

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 17-256

---

Judge:

Complainants:

---

**ORDER**

The complainants alleged a municipal court judge was rude and impatient and failed to follow the law in a protective order proceeding.

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).

Commission members Louis Frank Dominguez and Anna Mary Glaab did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: November 22, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie

Margaret H. Downie  
Executive Director

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

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

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

2017-256

**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.

- and the court staff did not inform us that the opposing party had legal representation until the moment before entering the court room. The court bailiff told us we should've been notified prior to the day of the hearing. We were placed at a significant disadvantage from the start, as people representing ourselves without an attorney.
- did not follow own guidelines, set at the beginning of the hearing, to allow both parties to discuss only the main topic at hand. The opposing party was allowed to freely discuss unrelated topics, while we were not given the same privilege. This was extremely unfair and unbalanced on part.
- After being told by the court bailiff on numerous occasions that our information would be allowed to be presented, would not allow it during the hearing. This is an example of "Failure to allow proper introduction of evidence allowed."
- did not allow the opportunity to speak, despite the court bailiff informing us otherwise prior to entering the hearing. was present at the hearing, which was the main prerequisite to allow him to speak. This was unfair and misleading.
- After promising that both parties would be given closing arguments, changed mind following a recess, and did not allow either party to present their closing arguments. failed to allow our closing argument to be heard. This occurred after the court bailiff interrupted during the hearing to say that the parties for the next hearing were waiting outside. The court bailiff asked if should move the parties to another room or place a stay on our current case. decided to take a five minute recess, which ended up turning into a fifteen minute recess. Throughout the hearing, seemed very rude and impatient.
- made assumptions about our presented information on numerous occasions, which is not position to take in any way. stated that heartfelt to his was , before saying that part of his letter was intentions have been clear for many years, to keep the safety and well-being of his and family as a top priority.
- The inability of to educate and inform about our situation has placed our family's safety in further jeopardy. didn't take the time to find out the true root of the problem, missing the opportunity to impact the lives of many.
- Following decision, told that he was not allowed to contact his in any way, despite not being involved in the case. has never been implicated in legal issues, which would eliminate any type of restrictions being placed against him. The request made by was unwarranted and is not legally binding.