

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-465

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

January 30, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner was biased and failed to protect children in a protective order 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).

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 30, 2026.

# Judicial Complaint

Comp

25-465

**To:** Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

**Re:** Complaint Against Commissioner

**Complainant:**

Phone:

Email: [your email]

**Judicial Officer:**

Commissioner

Court of Arizona, County

**Case Number:**

**Date of Order:** (Order of Protection issued)

**Hearing Scheduled:**

## ***Nature of Complaint***

I am filing this complaint against Commissioner for bias, misconduct, and violations of law in connection with my ongoing custody and protection matters. Commissioner has failed to uphold judicial impartiality, allowed unsubstantiated and retaliatory claims to advance, ignored ongoing child safety concerns, and violated my constitutional rights and statutory protections.

## ***Specific Misconduct and Violations***

### **1. Denial of Due Process (14th Amendment, U.S. Constitution)**

An Order of Protection was issued against me based on hearsay and retaliatory claims. My parental rights were restricted without credible evidence or fair process.

### **2. Violation of Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S. §13-3602 – Protective Orders)**

Orders must be based on specific acts of domestic violence or credible threats. The petitioner's claims are retaliatory and unsubstantiated, yet Commissioner granted and continues to enforce the OOP.

### **3. Interference with Child Safety and Parental Duty**

At the time the OOP was granted, my children's safety was already at issue based on concerns raised by therapists and other professionals about my children's well-being—and my ex was actively trying to block that information from reaching me. By enforcing the OOP, the Commissioner obstructed my ability to act protectively and address those dangers. I have already lost one son, , suddenly, from drug negligence at his father's home. This OOP now prevents me from protecting my other children from the s...

### **4. Violation of A.R.S. §25-403 (Best Interests of the Child)**

Arizona law requires that custody and related decisions prioritize the best interests of the child. By cutting me off from my children and ignoring credible safety concerns, the Commissioner violated this statute.

### **5. Judicial Bias and Misconduct**

On \_\_\_\_\_, Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ stated in open court that “\_\_\_\_\_.” This was said during proceedings in my family case. Such a statement demonstrates clear prejudice and disregard for child welfare, and it undermines the legal duty to prioritize the best interests of the child.

On a separate occasion, when I filed for an Order of Protection to shield my children, I testified that their father physically abused my daughters—dragging them by the hair from their bedroom into the living room because they refused to send me a text message he was coercing them to send in order to frame me. Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ denied my petition, dismissing the abuse by asking, “\_\_\_\_\_” At that time, I had text messages exchanged with my daughter where she admitted... This reveals extreme bias: he denied a mother’s petition supported by first-hand testimony and documented proof of physical abuse, yet later granted a retaliatory petition by the abusive father based only on hearsay.

The following year, on \_\_\_\_\_, my son \_\_\_\_\_ suddenly died while in his father’s custody after repeated safety concerns were ignored by the court. Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ mindset and bias contributed directly to the systemic failure to protect him.

## **6. Federal Civil Rights Violations (18 U.S.C. §242)**

By enforcing a knowingly unlawful order and depriving me of parental rights without cause, Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ is violating federal law, which prohibits deprivation of rights under color of law.

### ***Harm Caused***

- My children remain in an unsafe environment documented by therapists and professionals.
- I have been falsely restrained by an OOP, limiting my ability to act as a protective parent.
- If their father is detained, deported, or otherwise incapacitated, this OOP would block me from stepping in, leaving my children stranded without protection.
- My parental rights and constitutional rights have been violated, and my children’s safety is at ongoing risk.
- The consequences of this judicial neglect are not theoretical — on \_\_\_\_\_, my son \_\_\_\_\_ suddenly passed away while in his father’s custody, despite my repeated warnings and requests for intervention. This loss demonstrates the life-threatening risks created when the court disregards evidence and fails to act in the children’s best interests.

### ***Relief Requested***

- I request a full investigation into Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ handling of my case.
- I request disciplinary action for bias, misconduct, and violations of judicial ethics.
- I request that the Commission review his contradictory rulings:
  - Denying my OOP after I testified about my daughters being physically abused (dragged by their hair).
  - Ignoring text messages exchanged with my daughter in which she admitted she and her sibling had been hurt by their father and explained how it happened.
  - Stating, “\_\_\_\_\_” when evidence of abuse was presented.
  - Yet later granting the father’s retaliatory OOP, based solely on hearsay.
- I request that this matter be reviewed in light of the sudden death of my son \_\_\_\_\_ while in his father’s custody on \_\_\_\_\_, which occurred after repeated safety concerns were ignored.
- I ask the Commission to recognize that these actions demonstrate not only misconduct but a pattern of bias that places children’s lives and safety at risk.