

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 24-437

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

February 28, 2025

The Complainant alleged a municipal court judge erroneously admitted evidence, was biased, and antisemitic in a harassment 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 Denise K. Aguilar 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

2024-437

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.

THIS COMPLAINT INVOLVES
THE COURT, ARIZONA

, THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE IN

WITNESSES INVOLVED IN THIS MATTER ARE THE FOLLOWING;
HEARING ;

1. , (DEFENDANT)
2. , (DEFENDANT SPOUSE)
3. , (PLAINTIFF)
4. , (PLAINTIFF)
5. ,
6. SECRETARY OF

WITNESS INVOLVED IN THIS MATTER ARE THE FOLLOWING;
HEARING;

1. . (PLAINTIFF PRO-SE)
- 2, . (PLAINTIFF SPOUSE)
3. . (DEFENDANT)
4. (DEFENDANT SPOUSE)

THIS COMPLAINT INVOLVES
COURT ARIZONA

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE IN THE

PLAINTIFF VS , **DEFENDANT,**

A Police Report that was false and was filed with Officer . A states the following; That approximately around called her employer, and spoke to her boss. According to , threatened to sue the business, and her boss during the phone call because she did not have the correct certifications for the job. advised she was worried because had a history of Mental Health issues (. (See Enclosure Police Report).

THE ABOVE REPORT IS COMPLETELY FALSE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING;

The Secretary who received the phone call from testified that never spoke to her boss, and furthermore, never threatened to sue the Company unless they fired . The phone call was made because has lied about being an Industrial Engineer, to , and others. Proving a significant character flaw. During a previous InJunction for Harassment (produced evidence that he has severe diagnosed by the Rheumatology Department at the . (See Enclosed copy of the actual Report). To further support the fact that has neither or underwent The Minnesota Multiphase Personality Inventory by Board Certified Neuro-Phychologist. The result clearly demonstrated that has no , and documented the absence of . This is a highly regarded test in Arizona in terms of forensic psychology. (See the enclosed test result). I also testified once again, about solely, having further testified that while I was walking, due to her Air Conditioning being on and windows rolled up, she could not here me. The Judge accepted this obviously

perjured testimony in proving harassment. This obviously negates Harassment, and actually proves _____ was in fact harassing me. The Defendant has filed with the _____ Police Dept, a false Report incident involving _____ . (See the enclosed document). This is in fact a First class Misdemeanor. This false Police Report was accepted into evidence by the Magistrate Judge.

PLAINTIFF VS.

DEFENDANT

AND

The actual Injunction per Paragraph (5) notes _____ is a danger. The Injunction states that the Video of me, will show use of profanities, being enraged, emotionally unstable, and in _____ private space. The actual Video (See transcript) shows none of the above. The false Police Report also states I'm a danger. This is stigmatizing of a disabled person, by a Judge who is both biased, and anti- semitic. This stigmatization is prohibited by **The Americans With Disabilities Act**. The motive for _____ filing an Injunction for Harassment is I discovered he had installed wrong sized door thus it cannot be closed. This was proved at the Hearing via Three reputable Door Companies. As a 100 % disabled person the necessity of hearing a fully functional door, is utmost necessity. It is a critical issue under the American with Disabilities Act.

THE FOLLOWING VIDEO EVIDENCE OBJECTIVELY NEGATES HARASSMENT

The _____ Video page 30 of the Initial Transcript;

_____ ; We no longer want to speak with you, please leave .

_____ ; We've been trying to help you over and over again, but you just insisted that it doesn't working.

_____ ; Stop, Stop. We're not to address them. They are not to address us. We are not to address them

_____ ; has the following exchange with _____ .

When _____ says, put it in writing— You're saying you only Recorded the last 30–21 Second ?

: Yeah , Thats correct.

; So what was he talking about when he talking about when he asked, put it in writing.

; I don't, I haven't the Slightest

; Okay, so you don't know what happened before the exchange between.

; Oh, I know what happened before because I was there and I witnesses some of it.

; So there was no conversation about what he's referring to as put it in writing?

; I'm not sure I understand, conversation who ?

; With . my apologies for using his first name, or you.

Do you have any idea why would say, put it in writing, at this point?

; Well, prior to that, you can hear my husband saying, we've adjust your door. you were happy with it so according to the Video, it would have to be because has said, they've adjusted the door.

; They were unhappy.

; They're -- You're making assumptions now they're talking about the door?

; Well it come right after he had said that, so one would assume that yes, because that was the sequence of the discussion. We can replay it again, if you want hear the first part.

THE JUDGES ORDER

About carefully reviewing Video evidence in determining harassment by the undersign, is patently **False**. Furthermore the Judge's statement about the undersigned behavior being annoying, alarming, is a pattern of discrimination, and stigmatization of severely physically disabled person by this Judge. This is violation of **The American's With Disabilities Act**. This same process was repeated in the case of

**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.**