

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-304

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

October 3, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased and did not follow the law.

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 and Joseph C. Kreamer did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 3, 2025.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

2025 - 304

**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.

Please See attached Allegations.  
I have only had 2 interactions with  
this judge. One hearing on  
And A hearing on  
THIS A New Case.

In Pro Se

COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN COUNTY

	)	
	)	Case No.
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	CHANGE OF JUDGE FOR CAUSE
	)	PURSUANT TO 16 A.R.S. RULES OF
v.	)	CIVIL PROCEDURE, RULE 42.1(b)(1)(2)
	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	(Submitted to the Hon. Presiding Judge
	)	and the Hon. )

NOW COMES Plaintiff, ("Plaintiff" or "Pro Se Litigant"), and for her verified Complaint for cause, hereby alleges and states under oath as follows:

**STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR PRO SE PLEADINGS**

1. Plaintiff admits to some technical missteps attributed to the learning curve. However, none of which is fatal nor is it legal grounds for the Honorable Judge to invoke Rule 17B A.R.S. Rules Fam.Law Proc., Rule 37.1, because Plaintiff made the Honorable Judge angry by filing two pleadings with the Court, stating that he did not understand why Plaintiff was doing so. *See Exhibit (A)*
2. Plaintiff's pleadings were filed in good faith and meant to ensure Plaintiff was treated fairly by opposing counsel. *See Exhibit (B)*



### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. Because the nature and cause of these proceedings involves matters and disputes in controversy surrounding a "service animal" known as \_\_\_\_\_ the rescue, who was unlawfully removed by Defendant from the safety and security of the service animal's home in \_\_\_\_\_ Country on or about \_\_\_\_\_. Thus, this Court is the appropriate venue in which these proceedings may be commenced.

9. The amount of the controversy is a Tier 2 civil matter due to the severity of the actions of the Defendant toward the Plaintiff and her service animal.

10. Plaintiff attempted to settle the matter out of court with the Defendant on or about \_\_\_\_\_ whereby Plaintiff and her service animal were assaulted and traumatized by the excessive force used by the Defendant to "take back" Plaintiff's service animal threatening her with arrest for trespassing, whereby Plaintiff was advised by local \_\_\_\_\_ police to take the matter to civil court.

11. Plaintiff, filed a civil Complaint to have her service animal returned to her as the dog's legal owner on or about \_\_\_\_\_.

### GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings suit under 16 A.R.S. Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 42.1, Change of Judge as a matter of right.

13. **Allegation #1:** In an \_\_\_\_\_ initial hearing, conducted by video, the Honorable Judge \_\_\_\_\_ made some concerning statements to both pro se litigants whereby the Court was essentially giving legal advice to Plaintiff stating that if Plaintiff wanted to proceed with her Complaint naming \_\_\_\_\_ in her Complaint as a corporate entity, they are required by law to have legal counsel and that Plaintiff would therefore be responsible for their

legal fees. Implying, in subtle terms to both pro se litigants, that Plaintiff would be the losing party and would have to pay legal fees, whereby the matter of “ownership” of the service animal had already been determined by the Honorable Judge in Defendant’s favor.

14. **Allegation #2:** The Honorable Judge was also subtly trying to persuade Plaintiff toward arbitration and to waive her right to a jury trial. Although Plaintiff appreciated the Court’s recommendations, Plaintiff found the Honorable Judge suggestions to be inappropriate and biased toward the Defendant.

15. **Allegation #3:** Plaintiff’s concerns about the state of mind of the Honorable Judge was so concerning to Plaintiff as a pro se litigant in this case, she would need a jury trial to get a fair and just judgement. The DENIAL without explanation of Plaintiff’s request to the Court that her service animal’s well being and health be confirmed by a Professional medical assessment was further evidence of the Court’s bias. This standard request in a court hearing and its denial is in direct violation of A.R.S. §§ 13-2910(A)(2), (13) and (H) and 11-1013(B), (C), and (F). Whereby, Arizona criminal statutes can be introduced into a civil matter when negligence of an animal is involved.

16. **Allegation #4:** Plaintiff attended a court hearing on , via telephone details were provided by the court order dated on or about . Once the Honorable Judge addressed Plaintiff in the court hearing, he suddenly and without warning became enraged at Plaintiff for not appearing in-person at the hearing. The Honorable Judge stated on the record that he was VERY/VERY concerned that Plaintiff is in need of a Guardian ad Litem and/or a Conservatorship due to Plaintiff’s prior two pleadings filed with the Court, that he didn’t understand and therefore he questioned Plaintiff’s mental competence, due to

**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.**