. I will be in the office shortly and will send today.

Please excuse typos as I am responding from my allegedly "smart" phone and my fat fingers have trouble with the itty bitty teeny weenie tiny little screen keyboard.

---

**From:** Daniel Mikeska (MJC)

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 5, 2022 10:16:31 AM

**To:** Jeremy Goodman

**Cc:** Jackie Paredes (MJC)

; Brad Habros (MJC)

**Subject:** WESTGATE/ OCTANE CC2019 146852RC

Good Morning Judge,

The court has had several inquiries regarding the anticipation of your decision in this matter. The plaintiff and defendant were advised you had 60 day to make that decision which was 4/4/2022. If there is anything the court can do to help please let us know as soon as possible.

Thanks,  
Daniel Mikeska  
San Marcos Justice Court

-----Original Message-----

**From:** San Marcos Justice Court

**Sent:** Thursday, February 24, 2022 11:39 AM

**To:**

**Cc:** Amy Phillips (MJC)

**Subject:** CC2019 146852RC

Good Morning Judge Goodman,

Attached please find the Proposed Judgment and supporting documents for the Westgate vs Octane file. If there is anything the court can do to assist you, please let us know.

Thanks,  
Daniel Mikeska  
SMJC

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov) <[donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov)>

Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2022 8:11 AM  
To: Daniel Mikeska (MJC)  
Subject: Message from "RNP58387927BCCE"

This E-mail was sent from "RNP58387927BCCE" (MP 4055).

Scan Date: 02.24.2022 08:11:14 (-0700)  
Queries to: [donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:donotreply@mail.maricopa.gov)

## Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)

---

**From:** Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)  
**Sent:** Friday, April 8, 2022 12:25 PM  
**To:** Jeremy Goodman  
**Cc:** Jackie Paredes (MJC); Jay Tibshraeny (MJC); Brad Habros (MJC)  
**Subject:** CC2019-146852RC

Good afternoon,

I've received a communication from the San Marcos Court Manager about a pending ruling they are awaiting from you in the above referenced case. Apparently, you took this matter under advisement on February 3, 2022. It is now past the 60 days and the court still hasn't received your ruling despite repeated requests and your April 5 communication that you would send the ruling that day. When do you anticipate that you will have the ruling to the court?

---

**Taj Rahi-Loo / *Administrative Pro Tem***

Maricopa County Justice Courts

222 N. Central Ave., Ste 210 / Phoenix, AZ 85004

Work Cell:



## Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)

---

**From:** Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2022 9:36 AM  
**To:** Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC)  
**Subject:** Jeremy Goodman Complaint - TC Attempt - Voicemail message left requesting call - 9:30 a.m.

---

**Taj Rahi-Loo / *Administrative Pro Tem***

Maricopa County Justice Courts

222 N. Central Ave., Ste 210 / Phoenix, AZ 85004

Work Cell:

