

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-492

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

December 16, 2025

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace failed to follow the law, violated due process, and was biased in a protective order proceeding.

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).

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 member Michael J. Brown did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 16, 2025.

From:
Sent:
To: Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>
Subject: Hon. (Trial Court) Judicial Complaint

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

1501 W. Washington, Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007

COMPLAINANT:

Email:

RESPONDENT JUDGE:

Hon. Justice Court, County, Arizona

JUDICIAL COMPLAINT AGAINST HON. HON.

I. INTRODUCTION

I, respectfully submit this judicial conduct complaint against Judge for repeated and serious violations of my constitutional rights, statutory protections, and the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct during proceedings in **Case No.** ().

These violations include: (1) failure to provide a hearing within the statutory 7–10 day window, (2) refusal to accept and process my filings, (3) permitting ex parte communications, (4) granting injunctions without evidence, and (5) issuing prejudicial rulings that infringed on my due process and equal protection rights. Collectively, these actions deprived me of my right to be heard, obstructed access to the courts, and demonstrated bias against me as a self-represented litigant.

II. SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR COMPLAINT

1. Failure to Hold Timely Hearing

- Under **A.R.S. §§ 12-1809(F) and 12-1810(G)**, a hearing must be held within 7–10 days once requested by a defendant in an injunction case.

- Despite my timely request, Judge _____ granted continuances beyond this statutory period, unlawfully delaying my hearing.
- *Emery v. Superior Court*, 89 Ariz. 321 (1961), confirms that orders issued contrary to statutory mandates are void.

2. Denial of Due Process and Equal Protection

- Judge _____ disregarded my timely filed opposition and motions (including my Motion to Dissolve and Motion for Reconsideration), while granting Plaintiff's requests.
- This denied me the opportunity to be heard "at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner," in violation of the **14th Amendment** and **Arizona Const. art. 2, §§ 4, 11, 13**.
- Favoring one party's motions while ignoring mine constitutes an **Equal Protection violation** (*Village of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562 (2000)).

3. Improper Injunction Without Evidence

- The injunction against me was granted without credible evidence. My communications with _____ were lawful consumer protection activities (demand letters, notices of claim, requests for records).
- Under **A.R.S. § 12-1809**, harassment requires a "series of acts" with no legitimate purpose. Evidence filed shows I engaged only in protected legal activity.
- By granting the injunction, Judge _____ infringed on my **First Amendment right to petition** (*BE&K Constr. Co. v. NLRB*, 536 U.S. 516 (2002)).

4. Permitting and Acting on Ex Parte Communications

- Plaintiff's counsel sent emails to the Court seeking continuances without serving me. Judge _____ acted on these requests without requiring compliance with **Ariz. R. Civ. P. 5(c)**.
- This violated **Canon 2.9, Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct**, and **ER 3.5(b), Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct**, which prohibit ex parte communications on substantive matters.

5. Denial of Access to Public Records

- My requests for records under **A.R.S. § 39-121** were denied, obstructing my ability to prepare for hearings.
- Arizona courts recognize denial of public records as a due process violation (*Lake v. City of Phoenix*, 222 Ariz. 547 (2009)).

6. Prejudicial Rulings Without Timely Notice

- Orders were issued without giving me adequate time to receive notice or respond, violating **Ariz. R. Civ. P. 6 and 7.1**, and the **Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause**.

- This shows systemic prejudice against me as a pro se litigant.

7. Obstruction of Right to Be Heard

- Arizona Constitution, **art. 2, § 11**, guarantees that justice shall be administered “openly and without unnecessary delay.”
- By postponing hearings, ignoring filings, and sustaining an unsupported injunction, Judge _____ obstructed my statutory and constitutional right to challenge the injunction as required by law.

8. Improper Refusal and Obstruction of Filings

- I was first told that the Court did not allow filings. Later, I was told electronic filings were prohibited, and that only paper filings were accepted. Even when I complied and filed paper motions, they were not accepted or processed in time for hearings.
- This violates **Rule 5(d), Ariz. R. Civ. P.**, which requires the clerk to file every pleading and motion submitted.
- By preventing my filings from being considered, the Court denied my **due process rights (U.S. Const. amend. XIV)** and obstructed my **First Amendment right to petition**.
- Arizona’s **Open Courts Clause (art. 2, § 11)** and *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), require meaningful opportunity to be heard. Denying acceptance of my filings before hearings was a direct violation.

III. HARM AND PREJUDICE

- The injunction, entered and maintained without lawful basis, has caused **severe and irreparable harm** to me and my family. It has damaged my **personal and professional reputation**, branding me as a harasser despite clear, documented evidence disproving such allegations.
- The stigma of this injunction has harmed my **employment prospects and career opportunities**, limiting my ability to pursue work and diminishing my credibility in both professional and community settings.
- My **liberty interests and constitutional rights** have been directly compromised, as I am denied the ability to freely exercise my right to petition, respond to filings, and access the courts in a fair and timely manner.
- Beyond professional and legal consequences, my **children and I endure significant emotional distress and anxiety** each day the injunction remains in place. The ongoing prejudice has disrupted our family stability, safety, and wellbeing.
- The Court’s refusal to timely process my filings, acknowledge my motions, and uphold statutory deadlines has magnified this harm, compounding the **stress, financial**

strain, and psychological toll of fighting to defend myself in an unfair process.

- Each delay and obstruction deepens this prejudice, erodes public trust in the judiciary, and leaves me without meaningful recourse to protect myself and my family from continuing injustice.

IV. FEDERAL, STATE OF ARIZONA, AND ETHICAL AUTHORITY VIOLATED

- **U.S. Const. amend. I, XIV** – Right to petition, due process, equal protection.
- **Arizona Const. art. 2, §§ 4, 11, 13** – Due process, open courts, equal protection.
- **A.R.S. §§ 12-1809, 12-1810** – Mandated 7–10 day hearing rule.
- **A.R.S. § 39-121** – Right to public records.
- **Ariz. R. Civ. P. 5(d), 6, 7.1** – Proper filing and notice requirements.
- **Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, Canons 1, 2.2, 2.9, 2.11** – Fairness, prohibition on ex parte communications, duty to uphold the law.
- **Relevant Caselaw:** *Mathews v. Eldridge* (due process), *Curtis v. Richardson* (Arizona due process protections), *Emery v. Superior Court* (statutory deadlines void if ignored), *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech* (equal protection), *Lake v. City of Phoenix* (records), *Rawlings v. Apodaca* (petition rights).

V. REQUESTED RELIEF

I respectfully request that the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct:

1. Investigate Judge _____ conduct in Case No. _____.
2. Find that his actions violated constitutional rights, Arizona statutes, and the Code of Judicial Conduct.
3. Issue appropriate sanctions to ensure accountability.
4. Order corrective measures to protect litigants' due process rights in _____ Justice Court.
5. Ensure my record reflects that I was unlawfully denied hearings, filings, and equal access to justice.

Respectfully submitted,