

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-379

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

December 2, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased, had a conflict of interest, and made improper rulings in a family law 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 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 Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 2, 2025.

2025-379

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 refer to the ECR.. this is ongoing and very clear violations...

- 033 - ME: Reassignment Req Denied
- REL - REPLY - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- REL - REPLY
- RES - Response
- 023 - ME: Order Entered By Court
- 906 - ME: Response/Reply Times Set
- ORD - Order - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- 023 - ME: Order Entered By Court
- 023 - ME: Order Entered By Court
- MOT - Motion - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- RES - Response - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- RES - Response - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- REP - Report
- REP - Report
- RES - Response - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- NOT - Notice
- REP - Report
- REP - Report
- REQ - REQUEST
- MOT - Motion
- MOT - Motion - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- REP - Report
- REP - Report
- REP - Report
- AFF - Affidavit
- REP - Report
- ORD - Order - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- RES - Response
- REP - Report
- REP - Report
- MCO - Motion To Continue - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- 023 - ME: Order Entered By Court
- 019 - ME: Ruling
- RES - Response
- RES - Response - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- REP - Report
- MTD - Motion To Dismiss - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- REL - REPLY - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- RES - Response - PART 1 OF 1 - ID
- REP - Report
- REP - Report

FILED

BY

IN THE COURT OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF

In re the Matter of:

Petitioner,

and

, Respondent.

Case No.

Assigned to the Hon.

PETITIONER'S SWORN AMENDMENTS TO AFFIDAVIT SWORN UNDER OATH FOR DEMAND FOR RECUSAL of JUDGE (FILLED), REBUTTAL re. The dismissal of the Verified Affidavit And Demand For Judicial Action which was filled on as well as Petitioners Response To Respondents Objection To Notice Of Lodging And Request For Sanctions filled and Petitioners Response To Respondent's Objection to Notice of Lodging And Request For Sanctions filled and Response To Motion To Dismiss Verified Affidavit, And Demand For Judicial Action Filled which was filled. REBUTTAL re. Demand For Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law filled and Petitioners Response To Respondent's Response To Demand For Findings Of Fact And Conclusions Of Law And Affidavit Sworn Under Oath For Demand For Recusal Pursuant to ARS 12-409 filled

Amendments to Affidavit Sworn Under Oath For Demand For Recusal Pursuant to ARS 12-409 which was filled

Summary of Relief Sought

The cumulative effect of Judge actions—violating statutory and constitutional rights, misrepresenting legal authority, issuing orders without evidentiary support, and demonstrating a pattern of bias—constitutes clear grounds for recusal under A.R.S. § 12-409 and the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct. The record establishes that the judge has failed to uphold her oath of office and has engaged in conduct requiring disqualification to preserve public confidence in the judicial process.

Remedy Sought:

Petitioner respectfully requests that the presiding judge grant the motion for change of judge for cause, vacate all orders issued in violation of due process and statutory requirements, and reassign the matter to a conflict-free judge, with instructions to conduct all further proceedings in compliance with Arizona law and the requirements of due process.

Petitioner has, on multiple occasions and in compliance with Arizona Rule of Family Law Procedure 82(A), timely requested findings of fact and conclusions of law in connection with the following filings:

: MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE EMERGENCY HEARING

: PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR CONTINUED
RANDOM FULL-SPECTRUM DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING

: APPENDED TO PRIOR FILED RESPONSE MOTION FOR
CONTINUED RANDOM FULL-SPECTRUM DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING OF
PETITIONER

: AFFIDAVIT OF AND AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF PRIOR MOTION
TO BE APPENDED TO THE RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL
EVALUATION AND SUBSTANCE TESTING PURSUANT TO JUDGES RULING
REQUESTING AUTHORITY TO TAKE ACTION

VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT AND DEMAND FOR JUDICIAL ACTION

: NOTICE OF LODGING

DEMAND FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

PETITIONERS RESPONSE TO RESPONDENTS OBJECTION TO
NOTICE OF LODGING AND REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS

NOTICE OF PROCEDURAL MISCONDUCT, ATTORNEY
DISQUALIFICATION, AND REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL ACTION

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NO CONTACT AND REQUEST FOR
ORDER OF APPOINTMENT

PETITIONERS RESPONSE TO RESPONDENTS AMENDED
OBJECTION TO NOTICE OF LODGING AND NOTICE OF CORRECTION, AND
REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS

PETITIONERS RESPONSE TO RESPONDENTS RESPONSE TO
DEMAND FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND AFFIDAVIT
SWORN UNDER OATH FOR DEMAND FOR RECUSAL

RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DISMISS VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT AND
DEMAND FOR JUDICIAL ACTION

Despite these requests, the Court has either summarily denied, dismissed without explanation, or wholly ignored each filing. This pattern of noncompliance is contrary to Rule 82(A) and established Arizona precedent, which require the trial court to make specific findings when requested, so as to permit meaningful appellate review (see, e.g., Cutter v. Cutter; Stein v. Stein). The Court's failure to issue findings has prejudiced Petitioner's rights and undermines confidence in the impartial administration of justice.

In open court on _____ at _____. The judge ignored objections to the respondents questions asking for the petitioner to answer on the record to direct question asking the petitioner to tell him about his protected “_____” objected to 2 times..

In this same hearing the petitioner told the judge that he will be filing a special action and stay; the judges response was “_____”

The judge's statement that she will deny any stay upon filing of a special action is indeed a significant issue. The relevance of *Coffee v. Ryan-Touhill* lies in its examination of judicial impartiality and the appearance of bias when a judge makes statements indicating a predisposition to deny a stay if a special action is filed. In *Coffee v. Ryan-Touhill*, the Arizona _____ found that such statements creates an appearance of bias, which undermines confidence in the judge's impartiality and provides grounds for recusal or a motion for change of judge.

The significance of this in our case is that the judge's statement mirrors the situation in *Coffee v. Ryan-Touhill*, where the court recognized that statements suggesting a predisposition against a party seeking appellate review is viewed as a failure to exercise discretion and as evidence of bias and prejudgment. This precedent supports that the judge's statement in this case creates an appearance of bias.

1. **Direct Precedent:** The situation in our case is not merely similar but identical to the one in *Coffee v. Ryan-Touhill*, where the court found that such statements did undermine confidence in the judge's impartiality and provides grounds for recusal.
2. **Due Process Concerns:** The importance of procedural due process, requires that parties have a meaningful opportunity to be heard, including the right to seek appellate review. A categorical refusal to consider a stay deprives a litigant of the opportunity to protect their rights during the pendency of appellate

**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.**