

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-120

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

June 10, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner made improper rulings and had a conflict of interest in his child support 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 Scott H. O'Connor did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on June 10, 2025.

From:**Sent:****To:** Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>**Subject:** Complaint

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Att: Office of the Solicitor General
Chief Administrative Law Judge,

I am [redacted]. I have a family case [redacted] affirming the IV-D Enforcement of Support hearing set on [redacted] at [redacted] in this Division via Court Connect. Commissioner [redacted] do not even understand what is going on with my case, the Contempt of order i file on ex wife was due to settlement in divorce as nothing to do with child support she have the case mixed up and made bias decision within [redacted] mins to the hearing she she she will be forcing me to keep paying child support without providing remedy to the case law i represented i have to consent to child support which i repeatedly said i do not consent and i am challenging her jurisdiction she is not following the law .

2nd violation Commissioner [redacted] Conflict Of Interest. She has a history of working for [redacted] which previously represented [redacted]

3rd violation Deprivation Of Right Under The Color of Law under 18 U.S.C. §242; 18 U.S.C. §245; 42 U.S.C. §1983

4 violated my first amendment right and constitutional rights under Gross v. State of Illinois, 312 F 2d 257; (1963).

5 Commissioner [redacted] refused to honor Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958) which says States must obey the decisions of the Supreme Court and cannot refuse to follow them.

under Ableman v. Booth, 62 U.S. 506 (1858) No decision of a state court is valid if it conflicts with a decision by a federal court.

The CONSTITUTIONS AS WELL AS 45 C.F.R 303.101(C)(4) REQUIRES A JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FACTS AND DEMANDS DISMISSAL AND DISCHARGE OF ALL SUPPORT ORDER CREATED IN VIOLATION OF 45 CFR 303.101(C)(4) DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW WERE VIOLATED.

The following child support terms are presumed and unsubstantiated child support glossary terms and I demand these terms removed from any records unless this Title IV-D court can provide proof.

I, am; [redacted] hereby inform this court that he rebuts all presumptions and this court must support presumptions by clarification of evidence to support conclusive terms, such as obligor, an obligor is a obligated to a contract, and proof of consent is required before calling a man;

an obligor by providing proof he entered into a contract to pay child support through child support collection service. obligor (n.) look up obligor at Dictionary.com" person who binds himself to another by contract"

The following child support terms are presumed and unsubstantiated child support glossary terms and I demand these terms removed from any records unless this Title IV-D court can provide proof. A Man; denies being afforded due process and equal protection of laws as required by 14" Amendment, therefore these child support terms are presumptions insinuating guilt, which the facts and lack of physical evidence proved these presumptive terms are false therefore must be removed from all records claiming Title IV-A child support loan was made to a man; and this debt must be repaid to a IV-D State collection Agency by income deduction or possible license suspension or incarceration may occur;

Seubert v. Seubert

ORDER

On August 31, 2000, we issued an opinion in this case in which we held that §§ 40-5-272 and -273, MCA (1997), to the extent they authorize the Child Support Enforcement Division (CSED) of the State of Montana, Department of Public Health and Human Services, to modify a district court child support order, violate the separation of powers clause of the Montana Constitution.

Holmberg v. Holmberg, 558 N.W.2d 720 (1999)

constitutionality of Minnesota's administrative child support process. This appeal presents the issue of whether the administrative process, Minn.Stat. § 518.5511 (1996), violates the separation of powers doctrine by impinging upon the original jurisdiction of the district court, by creating a tribunal which is not inferior to the district court, and by permitting child support officers to engage in the practice of law. The court of appeals ruled the administrative process unconstitutional, relying on the separation of powers doctrine. We affirm the court of appeals and hold that the administrative process is unconstitutional because it violates separation of powers.

U.S. Code § 659 - Consent by United States to income withholding, garnishment, and similar proceedings for enforcement of child support.

Conflict Of Interest 42 U.S.C. 658, Title 1V-D, Section 458, Social Security. Act, INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO STATES Title IV-D law is being challenged as unconstitutional due to the financial incentives it creates which have allowed for corrupt actors to proliferate and abuse the law to willfully deprive citizens of their constitutional right under color of law for financial gain.

Monell vs New York city Dep't of social services 436 U.S 658, 700-701 (1978) There can be no doubt that Title 42 (§1983) was intended to provide a remedy , to be broadly construed against all forms of official violation of

I can not be force under a contract Monell vs New York city Dep't of social services 436 U.S 658, 700-701 (1978) There can be no doubt that Title 42 (§1983) was intended to provide a remedy , to be broadly construed against all forms of official violation of federally protected rights."

Blessing vs. Freestone, 520 U.S. 329 (1997) dismissal is proper if Congress "specifically foreclosed a remedy under § 1983.

I declare that a full discharge and dismissal for the unconstitutional procedures violating due process used in the efforts to collect an unsubstantiated debt for unsubstantiated loan for public assistance under Title IV-A of the social security Act.

--