

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 24-343

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The Complainant alleged a pro tem justice of the peace allowed a person who had once appeared in front of him in court to work for his business and reside in his apartment.

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 Commission approved sending the judge an advisory letter reminding him of the duty to avoid the appearance of impropriety under Rule 1.2 of the Code of Judicial Conduct. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Commission members Roger D. Barton and Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: April 2, 2025

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Christopher P. Staring

Hon. Christopher P. Staring  
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on April 2, 2025.

Comp

2024 - 343

Commission on Judicial Conduct  
1501 W. Washington St.  
Suite 229  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear

It has come to my attention that a *pro tempore* Justice of the Peace in the Justice Court in County has engaged in activities that could raise a doubt about his impartiality and may appear to be improper. As the County, Judicial Ethics Rule 2.15 (A) compels me to disclose this information to the Committee.

As I understand it, a criminal defendant appeared in front of Judge for an initial appearance. Later, Judge encountered the defendant by happenstance and inquired about her well-being. She informed him that she was looking for work and trying to remain law abiding.

In addition to being a pro tem judge, Judge and participates in other business ventures. He apparently told the defendant that he might have some work for her to do. He later contacted her and gave her some administrative jobs related to his other businesses.

Judge lives in He rented an apartment in due to the lengthy commute between the two towns. On occasion he would stay at the apartment to avoid making the commute. Judge allowed the defendant to use his apartment for the administrative tasks such as using the computer and printer.

Eventually, Judge allowed the defendant to occasionally stay at his apartment overnight. On more than one occasion the defendant stayed overnight in the apartment while Judge stayed in the apartment. Both the defendant and Judge deny that any type of sexual activity occurred and they slept in separate rooms.

The defendant began to stay at the apartment more frequently. Judge suspected the defendant was using illicit substances while he was not at the apartment. At some point the

defendant essentially “took over” the apartment and Judge                      stopped going there. The apartment management company notified the defendant that she was going to be evicted for violating the apartment complex’s policy regarding conducting illegal activities at the complex and she moved out.

My understanding is that the only time the defendant appeared before Judge                      was at the initial appearance hearing. If I can provide you with any additional information please do not hesitate to ask.

Sincerely,