

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-392

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

September 5, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased and violated due process in a family law matter.

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.

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

RE: Complaint Against Judge

Dear Members of the Commission:

I respectfully submit the following formal complaint and addendum against Judge _____ of the _____ County _____ Court, based on recent proceedings in Case No. _____.

On _____, Judge _____ issued a sweeping ruling denying over 30 pro se motions, many of which cited applicable statutes, controlling case law, and raised substantial constitutional and jurisdictional concerns. These filings were not frivolous but pointed to serious procedural failures and cross-jurisdictional breakdowns affecting both family and criminal court matters.

Key issues raised in the motions included:

- Expired and improperly merged Orders of Protection being used to initiate criminal prosecution.
- Repeated arrests without valid warrants due to lack of coordination between Family Court and Criminal Court.
- Improper ex parte filings by Petitioner despite being represented by counsel.
- Multiple procedural denials without response or rebuttal opportunity from opposing parties.
- Denial of Rule 85 motion without legal explanation or response to cited constitutional violations.

Judge _____ failed to acknowledge the legal foundation for many of these claims. The blanket denials lacked individual analysis, judicial transparency, or fair engagement, creating a legitimate appearance of bias, neglect, or avoidance. Further, the judge warned the pro se litigant that further filings might be restricted—a threat that chills constitutional access to the court, particularly in a family law matter involving custody, property, and due process claims.

This conduct violates Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, undermines public trust in judicial fairness, and reflects a systematic disregard for the rights of self-represented litigants raising genuine concerns.

Attached is a full summary and timeline of denied motions with context, including case citations and constitutional grounds presented.

I respectfully request that this complaint be reviewed, and appropriate corrective or disciplinary measures be considered.

Sincerely,

From:

Sent:

To: Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>

Subject: Judge – Systemic Denial of Due Proces

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#) | [Report](#)

Subject: Judicial Misconduct Complaint Against Judge

Court: County Court – Family Division

Case No.:

Complainant:

Address:

Phone: ()

Email:

Complaint Summary

I am filing a formal complaint against Judge regarding conduct in my family court case, . On Judge issued a ruling that summarily denied over thirty pro se motions—many of which were properly formatted, timely filed, and supported by controlling statutes and case law. Rather than evaluate these motions on their legal merit, the Court chose to characterize the filings as “ ” “ ” and implied vexatious conduct—without legal analysis or citation.

This ruling reflects a blatant disregard for due process and the rights of self-represented litigants under both Arizona and Federal law. I am requesting the Commission to investigate Judge conduct under the following grounds.

Grounds for Judicial Misconduct



1. Improper Summary Denials Without Judicial Analysis

Judge _____ denied motions addressing:

- Improper garnishment of exempt assets
- Protective orders issued without jurisdiction
- Parenting modifications under A.R.S. § 25-411
- Fraud, misconduct, and Rule 85(a)-(c) arguments

Each was dismissed with conclusory language and no legal rebuttal to my cited authority. These actions violate Canon 3(B)(7) which requires a judge to afford each party a meaningful opportunity to be heard.



2. Misrepresentation of Filings as Vexatious or Harassing

The Court accused me of filing unreasonable motions, despite the fact that:

- The majority cited statutes or precedent.
- My filings adhered to the Arizona Rules of Family Law Procedure (ARFLP).
- There is no prior finding of abusive conduct by me.

This violates Canon 2(A) which requires judges to uphold confidence in the judiciary and avoid arbitrary conduct.



3. Deflection of Jurisdiction and Refusal to Rule on Expired Orders of Protection

Despite raising valid legal questions about the cross-jurisdictional misuse of expired protective orders, Judge _____ refused to rule, claiming it was “ _____,” despite overseeing the same dissolution and custody matter from which the OOP issues stem.

This is an evasion of his Article VI, § 14 authority under the Arizona Constitution and a dereliction of duty.

Legal and Constitutional Authorities Violated

Case Law Ignored or Disregarded

:

- Goldammer v. Goldammer, 168 Ariz. 328 (App. 1991)
- Canty v. Canty, 178 Ariz. 443 (App. 1994)
- Williams v. Williams, 219 Ariz. 546 (App. 2008)
- Moore v. Meyers, 31 Ariz. 347 (1927)

Statutes and Procedural Violations

:

- A.R.S. § 25-411 – Custody modification grounds
- ARFLP Rule 85 – Motions to set aside
- ARPOP 28(e) – Expired OOPs must be cleared
- A.R.S. § 12-3201 – Improper use of vexatious litigant statute



Constitutional Rights Violated

:

- 14th Amendment (U.S. Constitution) – Due Process Clause
 - Arizona Constitution, Article 2, § 4 – Due Process and Equal Protection
 - A.R.S. § 1-602 – Parental Rights Protection
-

Canon Violations

- Canon 1 – Failure to preserve the independence and impartiality of the judiciary.
 - Canon 2(A) – Conduct that undermines public confidence and treats self-represented litigants unfairly.
 - Canon 3(B)(7) – Denial of opportunity to be meaningfully heard.
-

Requested Relief

I respectfully request that the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct:

1. Open a formal investigation into Judge _____ ruling.
 2. Examine whether this conduct constitutes systemic bias, willful disregard of law, or misuse of judicial discretion to suppress valid legal argument.
 3. Issue findings and impose disciplinary measures as necessary to preserve public confidence and equal access to justice for all litigants, including those proceeding pro se.
-

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Date:

**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.**