State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 22-360
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

February 22, 2023

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to follow the law and made improper rulings in 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).

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 22, 2023.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2022-360

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.
	Judge has consistently exhibited a thorough disrespect for the laws of the State of Arizona, behaving in ways that are not only immoral, but extraordinarily damaging to the law-abiding, tax paying citizens of the state of Arizona by encouraging continued illegal behaviors - which also happens to be extremely profitable and beneficial to his local colleagues in Judge recent appointment further encourages the continued abuse of the legal system, extending and exacerbating the corruption issues in the County Court system which have plagued the citizens of County for decades.
	This request is to remove Mr. immediately from his post and consider recommendation for disbarment due to this behavior, before the good citizens of County are forced to endure any further injustices due to his rulings. In case this judge represents a clear and present danger to the minor child involved by his last statements at the hearing, in which he stated that he intended to force the child into visitations with the mother and former supervising agency - even though the child has stated to multiple parties on record that she does not trust the mother or or the counselor at that agency.
	Judge has sought to intentionally enrich his colleagues and fellow local members of the rather than act in the best interest of the minor children in cases over which he exercises authority. These actions have been more than simply irresponsible - Mr. ongoing choice to suppress the Arizona Revised Statutes in his rulings has been intentional and blatant, ignoring documented and very real threats made by the Petitioner toward the child and the Respondent in case The enclosed file was submitted to the County and was admitted into the case record over the past hearings - which contains not only direct threats from the Petitioner such as: "love to you" but also the false accusations by the Petitioner of child neglect and by the Respondent - all which were proven to be false by Child Protective Services and the Department. Judge also chooses to ignore the fact that the Petitioner has been convicted of felony harassment of the Respondent and child's home in this case. Yes and yes, Felonies.
-	Not only has Judge dismissed all prior Judge's requirements of proven clean tests prior to any hearings on visitation, he also stated 'I will not bar the courtroom doors shut' in open court. Never was any request made to 'bar the courtroom doors' - a request was made merely to require the Petitioner prove an ability to act in the child's best interests before any ruling were to be considered, and to provide clean tests. The A.R.S. were referenced by the Respondent repeatedly, not only but also as the record of case clearly demonstrates a significant disparity of resources when Petitioner with the ability to hire firms yet also demonstrates an ongoing refusal to support the record of case and all documented and in the record.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE						
Name:	Judge's Name:					
Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the swords what you believe the judge did that constitute names, dates, times, and places that will help the commay be attached along with copies (not originals) of rethe paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for you	es judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the mmission understand your concerns. Additional pages elevant court documents. Please complete one side of					
The submissions on also contained the Re recovery efforts and ability to act in the child's best in past due medical bills she'd agreed to pay in writing, a Those requests were met not with payment of any kin lawyers with excuses for justification of non-payment, the total of the bills themselves - which is indicative of with regard to her own child - mathematically proof en	and which had been ordered by prior judges. Id, but instead with letters from the mother's current The cost of hiring a lawyer substantially exceeded If the mother's continued state of mind and intent					
Respondent has requested the following on the record 1. relief from legal harassment before any sort of substance 2. legal counsel for the child (not granted.) 3. proof of mother's ability to act in the child's best into the verbatim recommendation of the team at the time.) 4. more substantial requirements for the Petit requirements were instead removed.)	stantial sobriety is established (not granted.)					
A.R.S. 25-403 has multiple components to provide clear direction for judges in these types of cases - this father respectfully requests you please appoint a judge who understands and will put an end to the damage caused by entertaining a wealthy mother's legal firms' fanciful depiction of an 'innocent' mother who simply wants to be a part of daughter's life, when all evidence points to the exact opposite. The case history indicates as clearly as any could an individual who has only two things in mind: an intent to deprive the child of resources in order to preserve her own wealth, and an intent to destroy a father who has to date done nothing wrong, and seeks only to raise the minor child in peace and free from of a mother who continues to struggle with severe and issues - which is also documented thoroughly. If an officer of the court cannot understand the difference of what constitutes an ability to act in the child's best interests and what does not, they should not be in their position in any capacity.						
The Respondent and minor child have a right to a life of support from a multimillionaire mother, who should be encouraged to continue to abuse the system of govern misunderstands the role a judge is hired to play in soci been granted a great deal of power - making him all the gender bias and/or an unwillingness (or possibly inability prevalent.	held to account by the legal system, rather than nance by judges like Mr. who very clearly lety. This is a dangerous individual - who has a more dangerous when his own indoctrinated					

Sincerely,

COPY
IN THE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
Petitioner, REGARDING HEARING -
V. (Assigned to: Hon.
Respondent.
COMES NOW the Respondent, , in the matter of ongoing
for the minor child, and forced contact with the Petitioner.
The child is comfortable with the current and all other
companies on the court's list have been explored, and none have fit
the child's needs, including the Petitioner's current choice: the
.' At this time continuing on the current
path with the child's current is in the best interests of
the child. Forcing visits at this time are not in the
best interests of a child who has expressed on multiple occasions a
lack of trust - due the Petitioner's clear lack of honesty/recovery,
which is heavily documented throughout the case record. Furthermore,
the child has clearly stated her wishes to all parties on multiple
occasions: for her life to remain stable and to allow her mother
"time to work on herself." These statements are repeated in court
records, including those submitted by the prior visitation agency
(exhibit A) and the Conciliation Court interview.
Additionally, the child has seen multiple since the

31 Petitioner's recent attempts to force herself into the child's life,

```
1 who have concluded that the child is reacting in a normal and healthy
2 way under the circumstances and that forcing contact before the child
3 is ready would be most likely damaging and counterproductive - if the
4 intended course of action were to foster healthy interactions and a
5 lasting relationship between the child and Petitioner. The
6 have concurred that continuing to force the child to have contact with
7 the Petitioner at this time is not in best interests of the child as
8 it would cause confusion for the child's understanding of healthy
9 relationships, which are built on honesty and trust. This conclusion
10 also appears to be consistent with A.R.S. 28-403 and previous case
11 recommendations that follow the statutes (Exhibit B.)
         Respondent has made several good faith attempts since 2020 to
12
13 offer the Petitioner opportunities to move forward and act in the
14 best interests of the child, however the Petitioner remains unwilling
15 or unable to do so (exhibit C.) Despite this ongoing uncooperative
16 nature of the Petitioner, the Respondent has successfully explored
17 every open path to maintain the child's physical and
18 and welfare (exhibit D.) While the extraordinary lengths to which
19 the Petitioner has gone in order to deceive this court and in effect
20 further damage the only functional household of the child is of
21 utmost concern. This damage is clearly proven by the Petitioner's
                                                      years, including
                    on the Respondent over the past
22 repeated
                                                                    the
23 the unrepentant false claims that the father
                                                         and
24 minor child. Not only have these accusations never been withdrawn,
25 but none of the perjury has been amended in any way, standing to this
 26 day. As the Petitioner chooses to continue this course, she proves
 27 beyond any reasonable doubt her own continued inability to understand
 28 how to act in the "best interests" of the minor child.
```

```
The case history provides ample documentation in the record,
 1
 2 re-affirmed by multiple judges of this Court, noting the Petitioner's severe
                 , repeated perjury and repeated choices to intentionally cause
 4 unnecessary, punitive litigation. Respondent notes that his prior counsel
 5 requested relief on
                                        for the Petitioner's
 6 emergency filing after her
                                      failed
                                               test suspended visitation and
 7 / or parenting time. Judge
                                      postponed ruling on this matter, though
8 billing documentation was submitted. Respondent requests this relief is now
9 ordered including the additional, unnecessary burden imposed on the child's
10 household (Exhibit E) which will allow Respondent to continue to solely
11 provide for the minor child's well-being - consistent with A.R.S 25-415.
12
13 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this
                                      day of
14
15
16
     By:
17
18
19
     Copy of foregoing delivered by hand, this
20
                                                       day of
                                                                          to:
21
22
23
24
25
    cc: filed with
                        , Attn: Honorable Judge
26
27
28
```

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.