

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 23-186

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

September 1, 2023

The complainant alleged improper legal rulings by a superior court judge 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 Roger D. Barton did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on September 1, 2023.

Sent:**To:** Commission on Judicial Conduct**Subject:** complaint against a judge

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

It is imperative this complaint is kept anonymous as the judge is already retaliating against the person it affects.

This letter was originally sent to Judge _____, who took no action. Since Judge _____ took no action, Judge _____ has retaliated against the petitioner in this case including making orders without providing petitioner due process.

This letter is a last resort and a plea to save _____ little boys.

The following is a list of orders/judgments/lack of judgements made in direct violation of AZ Law and extreme overuse of discretion in the _____ case # _____ by Judge _____.

- Attributing arbitrary excess income (not based on any job held or even minimum wage) to a retired _____ disabled veteran just to force him to pay child support (otherwise the incomes were equal and nothing was owed)
- Ordering arrears on this arbitrary child support after the _____ and _____ advised there was none
- Never requiring mother to submit her paystubs, not even once; allowing her to testify to a different amount than on her W2
- Allowing mother to work less than _____ hours a week
- Reducing mother's child support obligation to _____ despite calculator results
- Making father pay mother's owed taxed for failure to report income from her personal business despite showing an IRS approved innocent spouse claim
- Never allowing father to claim children for any year
- Allowing mother to claim children for all years despite her not even qualifying for some of the tax credits in direction violation of the child support guidelines
- Requiring father to pay made up and fabricated medical bills (not even receipts) despite being shown the actual insurance claim/copay amounts
- Never requiring mother to disclose her extensive psychological history despite being shown text messages where she *states*

- Allowing mother to move to a different county without petitioning court
- Ordering children go to school in this different county despite requiring father (and the court) to pay for a professional school evaluation service that advised differently
- Allowing children to go without a parenting plan for almost a year
- Continuously and solely ordering mother and her counsel the right to prepare parenting plans
- Allowing mother and lawyer to reduce father's parenting time to a year without following any of the AZ guidelines despite his own verbal order stating father should have of the time
- Allowing mother and her lawyer to reduce father's parenting time in violation of the federal ICWA laws
- Allowing mother to get away with multiple false reports *that she admitted to filing*
- Allowing mother to get away with multiple false police reports and false Emergency Orders of Protection just to reduce children's time with father *that she admitted to filing*
- Sealing records that recommend mother have limited time
- Awarding mother presumptive medical decision making despite being shown evidence she never takes the children to the doctor or dentist
- Never making a judgment on Father's motion to modify parenting time and legal decision making and instead focusing on mother's motion for financial matters (with fabricated documents)
- Ignoring child molestation reports from the children by their step sibling in mother's house
- Ignoring a interview where one child says " ,” and details an assault by his mother and stepbrother
- Ignoring police reports of the same
- Ignoring a interview where it was determined by the detective that mother had been trying to coach the child
- Approving mother's lodged parenting plan that has absurd clauses such as " ” and is not anywhere close to the plan agreed upon in an RMC
- Allowing mother to block the children's psychological evaluations (that he ordered) by refusing to chose a provider or only choosing an autism evaluator (that he then sided with her on and originally ordered they see the autism evaluator)
- Allowing mother to block the children's dental care by canceling all dental appointments and then ordering they go to an adult dentist in *where neither parent lives*
- Allowing mother to further reduce father's already extremely limited parenting time by claiming it interferes with her required work hours despite her already testifying she is a 1099 employee and only works hours a week (not requiring any proof of the same)
- Signing mother's lodged parenting plan without a hearing, after he canceled the hearing for being sick
- Not sanctioning mother for providing a fraudulent parent plan to the children's school
- Not sanctioning mother for enrolling the children in activities that interfere with father's time, FaceTime calls, and never informing father of any of these activities
- Denying a Rule 48 after one other minor children alleged physical abuse by mother, injuries were found to the same, both children told police the same, and the forensic interview resulted in the same

Denying a Rule 48 after one of the minor children alleged physical abuse by his stepfather, injuries were found to the same, a detective from the county testified the case was going forward, and stated they couldn't comment on an *active criminal case*

- Awarding mother of the parenting time *even after both children had forensic interviews with findings of abuse in the mother's house*
- Awarding the mother essentially sole medical decision making by moving the children's providers to (where the father could never attend) despite being shown evidence that she intentionally cancelled years of appointments, delayed care, refused care, fabricated illnesses, and has never been the primary person to take the children to appointments.
- Providing the reasoning for changing the dentist to that the children would not miss as much school *despite being provided evidence the dentist in is just as far if not farther than dentists in and the children had already missed almost of the school year for unknown reasons (unknown why mother is not taking them to school)*
- Ordering the children's therapist cannot be subpoenaed for testimony in regards to parenting-time/custody after the children told her about the abuse they experience and that their mother hits them if they don't lie for her
- Sealing the records where the children detail the abuse by their mother and stepfather

I do not know if perhaps the judge knows mother, her family, or legal representation outside of court, he has a extreme bias against fathers or perhaps , if his case load is too much to handle such a case, if the case is confusing because he has multiple cases with the same last name, or he simply doesn't care.

The case should be immediately reassigned and all his previous orders reviewed for compliance with AZ law. Children are in imminent danger.

I trust you will do the right thing and thank you for your time.