

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 24-306

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

January 17, 2025

The Complainant alleged a municipal court judge made biased rulings in a protective order case.

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 Roger D. Barton did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 17, 2025.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

2024-306

**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.

Please see attached



My name is \_\_\_\_\_, I am the defendant in this case and was discriminated against in the court in case# \_\_\_\_\_ because I am \_\_\_\_\_ and the Plaintiff was \_\_\_\_\_ who is married to \_\_\_\_\_.

For the following reasons:

- 1- I was not given the chance to have an interpreter or explanation about what is my role and how to ask or cross examine the plaintiff ( \_\_\_\_\_ ). The judge gave this option to the plaintiff and I was not given the same rights or explanation as was given to plaintiff as shown below.

**(03:04). Judge.**

?

**(03:08).**

**Judge (03:09).**

?

**(03:12).**

**(30:48).**

**Judge (30:50).**

**(30:59).**

**Judge (31:00).**

As shown above court did not offer the defendant interpreter and did not indicate that she can ask plaintiff later. As you see my response to the question is “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” I had lots of questions and was not given this chance later in the hearing

**(40:21).**

**Judge (40:27).**

**(40:29).**

**Judge (40:31).**

As shown above the judge took the decision on the case without allowing me to ask the plaintiff. So a case was opened against me and me as defendant was not allowed to ask.

- 2- The judge did not hear my side of the story even though the judge gave all the time to plaintiff, I tried to explain to the judge but was not heard or all evidence including videos to be taken and given as exhibit which one of these evidence is a video of a plaintiff in front of my house crossing in front of my car taking pictures of me and later plaintiff went to court complaining from me harassing her.

***Judge (01:00:53).***

***(01:01:57).***

***Judge. (01:02:05).***

***. (01:02:07).***

***Judge. (01:02:11).***

***. (01:02:16).***

As shown above I told the judge I was not heard, even the judge did not understand (hear Vs here). And I indicated that my evidence was not presented.

- 3- The judge did not want to listen to anything from what I was saying, in the petition that was served to me for this case stated that “ ” and I asked the judge what does it mean and the judge stopped me from even talking about it or explaining what the plaintiff mean by that. Also plaintiff talked about it in court but judge denied that they talked about it.

***Judge (29:49).***

***(30:07).***

***Judge (30:10).***

***(40:21).***

***6 (43:12).***

***Judge (43:14).***

**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.**