

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-237

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

August 29, 2025

The Complainant alleged an appellate court judge made improper legal rulings in a family 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 member Michael J. Brown did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 29, 2025.



**Panels:**

**First Appeal ( )::**

- Judge
- Judge
- Judge

**Second Appeal ( )::**

- Judge
- Judge
- Judge

**Special Action (Jurisdiction Declined):**

- Judge
- Judge
- Judge

**Special Action (Jurisdiction Accepted, No Relief):**

- Judge
- Judge
- Judge

These panels repeatedly failed to address jurisdictional defects under **A.R.S. § 25-1305**, denied ADA accommodations, dismissed legitimate filings as “frivolous,” and affirmed void custody orders rooted in fraud, sealed record violations, and HIPAA breaches. They acted with knowledge of unresolved federal protections, grave jurisdictional defects, a pending \* investigation, CPIAP child passport alerts, CBP Protections, the US Department , due process violations, constitutional violations, and civil rights violations.

**Arizona Court Justices:**

- Justice
- Justice
- Justice
- Justice
- Justice
- Justice

These Justices issued contradictory orders, ignored emergency filings, and denied ADA motions without legal reasoning. Justice \_\_\_\_\_ barred all future filings in one case ( \_\_\_\_\_ ), foreclosing access despite live jurisdictional challenges. Their coordinated denials reflect systemic retaliation and obstruction.

**Relief Requested:**

I respectfully request that the Commission investigate:

- The procedural breakdowns, bias, and abuse committed by these judicial officers;
- Whether rulings were made to shield misconduct rather than uphold justice;
- The denial of fundamental rights, including ADA access, HIPAA compliance, due process, and VAWA protections.

Attached is my Emergency Motion filed \_\_\_\_\_. Please confirm receipt and advise if additional documentation or format is required. I am prepared to supplement this complaint with judicial orders, transcripts, medical information, and correspondence proving these violations.

Respectfully,

Confidential & Protected Party

Petitioner Pro Per

**ARIZONA**

**COURT**

**f/k/a**

Appellant/Petitioner,

v.

Appellee/Respondent.

Arizona  
No.

Court

Arizona  
Case

**EMERGENCY MOTION FOR  
STAY AND LEAVE TO FILE RULE  
14(c) SPECIAL ACTION UNDER  
ARCAP RULE 6(e); OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE  
PETITION FOR REVIEW DUE TO  
FRAUD, JURISDICTIONAL  
DEFECTS, ADA, HIPAA,  
CONSTITUTIONAL, AND CIVIL  
RIGHTS VIOLATIONS**

Arizona  
Case No.

Court

**COMES NOW** the Petitioner, (“Appellant” or “Petitioner”), a Confidential and Protected Party appearing pro se, and respectfully moves this Honorable Court pursuant to ARCAP Rule 6(e), Rule 6(b), and Rule 14(c) for: (1) an emergency motion for stay leave to file Rule 14(c), Special Action under ARCAP Rule 6(e); or, in the Alternative, motion for extension of time to file petition for review due to fraud, jurisdictional defects, ADA, HIPAA, Constitutional, and Civil Rights Violations to file a Petition for Review, currently set for \_\_\_\_\_ to protect Petitioner’s constitutional and statutory rights under federal and state law.

**This motion is made solely to preserve Petitioner’s constitutional rights as she:**

1. Has prepared several related filings culminating in this motion, which she respectfully requests be deemed a formal Petition for Special Action—if permitted by this Court—under Rule 14(c), addressing unresolved jurisdictional and constitutional violations, as well as RICO-based misconduct and coordinated legal abuse arising from the underlying trial court proceedings; and
2. Seeks to assemble and file under seal extensive supporting materials—including HIPAA-protected medical records, ADA documentation, federal protection notices, and confidential law enforcement evidence—that cannot be submitted through the public appellate docket absent further protective orders.

Appellant respectfully requests that this Court issue a stay of the filing deadline pending those efforts, as the circumstances in this case include not only jurisdictional defects under **A.R.S. § 25-1305**, but also ongoing **ADA** and **HIPAA** violations, unlawful ex parte proceedings, abuse of process, and retaliation by members of a coordinated legal enterprise that now spans multiple courts and **four (4) states**. The extraordinary circumstances and irreparable harm at issue justify a stay under both **Rule 6(e)** and the Court’s equitable supervisory powers. A.R.S. § 25-1305 requires a judicial determination of registration prior to any Arizona enforcement or modification of an out-of-state custody order. **The statute mandates that the party must be given notice, the opportunity to contest, and that the court must enter a ruling affirming validity. That never occurred here. The** **, filings were accepted but never adjudicated. The record contains no hearing, no minute entry, and no ruling under A.R.S. § 25-1305.**

The Arizona \_\_\_\_\_, ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) reliance on Judge \_\_\_\_\_, Title IV-D “**findings**” was misplaced, as \_\_\_\_\_ explicitly addressed child support arrears **only** and **issued no findings on custody jurisdiction**. As a result, every order

**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.**