

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 22-375

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

May 18, 2023

The Complainant alleged a municipal court judge pro tem improperly issued an injunction against harassment.

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 May 18, 2023.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

2022-375

**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.

Please see attached letter to  
County Superior Court Administ-  
rator.

To: County Superior Court  
Limited Jurisdiction Program Manager

Attn:

Re: Formal Complaint Against A Judicial Officer, Case no.

Municipal Court Judicial Officer, pro tem , , did on , sign  
an Injunction Against Harassment against me, , with the Plaintiffs being  
(DOB ) and his wife, , (DOB ).

The Judicial Officer did not follow the A.R.S. Rules of Protection, nor did he follow the protocol required by all Judges and Judicial Officers in the State of Arizona. He simply signed it, believing whatever the told him as fact, whether it was truthful or not, with no Evidence, no Police Report, no outstanding witnesses, no photographs and no established relationship.

Findings are Required for a judicial officer to rule in an case. had no findings. There were no series of acts of harassment against the plaintiff during a period of a year and a half by the defendant. There was no "good cause" for to sign the , no contact by the defendant or any evidence of harassment by electronic contact or communication.

This is poor judicial conduct on the part of . And going forward, I petition Superior Court to consider this judicial officer a person to recuse himself or to consider and myself, , as a " ." I am innocent until proven guilty, not the other way around. Please inform of this fact.

In conclusion, if a Judicial Officer cannot distinguish the difference between the proper procedure of administering 17B A.R.S. he should not be wasting the court's time on speculation with his signature. A criterion must be met in every case.