

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 22-273

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

May 25, 2023

The Complainant alleged denial of due process and improper legal rulings by a superior court commissioner hearing a family 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 Denise K. Aguilar did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 25, 2023.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2022 - 273

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.

see attached.

Commission on Judicial Conduct

is the ACCUSED in documents submitted and in this document

Arizona Judicial Code of Conduct:

RULE 1.1. Compliance with the Law

A judge shall comply with the law, including the Code of Judicial Conduct.

Hon. did neither of the above.

RULE 1.2. Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

5. Actual improprieties include violations of law, court rules, or provisions of this code. The test for appearance of impropriety is whether the conduct would create in reasonable minds a perception that the judge violated this code or engaged in other conduct that reflects adversely on the judge's honesty, impartiality, temperament, or fitness to serve as a judge

RULE 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness A judge shall uphold and apply the law, and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially.

Comment 4. It is not a violation of this rule for a judge to make reasonable accommodations to ensure self-represented litigants the opportunity to have their matters fairly heard.

The ACCUSED has not been heard in open forum. The ACCUSED has unlawfully had documents removed from the record by Hon. (18 U.S.C. §2071 Concealment, Removal, or Mutilation)

RULE 2.3. Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment

(B) A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct manifest bias or prejudice, or engage in harassment, including but not limited to bias, prejudice, or harassment based upon race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation, and shall not permit court staff, court officials, or others subject to the judge's direction and control to do so.

An independent judiciary requires that judges decide cases according to the law and facts, without regard to whether particular laws or litigants are popular or unpopular with the public, the media, government officials, or the judge's friends or family. Confidence in the judiciary is eroded if judicial decision making is perceived to be subject to inappropriate outside influences.

Hon. allowed the false, discriminatory, and hearsay testimony by police, respondent, and

The ACCUSED filed a motion to dismiss back on that has never been responded to by neither Commissioner nor opposing attorney and has not appeared on the record because Commissioner unlawfully removed it from the record and deprived the ACCUSED of the due process right to be heard.

At the _____ of fraudulent _____ (see attached dvd disk) hearing
Hon. _____ is heard laughing and joking with the Respondent hearsay witness Officer
whom gave false and discriminatory testimony. This interaction is on the
record.

“A judicial appointee must avoid conduct that may reasonably be perceived as prejudiced or biased. Examples of manifestations of bias or prejudice include epithets, slurs, demeaning nicknames, negative stereotyping, attempted humor based upon stereotypes, threatening, intimidating, or hostile acts, suggestions of connections between race, ethnicity, or nationality and crime, and irrelevant references to personal characteristics. Even facial expressions and body language can convey to parties and attorneys in the proceeding, the media, and others an appearance of bias or prejudice.”

Hon. _____ has personal prejudicial opinions of the ACCUSED stating on
fraudulent _____ Minute Entry ‘court’s interactions with Petitioner, his demeanor and
behavior’ while it is of court record that the ACCUSED has been allowed to say approximately
three total sentences in 2 fraudulent hearings on _____ and _____ Hon.
_____ drew this conclusion from personal bias because the ACCUSED has had only
extremely limited actual oral statements on record.

Hon. _____ refused to give the ACCUSED 5 mins to address process and
procedure, which MUST take place first before any matter is heard and adjudicated but deprived
the ACCUSED of the due process opportunity to be heard. Hon. _____ made threats
with coercion to the ACCUSED on the record at _____ on fraudulent
_____ hearing. Hon. _____ threatened to deprive the ACCUSED of ‘care, custody, and
control’ of my daughter unless I agreed to proceed without addressing any motions or
jurisdiction, requirement of due process. Then Hon. _____ did in fact deprive the
ACCUSED of ‘care, custody, and control’ of my daughter without due process. Commissioner
_____ gave the respondent and her attorney approximately 3 hours to tell as many lies as
possible with no challenge, no opposition, and no cross examination from the ACCUSED
because she deprived the ACCUSED of participation which is EXTRINSIC FRAUD.
Commissioner _____ refused to give the ACCUSED 5 mins.

Hon. _____ has purposely sabotaged any defense by the ACCUSED and has made personal biased and prejudicial opinions of the ACCUSED without fact or basis of law. Hon. _____ made a falsley and unfounded legal determination for a mental status examination without having any knowledge as to what that is herself. The ACCUSED always remained in honor doing what was requested of me even though it was unlawful and without cause when Commisioner _____ ordered a 'mental status examination which must include a clinical interview, descriptive summary and recommendations, and appropriate testings and when the ACCUSED submitted it, Commisioner _____ disregarded it as nothing more than *self reporting via telehealth*. Commisioner _____ does not have a master degree in psychology to even know what that is and the ACCUSED even had the therapist and evaluators conclude Commissioner _____ wrong with message from

_____ attached in AFFIDAVIT OF TAINTED TRIAL) stated that the evaluation that took place was in fact what was requested. However Commssioner _____ sole intent and purpose was to sabotage the ACCUSED. Hon. _____ did in fact receive by mail a completed mental examination that she immediately disregarded and issued 'ORDER' stating 'THE COURT FINDS that Petitioner has not fully complied with the order to "submit to a mental status examination which must include a clinical interview, descriptive summary and recommendations, and appropriate testing." There is no indication in the report that it is based on anything other than Petitioner's self reporting via tele-health services.'

However a mental status evalution was conducted by a clinician with title of MS, BHT (Behavioral Health Technician with a Masters of Science in counseling psychology, clinical psychology, clinical counseling, or educational psychology). The clinician and her supervisor were personally offended by Hon. _____ alleged 'FIND-ing' that their profession and their work was interpreted as nothing more than a 'self reporting via tele-health services.' The supervisor _____ was personally insulted by Hon. _____ alleged 'FIND-ing,' that he stated "

There is only 2 possible reasons that Hon. _____ disregarded a mental status examination that was falsley requested, and that is as either incompetence or sabotage. The ACCUSED believes it was sabotage and personal bias and prejudice given that Hon.

_____ has already deprived the ACCUSED of rights under the bill of rights and due process as

well as personal biased and prejudicial opinions of the ACCUSED without any fact or basis of law.

From the beginning of this improperly conducted matter to present day, this matter has been nothing more than an attack on the ACCUSED for defending my rights and exercising my lawful private contract agreed to between parties.

The ACCUSED called out Commissioner bias and due process violations in MOTION FOR JUDGE TO BE FAIR, EQUAL, UNBIAS, AND IMPARTIAL AND ORDER CHILD RETURNED TO FATHER DUE TO INDISPUTABLE EVIDENCE AND FIRST HAND KNOWLEDGE AND TESTIMONY and MOTION/PETITION TO DISMISS PRIOR ORDERS FOR INTERFERENCE WITH A PRIVATE CONTRACT, LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS ON THE RECORD, IMPROPER VENUE, INSUFFICIENT SERVICE OF PROCESS, FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM UPON WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED, ALL PLEADINGS, MOTIONS, STATEMENTS, ARGUMENTS, AND ATTACHMENTS BY COUNSEL ARE HEARSAY, FRAUD, AND INADMISSABLE, MOTION FOR EQUAL PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY DEMAND TO BE HEARD ON ALL MATTERS.

Shortly after filing those documents commissioner committed another due process violation and sua sponte dismissed these motions unlawfully without giving any credibility or due diligence to give the ACCUSED the opportunity to be heard in writing. Then commissioner realized her fraud when the ACCUSED served her with a NOTICE of intent to file a claim with a VIOLATION WARNING: DENIAL OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW (see COL form and proof of service) calling out Hon. for her fraud and lack of appearance of being fair, equal, impartial, and unbiased she recused like the coward she is to deprive me of my daughter and commit due process violations and then pass off her mess to another Judge. (see Notice Family Law Notice RE: Recusal)

The ACCUSED called out Hon. fraud and lack of appearance of being fair, equal, impartial, and unbiased with a document title AFFIDAVIT OF TAINTED TRIAL BY ACTS OF SABOTAGE AND LACK OF APPEARANCE OF FAIRNESS, IMPARTIALITY, UNBIAS, AND EQUALITY BY HON which Judge has already deprived the ACCUSED of due process violation of being heard by removing document from the record.

**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.**