

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 24-413

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

February 20, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was unprofessional, restricted his right to be heard, and failed to consider evidence.

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).

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 20, 2025.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2024-413

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 attachment.

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

Good morning or afternoon:

I am filing this complaint against **Judge** , as she failed to do her duty of upholding the law on
 . **Judge** never once looked at any of the information that I had
 presented to her in court so that she could make a better decision on what she herself said, that she **Judge**
 shouldn't be making a decision on because " " as she put it. Yet she made a
 decision to charge me of a company that is co-owned by the plaintiff and myself the
 defendant . And if this was a civil matter her ruling lacked **Jurisdiction**. Never have I seen
 such unprofessionalism as **Judge** hurried the court hearing because the plaintiff
 failed to notify the court ahead of time that she needed an interpreter. And when the court found an
 interpreter after sitting and waiting there for 10 minutes, the interpreter they found only had 20 minutes before
 she had to leave. So **Judge** sped the court along as quickly as she could, failing to uphold the
 ethics of her job. Now because the interpreter only had 20 minutes, most of the time was spent listening to the
 plaintiff and the interpreter repeating the questions without letting me present any rebuttal to her statements.
 Therefore, if these issues had arisen in the interest of fairness and justice a continuance should have been
 ordered so she could have better look at the information I had submitted to the court. **Judge**
 would have better understood the situation, and would have seen that both and
 co-owned the business together. The judge in making a decision for a business that is co-owned
 would have to charge half of those to the co-owner also. She would've also seen
 and known that had overdrafted the business account by **Judge**
 would also have seen the text messages that were presented in court as to the reason why I
 had to leave my residence in . **Judge** would also have seen the emails and texts
 messages from the insurance agency reps stating to myself that I had to take over
 operations of the business since would not be able to transact any new business and that
 the agency would have to be where I was since I was the license holder. **Judge** would also have
 seen that the phone number that she wanted to give is now synonymous with
 because of years of business. **Judge** would also have seen that there are
 companies that are co-owned by and
 and . **Judge** would also have seen that hadn't lost
 any money, or was abandoned like she said perjuring herself in court. She even reprimanded me for moving to
 , as if I had a choice.

Thank you for your time and attention,
Sincerely,