# State of Arizona

#### COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

|              | Disposition of Complaint 23-074 |
|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Judge:       |                                 |
| Complainant: |                                 |

#### **ORDER**

# September 8, 2023

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made improper legal rulings and demonstrated gender bias in a family court 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 members Roger D. Barton and Joseph C. Kreamer did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on September 8, 2023.

#### CONFIDENTIAL

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

# FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2023-074

# 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. If the shoe was on the other foot, and I was the parent moving to a new school district, would have sided with the mother and (B) would have stayed in his original school district. This is blatant favoritism towards the mother, and misandry against me. obvious because of would have used the argument that moving (B) would be too stresssful for him. Which would have been true. This double standary in her ruling clearly shows her misandry, favoritsm and discrimination of men. During and before the hearing, I had submitted professional reccommemendations that had demonstrated (B)'s Diagnosis of does not do well with changes. I wanted to keep him in the same district, and at a school closer to both parents current residences. All the professional teachers that had worked with (B) for many years, were knowledgeable and experienced with his diagnosis and condition. All professionals were reccommending him to stay in his current school district. Yet ruling was specifically against me, and and did not rule on what the professionals stated was in (B)'s best interest. Since (B)'s move to a new strange environment and school district( School), he and recently reportedly tried to run away and has tried to run away off campus multiple times in supposedly tried to choke teachers on school campus, specifically in . Normally, (B) is year old boy, very mild mannered in the past. However the stress of not being with his father enough, except every other weekend, and being shoved into a new school environment have caused him too much stress. Both are the result of rulings. This complaint is intented to put to light how devastating unempathethic rulings can be on a family structure. Especially when there is a child with special needs involved. vitriolic rulings and treatment of my family in the family court, characterize by her unremorseful persona and discriminatory rulings need to be held accountable. Also her blatant misandry and discrimination against men in the family court need to be addressed as well. As a current tax paying citizen and law abiding citizen, it is shameful that she continues to be allowed to rule on the bench and still be paid by the the state of Arizona's tax paying citizens. She should be investigated, sanctioned, disbarred from all duties in the family court and have all Arizona tax paid retirement and other benefits removed. Her rulings could potentially be scrutinized by every news organization out there, because of how horrendous they have become for our family and young children.

# 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:  |  |  |  |  |
| words what you believe the judge did t<br>names, dates, times, and places that  | paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the will help the commission understand your concerns. Additiona (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side complaint for your records.  |  |  |  |  |
| Misandry discriminations and favoritism younger son (B). (B) is yo boy who h  | is unrelated to any other prior complaint, however it is related ding due process in the family court. It is also related to verified in her ruling in the same court regarding school choice for my has I is a rare genetic lectual and some OCD and behavioral issues especially to  |  |  |  |  |
| favoritism and Misandry to rule against evidence to the court during this specific  | made an immediate, minute ruling, where she used me. She did this by preventing my attorney from presenting chearing, regarding the placement of our younger son (B) in an d within the same district. This violation and denial of due attorney , ex-wife , and her attorney  |  |  |  |  |
| destroyed the common due process whi also violated due process by he subject matter of my son's school choice favortism for the mother, rather than taki matter. was unable to exhibit a Her ruling and actions demonstrated to t | y right to speak where she cut me off in midsentence, and she ich was established by the Arizona Legislature many years ago. For refusal to allow my attorney to present evidence regarding the early was apparent that actions were directly related to ing the time to read, understand or listen to the facts of the shread of neutrality as a designated judical ward of the court, the court her misandry and discrimination of mens rights. Her play, with regards to the shame she has placed on the state of |  |  |  |  |
| younger son (B) from his current not do well with changes. Especially the my custody time from roughly , to explanation or reason given.  | e made a discriminatory ruling in favor of the mother to sever my school district home. My son has special needs and does  |  |  |  |  |
| district. Yet still sided with the moth<br>original school district was providing exc   | the mother was not even living in the new school her's forceful plan to move (B) to a distant location. My son's cellent education for him and had many years of experience with al school was destroyed when she ordered the move.  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |

| 1  |   |   |          |  |  |  |  |
|----|---|---|----------|--|--|--|--|
| 2  |   |   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 3  |   |   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | <br>  Attorney for Respondent/Fath                            | or  |          |  |  |  |  |
| 5  |   |   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 6  | IN THE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF |   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 7  |   | JR THE COUNTY OF                                  |          |  |  |  |  |
| 8  | In re the Matter of   | Case No.  |          |  |  |  |  |
| 9  | ,   |   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Petition  | er, FATHER'S SEPARATE PRETR<br>STATEMENT          | JAL      |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | and   |   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | ,   | (Assigned to the Honorable                        | )        |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Respond   | ent.  |          |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |   |   | 1 1.     |  |  |  |  |
|    | Respondent,   | (hereinafter "Father") by and thro                | ough his |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | respective counsel undersign                                  | ed hereby submits his Separate Pretrial Statement | pursuant |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | to Rule 76(c), Arizona Rules                                  | of Family Law Procedure:                          |          |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | I. STATEMENT OF U   | NCONTESTED ISSUES                                 |          |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |   | e two minor children in common namely             |          |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |   | ·   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | , born  | and , born .                                      |          |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | 2. The current or   | lers for legal decision making (custody) and par- | enting   |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | time were issued  | (filed ) by the Hone                              | orable   |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | . The Court o   | dered the following in pertinent part on page 10: |          |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | 1 112 33 312 3  | % r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r               |          |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |   |   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |   |   |          |  |  |  |  |

**Final Decision Making Authority -** Parental decisions shall be required for major issues in raising the children and in meeting on-going needs. When they arise, each parent shall give good faith consideration to the views of the other and put forth best efforts to reach a consensus decision. If the decision involves medical or schooling issues, the parties may further elect to seek input from treating physicians or educators. Both parents shall be provided with such input.

IT IS ORDERED that if they cannot agree after making a good faith effort to reach an agreement, Mother shall have "presumptive decision making authority", as to only. This level of authority shall allow Mother the right to make a preliminary decision that she shall then communicate to Father. If Father believes that Mother's decision is contrary to the best interests of the children, Father shall have the right to seek review through the Court. Father shall have the burden to demonstrate that Mother's decision is contrary to the children's best interests. It shall not be sufficient to demonstrate that an alternative decision may have also been in the interest of the children.

3. Based upon Mother's Response filed , Mother is now in agreement that attend in-person school in the fall. Although, Father wishes that Mother would have conveyed her position sooner than the week prior to hearing Father recognizes this issues is now moot.

### II. STATEMENT OF CONTESTED ISSUES

# a. School Choice/Mainstreaming

Mother has decided, despite several recommendations by teachers, that should <u>not</u> be placed in any additional mainstream general education areas. is currently in general education for Math and Reading, but remains in self-contained classes for Writing, Social Studies and Science. should be advancing to more general education class as recommended by his teachers, but instead Mother is seeking to have him in a more restrictive environment. During all the IEP meetings since , the team has expressed great improvement in behaviors emotionally, socially and academically including in class where he is mainstreamed.

. Father believes

return to

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.