

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 24-501

Judge: Mark W. Reeves

Complainant: David M. Haws

ORDER

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge had multiple delayed rulings and falsely signed payroll certifications.

On November 14, 2024, attorneys representing a party in a civil litigation matter, Yuma County Superior Court case S1400CV202000272, filed a petition for special action (case number CV-24-0268-SA) with the Arizona Supreme Court complaining that Yuma County Superior Court judge Mark Wayne Reeves did not issue orders on a motion to dismiss and an application for attorney's fees within sixty days as required by law. In the petition for special action, the attorneys claimed that the orders were overdue by more than three years, and they avowed they made numerous requests for Judge Reeves to sign the orders. The attorneys further claimed that Judge Reeves had regularly signed and filed monthly payroll certifications avowing that he had no cause submitted to him for decision which remained pending and undetermined for sixty days or more from the date of submission for decision. On November 20, 2024, the Arizona Supreme Court issued an order dismissing the special action and instructing the attorneys to first seek relief from Judge Reeves and from the Arizona Court of Appeals before resorting to a special action before the Supreme Court.

Following the dismissal of the special action, Judge David M. Haws, Presiding Judge for Yuma County Superior Court, met with Judge Reeves regarding the overdue rulings, and Judge Reeves made those rulings. Judge Haws also investigated with court staff if there were other delayed rulings on Judge Reeves' caseload. This investigation ultimately identified sixty matters in which there might be overdue rulings and additional instances of inaccurate payroll certifications. Additionally, Yuma County Court Administration received several complaints from litigants regarding delayed rulings by Judge Reeves, and they worked with Judge Reeves' staff regarding calendaring matters and worked to resolve the litigants' complaints.

In his response, Judge Reeves noted some delays were related to staff issues. He generally denied delayed rulings in the other cases but admitted to delayed

rulings in CV202000272. Judge Reeves did note there were issues with the electronic case management system which impaired tracking. The Commission acknowledges problems with this system. However, the Commission is concerned that Judge Reeves, in his response, generally failed to acknowledge that the ultimate responsibility for calendar management rests with the judge in order to comply with the Code and other provisions of Arizona law.

The Commission found that Judge Reeves' conduct violated the following provisions of the Code of Judicial Conduct and Arizona law:

- Rule 1.1 which states, “A judge shall comply with the law, including the Code of Judicial Conduct.”
 - Rule 2.5(A) which states, “A judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently, and promptly.”
 - Article 2, Section 11 of the Arizona Constitution which states, “Justice in all cases shall be administered openly, and without unnecessary delay.”
 - Article 6, Section 21 of the Arizona Constitution which states, “Every matter submitted to a judge of the superior court for his decision shall be decided within sixty days from the date of submission thereof. The supreme court shall by rule provide for the speedy disposition of all matters not decided within such period.”
 - Rule 91(e), Arizona Rules of Supreme Court which states, “Every matter submitted for determination to a judge of the superior court for decision shall be determined and a ruling made not later than sixty days from submission thereof, in accordance with Section 21. Article VI of the Arizona Constitution. Each superior court clerk shall report to the Administrative Director of the Courts, in writing, on the last day of March, June, September and December, in each year, all matters in that court submitted for decision sixty days or more prior to the date of such report and remaining undecided on the date of the report. The report shall contain the title of each action or proceeding, the matter submitted, the judge to whom submitted, and the date of submission.”
 - A.R.S. §12-128.01 which states:
Receipt of salary by judges and commissioners; affidavit; pending and undetermined causes; violation; classification
- A. A superior court judge or commissioner shall not receive his salary unless such judge or commissioner either certifies that no cause before such judge

or commissioner remains pending and undetermined for sixty days after it has been submitted for decision or there is submitted by the chief justice of the Arizona supreme court a certification that such superior court judge or commissioner has had a physical disability during the preceding sixty days or that good and sufficient cause exists to excuse the application of this section to particularly identified litigation then pending.

- B. Any certification submitted by the chief justice pursuant to subsection A shall set forth in detail the nature and duration of the physical disability involved or the reason why subsection A should not apply to the specified pending litigation.
- C. Any person who issues or causes to be issued any check, warrant or payment to a judge or commissioner knowing that, pursuant to this section, such judge or commissioner should not receive his salary is guilty of a class 3 misdemeanor.

In determining the appropriate sanction, the Commission noted that it recently issued public reprimands to other judges for delayed rulings that resulted in the parties having to resort to filing a special action with the appellate courts in order to force a ruling to be made – Case Nos. 24-110 (Thorn) and 24-128 (Gentry). Additionally, the Commission noted that in Case No. 20-171 (Sears), the Commission publicly reprimanded a justice of the peace, in part, for untimely rulings, even though there was not clear and convincing evidence of a violation of the sixty-day rule. Rule 2.5(A) of the Code is broader than the statutory and constitutional provisions, as it covers all judicial matters, not just matters that have been “submitted for decision.” See Formal Ethics Advisory Opinion 06-02. While the Commission did not find clear and convincing evidence to support a sixty-day violation in the other 59 cases cited by Complainant, there is clear and convincing evidence of an overall violation of Rule 2.5(A) that Respondent has not performed his duties promptly and diligently, particularly when coupled with Respondent’s hands-off approach toward calendar management.

Accordingly, Judge Mark W. Reeves is hereby publicly reprimanded for the conduct described above and pursuant to Commission Rule 17(a). The record in this case, consisting of the complaint, the judicial officer’s response, and this order shall be made public as required by Commission Rule 9(a).

Commission members Roger D. Barton and Cathy Riggs did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: December 9, 2025

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Christopher P. Staring
Hon. Christopher P. Staring
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 9, 2025.

**SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF ARIZONA**

DAVID M. HAWS
Superior Court, Division Four
Presiding Judge

**YUMA COUNTY
YUMA, ARIZONA**

STEPHANIE GONZALEZ
Judicial Assistant
DIANA LUNA
Baiff

December 20, 2024

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

Comp
DEC 23 2024
2024-501

RE: Conduct Complaint Regarding Judge Mark Wayne Reeves

Members of the Commission:

On November 14, 2024, attorneys representing a party in a civil litigation matter, Yuma County Superior Court case S1400CV202000272, filed a petition for special action (case number CV-24-0268-SA) with the Arizona Supreme Court complaining that the judge in the case, Mark Wayne Reeves, did not file orders relating to a motion to dismiss or to an application for attorney's fees within sixty days as required by Ariz. Const. art. 6 section 21, and Ariz. R. Sup Ct. 91(e). Indeed, in the petition the attorneys claim that the orders were due for more than three years and they had made numerous requests for Judge Reeves to sign the orders. They further claim that Judge Reeves has regularly signed and filed monthly certifications avowing that he had no cause submitted to him for decision which remains pending and undetermined for sixty days or more from the date of submission for decision. Such a certification is required for a judge to be paid his salary. On November 20, 2024, the Supreme Court issued an order dismissing the special action and instructing the attorneys to first seek relief from Judge Reeves and from the Arizona Court of Appeals before resorting to a special action before the Supreme Court.

When I learned of this special action, I became concerned about the possibility that there may be other matters in which orders had been due sixty days or longer. On November 18, 2024, my Court Administrator, Kathy Schaben, and I met with Judge Reeves in my chambers to discuss the special action. I told Judge Reeves to review that special action and issue any past due orders as soon as possible. Judge Reeves has issued the requested orders in the special action.

During the same meeting, I also instructed Judge Reeves to work with our Judicial Case Manager to review his ongoing and recently completed cases to determine if there are any other late orders. I instructed him to self-report to the Chief Justice if he found any such situations. During the meeting I gave Judge Reeves a handwritten list of twelve cases, given to me by the Judicial Case Manager. The list included cases that she believed might involve orders due for more than sixty days. I instructed him to review the cases on the list, to file any orders that were due, and self-report to the Chief Justice any matters in which the order was due sixty days or longer.

I have continued to consult with the Judicial Case Manager about this issue. She advised that Judge Reeves has not reached out to her for assistance to review his ongoing or completed cases. To my

knowledge Judge Reeves has not reported any late orders to the Chief Justice. I gave the Judicial Case Manager instructions to review Judge Reeves' cases, pending and recently completed, to see if there are other cases in which orders have not been entered when due. She has provided me with such a list which I am attaching to this letter. The list includes approximately sixty cases. To my knowledge, Judge Reeves has not reported any of these late orders to the Chief Justice nor requested an extension of time to file any orders beyond the sixty- day limit. Also, to my knowledge, Judge Reeves has signed and filed monthly certifications avowing that "no cause has been submitted to me for decision which remains pending and undetermined for sixty days or more since the date of submission of decision." (A blank copy of the monthly certification is being attached to this letter).

Prior to the filing of the special action referenced above, court administration received several complaints from litigants with cases assigned to Judge Reeves. Many of these complaints related to alleged delays in matters being set for hearing or other orders being issued by Judge Reeves. These complaints were forwarded to Judge Reeves and his staff. His Judicial assistant was given additional training and supervision by the Judicial Staff Supervisor and efforts were taken by Court Administration to resolve these complaints to the satisfaction of the complaining litigants.

I am concerned that Judge Reeves' apparent pattern of delay in setting matters for hearing and issuing rulings and orders in his cases may implicate a violation of Rule 2.5 of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct. That Rule states: "A judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently, and promptly." Where a judge delays in setting hearings, issuing orders or other rulings he may be viewed as failing to perform judicial duties in a diligent, prompt manner.

To the extent that these delays occurred because of deficient performance of court staff I note that the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.12 imposes upon a judge, the responsibility to supervise and monitor the performance his or her of court staff.

As Presiding Judge for Yuma County, I feel it is my responsibility to bring these issues to the attention of the Commission. I have not done an exhaustive investigation into these matters. With the assistance of the Judicial Case Manager, I have done a review of the computer AJACS record of Judge Reeves' ongoing and recently completed matters. If I can be of further assistance to the Commission, please let me know.

Sincerely,



David M. Haws

Presiding Judge Yuma County Superior Court

MWR

CASE NUMBER	TYPE OF PENDING MOTION/PETITION FILED	PENDING MOTION/PETITION FILED ON:	JUDICIAL OFFICE ADDRESSED MATTER/SET IN FOR HEARING ON:	MATTER WAS RULED ON/ORDER WAS ISSUED ON:	DAYS PENDING
S1400DO202300664	MOT. TO RECONSIDER	1/9/24		12/5/2024	331 DAYS
S1400DO202400704	PET FOR OSC & RESP.	9/13/24	12/6/2024		84 DAYS
S1400DO202400705	RESPONSE	8/21/24			113 DAYS
S1400DO202400776	RESPONSE	9/9/24			94 DAYS
S1400DO202400814	RESP & MOT. FOR T.O.	9/23 and 9/27/24			80 and 76 DAYS
S1400DO202400838	MOT. FOR T.O.	9/12/24			91 DAYS
S1400DO202400885	RESPONSE	9/27/24			76 DAYS
S1400DO202000175	PET TO MOD.	6/13/24	10/15/2024		124 DAYS
S1400DO202200504	PET FOR OSC	6/24/24	10/15/2024		113 DAYS
S1400DO202000596	PET TO MOD.	7/8/24	10/15/2024		99 DAYS
S1400DO202100106	PET TO MOD.	7/26/24			139 DAYS
S1400DO201701655	PET TO MOD.	8/12/24	10/31/2024		80 DAYS
S1400DO202300159	PET TO MOD/PET TO MOD.	9/24 and 10/9/2024			70 and 64 DAYS
S1400DO201700376	PET TO ENF.	10/1/24			72 DAYS
S1400DO200900356	PET TO TERMINATE	10/2/24			71 DAYS
S1400DO201701614	PET TO ENF.	3/5/24		12/11/2024	281 DAYS
S1400DO202000536	PET TO MOD.	3/21/24	10/14/2024		207 DAYS
S1400DO201700311	PET TO MOD.	4/5/24	10/9/2024		187 DAYS
S1400DO201600726	RESPONSE/RESPONSE	4/22 and 5/15/2024	10/14/2024		175 and 152 DAYS
S1400DO202300765	PET TO MOD.	5/3/24	10/14/2024		157 DAYS
S1400DO202300966	PET TO MOD.	6/6/24			189 DAYS
S1400DO202400814	MOT. FOR T.O.	9/27/24			76 DAYS
S1400DO202400059	MOT. FOR T.O.	7/1/24	10/22/2024		113 DAYS
S1400DO202300714	MOTION FOR FINDINGS	7/25/24	10/24/2024		92 DAYS
S1400DO202301026	RESPONSE	12/1/23	12/10/2024		377 DAYS
S1400DO202000995	REQUEST FOR RMC	12/19/23	9/11/2024		267 DAYS
S1400DO202000904	MOT. TO AMEND	11/7/23	4/11/2024		156 DAYS
S1400DO202200235	PET TO ENF.	8/19/24	11/26/2024		99 DAYS
S1400DO200600575	MOT. FOR APPROVAL	6/19/24	12/3/2024		167 DAYS
S1400DO200501045	PET TO TERMINATE	7/12/24		12/9/2024	150 DAYS

S1400DO200901064	PET TO MOD.	7/23/24	10/4/2024			73 DAYS
S1400DO202300664	MOT. RECONSIDERATION	1/29/24		12/5/2024		321 DAYS
S1400GC202400071	PETITION	3/29/24		8/28/2024		152 DAYS
S1400PO202400704	P.O. UNDER ADV.	10/7/24		12/10/2024		64 DAYS
S1400GC202400043	PETITION	2/26/24		8/28/2024		184 DAYS
S1400DO202400125	MOTION	4/9/24		7/17/2024		99 DAYS
S1400DO202400054	REQUEST FOR RMC	3/27/24		7/16/2024		111 DAYS
S1400CV202100573	RESP. TO REQ. RECONSID.	1/27/23	8/21/2023			206 DAYS
S1400CV202000421	RESP. TO REQ FOR RULING	4/27/24	9/29/2023			155 DAYS

COMPLAINTS

S1400DO202300436	PET. TO SERVE BY PUB.	7/13/23		9/5/2023		74 DAYS
S400DO201600905	REPLY TO MOT.	6/21/23		10/12/2023		113 DAYS
S1400DO201101095	PET. TO ENF.	12/1/23	3/15/2024			105 DAYS
S1400P8202200199	MOTION	10/16/23		9/13/2024		333 DAYS
S1400P8201600193	PETITION	6/12/24		9/4/2024		84 DAYS
S1400P8201600169	PETITION	6/12/24		9/4/2024		84 DAYS
S1400DO202300913	RESPONSE	2/20/24	9/18/2024			211 DAYS
S1400GC202200173	PETITION	6/25/24	10/25/2024			122 DAYS
S1400CV202200461	REQ. JUDICIAL NOTICE	9/21/22	6/30/3023			282 DAYS
S1400CV202200461	REPLY MOTION FOR T.R.O.	8/26/22	6/19/2023			297 DAYS
S1400DO202200325	MOTION	5/31/22		NO RULING- CONS. DECREE 1/12/23		226 DAYS
S1400DO202200075	MOTIONS	8/19/22	12/1/2022			104 DAYS
S1400DO202200135	RESPONSE	3/17/22	9/13/2022			180 DAYS
S1400DO202200166	RESPONSE	3/28/22	10/10/2022			196 DAYS
S1400DO202200306	RESPONSE	5/25/22	10/12/2022			140 DAYS
S1400DO202101215	RESPONSE	12/29/21	9/8/2022			253 DAYS
S1400DO202101215	MTS	6/8/22	9/8/2022			92 DAYS
S1400DO202101254	RESPONSE	1/24/22		10/17/2022		266 DAYS
S1400DO202100874	RESPONSE	10/19/21		10/17/2022		363 DAYS
S1400DO202300314	RESPONSE & REQ.	4/20/23		7/19/2023		90 DAYS
S1400DO202200745	RESPONSE	8/12/22		12/5/2022		115 DAYS

YUMA COUNTY
Judicial Officer Certification

SUPERIOR COURT

Pursuant to provisions A.R.S. §12-128.01 or A.R.S. §11-424.02 as appropriate, I the undersigned Judicial Officer, certifies to the following designated matters, as of the effective date indicated below:

Section 1:

- No cause has been submitted to me for decision which remains pending and undetermined for sixty days or more since the date of submission of decision.

Section 2:

- The Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court has certified that I have been physically disabled during the preceding 60 days.

Section 3:

- The Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court has certified that good and sufficient cause exists to suspend the application of A. R. S. §12-128.01 in the following pending litigation (Identify by name and case number):

Except for the litigation identified above, no cause that has been submitted to me for decision remains pending and undetermined for sixty days or more since the date it was submitted for decision, and to the best of my knowledge, no such cause will be pending and undetermined on the dates my salary warrants or checks are issued prior to _____.

(Signature)

Name:

Effective Date:

Mark Wayne Reeves
Superior Court Judge, Div. One
Yuma County Superior Court
250 W. 2nd Street
Yuma, Arizona 85364

Resp (Reeves)

JUN 04 2025
2024-501

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

June 2, 2025

Dear Commission on Judicial Conduct:

I am responding to your April 15, 2025, letter advising me of Complaint Case No. 24-501 filed by Judge David M. Haws. Thank you for granting me an extension to respond. I must respectfully and vociferously disagree with the substance of Judge Haws' complaint. I truly believe that I have fulfilled my duties and responsibilities as a judge. In one specific civil case cited, I belatedly realized I had not forwarded to my judicial assistant an order denying attorney's fees in a complicated case. This one case was an anomaly and not a course of conduct for me. As for the other cases, the timelines do not reflect accurately the matters before the court because; in fact, many matters were continued at the request of the parties or the court set orders to show cause why the matters should not be dismissed.

I appreciate your understanding my background, training and experience as a lawyer and

Superior Court Judge. I served approximately 3.5 years with the Legal Defender's Office where I represented defendants charged with all classes of felonies. I filed many Motions in Limine, Motions to Suppress, Severance motions which a fair number of them were successful and I conducted a significant number of felony jury trials. The last one, I will never forget because there were 7 counts of aggravated assault against explorer scouts and there was a verdict of not guilty on all counts. Thereafter, I went to the Justice Department as an Assistant United States Attorney from late 2000 to January 2006. I was a designated OCDF attorney who worked on large drug cases where I was in charge of approximately 14 electronic intercept cases (wire taps), and I also was assigned Public Corruption cases, working on corrupt inspector cases at the San Luis Port of Entry. I worked with Joseph Caffari who was in charge of the DOJ/OIG Tucson Sector Investigative Division.

On January 3, 2006, was my first day as Superior Court Judge in Yuma County. I was appointed by Governor Napolitano. My first assignment was a criminal calendar and a limited amount of Probate cases. In the Summer of 2007, I was assigned a Criminal calendar along with a Civil calendar at the same time. Additionally, I presided over Adult Drug Court program from 2007-2012 while handling my Criminal and Civil calendars. I continued in that assignment where I presided over a litany of Criminal felony and Civil trials until May 2012, I went to Juvenile Court where I was Presiding Judge until December 2018.

In Juvenile Court, I handled Dependency, Termination of Parental Right cases, Delinquency and Adoption cases, the National Adoption Day was always a highlight. I also presided over a Juvenile Drug Court program. I was fortunate because along with the Director of Juvenile

Court, we created a new concept court entitled Successful Futures Court which was a life skills court on steroids where we helped students gain employment, gain access to areas of children's interests for future jobs. We had many lectures on how to rent an apartment, buy a car, obtain a student loan, while building the student's self-esteem. We took students to and worked with them at the local Food Bank and used the Juvenile Court kitchen to bring in chefs to teach and demonstrate cooking skills. We graduated students from Culinary Art schools as a result. In 2017, I was awarded the Terry Chandler Award which is given each year to someone who exhibited excellence in the area of Juvenile Justice, I was honored.

In December 2018, I was assigned a calendar of Guardianships/Conservatorships, Probate, Domestic and an overflow of Civil cases. Approximately 65% of my cases are pro per or self-represented litigants with varying level of skills, talents or familiarity with the court system. Many litigants do not follow the rules, file timely or understand how the system works. Many of their pleadings do not even reach the court until long after the pleadings are filed, and many do not file responses or replies on time and often their pleadings do not reach the judge in a timely or efficient fashion. Additionally, many litigants on which the Court ruled on a modification or establishment of legal decision making and/or parenting time will file two or three months after the issuance of the decree for modification of legal decision-making and/or parenting time, which is earlier than one year, unless the court finds that there is reason to believe that the child(ren)'s present environment seriously endangers the child(ren)'s physical, mental, moral or emotional health pursuant to ARS§ 25-411.

Self-represented litigants rarely appeal they, instead, complain because the Court did not find favorable to him or her.

The timelines indicated do not reflect accurately the matters before the court. In fact, many matters are continued at the request of the parties or the court sets orders to show cause why matters should not be dismissed. There is no measurement of when a judge actually receives a case in order to know upon when it should be ruled.

During the last 6 years on this assignment, I have presided over and completed approximately 450 divorce decrees, and countless more Petitions to Modify Legal Decision-Making, Parenting Time and Child Support Orders, in addition to Guardianship/Conservatorship, Probate, and Civil Cases.

In Probate cases, I have had many challenges to competency of the testator and a number of challenges for undue influence where the children or parties believe that their mom or dad's will has been overborne. Additionally, I have had many contested guardianships of adult where the ward's adult children have attempted to become the guardian over his or her parent, even though the ward is married.

Mainly in Domestic cases, principally divorces, Modification of Legal Decision Making, Parenting Time and/or Child Support, I take matters under advisement. I have a large white board on which I mark the date taken under advisement and fastidiously and carefully get my orders out before the 60 days run. I regularly come to the office two Sundays a month to work on these cases for 5 or 6 hours to ensure I create not only a good work product but a

timely one as well. I take my job and responsibilities seriously and am not a flippant person. I am not dilatory regarding my responsibilities. I steadfastly and assiduously work on these cases on a daily basis.

In pro se cases there is not nor never has been a timeline when the case actually reaches us that one can draw a definitive demarcation point and when it does, the judge does not simply rule within 60 days or take action for a myriad of reasons, including continuances requested and unrequested; for example, parties attending mediation before coming back to court for parenting time and legal decision-making determinations, parties failing to appear at the scheduled hearing, requesting more time to file a response or reply as an example. This process of counting time is much more of an art than a precise science.

Judge Haws was concerned that I have failed to self-report in that I have been negligent in failing to file or take action within 60 days after matters have been filed with the Court. Judge Haws informed me verbally that there were complaints about matters pending; however, I never received any complaints directly from pro per litigants or from counsel. I received from the Commission and from Judge Haws a list of matters entitled "MWR" and on the second page "Complaints". Attached are my responses to each matter listed. In that regard, I have not failed to file or respond accordingly to any of these allegations.

When Judge Haws handed me the cases to review, I went through them carefully with my Judicial Assistant and found nothing that was improper or that I was dilatory in my actions. Attached, are the cases provided to me by the Commission which I have reviewed, Exhibit 1.

Also, attached are my explanations of the matters marked "MWR/Complaints", Exhibit 2. There are reasonable explanations for each entry. I have not failed my duties to act as required.

A common situation that arose, for example, the Court made a final Parenting Time Order. Thereafter, the Court set a date for an evidentiary hearing on a Motion to Alter or Amend Ruling or Judgment filed by Respondent, a Petition to Modify Child Support filed by Petitioner, and a Post Decree Petition to Modify Parenting Time. Before that matter could be heard the Petitioner filed: a Motion for Attorney's Fees (litigant not represented by counsel), a Motion for Protective Order filed by Petitioner, a Motion to Compel, a Motion for Temporary Modification of Parenting Time; an Amended Motion to Temporary Orders; Request for Expedited Hearing and Petition to Strike Respondent's Motion. All of these were filed before the Court could get to an evidentiary hearing to hear the matters set. I give an example where the Court made orders and pro se litigants continue to file pleadings not allowed under the rules because such pleadings are untimely filed or the matter has already been decided and no appeal is taken; instead, the course of action is to continue to file pleadings if the litigant disagrees with the findings.

In addition, to taking action within 60 days, when I take a case under advisement, I write the case number, parties' names, type of case and the matter taken under advisement on a white board in my chambers. My Judicial Assistant writes the same information in her book and has a date which the under advisement is due, with the exception of the one Order

Denying Attorney's Fees referenced in this entire matter, I have not missed an under advisement.

Attached, is a Quarterly Under Advisement Report (Exhibit 3) issued showing matters under advisement which plainly shows Judge Johnson and Judge Gonzalez have matters under advisement for more than six or eight hundred days and Judge Sorenson 148 days and Judge Reeves 86 days. The calculating of days is incorrect and inaccurate. None of these judges are out of compliance or derelict in their duties. The reporting systems do not accurately reflect continuances for a host of reasons and other reasons why the numbers are skewed, and the time continues to run even after a matter has been resolved. In fact, I believe that we are fortunate in Yuma to have a hard-working, dedicated bench.

I will illustrate a common occurrence, In the Matter of JAIME BARAJAS MORA, Petitioner and MARYAM ZEYNALOVA, Respondent in DO202401136, the Quarterly Report asserts that I am 86 days past due. I apologize for taking the Commission down the proverbial rabbit hole, but I want to show what actually happened. On February 11, 2025, I took Temporary Orders under advisement. On February 13, 2025, I issued an order for the under advisement on February 11, 2025. Then on May 7, 2025, the Court held an Establishment of Legal Decision Making, Parenting Time and Child Support hearing at the conclusion of which the Court took that matter under advisement. On May 16, 2025, the Court issued a final order in that matter for Joint Legal Decision-Making, Parenting Time and Child Support which ended or concluded the matter as a final matter. At no time during this case was I 86 days past due in my ruling; in fact, there was not one, single, solitary day that I was past due.

This is emblematic what occurs time and time again.

If one has never or at least seldom presided over a predominantly family law calendar, just looking at numbers does not begin to tell the tale of the tape. One has to forensically do a deep dive into each case before concluding that something is amiss rather than only looking at indiscriminate days or numbers.

In DBT Yuma, L.L.C., and Arizona limited liability company, et al, Plaintiffs/counterdefendant, v. Yuma County Airport Authority (YCAA), Defendants/counterclaimant in CV201001309, YCAA elected to dismiss the case predicated on the effect of Specialty Companies Group, LLC v. Meritage Homes of Arizona Inc., 251 Ariz. 365 (2021) "2021 Specialty Decision" which was filed on August 5, 2021, holding which allowed alter ego matters be brought as an action in contract, not judgment and believed the same statute of limitations might apply to the Motion in Aid of Judgment. Because of the mercurial nature and procedural aspects of this case, the Court declined to award attorney's fees holding which allowed alter ego matters to be brought as an action in contract, not judgment and believed that the same statute of limitations might apply to the Motion in Aid or Judgment. This Court denied DBT's application of Attorney's Fees and attendant costs.

In CV202000272, Yuma County Airport Authority (YCAA), Plaintiff v. DBRT Yuma FBO, et al Defendants where the parties had agreed in open court to dismiss both CV202000272 and CV201001309 and application for Attorney's Fees were sought in each matter.

The application of Attorney's Fees in CV201001309 involved the same issues for the fee application in CV202000272.

The Court denied Attorney's Fees in CV201001309 and believed that it had filed the denial in CV202000272 predicated on the same issues present in CV2021001309. The Court uses a share drive with my Judicial Assistant; however, the order was never filed. I prepared the order and thought I sent it to my Judicial Assistant, but I evidently failed to forward it to my Judicial Assistant. This was anomalous conduct, not a regular course of action. I filed by Judgment in this case on November 25, 2024, when I realized that the Judgment had not been filed.

I do not admit that I have failed to self-report because I have not failed to fulfill my duties and responsibility as a judge; therefore, there is nothing to self-report. I remain steadfast and unwavering that I have consistently followed the policies, procedures with which I am entrusted, in fact, I work industriously to address all matters before me.

I have compassion for others and a surfeit of patience, fortunately. The Court understands in domestic cases, especially, this may be the most difficult time in the litigants' lives. Life is mercurial in nature, for one does not live his or her life as one continuance stint; rather, one lives his or her life in chapters. I am involved in many persons' lives where they have reached a crossroads of ending a relationship, closing one chapter, while balancing parenthood and attempting to strike a delicate balance with his or her former partner or spouse in co-parenting, opening a new one. This current assignment is the most daunting of my career as a judge, but I inexorably believe that because of my experience in Juvenile Court,

that background and experience has made me a better judge in this current arena.

In addition to my judicial duties, I have taught Ethics in Phoenix and Yuma during the last 15 years often times with Patricia Sallen. I have also co-taught Criminal Trial Advocacy at ASU Law School by zoom with Kevin Rapp, Assistant U.S. Attorney who was my supervisor when I was with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

Recently, I determined through with the assistance of a State Representative when I would reach my 20 years as Superior Court Judge. I was told that I would reach my 20 years as a judge on July 13, 2026. Armed with that information, I am planning on retiring on July 31, 2026, after 20 years on the bench.

During my last 19 years as, Superior Court Judge I am proud to act with integrity, alacrity, giving litigants the opportunity to seek justice. In Court I use one term frequently; that is, what we are seeking is fairness. I have dedicated myself during the last 28 years as a lawyer and a judge to administering fairness, engendering respect and promoting justice.

I offer to respond to any additional questions from the Commission, and I request based on the foregoing that the complaint be dismissed.


Note – The Superior Court of Yuma County has no system in place that indicates dates/times as when a case is given to an assigned Judge for review. Staff for the division is usually made aware of a case when a litigant calls requesting information, if they are representing themselves, Pro Per status; most times no copies are given to assigned Judges.

Another way of notification is by other staff indicating a case is pending review, usually when they receive calls or emails of someone inquiring. The only information on e-bench is when the attorneys upload an Order for a Judge's review; unrepresented litigants do not enter orders in e-bench. Only just recently the Clerk's Office department has designated specific personnel to start emailing pleadings to judicial staff as they are clocked in, but not all departments do this.

There is a long-time lapse before the case management department sends notices to divisions for signature of orders that cases will be dismissed if no further action is taken.

Some of these cases require the litigants to move this case forward and not the assigned judge, as noted by cases above. Cases with IV-D matters are assigned to other Judge's other than the IV-D Judge, which causes confusion regarding where the case needs to be sent for review. The time is running (pending days) on the original judge assigned and not the IV-D judge. The original judge has no ability to control what the IV-D judge does or when the case is heard. Hence, the clock continues to run.

Respectfully yours,



Mark Wayne Reeves
Superior Court Judge

EXHIBIT I

MWR

CASE NUMBER	TYPE OF PENDING MOTION/PETITION FILED	PENDING MOTION/PETITION FILED ON:	JUDICIAL OFFICE ADDRESSED MATTER/SET IN FOR HEARING ON:	MATTER WAS RULED ON/ORDER WAS ISSUED ON:	DAYS PENDING
S1400DO202300664	MOT. TO RECONSIDER	1/9/24		12/5/2024	331 DAYS
S1400DO202400704	PET FOR OSC & RESP.	9/13/24	12/6/2024		84 DAYS
S1400DO202400705	RESPONSE	8/21/24			113 DAYS
S1400DO202400776	RESPONSE	9/9/24			94 DAYS
S1400DO202400814	RESP & MOT. FOR T.O.	9/23 and 9/27/24			80 and 76 DAYS
S1400DO202400838	MOT. FOR T.O.	9/12/24			91 DAYS
S1400DO202400885	RESPONSE	9/27/24			76 DAYS
S1400DO202000175	PET TO MOD.	6/13/24	10/15/2024		124 DAYS
S1400DO202200504	PET FOR OSC	6/24/24	10/15/2024		113 DAYS
S1400DO202000596	PET TO MOD.	7/8/24	10/15/2024		99 DAYS
S1400DO202100106	PET TO MOD.	7/26/24			139 DAYS
S1400DO201701655	PET TO MOD.	8/12/24	10/31/2024		80 DAYS
S1400DO202300159	PET TO MOD/PET TO MOD	9/24 and 10/9/2024			70 and 64 DAYS
S1400DO201700376	PET TO ENF.	10/1/24			72 DAYS
S1400DO200900356	PET TO TERMINATE	10/2/24			71 DAYS
S1400DO201701614	PET TO ENF.	3/5/24		12/11/2024	281 DAYS
S1400DO202000536	PET TO MOD.	3/21/24	10/14/2024		207 DAYS
S1400DO201700311	PET TO MOD.	4/5/24	10/9/2024		187 DAYS
S1400DO201600726	RESPONSE/RESPONSE	4/22 and 5/15/2024	10/14/2024		175 and 152 DAYS
S1400DO202300765	PET TO MOD.	5/3/24	10/14/2024		157 DAYS
S1400DO202300966	PET TO MOD.	6/6/24			189 DAYS
S1400DO202400814	MOT. FOR T.O.	9/27/24			76 DAYS
S1400DO202400059	MOT. FOR T.O.	7/1/24	10/22/2024		113 DAYS
S1400DO202300714	MOTION FOR FINDINGS	7/25/24	10/24/2024		92 DAYS
S1400DO202301026	RESPONSE	12/1/23	12/10/2024		377 DAYS
S1400DO202000995	REQUEST FOR RMC	12/19/23	9/11/2024		267 DAYS
S1400DO202000904	MOT. TO AMEND	11/7/23	4/11/2024		156 DAYS
S1400DO202200235	PET TO ENF.	8/19/24	11/26/2024		99 DAYS
S1400DO200600575	MOT. FOR APPROVAL	6/19/24	12/3/2024		167 DAYS
S1400DO200501045	PET TO TERMINATE	7/12/24		12/9/2024	150 DAYS

S1400DO200901064	PET TO MOD.	7/23/24	10/4/2024		73 DAYS
S1400DO202300664	MOT. RECONSIDERATION	1/29/24		12/5/2024	321 DAYS
S1400GC202400071	PETITION	3/29/24		8/28/2024	152 DAYS
S1400PO202400704	P.O. UNDER ADV.	10/7/24		12/10/2024	64 DAYS
S1400GC202400043	PETITION	2/26/24		8/28/2024	184 DAYS
S1400DO202400125	MOTION	4/9/24		7/17/2024	99 DAYS
S1400DO202400054	REQUEST FOR RMC	3/27/24		7/16/2024	111 DAYS
S1400CV202100573	RESP. TO REQ. RECONSID.	1/27/23	8/21/2023		206 DAYS
S1400CV202000421	RESP. TO REQ FOR RULING	4/27/24	9/29/2023		155 DAYS

COMPLAINTS

S1400DO202300436	PET. TO SERVE BY PUB.	7/13/23		9/5/2023	74 DAYS
S400DO201600905	REPLY TO MOT.	6/21/23		10/12/2023	113 DAYS
S1400DO201101095	PET. TO ENF.	12/1/23	3/15/2024		105 DAYS
S1400PB202200199	MOTION	10/16/23		9/13/2024	333 DAYS
S1400PB201600193	PETITION	6/12/24		9/4/2024	84 DAYS
S1400PB201600169	PETITION	6/12/24		9/4/2024	84 DAYS
S1400DO202300913	RESPONSE	2/20/24	9/18/2024		211 DAYS
S1400GC202200173	PETITION	6/25/24	10/25/2024		122 DAYS
S1400CV202200461	REQ. JUDICIAL NOTICE	9/21/22	6/30/3023		282 DAYS
S1400CV202200461	REPLY MOTION FOR T.R.O.	8/26/22	6/19/2023		297 DAYS
S1400DO202200325	MOTION	5/31/22		NO RULING- CONS. DECREE 1/12/23	226 DAYS
S1400DO202200075	MOTIONS	8/19/22	12/1/2022		104 DAYS
S1400DO202200135	RESPONSE	3/17/22	9/13/2022		180 DAYS
S1400DO202200166	RESPONSE	3/28/22	10/10/2022		196 DAYS
S1400DO202200306	RESPONSE	5/25/22	10/12/2022		140 DAYS
S1400DO202101215	RESPONSE	12/29/21	9/8/2022		253 DAYS
S1400DO202101215	MTS	6/8/22	9/8/2022		92 DAYS
S1400DO202101254	RESPONSE	1/24/22		10/17/2022	266 DAYS
S1400DO202100874	RESPONSE	10/19/21		10/17/2022	363 DAYS
S1400DO202300314	RESPONSE & REQ.	4/20/23		7/19/2023	90 DAYS
S1400DO202200745	RESPONSE	8/12/22		12/5/2022	115 DAYS

YUMA COUNTY
Judicial Officer Certification

SUPERIOR COURT

Pursuant to provisions A.R.S. §12-128.01 or A.R.S. §11-424.02 as appropriate, I the undersigned Judicial Officer, certifies to the following designated matters, as of the effective date indicated below:

Section 1:

- No cause has been submitted to me for decision which remains pending and undetermined for sixty days or more since the date of submission of decision.

Section 2:

- The Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court has certified that I have been physically disabled during the preceding 60 days.

Section 3:

- The Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court has certified that good and sufficient cause exists to suspend the application of A. R. S. §12-128.01 in the following pending litigation (Identify by name and case number):

Except for the litigation identified above, no cause that has been submitted to me for decision remains pending and undetermined for sixty days or more since the date it was submitted for decision, and to the best of my knowledge, no such cause will be pending and undetermined on the dates my salary warrants or checks are issued prior to _____.

(Signature)

Name:
Effective Date:

CAPTIONED AS (MWR)

1. DO202300664 – Does not give a specific time when we received in office

2023 case has various motions and orders

1/5/24 Under Advisement Ruling

1/19/24 Mot. To Reconsider filed.

*Nothing happened during this time frame (almost a year), there is nothing noted that this division received the Motion to Reconsider. Nothing noting contact was made with parties and no case notes. Case management did not take any action.

12/5/24 Order of denial regarding Motion to Reconsider issued.

12/5/24 Case closed

DO202400704 – Does not give specific time when we received in office

9/13/24 Pet. for Order to Show Cause Re: Jurisdiction filed.

9/13/24 Response to Dissolution of Marriage filed.

*No Motion to Set filed - Procedurally no action is taken until the parties file a Motion to Set. or until case management issues a notice of dismissal.

12/06/24 Order issued regarding Jurisdiction

2/5/25 Hearing held

4/17/25 Court Trial held

Currently pending, UA due 06/16/25

2. DO202400705 – Does not give specific time when we received in office.

7/31/24 Pet. for Dissolution filed

8/21/24 Response filed

*Procedurally no action is taken until the parties file a Motion to Set or until case management issues a notice of dismissal.

2/4/25 Motion to Set filed

3/20/25 Trial Setting Order filed

Currently pending -Court Trial hearing 06/11/25 at 10:30 a.m.

3. DO202400776 – Does not give specific time when we received in office

8/20/24 Pet. to Establish filed

9/09/24 Response filed

1/10/25 Order filed advising matter will be dismissed if parties do not move this case forward, No action will be taken until the parties file a Motion to Set.

1/27/25 Motion to Set filed

4/01/25 Mediation Order filed

4/01/25 Trial Setting Order filed

Currently pending – Court Trial hearing 07/09/25 at 1:30 p.m.

4. DO202400814 – Case began as Pro Per parties, does not give specific time when we received in office.

Establish Legal Decision Making, Parenting Time and Child Support

Pet. to Establish filed on 08/30/24

Response 09/23/24

Mot. For Temp Orders filed on 09/27/24

Notice of Hearing for Temp Orders filed on 12/16/24 – Hearing 01/28/25 at 1:30 p.m.

Mediation Order filed on 12/16/24

Notice of Appearance filed by Attorney Clifford Levenson (Respondent) filed on 01/27/25

Notice of Scheduling Conflict of 1/28/25 hearing, filed by Attorney Levenson on 1/27/25

1/28/25 Temp Orders hearing held, set for Court Trial for 3/5/25 at 1:30 p.m.

Mot. to Continue Court Trial filed on 02/26/25 by Attorney Levenson

Order Setting RMC instead of Court Trial filed on 2/28/25

RMC held on 3/5/25, scheduled Court Trial for 5/6/25 at 1:30 p.m.

Motion for In Camera Interview of Child filed by Petitioner, Pro Per – waiting on Response.

Currently pending Court Trial on 5/6/25 at 1:30 p.m.

5. DO202400838 – Dissolution of Marriage – P/Atty. Janet Metcalf – R/Pro per

This case was originally assigned to Hon. Eliza Johnson

Pet. for Dissolution of Marriage filed on 9/6/24 by Janet Metcalf

Motion for Temporary Orders filed on 9/6/24 by Janet Metcalf

Order to Appear issued by Judge Johnson for hearing on Temp Orders filed on 9/9/24

*Reassignment from Judge Johnson to Judge Reeves on 9/12/24

*JA spoke to Janet Metcalf's Office to reset this matter to another date on 9/24/24, they advised there are two pending cases with the same parties, DO202400826 which opened on 9/5/24 and DO202400838 which opened on 9/6/24, at which time they advised they did not want this matter set in because they wanted to proceed with case number DO202400826, they advised they would let this case go inactive and be dismissed procedurally.

Order placing case on Dismissal calendar filed on 12/19/24

Order dismissing case filed on 2/24/25

Case closed 2/24/25

6. DO202400885 Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties/Pro Per.

Dissolution of Marriage

Pet. Dissolution of Marriage filed on 9/19/24

Response filed on 9/27/24

*No Motion to Set was filed, no action taken until a Motion to Set is filed, there is nothing prompting Judge to move this case forward.

Order placing on dismissal calendar 1/28/25

The parties submitted a Consent Decree which was signed by Judge Reeves on 2/6/25 and filed on 2/7/25

Case Closed 2/7/25

7. DO202000175 Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties/Pro Per.

Pet to Mod LDM, PT, CS filed 6/13/24

Order to Appear filed 10/15/24 setting for hearing on 1/29/25

Response filed 1/28/25

Hearing held on 1/29/25 at 9:00 a.m. and continued to 4/9/25 at 3:30 p.m.

Case Closed 4/9/25 – signed minute entry

8. DO202200504 Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties/Pro Per.

Pet for Order to Show Cause Re: LDM, PT and Income Tax Deductions filed on 6/24/24

Order to Appear filed on 10/15/24, hearing set for 1/9/25

Motion to Continued filed by Respondent on 12/27/24

1/9/25 hearing held at which time, the court granted a continuance to 3/11/25

Order to Appear filed on 1/9/25, setting for hearing on 3/11/25

Hearing held on 3/11/25, signed minute entry 3/19/25

Case closed 3/19/25

9. DO202000596 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties/Pro Per.

Pet to Mod LDM, PT and CS filed on 7/8/24

Mot. for Temporary Orders Without Notice filed on 7/8/24 – brought up same day as an emergency, at which time 7/8/24 an Order was filed denying the request.

Mot. for Temporary Orders Without Notice filed on 7/19/24 – brought up same day as an emergency, at which time 7/19/24 an Order was filed denying the request.

Order to Appear was filed on 10/15/24 setting this matter for hearing on underlying Petition to Modify LDM, PT and CS, set for hearing on 1/22/25.

Hearing held on 1/22/25 no Affidavit of Service upon Respondent was received, he was not present, this matter continued to 3/20/25.

An Order to Appear filed on 1/22/25 setting this matter for hearing on 3/20/25

On 3/20/25 hearing held, signed minute entry 3/28/25

Case closed 3/28/25

10. DO202100106 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties/Pro Per.

Pet. to Mod LDM, PT and CS filed on 7/26/24

Order to Appear filed on 12/16/24 set for hearing on 1/7/25

Notice of Appearance and Notice of Change of Judge filed by Pedro Santana on 1/3/25

*Order transferring to Judge Johnson filed on 1/7/25, hearing vacated

Currently assigned to Judge Johnson

11. DO201701655 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties/Pro Per.

Pet to Modify Support filed on 8/12/24

Pet for Protected Address filed on 8/12/24

Order granting Protected Address filed on 8/26/24

Order to Appear setting for hearing for 2/26/25, filed on 10/31/24

2/26/25 hearing held, child support order filed on 2/26/25

Case Closed 2/26/25

12. DO202300159 -Does not give specific time when we received in office, P-P.Santana/R-PP

This matter was assigned to Judge Johnson during the time the Petitions below are referenced:

Pet to Modify LDM, PT and CS filed on 9/24/24

Motion for Temporary Orders Without Notice filed on 9/24/24

Pet to Modify PT and CS and Unadjudicated Assets filed on 10/9/24

Reassignment of case to Judge Reeves on 10/16/24

Notice of Appearance by attorney, Pedro Santana filed on 11/9/24

Notice of Objection to Mediated Agreement filed on 1/16/25

Trial Setting Order setting matter for Trial for 3/20/25, filed on 1/17/25

Stipulation to Continue Trial filed on 1/17/25

Matter Pending -Court Trial scheduled for 6/12/25

13. DO201700376 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, P-PP/R-PP

Pet to Enforce filed on 10/1/24

Judgment Order filed on 1/6/25

Case Closed 1/6/25

14. DO200900356 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, P-PP/R-PP

Petition to Terminate CS (IV-D matter) filed on 10/02/24

*This matter is a IV-D case, which should have gone to Judge Johnson for review not to Judge Reeves, no orders were entered by Judge Johnson and no hearing date was set as of 1/29/25.

Judge Reeves issued an Order referring this matter to Judge Johnson for review, filed on 1/29/25 in order to stop accumulating (days pending) for Judge Reeves.

15. DO201701614 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, P-PP/R-PP

Order of Under Advisement filed on 2/8/24

Pet to Enforce PT and Visitation filed on 3/5/24

Certificate of Service filed on 4/5/24

Pet to Modify LDM, PT and CS filed on 10/4/24

Motion for Temporary Orders With Notice filed on 10/4/24

Order to Appear for hearing on 11/01/24 filed on 10/9/24

11/01/24 Hearing held

Order of Under Advisement filed on 12/11/24

Case Closed 12/11/24

16. DO202000536 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, P-PP/R-PP

Pet to Mod LDM, PT and CS filed on 3/21/24

Motion for Temporary Orders Without Notice filed on 3/21/24

Order filed on 3/21/24

Certificate of Service filed on 3/25/24

4/30/24 Hearing held, due to Respondent's pending criminal case, this case cannot go forward until criminal matter is adjudicated. A minute entry was signed on 5/17/24.

*Case Management should've placed case on inactive calendar, which was not done.

Due to the case still open and no activity the Court decided to set this matter for hearing for 3/27/25, Order Setting filed on 10/14/24

3/27/25 Hearing held, Review Hearing was scheduled for 6/10/25, signed minute entry on 4/3/25

17. DO201700311 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, P-PP/R-PP

This case was assigned to Judge Sorenson during the time, the Petition below was referenced:

Pet to Mod PT and CS filed on 4/5/24

Reassignment of Judge Sorenson to Judge Reeves, filed on 4/29/24

Order to Appear setting hearing for 12/17/24, filed on 10/9/24

12/17/24 Hearing held and reset by issuance of a new Order to Appear, minute entry dated 12/17/24

Order to Appear for new hearing for 3/20/25 filed on 1/17/25

3/20/25 Hearing held, Case dismissed, signed minute entry

18. DO201600726 - Does not give specific time when we received in office

Response to Petition to Enforce Spousal Maintenance filed on 4/22/24

Response to Petition to Modify Spousal Maintenance filed on 5/15/24

Motion of Counsel Withdrawal (Stephen Martin) filed on 6/20/24

Order of Counsel Withdrawal (Stephen Martin) filed on 7/15/24

Order Setting Hearing for 12/18/24 filed on 10/14/24

Mot to Continue filed 10/22/24

Mot to Continue filed 10/23/24

Order continuing hearing to 2/6/25 filed on 12/9/24

Mot to Continue filed on 2/3/25

Order continuing hearing to 4/10/25 filed on 2/5/25

4/10/25 Hearing held, continued matter to 6/10/25

Matter Pending next hearing 6/10/25

19. DO202300765 - Does not give specific time when we received in office

Decree was entered on 3/15/24

Pet. to Mod. LDM, PT and CS filed on 5/03/24

Mot. for Temp Orders without notice filed on 5/03/24

Order setting hearing Temp Orders -hrg set for 5/17/24 filed on 5/3/24

Order resetting hearing set for 5/17/24 to 6/4/24 filed on 5/6/24

6/4/24 hearing held, signed minute entry

Order setting hearing for 1/8/25 filed on 10/14/24

1/8/25 hearing held, signed minute entry

3/5/25 hearing held, signed minute entry

Case Closed 3/5/25

20. DO202300966 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties Pro Per

Hearing held on 5/15/24 – signed minute entry

Pet to Mod. LDM, PT and CS and Motion for Temporary Orders filed on 6/6/24

Notice of Intent to Relocate with Minor Children filed on 8/15/24

Order filed on Supplemental Application filed on 8/29/24

Motion for Civil Contempt and Sanctions, enforce Court Order of 3/4/24 hearing filed on 9/25/24

Order to Appear filed on 10/9/24 setting for hearing on 12/12/24

12/12/24 Hearing held, signed minute entry

Request to Relocate filed on 12/19/24

Order setting hearing on 2/18/25 filed on 1/21/25

2/18/25 hearing held, signed minute entry
Order Under Advisement ruling filed on 4/15/25
Motion for Reconsideration filed on 4/23/25
4/29/25 filed Order denying Motion for Reconsideration

21. DO202400814 -Does not give specific time when we received in office, Parties Pro Per

Motion for Temp Orders filed on 9/27/24
Order sending to Mediation filed on 12/16/24
Notice of Hearing issued on 12/16/24 – Hearing date 1/28/25
1/28/25 hearing held, signed minute entry
Pending – next hearing is 5/6/25

22. DO202400059 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, P- V. Florez / R-

Amanda Taylor
2024 case, previous motions and orders were issued.
Motion for Temporary Orders filed on 7/01/24
Request for Settlement Conf filed on 10/2/24 (this document was addressed to Hon.
Johnson)
Order to Appear filed on 10/22/24 – Hearing set for 12/17/24
Order Setting Settlement Conf. filed on 10/22/24 – Settlement Conf set for 2/6/25
12/17/24 Temporary Orders held
Motion to Continue Settlement filed on 1/30/25
1/31/25 Order resetting Settlement Conf to 7/10/25
Pending – next hearing 7/10/25

23. DO202300714 - Does not give specific time when we received in office P-A.Taylor

2023 case, previous motions and orders were issued.

Motion for Findings filed on 7/25/24

Order setting Trial filed on 10/24/24 – hearing set for 2/13/25

Motion to Continue Trial filed on 2/3/25

Order resetting Trial filed on 2/7/25

Motion for Temp Orders filed on 3/11/25

Order filed on 3/12/25

Pending – next hearing 5/15/25

24. DO202301026 - Does not give specific time when we received in office P- atty Samuel

Pittman / R-atty Elizabeth Brooks

Petition filed on 11/02/23

Response filed on 12/1/23

Mediation Ordered 12/10/24

*No Motion to Set was filed prompting Judge to move case forward.

* Case Management should've placed case on inactive calendar, which was not done.

Motion to Withdraw from Counsel Elizabeth Brooks filed on 1/3/25

Order issued withdrawing Elizabeth Brooks filed on 1/24/25

Notice of Mediation Outcome filed on 2/4/25

Consent Decree filed on 2/7/25 – case closed

25. DO202000995 -Does not give specific time when we received in office

2020 case, previous motions and orders have issued

Request for RMC – atty Melissa Benson filed on 12/19/23

Notice of Change of Firm filed on 8/2/24

Motion Req. Trial Set filed on 8/15/24

Order Setting RMC and CT – filed on 9/11/24

Various motions and orders have issued after 9/11/24

Under Advisement Order issued on 3/28/25

Case Closed

26. DO202000904 - Does not give specific time when we received in office

This case has been pro per and attorneys have filed notices of representation

2020 case, previous motions and orders have issued

Motion to Amend Judgment filed on 11/7/23

Order issued on 4/11/24

Various motions and orders have issued after 4/11/24

Evidentiary Hearing set for 5/2/25 – case pending

27. DO202200235 - Does not give specific time when we received in office, parties Pro Per

2022 case, previous motions and orders have issued

Child Support Order filed on 3/4/24

Req. to Enforce Post Decree Judgment filed on 8/19/24

Order to Appear for hearing 1/23/25 filed on 11/26/24

1/23/25 hearing held, signed minute entry

2/20/25 efiled UA ruling

2/20/25 Case closed

28. DO200600575 - Does not give specific time when we received in office,

Amanda Taylor/PP

Pet. to Terminate Support filed on 6/19/24

No service was completed

Motion for Alternative Means of Service filed on 6/19/24

Motion to Appear Telephonically filed on 6/19/24

Order Approval of Means of Service filed on 12/3/24

Affidavit of Service by Publication filed on 4/24/25

Case Pending

29. DO200501045 – CS IV-D case, Parties are Pro Per

Does not give specific time when we received in office

*This case should've gone to Judge Johnson to review/set not Judge Reeves since the matter is a IV-D case.

Petition to Terminate Income Withholding Order filed on 7/12/24

Affidavit of Service by Mailed filed on 8/27/24

Order referring to IV-D Judge Johnson, filed on 12/9/24

Hearing currently scheduled before IV-D Judge Johnson on 5/13/25

30. DO200901064 - Does not give specific time when received in office, parties are Pro Per

2009 case, various motions and orders issued

Mot. for Temp Orders Without Notice filed on 7/23/24

7/23/24 order Denying Motion for Temp Orders Without Notice

Mot. for Temp Orders Without Notice filed on 7/23/24

7/23/24 order Denying Motion for Temp Orders Without Notice

Pet. to Mod LDM, PT and CS filed on 7/23/24

10/4/24 Order to Appear set for hearing 11/8/24

*10/4/24 Order referring CS matter to IV-D Judge

11/8/24 Order to Appear set for hearing 1/15/25

1/15/25 Hearing held, No Service on Order to Appear, continued to 3/11/25

3/11/25 hearing continued to 5/1/25

Case pending next hearing 5/1/25

31. GC202400071 - Does not give specific time when received in office, parties are Pro Per

Pet. to Appoint Guardian for an Adult filed on 3/29/24

Order appointing attorney and investigator filed on 8/24/24

No notes as to when the petition was received

32. PO202400704 –

10/7/24 Order of Protection Under Advisement

12/5/24 Judge Reeves signed Order taking out of Under Advisement (in compliance)

60 days is 12/6/24

12/10/24 Clerk's Office filed document this date.

33. GC202400043 - Does not give specific time when received in office, parties are Pro Per

Pet to Appoint Temporary Appointment of Guardian filed on 2/26/24

Order appointing attorney and investigator filed on 8/28/24

No notes as to when the petition was received

34. DO202400125 - Does not give specific time when received in office, parties are Pro Per

Motion for Alternative Methods of Service filed on 4/9/24

Order granting filed on 7/17/24

No notes as to when the petition was received

35. DO202400054 - Does not give specific time when received in office

Req for Resolution Management Conference filed on 3/27/24

No notes as to when this request was received

Order setting RMC filed on 7/16/24

1/8/25 Decree of Dissolution of Marriage entered

3/31/25 Order issued regarding property

36. CV202100573 –

1/27/23 Notice of Non-Opposition for Motion for Reconsideration filed

Case Notes indicate this division was not made aware of this filing until 6/20/23

6/20/23 Came before the Court for review

8/21/23 filed Order Setting this matter for hearing

1/24/25 Case Closed

37. CV202000421 -

4/27/23 Response to Request Ruling on Mot. for Reconsideration (list has 4/27/24 this date is incorrect)

Case Notes indicate this division was not made aware of this filing until 6/6/23

9/29/23 filed Order setting hearing

1/2/24 Case Closed

REFERRED TO AS COMPLAINTS

1. DO202300436 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

7/13/23 Motion to Serve by Publication filed

9/25/23 Order for Approval of Alternative Service

4/4/24 Case Closed

2. DO201600905 –

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

6/21/23 Reply to Motion for Reconsideration filed

10/12/23 Order issued regarding Reconsideration

Case open / pending

3. DO201101095 –

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

12/1/23 Pet. to Enforce Support Civil Contempt and Modification of CS filed

3/15/24 Order to Appear setting for hearing filed by Judge Johnson

*This matter is a IV-D case, this case should've gone to Judge Johnson to review/set
not Judge Reeves since the matter is a IV-D case.

4. PB202200199 –

Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

10/16/23 Notice of Lodging Form of Order and Judgment filed

10/16/23 Motion to Withdraw as Counsel and Approval of Attorney Fees and Costs
filed

9/13/24 Order issued / Case closed

5. PB201600193 –

Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

6/12/24 Notice of Lodging Proposed Form of Order filed

9/4/24 filed Order Approving

6. PB201600169 –

Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

6/12/24 Notice of Lodging Approval of Final Accounting, Fees and Costs and
Discharge of Public Fiduciary filed

9/4/24 filed Order granting

7. DO202300913 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

2/20/24 Response to Motion to Amend filed

6/5/24 Response to Petition for Paternity filed

9/10/24 Motion for Sanctions and Response filed

9/18/24 Order issued setting for hearing

2/27/25 Closed case

8. GC202200173 –

Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

6/25/24 Pet for Amended Pet for Perm Appointment of Guardian for an Adult

10/25/24 Order Appointing Attorney and Investigator

12/2/24 hearing held

1/22/25 Amended Orders issued

*5/12/23 -The Court had previously issued an Order appointing Guardian, Order of Acknowledgment and Letters issued.

9. CV202200461 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

8/26/22 Reply in Support of Request for Ruling and/or hearing on Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and/or Preliminary Injunction filed

6/19/23 filed Notice of Hearing

9/21/22 Request for Judicial Notice in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss filed

6/19/23 Notice of Hearing issued

10/13/23 Under Advisement Ruling

10. DO202200325 - Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

5/31/22 Mot. to Withdraw from Summary Consent Decree Process filed.

12/8/22 Order issued placing case on dismissal calendar

1/10/23 Judicial Assistant received notice that Motion above is pending.

1/11/23 Decree of Dissolution was delivered to Division One and it was signed same date.

1/12/23 Decree was filed.

11. DO202200075 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as this matter having a complaint.

8/8/22 – Order placing on Dismissal Cal.

8/19/22 – Motion to Set filed

12/01/22 – Order setting for hearing filed

2/22/23 Hearing held, Under Advisement

4/20/23 Decree entered

12. DO202200135 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

3/17/22 Response to Dissolution of Marriage filed

7/27/22 Motion to Set Trial filed (matter remained pending until parties move case forward) or until case management issues a notice of dismissal

9/13/22 Order Setting Mediation filed

9/13/22 Order Setting Court Trial filed

1/25/23 Court Trial held

2/28/23 Under Advisement Ruling – Decree entered

13. DO202200166 - Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

3/28/22 Response to Dissolution of Marriage With Children filed

No Motion to Set was filed (matter remained pending until parties move case forward) or until case management issues a notice of dismissal

10/10/22 Mediation Order filed
10/10/22 Order Setting Trial filed
1/18/23 Court Trial held
2/27/23 Under Advisement Ruling, Decree entered

14. DO202200306 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

5/20/22 Hearing held by Hon. Mark Wayne Reeves, signed minute entry, Temporary Orders in place

5/25/22 Order issued by Hon. Larry Kenworthy

10/12/22 Mediation Order filed

10/12/22 Order Setting this matter for Trial

1/25/23 Court Trial held

3/29/23 Court Trial held – signed minute entry

15. DO202101215 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

12/29/21 Response

6/8/22 Motion to Set was filed, (matter remained pending until parties move case forward) or until case management issues a notice of dismissal

9/8/22 Mediation ordered

9/8/22 Order Setting Trial

12/8/22 Trial held, signed minute entry

*Note on case indicates Mediation Order and Trial Setting Order were issued and efiled on 8/24/22 – Upon review of the matter, the above orders were not located and Judicial Assistant had to resubmit on 9/8/22.

16. DO202101254 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

1/24/22 Response to Dissolution of Marriage filed.

No Motion to Set filed (matter remained pending until parties move case forward) or until case management issues a notice of dismissal.

10/17/22 Mediation Ordered

11/7/22 Consent Decree entered

17. DO202100874 – Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

10/19/21 Response to Dissolution of Marriage filed.

No Motion to Set filed (matter remained pending until parties move case forward) or until case management issues a notice of dismissal.

10/17/22 Mediation Ordered

1/23/23 Consent Decree entered

18. DO202300314 –

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

4/20/23 Response for Legal Decision Making, Parenting Time and Child Support filed.

Case notes indicate this matter was received in the office on 4/25/23.

On 5/17/23 -Case management provided Mediation Order for Judge's signature, which was not signed due to this Court having information that there was an open Cocopah Indian Tribe case where Father has full custody. At this time it was under review, pending requested Cocopah Indian Tribe documents.

7/19/23 An Order was issued regarding Jurisdiction – case closed.

19. DO202200745- Does not give specific time when received in office

This office has no notes as to this case having a complaint.

8/12/22 Response to Pet for Legal Decision Making, Parenting Time and Child Support filed.

No Motion to Set filed (matter remained pending until parties move case forward) or until case management issues a notice of dismissal.

12/5/22 Mediation Ordered

1/9/23 Order Setting Trial

3/01/23 Hearing held, signed minute entry

Note – There is no system that indicates dates as to when a case is given to an assigned Judge for review, usually the Judge is made aware of a case when a litigant calls requesting information or by an email indicating a case is pending review. The only information on ebench is when the attorney's upload an Order for a Judge's review, unrepresented litigants do not enter orders in ebench.

There is a long time lapse before case management sends notices that case will be dismissed if no further action is taken.

A lot of these cases require the litigants to move this case forward and not the assigned judge.

Cases with IV-D matters are assigned (in the system) to other Judge's other than the IV-D Judge, which causes a confusion on where the case needs to be sent for review. The time is running (pending days) on the original judge assigned and not the IV-D judge.



Quarterly Under Advisement Report

Yuma Superior

Report generated on: 5/8/2025 3:43:23 PM

EXHIBIT 3

Criteria: Judge Name:ALL

Article v1, Section 21. of the Arizona Constitution:

"Every matter submitted to a judge of the superior court for his decision shall be decided within sixty days from the date of submission thereof. The Supreme Court shall by rule provide for the speedy disposition of all matters not decided within such period."

In accordance with the Arizona Constitution Rule 91(e) of the Rules of the Supreme Court, the following is the report of all matters in this court submitted for decision sixty days or more prior to the date of this report and remaining undecided on the date of this report.

A matter is reported as submitted on the date when all that is required or permitted on the part of any party or his attorney has been completed and disposition of the matter awaits only the decision of the court: that is, a matter is not submitted until all briefs or other papers ordered or permitted by the court have been filed, until all scheduled oral arguments have been heard, and until the transcripts of all testimony required to be reduced to writing have been filed.

Case Caption	Case Number	Matter Submitted	Under Advisement Date	Judge	Days Since Under Advisement Date
STATE OF ARIZONA-DES BRITTANY LEA WARNOCK PETITIONER VS JULIO HECTOR MORENO RESPONDENT	S1400DO201800654	SEE MINUTE ENTRY 5/17/24	05/17/2024	JOHNSON, COMMISSIONER ELIZA	356
STATE OF ARIZONA-DES BRITTANY LEA WARNOCK PETITIONER VS JULIO HECTOR MORENO RESPONDENT	S1400DO201800654	SEE THE MINUTE ENTRY FROM 11/23/2022	11/23/2022	JOHNSON, COMMISSIONER ELIZA	897
In Re the Marriage of: AILEEN JADORMIO PETITIONER AND RANIE JADORMIO RESPONDENT	S1400DO202200939	SEE MINUTE ENTRY OF 7/31/2023	07/31/2023	GONZALEZ, CLAUDIA	647
In Re the Marriage of: MARK E FRANSEN PETITIONER AND VERONICA FRANSEN RESPONDENT	S1400DO202400790	MINUTE ENTRY DATED 12/11/2024	12/11/2024	SORENSEN, HON NATHANIEL	148
JAIME BARAJAS MORA PETITIONER vs. MARYAM ZEYNALOVA RESPONDENT	S1400DO202401136	SEE MINUTE ENTRY DATED 02-11-2025	02/11/2025	REEVES, HON MARK WAYNE	86