

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-568

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

February 20, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased in denying a temporary restraining order.

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 member Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 20, 2026.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2025-568

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

Judge's Name:

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

The judge presided over an emergency TRO case to prevent my family from being displaced out of our home by a predator lender, that I have filed an action for a court procedure about. There are several cause of actions that have been violated the second position on my home, both state and federal violations. The judge proceeded to circumvent the law and acted out a gross overreach of discretion the law provides him. Some of the causes that violated are; Count 11 (Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing), that every contract is binding by in Arizona Law and Federal Law. The judge stated that I was not entitled to any modification or loss mitigated plans even though I was already in the midst of modification with the previous advisory group, before the loan was sold off several times to ensure I would not get a modification. That's both Count III - Wrongful Foreclosure (Dual Tracking) and Count IV - Violation of RESPA, 12 U.S.C. 2605; and Regulation X 12 C.F.R. 1024.41. Every mortgage loan is binding by loss mitigation efforts federally. I explained to the judge this would cause irreparable harm to my family and we could not afford to lose our home that includes my pregnant wife and 2 small children being years old and yr old. The law describes irreparable harm and damage as a strong point for TRO. The judge then professed that this ruling isn't an indicator of any ruling in the action for a court procedure. I believe this just showed bigoted ways a behavior, whether it was simply because I Pro Se or whether it was another underlining cause, I am not sure. I'm under the belief that this judge should not be allowed on any bench presiding over Arizonans in any effect, their fate would not be from fair judgement, compassion, and it most certainly won't be by judgement based on the law.

COURT OF ARIZONA
COUNTY

HONORABLE

CLERK OF THE COURT

Deputy

v.

JUDGE

HEARING

Building – Courtroom

This is the time set for a virtual Order to Show Cause Return Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion for Emergency Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction, filed

Plaintiff is present on his own behalf. Defendants and are represented by counsel,

Defendant is represented by counsel,

COURT OF ARIZONA
COUNTY

A record of the proceedings is made digitally in lieu of a court reporter.

The Court notes service by mail has been accepted and counsel for the Defendants have appeared at today's hearing.

Discussion is held regarding the case and the temporary restraining order (TRO).

THE COURT FINDS that given the amount of default time on the loan and the status of the loan, a TRO is not appropriate. This does not stop from seeking the damages stated in his Complaint.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that there is no sufficient basis to grant a TRO. The Court notes the Complaint, and the Application for a TRO are not a verified complaint nor is the application accompanied by a verified declaration.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Plaintiff has no reasonable likelihood of success on the merits.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Motion for Emergency Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction.

Plaintiff makes additional arguments to the Court.

Contact information is exchanged between Counsel and Plaintiff

LET THE RECORD REFLECT the Court affirms its initial denial of Plaintiff's Motion for Emergency Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction.

Discussion is further held regarding the loan modification.

Matter concludes.