

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 23-328

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

December 22, 2023

The Complainant alleged an appellate court judge engaged in ex parte communications and abused his authority.

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 members Roger D. Barton, Louis Frank Dominguez, and Regina L. Nassen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 22, 2023.

**From:**  
**To:** [Commission on Judicial Conduct](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Date:**  
**Attachments:** [IMG\\_5518.pdf](#)  
[IMG\\_5517.pdf](#)  
[IMG\\_B2BA148D4C62-1.pdf](#)

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Against

called to tell me that he was having a civil litigation problem. He and his wife had befriended their widow neighbor, and he said in exchange helping her before she died, she would refund them for their time and expense for . It was an oral agreement.

She died but her estate did not list the so he, not his wife, he filed, a mechanics lien against the estate. I asked him why a mechanics lien and he said because he told me " '.

After that, then " " showed up, they are the beneficiaries, and hired a lawyer. That lawyer wrote a letter demanding he rescind the lien, which he did not then.

Then and his wife avoided service on purpose because they noticed a process server on their home camera. And he figured it was related to the lien or his role in But he was avoiding service on purpose while the

He told me he had called two judges for help, one of the them being . I don't know who the other judge is. Anyway, told me said he could " " it for him and wanted to ask me what I thought. was very proud of his "friendship" with even emailing me that he had called him for a lunch date, which was a regular thing. That's why he kept dropping his name I guess

because of [redacted] obvious inferiority complex.

Anyway, I referred him to a friend to maybe call the other side's lawyer and clear up the "misunderstanding" because [redacted] claimed the [redacted] was all justified expenses he could prove with receipts. If so, my attorney friend could clear that up in no time and avoid [redacted] paying attorneys fees. See attached text messages from that day. I told him trying to use his judicial connections was IMO a mistake because in his position that was corrupt and he could be charged criminally.

[redacted] knew all this because [redacted] said he told him. But I suppose [redacted] thought since he was going to get the [redacted] to drop their complaint against me, I'd have my [redacted] and everything he told me was confidential. That is how obvious the [redacted] behavior against me was that he was so confident I would get my [redacted] he told me everything, even about [redacted] role. But that did not happen so here we are.

After the [redacted] Court ruled against me and [redacted] "missed" his meeting with [redacted] about me the very same day as the Court decision, I spoke with [redacted] again the next day while he said he was in [redacted]. He said he missed the meeting bc of [redacted] business but would follow up with [redacted] the following week.

After he spoke with [redacted] the following week, [redacted] told me he was dropping me because of what [redacted] told him. He implied [redacted] repeated his offer to "fix" his problem if [redacted] played ball regarding me and the [redacted]. After I asked [redacted] why the Court and [redacted] were hiding my decisions from public disclosure, he said [redacted] said it visibility as required. See attached text. In other words, [redacted] flat out lied to [redacted] about my the [redacted] Court

not publishing my decision as required by the Arizona constitution. The Court still has not published it to this day.

The compliant against \_\_\_\_\_ is:

First, lying to \_\_\_\_\_ that my decision is public.

Second, cronyism for \_\_\_\_\_ offer to "fix" \_\_\_\_\_ personal lawsuit behind the scenes, and in exchange drop his efforts against the \_\_\_\_\_ on my behalf.

Third, not reporting \_\_\_\_\_ for avoiding service, and knowing committing fraud on the public with his knowingly false mechanics lien. In fact, in his response to the plaintiffs request for attorneys fees, which the court granted for \_\_\_\_\_ against his wife because the \_\_\_\_\_ was hiding his role, \_\_\_\_\_ wrote the issue was simple and obvious. On a filing dated

:

"

Yes it was simple. \_\_\_\_\_ is a crook and so is \_\_\_\_\_. It is banana republic cronyism.

If you see the pleadings in that case, \_\_\_\_\_ name is not to be found. In fact the plaintiffs attorneys did not even know \_\_\_\_\_ was married, much less that she was married to the \_\_\_\_\_.

So the only way I would know about the lawsuit is because me all about it himself.



from the [redacted] Thank  
you. [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Thanks!

Very welcome [redacted] I  
just talked to him and  
gave him some back-  
ground He's super  
smart and honest which  
is too rare among  
lawyers



Text Message





[redacted] Court just emailed a bill for [redacted] for just trying to defend myself in case I ever try to get my [redacted]

Wow.

I am meeting with [redacted] on [redacted].

thank you for doing that for me Not enough for them to take my job but then send me a bill salt in the wound

Been there...



Text Message



**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.**