

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 24-435

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

February 28, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner did not follow the law in failing to direct the victim receive payments first, rather than the insurance company, in a juvenile 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 members Denise K. Aguilar and Joseph C. Kreamer did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 28, 2025.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

2024 - 435

**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.

Per arizona Statute 13-804 Section E..."If a victim has received only partial reimbursement for the victim's economic loss, the court shall order the defendant to pay restitution first to the victim and then to the entity that partially reimbursed the victim. "

This statute clearly states that the Victim is to be paid Restitution 1st prior to any Entity. Entity in this case being the Insurance company.

In Judge original sentencing, she made an agreement with the insurance company..WITH OUT the knowlege of the Victims.. for the Juvenile convicted and his parent, to make a one time payment FIRST to the insurance company ,

Knowing that the Juvenile / Parent could not make a one time payment, all payments moving forward have gone to the Insurance company and not the Victims.

When Judge was served with a motion to Clarify, Dated she was asked to make the 2 victims in the case a Priority to be paid first before the Insurance company.

Her amended motion Dated is for the Juvenile to pay a month starting

Judge did not even make mention of the Requested motion..To put the Victims Restitution First before the Insurance Company. As a result of her ammended Order, will continue to receive payments prior to the victims.

This clearly shows Favoritism in her prioritizing above the victims when there is an ARS Statue directing her to have the Victims Restitution paid first.

This begs to question, Does Judge in her personal life have as her choice of insurance company, Did Judge NOT understand the Motion to Clarify put before her? Does Judge NOT know of or understand ARS statute 13-0804 which also states that the Victims are to receive Restitution in a Timely manner.