

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 24-222

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

October 11, 2024

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner made improper rulings and was biased in a protective order hearing.

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 Denise K. Aguilar did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 11, 2024.

evidence presented. Notably, neither party is incarcerated or deceased, which are significant contextual factors.

5. **Consideration of Defendant's History:** The defendant has no criminal history, complaints, or reports against him. This context should have been considered more thoroughly during the hearing.
6. **Acceptance of Questionable Evidence:** Commissioner [redacted] admitted and accepted exhibits as evidence despite objections and their tenuous connections to the case. This practice does not align with fair judicial standards.
7. **Emotional Basis for Ruling:** It was evident that the commissioner's ruling was emotionally driven. She appeared to see what she wanted to see, rather than basing her decision on objective evidence.
8. **Credibility of Petitioner's Source:** The petitioner's evidence came from a discredited third party with known [redacted] health issues. Despite the defendant presenting distorted copies of photos from a questionable source, Commissioner [redacted] still allowed it as evidence. This oversight disregards significant red flags.
9. **Misquotation and Contextual Errors:** When Commissioner [redacted] reiterated statements during her ruling, they were taken out of context and misquoted. Such misunderstandings can have severe negative impacts on individuals' lives.
10. **Burden of Proof:** The burden of proof lies with the petitioner, who failed to provide substantial evidence. The petitioner's entire claim relied on an unfit source, previously discredited and case dismissed on [redacted] due to false claims, mental illness, and child endangerment.

I hope this detailed account will be taken seriously to ensure that such issues are addressed, promoting fairness and consistency in judicial proceedings. I request a thorough review of Commissioner [redacted] conduct during this hearing and appropriate measures to prevent similar occurrences in the future. I am available to provide further information or clarification as needed.

Thank you for your attention to this serious matter. This directly affects my life.

Sincerely,