

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-015

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

A justice of the peace self-reported a delayed ruling in a civil 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 reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The Commission approved sending the judicial officer an advisory letter reminding of the duty to issue rulings timely under Rules 1.1 and 2.5(A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, along with Art. 2, §11, and Art. 6, §21 of the Arizona Constitution, and A.R.S. §12-128.01, relating to payroll and certifications of compliance. The Commission's file in this matter has been closed, pursuant to Commission Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Commission member Roger D. Barton did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: June 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 June 9, 2025.

Comp (Self-Report)

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington St., Ste. 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Re: Self-Report of 60 Day Ruling Violation

Dear Commission Members.

I am writing to self-report that I had inadvertently violated provisions of the judicial code by signing the judicial certification pursuant to ARS §11-424.02 that no cause before such justice remains pending and undetermined for sixty days after it has been submitted for decision.

That case was _____ v _____
in the _____ Court. A default hearing was held on _____. The Plaintiff was
ordered to provide a supplemental declaration in support of attorney's fees within twenty days
of the default hearing. Plaintiff properly filed the supplement on _____ and I should
have ruled in a timely manner and failed to do so. Once discovered, I issued a ruling within 24
hours.

I will not make any excuse, and I take full responsibility and acknowledge that this is my
responsibility alone, and I take that responsibility very seriously, however, I do understand how
it happened. It was not a computer problem, but rather, human error that kept this from being
set for judicial review in our data management system, causing it to sit in limbo. A new staff
member did not understand that the matter needed to be re-scheduled (tickled) after the
original default hearing and while waiting for the supplement. When the supplement was
added, it had no calendared event to go with it, so it just sat. It was found only after that staff
member departed employment and her cases were reviewed by a senior staff member. I have
discussed this with all staff members and the courts management team, and we have
implemented more thorough training in this area.

Let me assure you that at the time of signing each judicial certification stating that no matter
had been submitted to me for decision pending for over sixty days, I truly believed it to be true
and correct. I am very sorry for my error and for not catching it sooner. I have taken steps to
ensure that it does not happen again. I take full responsibility for the error and have taken
corrective action to ensure that it does not happen again.

Please let me know if I can assist in any way.

Sincerely, 