

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-026

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

May 16, 2025

The Complainant alleged a magistrate made improper rulings in a protective order proceeding.

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 Denise K. Aguilar and Regina L. Nassen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 16, 2025.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2025-026

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.

THE JUDGE IN THIS CASE HAS ISSUED A INJUCTION FOR HARRASMENT IN THE WORK PLACE. THIS IS THE RESULT OF MEAN E MAILS I SENT TO THE PLAINTIFF IN THE CASE.

THESE E MAILS NEVER CONTAINED ANY THREATS OR ANY OTHER PROHIBITED SPEECH SUCH AS FIGHTING WORDS OR PORN OR ANY OF THE OTHER FORMS OF UN PROTECTED SPEECH.

MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE THREATENED BY NOTHING MORE THEN MEAN WORDS SENT TO THE PLAINTIFF. THE PLAINTIFF HAD THE OPTION AT ANY TIME TO BLOCK THESE EMAILS. THE PLAINTIFF IS HEAD OF A NOT FOR PROFIT CATERING TO NOMADS AND MARGINALIZED GROUPS. THE DEFENDANT WAS REMOVED FROM ZOOM MEETINGS THAT ADVERSLY AFFECT THE DEFENDANT.

AT NO TIME WAS THERE ANY INCIDENT OF PHYSICAL CONTACT, PHONE CONTACT, OR ANY OTHER FROMS OF CONTACT MINUS E MAIL.

SO THE JUDGES ACTION IN THIS CASE IS A BACK DOOR OR USURPATION OF MY BILL OF RIGHTS.

THERE IS NOTHING IN MY PAST TO GIVE THE JUDGE A REASON TO ISSUE THIS INJUNCTION.

SENDING EMAILS WITH INSULTS DOES NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF A SUSPENSION OF THE US CONSTITUTION, ESPECIALLY WITHOUT FORMAL CHARGE OR OPPORTUNITY TO DEFEND ONESELF.

MY ACTIONS DO NOT WARRANT THIS INJUCTION. ESP IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY DIRECT CONTACT OR THREATS OR ANYTHING OF THE SORT.

I HAVE ONLY BEEN A PARTICIPANT IN VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETINGS WITH REGARD TO THE PLAINTIFF. I HAVE NEVER MET THE PLAINTIFF, I HAVE NEVER PARTICIPATED PHYSCIALLY IN ANY OF THEIR ACTIVITIES. I HAVE NEVER BEEN A EMPLOYEE OR A FORMAL MEMBER OF HOWA.

SO CAN A WORKPLACE INJUCTION BE USED AGAINST A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WHO HAS NO DIRECT TIES TO THIS GROUP? SEEMS A MISUSE OF THE PROCESS OF WORKPLACE HARRASSMENT OR INJUNCTION. I AM NOT A EMPLOYEE OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT.

