

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 24-390

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

March 18, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge issued biased rulings in a child dependency 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 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 and Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 18, 2025.

The Commission
1501 W. Washington Street, Ste 229,
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Comp

2024-390

Re: Judge

Dear Commission:

My name is [redacted] a retired [redacted] and my husband [redacted] is a retired [redacted]. Together we own and operate a [redacted] and are licensed [redacted] with current [redacted] placements. We have been married for [redacted] years and have resided in [redacted] for [redacted] years. This complaint is being forwarded to you regarding the [redacted] Judicial Code of Ethic violations in relations to Judge [redacted]

[redacted] and [redacted] rights as parents were severed. There is a pending appeal. As the [redacted] of [redacted] and [redacted] of the children currently in out-of-home placements, the "[redacted]" denied us placement at the initial dependency hearing. After finding out a "[redacted]" letter was needed to file a grievance, we requested one in [redacted] years later. The "[redacted]" sent the denial letter with the allegation of harboring the children. At this point, we began the grievance process through level one and level two and the denial for visits and placement was "[redacted]". This announcement came along with an acknowledgement to begin transitioning the children and filing a [redacted]

Within a matter of a few days, the "[redacted]" switched gears and began assessing the [redacted] for placement. It should be noted, the [redacted] took placement of the [redacted] girls and refused placement for [redacted] and [redacted]. It also should be noted, she did not intervene throughout [redacted] foster care disruptions of [redacted] and [redacted]. Recently, [redacted] and [redacted] were returned to the first placement that initially disrupted them. This "[redacted]" disrupted the children at a court hearing for mental health concerns.

Not until the [redacted] family denial was "[redacted]" did the [redacted] decide to request the children for placement while insisting the children were fine with the current foster placement. After knowing all of these things at the [redacted] hearing for [redacted] [redacted] ludge [redacted] denied us [redacted] Judge [redacted] did not move the [redacted] from current placement and went on to set an adoption hearing date for [redacted]

Also at this hearing, the Assistant Attorney General (AAG), Guardian at-litem (GAL), and another Family Attorney continued to push their narrative of the harboring the children and and living with them. Additionally, letters were written by two of the three stating how we harbored them. We had an excellent relationship and spent lots of time with the . I am not sure what has changed or what was said to them or by them. But harboring was not possible because there was not an open case nor investigation during the time of the allegation. Their letters were logged in the court record without opposition.

Furthermore, the GAL testified as a matter of fact on the record that and currently reside with us. This statement was an intentional lie to tip the scale for a decision in their favor and for the Judge to accept hearsay without evidence or question. Despite Judge knowing the truth that the harboring allegations had already gone through three channels of investigations, first at a Meeting (), next through the , and finally through the the court still ignored these three agency decisions and accepted the intentional lies to mislead the court.

We also hired to petition the court with a Motion to Intervene for the family to have representation. Judge also denied this petition without an explanation. In this case, only the has a voice. The are forced to sit idly by while our name and character are slandered on court record without recourse. Despite the numerous statutes preferring, Grandparents for placement, how is it possible that the paternal family are not allowed a voice, visits, or placement for and with our grandchildren, while the Maternal grandmother enjoys all of her privileges.

A double standard and biases clearly exist for the Maternal family. Since the did not have representation, we were not able to contest their slander nor bring out the fact that the were coached into writing those letters. In one of the earlier hearings, one of them was asked if they knew the difference between the truth and a lie. quoted, “ ” The other was asked to read a letter being submitted to the court. did not write it nor could she read it because she is on an Furthermore, was a reactivated case from where the Maternal grandmother had all of the children in her care. During their stay, the call the hotline to report their grandmother for locking up in the closet regularly. had a days in her care. did nothing! We could not bring any of these things up, because we were being censured and not able to represent the children.

Judge partiality is blatant by allowing hearsay to prevail all while allowing the attorneys to push their agenda to ignore three agency decisions that overturn the “ ’ allegations of harboring:

1. Closed Investigation
2. Closed Investigation citing not enough evidence
3. denial overturned

has been in and life consistently for the past years. The Maternal mother has used to police her daughter’s life since she was years old. She reports to regularly

on [redacted] and now on the [redacted] Family. For the past [redacted] years, I have had a bird's eye view of watching and listening to court room attorneys speak off the cuff with unsubstantiated allegations, without hesitation. Hearsay, lies, and deception is my experience with [redacted]; clear and convincing evidence is not a requirement of the courts. E.g. The allegation of [redacted] and [redacted] living with us was perpetuated throughout this case by [redacted] and Court Attorneys to block placement. The evidence of the lies, deception, and misconduct can be found with the submission of [redacted] and [redacted] current lease agreement and last monthly payment along with copies of their prior utility bills from their previous residence. The [redacted] recently released a case study that put [redacted] on probation by the [redacted]. This report highlights [redacted] as #1 in the country for its fanatical drive to tear apart families. [redacted] reputation precedes them.

Judge [redacted] was recently [redacted]; her time ends in [redacted] with honor and dignity would be a nice way to finish strong. We are requesting that she would complete the [redacted] for [redacted] and [redacted] before her time ends. Or, I ask that she be disqualified for her bias, prejudice, personal knowledge of the facts, and misconduct for participating in a Censure of the [redacted] family or that she be censured from the bench.

I [redacted] attest that these statements are true to the best of my knowledge. After [redacted] years of " [redacted] delays and stall tactics, your immediate attention to this matter would be greatly appreciated. Feel free to reach out by contacting me at [redacted].

Respectfully Submitted,

ATTACHMENTS:
Motion to Intervene
Motion to Intervene Denied

Decline Letter
Overturned p.3
Lease agreement
Previous Residence
Water utility

Placement Notification

Caregiver's Full Name _____

Date _____

Address (No., Street) _____

City _____

State _____

ZIP _____

Dear _____

Mr/Mrs/Ms Caregiver's Last Name

Thank you for offering to provide a kinship foster home placement for:

Child(ren)'s Full name(s) _____

Your interest in the well-being of the child(ren) and your willingness to provide a home for the child(ren) are appreciated. _____ considers information received from various sources in assessing a potential kinship foster family. Factors the Department considers include any criminal or child abuse and neglect history for all adult household members, the child's individualized placement needs, and the family's ability to meet those needs.

After careful assessment and consideration, _____ will not be recommending to the _____ Court that the child(ren) be placed in your home for the following reason(s):

One or more adult members of your household did not clear the background check. Concerns about criminal background records cannot be addressed by _____ staff but must be directed to the _____ staff are not allowed to provide criminal records.

The child's overall placement needs cannot be met in your home.

Another kinship foster home has been selected.

Other: _____

Disqualifying Reason(s) _____

You have the right to have _____ review this decision. In order to have _____ review this decision, complete page 3 of this letter and mail it to the address shown on page 3.

If you do not understand this letter or would like to have further discussion about this recommendation or the review process, please call me at the telephone number below.

For additional information about placement and placement decision, please refer to the _____ website at _____

Keep in mind the _____ is responsible for making the final placement decision.

Sincerely,

Representative's Name

Title

Phone No.

Email

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Telephone:
Facsimile: (
Email: _____
Attorney for

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

In re the Matter of:

No.

MOTION TO INTERVENE

(Assigned to the Hon. .

(Persons under 18 years of age).

COMES NOW, (“ ”), by and

through undersigned counsel, requests that this Court grant her Motion for Intervention in order to fully represent the best interests of the children.

In deciding this motion, the Court need only address one issue: whether Paternal Grandmother can permissively intervene in this dependency case on behalf of her

**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.**