

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-370

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

November 14, 2025

The Complainant alleged a city court hearing officer was unprofessional and biased.

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 Roger D. Barton and Cathy Riggs did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on November 14, 2025.

Comp

2025-370

gmail.com

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

Re: Formal Complaint — Hearing Officer
Case No. ()

Court

Dear Commissioners:

I respectfully submit this complaint regarding the conduct of **Hearing Officer** in *Case*. His handling of this matter reflects multiple violations of judicial ethics and due process.

1. Failure to Provide Public Records

On , I submitted a lawful request under **A.R.S. § 39-121** and **Ariz. Sup. Ct. Rule 123** seeking digital copies of the Court's findings of fact and supporting records from the documentary hearing. Despite my documented compliance and good-faith follow-up, the Court failed to provide these records or offer any valid explanation. This denial violates both statutory and constitutional rights to access public records.

2. Improper Financial Penalties Without Notice

I paid the \$ sanction on . Later, I received a collections warning with accrued penalties **without prior notice or opportunity to cure**, violating fundamental procedural due process. The imposition of a \$ " " in a hearing format where same-day payment was impossible further compounded the unfairness.

3. Unprofessional and Demeaning Judicial Demeanor

In the Minute Order, Hearing Officer wrote:

"

This language is hostile and inappropriate toward a self-represented litigant acting in good faith, violating **Rule 2.8 (Decorum, Demeanor, and Communication)** of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct.

4. Willful Neglect of Impartiality and Fairness

His refusal to address legitimate procedural concerns shows disregard for judicial impartiality and undermines public confidence. It violates **Rule 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness)**, which mandates fairness and open-mindedness in all judicial duties.

5. Institutional Bias in High-Volume Traffic Camera Citations

top five traffic camera intersections alone generated over **64,000 citations in 2023–2024**. In this high-volume environment, judicial officers have an elevated duty to meaningfully review each case. Instead, Hearing Officer _____ appears to have treated these matters as routine administrative processing rather than true adjudication—functioning primarily as a **rubber stamp for automated enforcement**.

6. Failure to Document Findings Reflects Rubber-Stamp Adjudication

When I requested the Court’s **findings of fact** from the _____ hearing, none were produced. This strongly suggests that **no substantive findings exist** because the hearing officer did not meaningfully review the evidence. Had he performed an impartial, diligent analysis of the documentary evidence I submitted, there would be a reasoned explanation. The absence of any such findings supports the conclusion that the ruling was a mere perfunctory affirmation of the citation, not a genuine judicial determination.

This refusal to provide findings reinforces the lack of impartiality and violates both **Rule 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness)** and **Rule 2.5 (Competence, Diligence)** of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct.

7. Advanced Age and Capacity Concerns

It is publicly documented that Hearing Officer _____ is approximately _____ years old. While age alone is not disqualifying, _____ coupled with the **extraordinary volume of automated traffic-camera cases assigned to _____ Court**, raises legitimate questions about his capacity to exercise the sustained focus and diligence required for impartial adjudication. The absence of findings of fact and his dismissive tone toward self-represented litigants suggest he is **no longer able to meaningfully manage the workload** or review each matter with the care required of a judicial officer.

Requested Action

I respectfully request that the Commission:

- Investigate Hearing Officer _____ conduct,
- Determine whether his actions violate **Rules 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.8** of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, and
- Take appropriate remedial or disciplinary measures to uphold judicial integrity.

I have **supporting documentation** available, including correspondence, proof of payment, and the Minute Order referenced above, and I will provide it promptly upon the Commission's request.

Thank you for your consideration. Please confirm receipt of this complaint.

Sincerely,

Cc:
Hearing Officer