

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 22-292

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

August 25, 2023

The complainant alleged improper legal rulings by a municipal court judge hearing a petition for order of protection.

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 members Denise K. Aguilar, Roger D. Barton, and Michael J. Brown did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2022 - 292

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.

In case _____ The Hon _____ WITHOUT EVIDENCE issued a restraining order
against _____ Judge _____ in violation of the Arizona Rules of Order of
Protection Procedure. under 1 (F), issued an order of Protection against _____ naming her
child, _____ as a 'protected person.'
Additionally, this is a violation of the defendant, _____ 14th amendment due process rights.
Without any credible, valid evidence presented and verified as authentic, Judge _____ issued an Order
of Protection against _____
According to The Fourteenth Amendment of The US Constitution, "No State shall make or enforce any
law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State
deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law: nor deny to any person within
its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Between _____ was deprived of her
right to have contact with her child, _____ by the order erroneously issued by Judge _____

In violation of Rule 6(D)2. Judge _____ chose to issue Order of Protection with no reasonable grounds.

Regarding the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, Cannon 1. States, "A judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety." It is the ethical obligation of all officers of The Court and Judiciary of Arizona to uphold and abide by the laws of the state and federal and state constitutions. Judge _____ chose to NOT do so by issuing a warrant against a person- _____ who has been a victim of Domestic Abuse by the Plaintiff for fifteen years, WITHOUT any credible evidence, restricting her from her child (violating the procedural rules for Orders of Protection, issued by The Arizona Supreme Court. This conduct and choice compromises the integrity of the judiciary of Arizona and the legitimacy of the Court, undermining the public confidence in the court system for _____ and state (Rule 1.(2) 3 & 5).

Subsequently, this judge was motioned to correct the indiscretions of the court, against _____ and refused to do so, exercising bias and prejudice against an innocent person, also decreasing the faith that this community may have in their local municipal court's integrity.