State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 23-345
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

February 20, 2024

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge had improper demeanor and failed to allow her to be heard.

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 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 Michael J. Brown did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 20, 2024.

(Omb

COPY

2023-345

1	Woman Filing:						
2	Address (if not prote	cted):					
3	City, State, Zip Code):					
4	Telephone:						
5	Email Address:						
6	ATLAS Number:						
7	Presenting X Self,	without a Lawy	yer or X Attorne	ey	for Responden	t <u>X</u>	
8							
9	AT T	HE	COURT OF	ARIZONA II	N	COUNTY	
10							
11	n 1 ./n				-		
12	Respondent / Party B	,		Case N	No.		
13							
14		ATLAS No.					
15	Petitioner / Party A						
16					~~~~	•	
17		<u>AFFID</u>	AVIT AND M	OTION FOR	RECUSAL		
18							
19	COMES NOW,		r after Responde	•	Respondent	I, Me, her, she,	
20	of her own accord an					, the woman acting in	
21	the Office of Judge b	ased on the Adm	issible Evidenc	e, attached he	rein.		
22							
23	This document will		davit and a Mo	otion for Rec	usal of	, the woman	
24	acting in the Office	of Judge.					
25					T		
26	•						
27	Evid. 901 and the Self Authenticating Admissible Evidence pursuant to Ariz. R. Evid. 902. To avoid the						
28	unconstitutional adjudication and deprivation of Due Process of Law, the Respondent has filed the following Action with this Honorable Court, a motion moving this Honorable Court to issue the recusal is a necessity						
29						the recusal is a necessity	
30	to maintain the integr	rity of our Judici	al System in the	State of Ariz	ona.		
31			CENED	AT TACTE			
32			GENER	AL FACTS			
33	<i>T</i> ,	. 1 1 1 61	1 11		1.1.1.1		
34	_					we been ignored and	
35	disregarded by	,	the woman acti	ng in the Offi	ce of Juage,		
36	0	Daguan	. dont	filed a Degree	at for Draduation	n Dunguont to ADCD 26	
37	On or about	Respon		•	nored and disre	on Pursuant to ARCP 26	
38	(See Attached Exhib	us) which Petitio	oner	ig	nored and disre	garded.	
39	On th	is Court entered	on Order requir	ing Patitionar		and	
40						days of entry of that	
41	Respondent Order.	to produce an	Allidavit of Fil	ianciai illioini	ation within 40	days of entry of that	
42 43	Order.						
	Petitioner	faile	d and refused to	obey this Co	urt'e	Order.	
44 45	retitioner	Tanco	u and refused to	obcy uns co	uits	Older.	
46	On the	hearing Respond	ent s	noke on the re	ecord with Case	Manager	
47	and Notified Case M		that Petit	•		ailed to provide	
48	Respondent with an Affidavit of Financial Information within 40 days of entry of the						
49	Court Order.	an Amuavit or	i manoidi mion	mation within	To days or onu	j or aic	
75	Court Order.						

During a scheduled conference call Case Manager said that Respondent would have to bring up any issues with the Court Judge that has been assigned to the case.						
Petitioner failed to keep Respondent up to date with a valid mailing address pursuant to the Court Order stating that both parties must keep the Court and the other party updated with any and all address changes.						
Before having a scheduled meeting with , the woman acting in the Office of Judge, Respondent was proactive enough to stamp and file a Motion to Compel Production, a Motion to find Petitioner in contempt of Court, and a Motions Hearing document into the case.						
Respondent stamped and filed a Notice for a Motions Hearing to take place via Court Connect at the Court of Arizona Courthouse, at on						
During the Court Connect meeting Respondent attempted to bring up the motions she had stamped and filed with the clerk of the court.						
the woman acting in the Office of Judge, has been incredibly Rude and Unprofessional when speaking with Respondent has shown a pattern of misconduct, bias, and being unprofessional.						
Unprofessional during the meeting. did Not want to hear anything that Respondent had to say regarding the motions that stood before the court.						
the woman acting in the Office of Judge, even went as far as yelling at Respondent to STOP TALKING! a few times and muted Respondent thereby denying Respondent of a Fair, Impartial trial, and Due Process of Law.						
Respondent had a Reasonable expectation that the men and women working for the Court of Arizona would be professional, courteous, and helpful, however that has not been the case with or						
appears to have issues dealing with and controlling her temperament.						
So far it appears that and the woman acting in the Office of Judge, are more interested in clearing out cases from the docket, than helping the people they solemnly swore to serve with the utmost of professionalism.						
It appears that the woman acting in the Office of Judge, is more focused on rushing through the divorce process even when it prejudices Respondent						
Pursuant to Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 1.1 Rule 1.1 - Compliance with the Law A judge shall comply with the law, including the Code of Judicial Conduct.						
There are still very important factual matters that must be heard and decided on before the divorce case can be finalized.						

1 2	Respondent is still attempting to go through the discovery process that will allow Respondent to make informed decisions regarding the divorce.
3 4	The actions of and appear to be very biased towards the benefit of
5 6	Petitioner even though Petitioner has failed to keep the court updated regarding a valid mailing address, following court orders, or discovery
7 8	request.
9 10	conduct is truly unbecoming of a Public Servant.
11 12 13 14	Respondent has found that the woman acting in the Office of Judge, has been hostile towards Respondent since the first meeting, the hostility, bias, and apparent prejudice from has only gotten worse.
15 16 17 18	Respondent has in Good Faith done everything she can to help resolve the divorce as soon as possible, however the actions of and , the woman acting in the Office of Judge, have caused unnecessary delays and have only prolonged the entire divorce process.
19 20 21	The actions of and have created a significant amount of Emotional and Mental Stress, which have caused Respondent physical ailments and health complications, resulting in Respondent having to go through various medical interventions.
22 23 24	Mayor & Aldermen of the City of Savannah v. Batson-Cook Co., 291 Ga. 114, 114, 728 S.E.2d 189 (2012) states:
25 26 27 28	a. "It is vital to the functioning of the courts that the public believe in the absolute integrity and impartiality of its judges, and judicial recusal serves as a linchpin for the underlying proposition that a court should be fair and impartial."
29 30 31	"Impartial," "impartiality," and "impartially" mean absence of bias or prejudice in favor of, or against, particular parties or classes of parties, as well as maintenance of an open mind in considering issues that may come before a judge.
33 34 35	Pursuant to Az. Code. Jud. Cond. Rule 2.3 (A) A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office, including administrative duties, without bias or prejudice.
36 37 38 39 40	Pursuant to Az. Code. Jud. Cond. Rule 2.3 (B) A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct manifest bias or prejudice, or engage in harassment, including but not limited to bias, prejudice, or harassment based upon race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation, and shall not permit court staff, court officials, or others subject to the judge's direction and control to do so.
12 13	A judge who manifests bias or prejudice in a proceeding impairs the fairness of the proceeding and brings the judiciary into disrepute.
14 15 16	A judge must avoid conduct that may reasonably be perceived as prejudiced or biased.
17 18	Pursuant to Az. Code. Jud. Cond. Rule 2.5 Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation (A) A judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently, and promptly.

1

4 5 6

11

12

13 14 15

> 17 18 19

16

21 22 23

20

29

30

24

36

37

38 39 40

41

42 43

A judge should seek the necessary docket time, court staff, expertise, and resources to discharge all adjudicative and administrative responsibilities.

Pursuant to Az. Code. Jud. Cond. Rule 2.11 (A) A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, including but not limited to the following circumstances:

(1) The judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or a party's lawyer.

The decision about referring a recusal motion for reassignment to another judge does not involve an exercise of discretion by the judge whose recusal is sought however it "must be considered from the perspective of a reasonable person rather than from the perception of interested parties or their lawyer-advocates, or from the subjective perspective of the judge whose continued presence in the case is at issue." Batson-Cook Co., 291 Ga. at 121, 728 S.E.2d 189

Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35 (1975) states:

a. "Experience teaches that the probability of actual bias on the part of the judge or decisionmaker is too high to be constitutionally tolerable."

Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35 (1975) quotes "Not only is a biased decisionmaker constitutionally unacceptable but "our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of unfairness." In re Murchison, supra, at 136; cf. Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U. S. 510, 532 (1927)

Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35 (1975) states:

a. "It must overcome a presumption of honesty and integrity in those serving as adjudicators; and it must convince that, under a realistic appraisal of psychological tendencies and human weakness, conferring investigative and adjudicative powers on the same individuals poses such a risk of actual bias or prejudgment that the practice must be forbidden if the guarantee of due process is to be adequately implemented."

Pursuant to Az. Code. Jud. Cond. Rule 42.1 - Change of Judge as a Matter of Right

- (a) When Available. In any action in superior court, except an action in the Tax Court, each side is entitled as a matter of right to a change of one judge. Each action, whether single or consolidated, must be treated as having only two sides. If two or more parties on a side have adverse or hostile interests, the presiding judge may allow additional changes of judge as a matter of right, but each side must have the right to the same number of such changes. The term "judge" as used in this rule refers to any judge, judge pro tem, or court commissioner. The term "presiding judge" as used in this rule refers to the presiding superior court judge in the county where the action is pending, or that judge's designee.
- (b) Notice Requirements. A party seeking a change of judge as a matter of right must either file a written notice.

Pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 42.2 - Change of Judge for Cause and A.R.S. § 12-409 (A)(B)(5) 5. That the party filing the affidavit has cause to believe and does believe that on account of the bias, prejudice, or interest of the judge he/she cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial.

1 2	CONCLUSION
3 4	The facts stated herein show a "high probability of unfairness" should continue as the presiding judge over Respondent divorce case.
5 6 7 8 9	If the State of Arizona is going to guarantee an adequate implementation of Due Process of Law, secured by the Arizona Constitution and the United States of America Constitution, these matters should immediately initiate the "use of the circuit's existing random, impartial case assignment method."
10 11 12 13	WHEREFORE moves this Honorable Court to enter an Order assigning another Judge to rule on the merits of this Affidavit and motion, to generate written findings and conclusions, along with such other and further relief as the Court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.
14 15 16	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this day of
17 18 19	A CC V
20 21	<u>VERIFICATION</u>
22 23 24 25	STATE OF ARIZONA) COUNTY)
26 27 28	BEFORE ME personally appeared who, being by me first duly affirmed and identified in accordance with Arizona law, deposes and says:
29 30 31	 My name is Affiant herein. I have written, read, and understood the attached document filed herein, and each fact alleged therein is true and correct of my own personal knowledge.
32 33 34 35	FURTHER THE AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.
36 37	Affiant
38 39 40	AFFIRMED TO and subscribed before me this day of
41 42 43	Notary Public sitting in and for the State of Arizona. (Seal)
44 45 46	My commission expires:
	- 1

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.