

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-132

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

August 15, 2025

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace violated his rights in a protective order hearing by allowing the other side to present evidence but denying the presentation of evidence by Complainant.

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 Regina L. Nassen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 15, 2025.

2025-132

**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

**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.

I, \_\_\_\_\_ submit this formal complaint against Judge \_\_\_\_\_ for violations of due process, equal protection under the law, constitutional infringements, and failure to uphold federal judicial obligations. The actions committed by Judge \_\_\_\_\_ are in direct conflict with multiple United States Supreme Court rulings, constitutional amendments, and federal statutes. These violations have not only deprived me of my fundamental rights as a father but have also effectively stripped me of my ability to protect and engage in the life of my own daughter.

**1. Unlawful Arrest & Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law (18 U.S.C. § 242)**

On \_\_\_\_\_ I was subjected to an unlawful arrest orchestrated by law enforcement officials in collusion with the Arizona judicial system. During an interrogation by Deputy Chief \_\_\_\_\_ of the Police Department, I was never read my Miranda rights as required by *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966). This alone constitutes a flagrant violation of my Fifth Amendment rights and voids any statements obtained during the interrogation.

18 U.S.C. § 242 – Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law (Criminal offense for officials who willfully deprive individuals of their constitutional rights.)

42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Civil Rights Action for Deprivation of Rights (Civil liability for any individual acting under state law to deprive another of their constitutional rights.)

5th Amendment – Protection against self-incrimination and due process violations.

**2. Violation of Parental Rights & Family Law Precedents**

The Arizona courts have demonstrated a clear bias against me as a father, depriving me of any meaningful parental rights without due process. My former partner, \_\_\_\_\_, unlawfully removed our daughter from \_\_\_\_\_ years ago, violating Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) standards. Despite these clear federal violations, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ has taken an authoritarian approach, refusing to acknowledge the established federal precedence protecting parental rights.

Judge \_\_\_\_\_ declared that I had " \_\_\_\_\_ " because there was no prior custodial ruling, despite the fact that I am on my daughter's birth certificate. This directly contradicts the Supreme Court's ruling in *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000), which affirms that parents possess a fundamental constitutional right to the care, custody, and control of their children.

*Troxel v. Granville* (530 U.S. 57, 2000) – Establishes that parental rights are a fundamental liberty interest under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

*Santosky v. Kramer* (455 U.S. 745, 1982) – Establishes that the state must provide due process before infringing upon parental rights.

14th Amendment – Guarantees due process and equal protection under the law.

UCCJEA Violations upon departure of child's true home state.



**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

**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.

Judge \_\_\_\_\_ denied me my constitutional right to present evidence in my defense. The court allowed my former partner, \_\_\_\_\_ to present evidence but refused me the same right. This is a clear violation of procedural due process as established under Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), which mandates that individuals must be granted the right to present evidence when their rights are at stake.

Further, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ explicitly stated that custodial rights automatically default to the mother, which is a clear gender bias and violation of the Equal Protection Clause. This unconstitutional conduct invalidates his ruling.

Mathews v. Eldridge (424 U.S. 319, 1976) – Ensures the right to present evidence and cross-examine in hearings affecting fundamental rights.

14th Amendment – Equal Protection Clause – Prohibits discrimination based on gender in judicial proceedings.

It is evident that the protection order issued against me was not grounded in legitimate safety concerns but was a weaponized legal maneuver used to retaliate against my parental rights. The ruling directly ignored federal precedence and the constitutional principle that a parent has an inherent right to protect their child.

42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Civil action for deprivation of rights.

First Amendment Retaliation Claims – Prohibits state actors from using legal tools to silence individuals advocating for their rights.

8th Amendment Violations while unlawfully imprisoned.

Estelle v. Gamble (429 U.S. 97, 1976) – Establishes that deliberate indifference to medical needs constitutes cruel and unusual punishment.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Title II – Prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities in state institutions. I formally request the following actions:

Immediate investigation into Judge \_\_\_\_\_ conduct for gross judicial misconduct and constitutional violations.

Vacating of any and all unlawful rulings rendered by Judge \_\_\_\_\_ that violate federal law and constitutional rights.

A federal civil rights lawsuit to be initiated against the Arizona judiciary for systemic discrimination and deprivation of parental rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Federal intervention to rectify procedural violations in the handling of my case.