

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-280

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

September 5, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner made improper evidentiary rulings in a protective order matter. The Commission's investigation revealed the Complainant misidentified the judge involved.

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 complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission members Denise K. Aguilar, Roger D. Barton, Regina L. Nassen, and Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on September 5, 2025.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2025-280

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

Judge's Name:

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.

- The judge allowed evidence that I myself could not see or review. Access could have been given through the portal but was not.
- The judge entered ~~was~~ irrelevant evidence. I continuously raised issue of relevance.
- The judge stated things " "against me.
She never factored in that I appeared remotely
So audio delays were present.
At times I would talk she would talk but because of
delays in audio we appeared to be talking at same time.
- I live minutes from defendant. I left AZ temporarily
to get peace while on medical disability. She put me
in danger by dismissing the order because at times
I still run into the defendant since she moved
So close to my home.