

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-580

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

February 13, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to follow the law in a family law case.

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.

# COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

## FORMAL COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

### Complainant:

### Judicial Officer:

Hon.

Court of Arizona, County  
Family Court Department

### Case:

#### Relevant Dates:

**Type of Complaint:** Failure to Review Record; Failure to Consider Material Evidence;  
Violation of Judicial Duties Under the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct

## I. INTRODUCTION

This complaint concerns a **multi-year pattern** in which Judge issued rulings in **without reviewing the underlying record**, resulting in inaccurate child-support calculations, reliance on incorrect parenting-time data, failure to act when notified of defects in prior filings, and dismissal of a safety-related petition without referencing or addressing the material facts presented.

These actions implicate **Rule 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness)**, **Rule 2.5 (Competence, Diligence, and Accuracy)**, **Rule 2.6 (Right to Be Heard)**, and **Rule 2.15 (Duty to Act on Misconduct or Irregularities)** of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct.

This complaint does not seek to challenge judicial discretion, nor does it ask the Commission to revisit any legal ruling.

It seeks review of whether the judge carried out required judicial duties when issuing multiple orders that appear inconsistent with the record and with governing ethical standards.

## II. SUMMARY OF MISCONDUCT ALLEGED

### A. Failure to review underlying orders before modifying or calculating child support

Judge \_\_\_\_\_ repeatedly issued support-related orders that relied on **parenting-time numbers not supported anywhere in the record**, including assigning the father ( ) *days per year* of parenting time in \_\_\_\_\_, despite no such parenting-time order existing in this case.

### B. Failure to act after receiving written notice of irregularities in prior filings

On \_\_\_\_\_, the Court received a written objection explaining that the parenting-time numbers used throughout the case arose from irregular circumstances, were inconsistent with the father's understanding, and did not reflect an actual filed or signed parenting plan.

Under Rule 2.15, the Court was required to take appropriate action when notified of potential defects affecting the validity of prior orders. No action was taken.

### C. Failure to consider or address material safety-related evidence in a Rule 91 adequate-cause review

On \_\_\_\_\_, the Court dismissed the father's petition without acknowledging or referencing the specific factual safety concerns raised, including a history of self-harm, recent suicidal ideation, denial of mental-health treatment, and abrupt cutoff of communication following the filing.

## **D. Pattern of rulings inconsistent with the case record**

Across multiple orders, the Court issued findings or calculations that do not align with filed documents, existing orders, or the factual record of the case.

# **III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

## **A. Issues with the Parenting-Time Foundation**

The case record shows no filed, signed, or entered parenting plan establishing the father's parenting-time percentage in .

The only documented parenting-time percentage (19%) appears in a support worksheet filed by counsel, not in any approved or executed order.

The father raised concerns that he signed documents under irregular circumstances and that the resulting percentages did not reflect agreed terms.

These irregularities carried forward into every subsequent child-support calculation.

## **B. – Support Modification Order**

Judge entered a support modification without reviewing or identifying the absence of a valid parenting-time order.

The Court used historic numbers that did not originate from a filed, signed parenting plan or from a judicial order.

## **C. – Support Modification and Worksheet**

The Child Support Worksheet issued on this date assigned the father:

## “Parenting Time Table (C) for (5) days at (0.00%).”

There is **no order anywhere in the record** granting the father ( ) days per year of parenting time.

Even during supervised parenting time, the father’s scheduled time exceeded this number.

Using a parenting-time figure not supported by any order is inconsistent with:

- Rule 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness)
- Rule 2.5 (Competence and Diligence)
- Rule 2.6 (Right to Be Heard)

The Court is required to verify the actual parenting-time allocation before calculating child support.

No such review appears to have occurred.

## D. – Written Notice of Irregularities (Objection to Attorney Fees)

In a written objection filed with the Court, the father informed Judge Francis that:

- He signed parenting-time paperwork in a side office in under irregular circumstances.
- The terms entered into the case did not match what he understood or agreed.
- He immediately received contradictory communications afterward (including a “stay-away” directive).
- He believed the numbers used against him were inaccurate and not reflective of a valid order.

Under **Rule 2.15(A)**:

*If a judge receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that a lawyer or another person has committed a violation affecting a proceeding, the judge shall take appropriate action.*

No action was taken.

No review of prior filings was ordered.

No clarification was sought.

Subsequent orders continued to use the same defective foundation.

## **E. – Rule 91 Adequate Cause Dismissal**

The father filed a petition detailing multiple specific, documented safety concerns involving the minor child, including:

- A history of self-harm
- Recent suicidal ideation within the prior months
- A complete lack of mental-health treatment for over a year
- Panic-type symptoms
- The stepfather's professional behavioral-health role and his support for withholding treatment
- Abrupt cutoff of contact with the father following the filing
- Required retrieval of court papers and a compelled denial video

The Court's minute entry stated only that the father had not adequately alleged a material change and referenced no facts.

The ruling did not acknowledge or address any of the safety-related information submitted.

This raises concerns under:

- Rule 2.2 (responsibility to consider the facts)
- Rule 2.5 (competence and diligence)
- Rule 2.6 (ensuring parties have the right to be heard)

**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.**