# State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 23-451
Judge:	
Complainant:	

### **ORDER**

May 24, 2024

The Complainant alleged bias by a superior court judge in her son's family law 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 Barbara Brown, Michael J. Brown, Joseph C. Kreamer, and Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 24, 2024.

23-451

RE: Judicial Complaint again	nst Hon.
------------------------------	----------

The standard of Review for judicial misconduct is clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct. (Emphasis added)

RULE 2.16. Cooperation with Disciplinary Authorities (A) A judge shall cooperate and be candid and honest with judicial and lawyer disciplinary agencies.

(B) A judge shall not retaliate, directly or indirectly, against a person known or suspected to have assisted or cooperated with an investigation of a judge or a lawyer.

The Father in the above-mentioned action filed a complaint against the Best Interest Attorney in this case SBA File No. (exhibit 1) due to the fact that after meeting with my year-old granddaughter she stated he made her feel funny, and he looked at her inappropriately.

Father worked with the in this complaint and informed them that I just wanted to make them aware of my child's experience. The complaint was recorded and closed (exhibit 2). The BIA in this matter received text from me on indicating that that he has some "regarding his behavior with my child. He then reported the matter to Court via email. Please see exhibit 3.

Minute Entry

APPOINTEMTN OF BEST INTEREST ATTORNEY FOR CHILD.

Best Interest Attorney (BIA) and Petitioner had a phone interview on

at a later time a

interview with child was conducted at the child's school

in BIA met with Child during school hours at the child's School for a full interview. The child later told

approximately Petitioner that "

"Father then reached out to BIA via text message". The petitioner then followed that text message up with ". (Exhibit 8)

at

then reached out to the court (Judge's Assistant in an email to all parties stating he had rec'd some troubling messages from someone, and he believed it was Petitioner.

closing argument during the

**Evidentiary Hearing** 

p.189 lines ln 12-25 and P 190 ln 1-5)

#### [Emphasis added]

Please note that this occurred on over months after the at school interview, of which the father reported how uncomfortable the child was with due to him leering at her and making her feel very uncomfortable. She felt better because she did was not in his presence and the interaction was over a phone she did not know who the he was.

The Judge in this matter clearly was aware that the child was uncomfortable with this man and again did all she could to sweep his actions under the rug.

Father also realized that opposing counsel working under limited scope for the Respondent in this party was doing the Respondent bidding by using her influence to provide the court misinformation. The Father in this matter reached out to the opposing counsel with the intention provide some form of proof of some of the allegations that were being made in court as they were clearly false. The opposing counsel initially stated that she would provide the requested information; upon realizing that her client in fact was misleading the court; indicated that she would no longer be willing to provide me the requested information prompting me to file a complaint with the . Please and attachments.

This Judge in this matter has shown she is not impartial and clearly bias, she clearly violated (B) A judge shall not retaliate, directly or indirectly, against a person known or suspected to have assisted or cooperated with an investigation of a judge or a lawyer.

My son then filed a Judicial complaint with Commission on Judicial Conduct Case

and later

Please see ME

p.5

This Judge in one breath states that Father can complain but in the next breath:

Clearly the last paragraph doesn't illustrate any harm to the child, father had every right to make complaints against the BIA, opposing counsel as well as the Trier of facts. Simply put, this is retaliation for complaints. (Emphasis added)

The judge clearly retaliated. 17C A.R.S. Jud.Conduct Comm.Rules of Proc., Rule 14

Rule 14. Prohibition Against Retaliation

#### Currentness

A judge against whom a complaint is filed shall not directly or indirectly engage in any act of retaliation against any person who files a complaint, cooperates in the investigation of a complaint, or acts as a witness in any proceeding brought against the judge. "Retaliation" includes, but is not limited to, the act of dismissing or procuring the dismissal, without reasonable cause, of a member of the judge's staff or other person subject to the judge's direction and control, creating a hostile or offensive working environment for such person, or filing a frivolous bar complaint against an attorney who is a complainant or witness. The commission or disciplinary counsel may, at any time, file a petition with the supreme court for an order prohibiting, at the risk of sanctions for contempt, conduct of a judge that is or appears to be retaliatory in nature.

*Please note this Jud as a form of re	dge during the taliation please see exhi	hearing dismissed the father's motion of contempt of court from bit 6.
LLC	O 5.14 lines 8-14	TRANSCRIPTVERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION,
common law in his P	re-trial statement as It p	be faithful to the law (Emphasis added). Father advised this Court of pertains to exhibits and evidence. This court went on abandon e" exhibits. <i>Kelly v. Kelly</i> , 503 P.3d 822, 252 Ariz. 371 (Ariz. Ct.
Please see footnote F	Page .5	Please see exhibit 7
the Court's order, Far	ther submitted a volumin IE, the Court limited its r	2-page summary of caselaw or a closing following trial. In violation of tous pleading that attached many of his previously <i>excluded</i> exhibits. The eview to the first two substantive pages of Father's submission, which
1. Should Judge	nave recused herse	elf under Rule 2.11?

RULE 1.1. Compliance with the Law A judge shall comply with the law,

including the Code of Judicial Conduct. Comment For a discussion of the judge's obligation when applying and interpreting the law.

RULE 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness A judge shall uphold and apply the law and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially.

Comment 1. To ensure impartiality and fairness to all parties, a judge must be objective and open-minded.

RULE 1.2. Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety. Comment 1.

Public confidence in the judiciary is eroded by improper conduct and conduct that creates the appearance of impropriety. This principle applies to both the professional and personal conduct of a judge. 2. A judge should expect to be the subject of public scrutiny that might be viewed as burdensome if applied to other citizens and must accept the restrictions imposed by the code. 3. Conduct that compromises or appears to compromise the independence, integrity

RULE 2.11. Disqualification (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:

Under this rule, a judge is disqualified whenever the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, regardless of whether any of the specific provisions of paragraphs (A)(1) through (5) apply.

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.