

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 17-020

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge should be removed from office for poor performance on the bench.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: February 22, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 22, 2017.

*This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.*

Comp

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

2017-020

Re:  
Case:

It has come to my attention that

past have been ignored though they are valid complaints on the poor performance of this judge. I am formerly requesting by the powers vested in your role and your *moral obligation* immediately before she causes more harm to the public. This is within your powers. She has caused so much harm to children over the years and including mine by giving the abuser power and custody. She clearly does not demonstrate that she understands the law, nor how to apply it other than to harm the victims.

As noted has violated the following Code of Conduct:

**A. RULE 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness - To ensure impartiality and fairness to all parties, a judge must be objective and open-minded.**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

**B. RULE 2.9. Ex Parte Communication – meetings or conversations with the other party without the knowledge or inclusion of the other party.**

**C. RULE 2.5. Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation - Competence in the performance of judicial duties requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and preparation reasonably necessary to perform a judge's responsibilities of judicial office.**

1. She did not following the current statues under ARS 25-411 which prohibits a party from seeking custody modification earlier than 1 year. There was no basis for reviewing the case prior to a year and there was no reasoning presented to agree to this premature review of custody. Order of protection was not reviewed in a formal hearing. In fact, Respondent did not even allege that the child's present environment may seriously endanger the child nor was any testimony given. The order protection remained in place.

Statutory presumption against an award of joint custody to respondent pursuant to ARS 25-403.03 by virtue of domestic violence.

**D. RULE 2.6. Ensuring the Right to Be Heard - A judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law.**

1. She did not let my key witnesses (e.g. Dr.) speak, nor give opportunity for my attorney to speak.

**E. RULE 2.8. Decorum, Demeanor, and Communication with Jurors -judge shall be patient, dignified, and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity, and shall require similar conduct of lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control.**

1. Again she was rude and demonstrated partiality to one side and refused to listen to my attorney or to my witnesses. She used intimidation in her court and had already made up her mind without careful review and listening to key medical witnesses like \_\_\_\_\_ and others.

In conclusion, she violated my due process rights and caused further harm by forcing me to supervise visitation with a restraining order between my ex-husband and I. Agencies representing family therapy \_\_\_\_\_ who have stated she is notorious for continuing to abuse the victims. She lacks judgment and understanding of the law even noted by her judicial performance review. To this day \_\_\_\_\_ is attending play therapy and has not adjusted well.

Thank you in advance.

CC: