

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 24-415

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

January 24, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge violated her constitutional rights in a family court matter.

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 Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 24, 2025.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

2024-415

**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Name:  Judge's Name:

**Instructions:** Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

See attached documents

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

**Name:****Judge's Name:**

**Instructions:** Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

Date:

Case number(s):

- 
- 

Subject: Violation of due process and 1<sup>st</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments of the United States Constitution.

Complaint against:

Judge

, Family Department

Court Center

Court Appointed Advisor

, Court Ordered Behavioral Interventionist

<b>EXHIBIT A</b>	INITIAL PROGRAM SUMMARY	
<b>EXHIBIT B</b>	COURT-APPOINTED ADVISOR REPORT	
<b>EXHIBIT C</b>	COURT ORDERED BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION REPORT	
<b>EXHIBIT D</b>	NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION	
<b>EXHIBIT E</b>	JOINT PRE-TRIAL STATEMENT	

**Arizona Family Courts c/o Judge [redacted] are using Content and Viewpoint based prior restraint hindering my ability to exercise these protected rights under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.**

The Arizona Family Court has overstepped its judicial responsibility by having an opinion on how I have chosen to raise my children. There has been lack of due process to prove I am an unfit parent that would require them to step in to determine the best interest of the children. Therefore, I am plenty capable of continuing to make decisions regarding the living arrangements, medical coverage and whether the children should be pulled from school for reunification appointments with father.

***In Troxel v Granville: "As we have explained, the Due Process Clause does not permit a State to infringe on the fundamental right of parents to make child rearing decisions simply because a state judge believes a "better" decision could be made. ...Accordingly, we hold that # 26.10.160(3), as applied in this case, is unconstitutional.***

***"Best Interest of the Child Doctrine" (BIC) from being used in your family court case. (This only applies if you have not been proven unfit or a clear and present danger directly to your child.)"***

Unless the courts can prove my lack of fitness, I cannot be forced to engage in these antiquated legal proceedings and be led to believe that I have no choice but to turn over my rights as a parent to the courts.

The judge has violated my First Amendment rights by leveraging a "diagnosis" of parental alienation based on **Viewpoint Based Restraint**. The court has restricted my ability to parent my children because they have assumed the information, I have chosen to share with my children is derogatory to the other parent. The government is not permitted to have an opinion, restrict or punish based on the information that I share with my children

They have also issued a "gag" order/**Content Based Restraint** prohibiting discussions with my children regarding the case and the changes that are occurring in their lives as a result. This further violates my Constitutional rights to raise, teach and imprint on my children as I see fit.

The Court has manipulated testimony to support their agenda instead of accurately reporting the facts of the case. The Court has repeatedly ruled leveraging inaccurate information submitted by opposing party, siding with opposing party and unwillingness to entertain clarification to correct the record before forming an opinion. This is a violation of my **due process** rights to a fair and unbiased review.

As part of due process, they have failed to complete a proper evaluation to determine the fitness of the other parent that the children are estranged from. They have failed to interview the children

to determine their viewpoint – all because the Court and officials of the court have formed an **opinion**, therefore deciding only they can determine the best interests of the children.

As the primary caretaker of the children for their entire lives, alienation cannot be “diagnosed” merely because they didn’t like that I shared the who/what/where/why with the children as to what happened to their father and why we aren’t together. Never meant to be derogatory but the court officials specifically stated: “

” **(EXHIBIT E, pg 11, line 11)** “

’ **(Exhibit B, pg 13)** This is ONLY an opinion, an insulting one at that, to compartmentalize the intelligence limits of a child.

The court’s opinion nurtures selective and vindictive persecution, erasing and minimizing the years prior when I was responsible for taking care of Father during recovery from a ; taking him to doctor’s appointments and rehabilitation as they claim I have perpetrated the estrangement because I did not force Father to call the kids or force the kids to want to invite him to events. In addition to raising the children, it’s the court’s opinion that I should also be responsible for raising Father and anything less is seen as not supporting the relationship instead of holding Father accountable as a parent or an adult human being. “

**(Exhibit B, pg 13)** The court has failed to rely on facts, failed to acknowledge the history of the Father’s absence and failed to consider what is in the children’s best interests, not the interests of the court and has no business determining my compassion towards Father because I intend to ensure the safety of the children. There is no logical line that would bring you to that conclusion aside from the manifestation created by the Judge.

The medical evidence submitted in this case is/was clearly out of area of expertise for these officials, yet the Judge and court appointed professionals used the evidence to strengthen their agenda against Mother instead of ensuring they have sufficient understanding regarding the medical evidence presented against Father. There was heavy reliance on the fact that Father completed a program at called . This program only focuses on the ability to return to competitive employment. It does not provide support for living alone, co-parenting, finances or raising children. It also cannot provide an opinion on any of the above as none of there was no observation or assessment completed in any of those areas. **(Exhibit B, pg 12).**

In reviewing Father’s neuropsych examination conducted in **(Exhibit D)** with medical professionals in the field of recovery and supporting neurodivergent individuals the consensus is there is a lot of missing information needed to determine fitness of Father. As presented to the

**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.**