

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-453

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

January 6, 2026

The Complainant alleged a pro tem justice of the peace improperly issued a search warrant.

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 Denise K. Aguilar and Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 6, 2026.

Comp

2025 - 453

**Complaint 1: Judge Pro Tem
Court**

Justice

Submitted by:

Statement of Facts

On _____, _____ County Sheriff's Office (_____) executed Search Warrant _____ which was signed by Judge Pro Tem _____. The warrant listed my mother, _____ by name and date of birth and included only a vague description of an "Unknown Male" as " _____ years old, _____. I (_____) was not named anywhere in the warrant, and I am _____ per my arrest record.

Furthermore, according to the Arrest Record received in _____, it was claimed in the initiating response on _____ that Deputy _____ cited and released me that day with an order to appear before the _____ Court on _____. While that never happened, they clearly documented that they knew my name and who I was, so if they wanted to search me and my rental property, why wasn't I named. They can't have it both ways.

The Crime Summary of that same report claimed deputies heard gunshots, saw wounded cattle with "bullet holes," and observed a man walking nearby during surveillance. If deputies truly heard gunfire, observed wounded cattle, and saw a man in proximity, standard procedure under the Fourth Amendment and Arizona law would have been to immediately detain or question that individual based on at least reasonable suspicion. Their failure to do so undermines the credibility of their surveillance narrative and therefore the probable cause foundation presented to Judge _____.

Despite the lack of particularized identification of me and the inconsistency in the deputies' narrative, _____ was issued. When executed, deputies exceeded the scope by treating me as a named target, detaining me, and seizing my property even though the warrant did not authorize a search or seizure directed at me or my separate residence as a tenant.

This warrant remains under my mother's name, _____ with no birth month or year as an identifier. It has never been linked to my case because it failed to ever identify me as a person to search.

The second search warrant in this matter raises serious questions of jurisdiction and legality. The first warrant () was issued through the Justice Court, the proper jurisdictional authority at the time. However, the subsequent warrant suddenly appeared under the Court with no case number, no printed or typed judicial name beneath the signature, and no expiration date.

There is no record of the case having been elevated to Court at the time the warrant was issued, and therefore the Justice Court should have retained jurisdiction. The absence of a case number and proper judicial identification makes the warrant impossible to verify through standard court records.

This procedural irregularity strongly suggests that the warrant was either improperly issued or never lawfully entered into the record. Despite this, evidence was seized under this defective warrant and is being used against the defendant. Such actions strip the process of accountability, undermine due process, and raise the possibility of fabricated or unauthorized warrants being used as the basis of prosecution.

Grounds for Complaint

- Failure of warrant gatekeeping and particularity: The warrant did not particularly describe me or my separate residence, yet deputies expanded the scope with no documentation to wrongfully target me.
- Acceptance of questionable probable cause: The surveillance account presented (gunshots, wounded cattle, nearby male) was not acted upon contemporaneously.
- Resulting constitutional harm: The overbroad warrant enabled unlawful intrusion into a tenant's separate residence and seizure of my property.
- On County Sheriff's Office, not the court, issued a property return of the items seized from house. There was no authorization of this by the court, no notation in the records, and now there is no trail of where the remaining seized items are.
- On went to the Justice Court to request access to the documents contained within this search warrant, she was told that it was not public record and access was denied.

Relief Requested

I request the Commission investigate Judge issuance of given the lack of particularity and the questionable probable cause narrative, and determine whether judicial gatekeeping duties were met.

(CJC Insert Sheet – Not Originally Submitted)

ARREST/BOOKING RECORD

NAME: LAST		FIRST		MIDDLE		ALIASES/CARS		MARK(S)		BOOKING #						
ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP						ORIGIN	SEX	HT	WT	HAIR	COMPLEX					
AGE	DOB		PLACE OF BIRTH		CITIZEN	EMPLOYER			OCCUPATION							
NEAREST RELATIVE & RELATIONSHIP						ADDRESS										
FBI NO			SID NO			VEHICLE # & STATE			DRIVER'S LICENSE # & STATE							
AGENCY USE ONLY			MISC NO			FPC										
ARREST AGENCY		ARREST NO		ARREST DATE		ARR TIME		DR #		LOCATION OF ARREST						
ARRESTING OFFICER NAME AND NUMBER			TRANSPORTING 1st		TRANSPORTING 2nd		BA OPER#		BA READING		LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE					
COURT DATES		EVIDENCE IMPOUNDED WHERE? YES <input type="checkbox"/>				PRES PROP IMPOUNDED WHERE? YES <input type="checkbox"/>										
DETAILS OF ARREST <p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">WAS ARRESTED FOR UNLAWFULLY KILLING LIVESTOCK OF ANOTHER AND ANIMAL CRUELTY.</p>																
JP COURT	JP WARRANT#	SC DIV	S.C.WARRANT#	JP COURT	JP WARRANT#	SC DIV	S.C.WARRANT#	JP COURT	JP WARRANT#	SC DIV	S.C.WARRANT					
CHARGE			CNTS	CHARGE			CNTS	CHARGE			CNTS					
UNLAWFULLY KILLING LIVESTOCK OF ANOTHER			1	CRUELTY TO ANIMALS			1	CRUELTY TO ANIMALS			1					
VIOLATION OF CODE/ARS			COMPL NO	VIOLATION OF CODE/ARS			COMPL NO	VIOLATION OF CODE/ARS			COMPL NO					
ARS3-1307A				ARS13-2910A5				ARS13-2910A9								
INT APPEAR		JP PRELIM DATE		BOND		INT APPEAR		JP PRELIM DATE		BOND						
SUP CT ARRAIGNMENT		SUP CT TRAIL DATE		SUP CT ARRAIGNMENT		SUP CT TRAIL DATE		SUP CT ARRAIGNMENT		SUP CT TRAIL DATE						
SENT DATE		SENTENCE		CODE		SENT DATE		SENTENCE		CODE						
WHY RELEASED & BONDING CO OR RECEIPT #				WHY RELEASED & BONDING CO OR RECEIPT #				WHY RELEASED & BONDING CO OR RECEIPT #								
RELEASED BY			DATE RELEASED			RELEASED BY			DATE RELEASED							
UCR	F	M	H	NARC	AGCY ARR FOR	UCR	F	M	H	NARC	AGCY ARR FOR					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO						
DATE BOOKED	TIME	DAY	FLOOR	LOCKER	JAILER	JAILER	CELL	BK REASON	LOCATION OF PRISONER- FACILITY			PHO IN	F P IN			
HOLDS						BOOKING OFFICER SIGNATURE & ACCEPTANCE OF PRISONER										
CASH	PROPERTY DESCRIPTION IN DETAIL															
\$	Personal clothing															
VEHICLE COLOR		YEAR		MAKE & MODEL			LICENSE NO		IN		EIGHT		THRU/MS		OUT	
DISPOSITION OF VEHICLE						ALL MONEY & PROPERTY HELD IS LISTED										
INMATE RECEIVED ALL MONEY & PROPERTY HELD						OFFICER SIGNATURE ACCEPT PROPERTY										
DATE RELEASED				TIME		RELEASED BY										
X PRISONER SIGNATURE																

**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.**