

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 20-300

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

March 15, 2021

The Complainant alleged a part-time pro tem superior court judge improperly served as an attorney in the same court, failed to disclose her status as a colleague of the assigned judge, and engaged in improper ex parte communications.

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 Roger D. Barton did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 15, 2021.

Arizona Judicial Commission for Judicial Conduct

Comp

Please accept this as an initial complaint Regarding Pro Temp Judge
County

of
2020-300

Please see filings and be aware that investigations and reports have commenced in regards to the as well in her capacity as an and her admitted major illegalities, improprieties, and multiple misconducts you can find in her response filed while admitting to the " and stating formal discipline is not necessary.

I ask you to also investigate this Judge along with already reported Judge regarding their Conducts through out the Family Law cases and Civil law cases and the violations of Civil rights, Civil law, Procedural laws, and federal laws as well as improper conflicts of interest and personal relationship which can be heard on record at Both the hearings as well as the hearings on the audio records, as well as Judge conduct Highlighted in County on with in the audio recording.

J

Email:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Plaintiff Pro Se(restraining order only)

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF

In re the Matter of:

Plaintiff,

and

Defendant.

Case No.

Expedited Motion to Rescind and Reinstae

Motion to Strike Defendant's China Doll Affidavit/Request

(Assigned to the Honorable

Plaintiff, objects to the Defendants request for attorneys fees
Filed on This affidavit and request was done over 66 days after
the request before Judge was made in open Court. In accordance of law and
the rules, this must be filed with in 30 days. This is twice the allowable time allowed
for such a ridiculous request.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

I. Timeliness

On _____ a hearing took place in front of Honorable Judge _____ in _____ County Az. In the hearing, Judge was hesitant in granting the Defendant being allowed to file this China Doll Affidavit for fees. Counsel for the Defendant can be heard in the Audio Recording of the hearing, stating “ _____ ?” And the Judge explaining he wasn’t granting it , and that the case would now likely be seen and heard by the new coming Judge and made introductions, as the new Judge was present and seated in the court room .

II. MERRITT

A.Counsel for the Defendant continues to Grossly misconstrue the Facts in this Case as well as in the Family Law case as noted in other filings by the Petitioners Family Court Attorney, _____ in earlier filing. The same issue resides in this case, in effort to mislead the court and any new Judge ruling in this case and family law case.

B.The OOP, filed by Plaintiff, was **APPROPRIATELY** filed in _____ County, the County in which she lived in at the time of filing and still currently resides.

C. Counsel has not abided by the Rules of the court set fourth in Arizona Regarding OOP, in accordance to Arizona State law. After Defendant was served, Defendants Counsel did not follow the Rules and attempted to litigate

1 this matter through motion by mail no less to the County Court,
2 WITH OUT requesting a hearing to challenge or argue the matter.
3 Defendants Counsel, also corresponded with plaintiffs counsel, and had
4 knowledge the Plaintiff was a resident of County, and then **AGAIN**
5 intentionally mislead the court to believe one or both of the parties resided in
6 County, and that these matters were apart of the family law case, effort to
7 place the matter back before Judge Specifically in County. It
8 should also be said that Counsel for the Defendant also requested (though not
9 allowed) that Judge be the only Judge to hear any matters
10 pertaining to the Plaintiff, This needs to be brought to the
11 current courts attention, as Opposing Counsel for the Defendant is and has
12 been Honorable Judge Pro Tempre Judge in Superior Courts of
13 County, to Judge , as she is
14 Prohibited by The Judicial Code of Conduct for Judges set forth by the
15 Judicial Commission from being allowed to “ ” or oversee any criminal
16 hearings, due to her
17 as This information was not Divulged
18 to ANY of the Plaintiffs family law counsel, nor any counsel who received
19 communications by the Honorable Judge in neither the Family
20 Court Matters, nor either OOP matters.

21
22
23
24
25
26 D. The OOP filed in County, WAS NOT apart of the family law case, as
27 the minor child the have in common WAS NOT a protected party

1 E.The facts and issues in the OOP filed in County were NOT the same
2 facts in the OOP filed in County in the Nor could the
3 facts addressed in the OOP Filed in County be heard in
4 previous OOP in County, due to the incidents not occurring until early
5 s attempted to be argued by Plaintiffs current family law attorney
6 and prejudicially ignored by the Honorable Judge
7
8

9 F.The OOP was dismissed Prejudicially with Bias and **WITHOUT** any proper
10 hearing or evaluation of the facts or evidence other than Defendants, nor was
11 any testimony of any witnesses or potential witnesses heard. Judge
12 immediately Called the case on record, and record will show the judge
13 did not review, evaluate, or try any case facts of the issues pertaining to OOP
14 filed in Judge called the case and dismissed it immediately
15 violating the Plaintiffs right to argue her case and show evidence regarding
16 the facts. Also not following proper procedures of Law in Arizona in regards
17 to Restraining Order and Orders of Protection.
18
19

20 **III. IMPROPER VENUE:**

21 **A.** Plaintiff Filed OOP based not he defendants actions with in the appropriate
22 venue that she resided at the time, County, in which she still resides
23 as evident by her drivers license presented at time of filing, and substantial
24 amounts of her mail confirming her address, as disclosed to defendants
25 counsel. This is with in accordance of law. There was no Improprieties on the
26 Plaintiffs behalf.
27

1 **B. NEITHER PARTY RESIDES NOR HAS RESIDED IN COUNTY**

2 1. At the Time of Filing, and at the time of the Hearing on neither
3 party was nor has been a resident of County for or more. Defendant
4 I moved to state some where between of
5 this is still where defendant currently resides. Plaintiff, moved in early to
6 where she currently resides. Thus according to Arizona state law for
7 Proper Venue and Jurisdiction for this case is and should remain county,
8 the county in which it was originally filed, as neither party has any intent on moving
9 back to County in the near future. This law also prohibits County from
10 making any decisions or judgements in regards to these matters, as no parties were
11 living in county at time of filing nor present date.

12 2. On the courts found and stated on record that neither
13 party were a resident of County at the time of filing nor at the time the hearing
14 was improperly filed by defendants counsel.

15 **C. Accusations and Allegations by defendants Counsel:** 1. Defendants

16 counsel stated in her petition that the defendant “
17
18
19 .” Defendants own evidence of dictation of that
20 hearing, proves this to be un-biasely untrue, and an obvious attempt to
21 mislead and further compromise a new comings judges perception to the
22 facts surrounding this case AND the family law case, as we have consistently
23 seen and many of the Plaintiffs family law counsel’s have brought to the
24
25
26
27

**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.**