

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 24-461

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

January 6, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner made factual errors in the decree and issued biased and erroneous rulings.

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, Colleen E. Concannon, and Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 6, 2026.

JUDGE

– JUDICIARY COMPLAINT

Judge _____ is bound by judicial conduct rules, specifically:

Canon 1: A judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

Canon 2: A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently.

In the matter _____, Judge _____ clearly lacked integrity, impartiality, fairness, and competence. The Judge issued a Divorce Decree that contains well over 50 statements that are factually incorrect, not in testimony, in testimony but contextually do not accurately represent testimony, and/or that are purely speculative statements. The Decree is highly biased and heavily favored the Husband. The decree does not promote confidence in the judiciary and clearly depicts Judge _____ as incompetent, lazy, lacks impartiality and fairness and intentionally disregarded or does not have the mental acuity to comprehend governing case law.

As a result of the Judges incompetence as shown in her positions within the Decree, I was forced file a Rule 83 and an appeal given the outcome of the Rule 83 concerning the Business Checking account that was opened/established during marriage and the level of spousal maintenance awarded to Husband – based on a spousal maintenance calculator that did not apply to my case. Additionally, the award improved Husband’s monthly after-tax income by 3x while Wife’s was reduced by 37%. Her actions have caused me financial and mental harm.

Given my experience with the Judge, I no longer have confidence in the judicial system. More importantly, I am highly concerned the Judge has acted similarly in other cases. I am confident a review of her cases would reveal she is consistently biased and prejudice against women. I urge the court to review her cases as should the review confirm Judge _____ is biased, she should be removed from her position.

1. The decree (page 5, line 17) gave Wife _____-days to remove Husband from the _____ mortgage obligation/note/deed of trust and Husband an additional _____-months after Wife removes Husband from the _____ deed and all financial obligation on the _____ property. The decree also contained tolling language. The Rule 83 Order removed the tolling

language, but the Judge remained steadfast in her biasedness by not addressing the disparity between the time allotted Husband verse Wife in removing the other from the deed of trust and financial obligation.

2. The judge was unable to comprehend the difference between a deed of trust (property rights) and a loan note (debt obligation) as evident by the decree ordering Wife to “

.”(Page 4, line 3). Note the decree states the loan note to is signed by Wife only (page 3, line 18). The Rule 83 order acknowledged Husband had no financial obligation on the home and required Husband to file a Quit Claim within five days of the order.

3. The judge accepted Husband’s AFI (his Exhibit 15) which any reasonable person, which a reasonable person would think would be a judge, would find inconceivable and clearly misleading, as stated after tax income reflects while expenses reflect , a mismatch of per month. Either income is grossly understated, or expense is grossly overstated, most likely both. The purpose of an affidavit of financial information is to show the court a complete picture of your financial situation/circumstances at the time that you sign the document. The filer presents to the court to the court under oath, which means the affiant is swearing to the truthfulness of the statement in the affidavit. Testimony reveals Husband’s affidavit did not reflect his actual financial circumstances, it’s not historical or even his reasonable expenses, but contains expenses to support Husband’s spousal maintenance request:

Husband’s testimony (page 205, line 13)

Q –

A –

Q –

A –

4. The confabulated AFI contains numerous business expenses as testified to by Husband as well as clear by description and/or clear by identification within the Decree. These total /month. The decree adopted is Husband’s form of order. Husband chose not to provide the court with a

corrected AFI as is customary. Husband's testimony can be found in the Transcript of Proceedings beginning on page 156, line 17.

Testimony: Husband testified that the AFI included the following business expenses, and they should not be on the AFI:

- Business telephone -
 - Business truck insurance -
 - Business truck oil & gas - *
- *Curiously this amount is exactly the amount Wife receives monthly for an automobile allowance.

TOTAL =

Other: Husband remained silent and/or no testimony, and/or description identifies intentions, and/or duplicate:

- Replace business truck -
The "vehicle" reference can be found as support for spousal maintenance award, page 27 of the decree, "
" and Wife's testimony, page 248, starting on line 20. Additionally, husband's AFI stated the had the brakes recently replaced and the car needed a new engine which had yet to be replaced, and the AFI contains /month in auto maintenance, testimony supports the same. The AFI amount for the new truck is plus another for insurance.
- Uniforms/special work cloths -
The AFI contains for uniforms/special work clothes which Husband was silent in testimony but clearly is a business expense.
- Pets -
The AFI lists pet expense of /month. Husband does not have pets, he was silent on this expense while Wife testified that she took the dogs not Husband, trial transcripts page 250, line 15.
- Onetime Property Tax Payment - month/ /year
The Judge failed to notice Husband asked for onetime property tax payment in two areas - one is on the equalization table, and one is within the AFI. The equalization table accurately listed the onetime property tax payment in the amount of (Husband's exhibit 6, trial transcripts page 121, line 16) while the AFI listed a month which is the amount Husband paid for the additional state income tax | /trial transcripts page 183, line 23 and Husband's exhibits 54-55). Husband perjured himself when he testified, he believed he should be reimbursed by Wife but he was not asking to be reimbursed. The judge ruled against Husband on this issue, Rule 83 corrected the equalization table, appeal should

correct this intentional manipulation of expenses on the AFI and the judge's oversight.

- Clothing/golf clothing - *

Any reasonable person would see this request for a monthly clothing spend as unreasonable and ridiculous. The fact the line item is asterisk is nothing more than an attempt to inflate expenses to obtain as much spousal maintenance as possible. Husband's testimony reflected he has never spent this much on clothing but he " ."

Trial transcripts page 158, line 1

Q -

A -

Q -

A -

Q -

A -

Q -

A -

5. For spousal maintenance, the judge did not rule on the merits of the case but used the spousal maintenance calculator that did not apply to this case because it was filed prior to implementation of the calculator. Not only did the judge state she considered the spousal maintenance calculator, but she also stated in the decree, "

" and the judge attached the calculator to the adopted form of order. The judge failed to use the merits of the case to determine the amount of spousal maintenance.

6. The Judge concluded Husband had no debt, was able to pay his monthly obligations, and the Judge ruled that Husband, " (Page 39, line 15), then the judge awarded Husband in spousal maintenance! The award is the exact amount requested by Husband even though he testified that numerous expenses on the AFI should not be on the AFI as they were business expenses. Additionally, it's obvious the judge did not rule on the merits of the case but relied on the Spousal

Maintenance Calculator as the spousal maintenance award exceeded the difference between the confabulated AFI's income () and expenses () = . Clearly, the Judge was heavily influenced by a tool that does not apply to the case, so much so, she failed to do simple math and conclude the ask by Husband exceeded his AFI net of which is overstated as noted above. The judge failed to comprehend very little changed financially for Husband from the marriage to the divorce. The values to each of what she noted to be the change in circumstances – medical insurance (), renters (), new truck (– business expense), and increased mortgage payment due to refinance which was subsequently removed from the decree in the Rule 83 order is less than

7. The award improves Husband's after-tax earnings by almost 3x while reduces Wife's after-tax earnings by 37%. The purpose of spousal maintenance is to provide a party with the necessary support to become self-sufficient not to change the standard of living of either spouse. The level of spousal maintenance awarded greatly improved Husband's standard of living and adversely changed Wife's.
8. The Judge stated in her Rule 83 order that an expired Fictitious Name Statement (Husband's Exhibit 34) was a factual document that evidenced when a business opened. The person who completes the fictitious name statement writes in the business opening date. **The Judge ignored Wife's Exhibit 35, the Business Checking Account signature card, an official bank record and factual proof that the Business Checking Account opened on , during the marriage and after Husband's disability, employment with , and unemployment,** which the Judge referred to as " . The business had no earnings during this so called " , " no profit, no tax returns were provided to evidence business was operating. In fact, Husband failed to provide any evidence as to when the business started. But Wife provided proof as to when the Business Checking account was opened. The account was opened during the marriage and the funds deposited into the account were predominately earnings from labor during the marriage – Husband provided no evidence to the contrary.
9. The Judge stated in her Rule 83 order that "

" . That's a bold statement given the account has been open for -years! The Decree, which is supported

**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.**