

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-533

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

February 13, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court pro tem judge had a conflict of interest because of a prior appearance as a prosecutor years earlier.

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 Cathy Riggs did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 13, 2026.

Comp

2025-533

Court Of Arizona In County

State of Arizona,
Respondent,

V.

Petitioner.

Case No.

Motion Pursuant To Az. R. Crim. P. 10.1
Requesting Change Of Judge Due To Bias
With Brief

Corres Now Petitioner pro se in forma pauperis requesting change of judge due to judge violations of Canon Two Rule 2.3 which reads ("Bias, prejudice, and harassment") by claiming or Petitioner's constitutional rights were not violated. This inaccurate allegation fails to represent the factual court record in violation of A.R.P. § 13-2702 and Az. R. Crim. P. 35.1 (a) and (b). See Exhibit-1: Court transcripts

dated _____ at _____ (Page 10) judge
 (Line 12) acknowledged she was in fact involved in _____ on
 under the name _____ See Exhibit-2; Court document
 indicating for the state, Prosecutor _____ . Petitioner articulates
 judge _____ violated Canon One Rule 1.2 by clearly denying
 Petitioner a change of counsel who would have at minimum, a witness
 list and an adversarial testing to the state uncorroborated allegation, and
 a conflict of interest investigation conducted pursuant to ER 1.1 and
 ER 1.3 mandating "competent representation to a client, which requires
 the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably for
 the representation." and "reasonable diligence and promptness in representing
 a client.", these laws were deliberately ignored by both judges in
 violation of *Bracy v. Gramley*, 520 U.S. 899, at 904-905, 117 S.Ct. 1793,
 at 1797, 138 L. Ed. 2d 97 (1997) (HN 2-3) mandating the due process
 clause to a fair tribunal. Also the U.S. Supreme Court mandated all
 Courts are bound to the constitution, see *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch
 137, 5 U.S. 137, 2 L. Ed. 60 (1803): ("the particular phraseology of the
 constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the
 principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law
 repugnant to the constitution is void; and that courts, as well as other
 departments, are bound by that instrument. The rule must be
 discharged.") Id at 1, 28 Cranch 137, 5 U.S. 137, 180. See Exhibit-3,
 judge _____ was given notification of judge _____ violation of
 Ariz. law which mandated this case dismissed with prejudice, see

EXHIBIT-4 judge recusal dated due to her
previous involvement with Petitioner in , thus denying
Petitioner's due process right under the 14th Amendment. See
EXHIBIT-5 judge order on denying
dismissal with prejudice in violation of Canon One Rule 1.1.

These judges are bound by the law, not their personal agenda.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct as I understand the court's illegal application of the law.

Date - By -

EXHIBIT-1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
)
Defendant.)
)

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE
Judge of the Court

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
(Priors Trial - Part 1)

, Arizona

Reported By:

**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.**