

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-601

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

March 31, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge provided an insufficiently detailed minute entry and made improper rulings in a child custody 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).

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 31, 2026.

Comp

**Attachments:** [PDFSuplamente re status conference.pdf](#)  
[Court hearing - Transcript.pdf](#)  
[Minute entry fo hearing.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:**  
**Sent:**  
**To:** Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Complaint re Judge from

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

**Subject:** Supplemental Complaint: Judicial Misconduct—Omission of Substantive Proceedings, Failure to Assess Financial Ability, and Interference with Appellate Rights

Dear Commission on Judicial Conduct,

I am writing to supplement my pending complaint against Judge County Court, I have attached my most recent filing with the Court, which includes the transcript and minute entry from the hearing, as well as the Court pleading itself.

**Summary of New Developments and Judicial Conduct Violations:**

- At the status conference, I made clear, on-the-record requests for immediate reunification with my son, for a financial assessment regarding supervised visitation (as required by law), and for the court to recognize the unopposed psychological evaluation by , which finds me a fit parent.
- The judge acknowledged on the record that my psychological evaluation is the operative expert evidence in the file.
- Despite these substantive matters being raised and addressed, the minute entry for the hearing was docketed as “hearing set” and omits any mention of these critical issues. It records only the scheduling of a future hearing, with no reference to the requests, the judge’s responses, or the evidentiary status of the psychological evaluation.
- Most egregiously, the judge has repeatedly failed to assess my financial ability to pay for supervised visitation, both in open court and in response to multiple written motions, all of which were summarily denied without findings or explanation. This is a direct violation of Arizona law and controlling appellate precedent.

**Why This Is a Serious Judicial Conduct Issue:**

- The omission of all substantive matters from the minute entry, despite their clear discussion in the transcript, is not a clerical oversight but a substantive failure that deprives the parties of a transparent, reviewable record

and impedes meaningful appellate review. This is a violation of the judge's duty to maintain the integrity and transparency of the judicial process.

- The repeated refusal to assess financial ability, despite statutory and constitutional mandates, is a violation of due process and the judge's duty to uphold the law.
- The pattern of summary denials and omissions appears calculated to interfere with my ability to obtain appellate review. Given that the judge is aware of the pending Court review, the only plausible explanation for these omissions is to make my case unappealable or to insulate her rulings from scrutiny. This suggests motive, intent, and execution of a plan to benefit the opposing party—my ex-wife—with whom the judge has a relationship and history with spanning years, as there is no other rational explanation for this conduct.

**Relevant Canons and Rules of Conduct Violated:**

- **Canon 1 (A.R.S.Ct. Rule 81, Code of Judicial Conduct):** A judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.
- **Canon 2:** A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently.
- **Rule 2.2:** A judge shall uphold and apply the law, and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially.
- **Rule 2.6(A):** A judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law.
- **Rule 2.9(A):** A judge shall not initiate, permit, or consider ex parte communications, or consider other communications made to the judge outside the presence of the parties or their lawyers, concerning a pending or impending matter.

**Violation of Oath of Office:** By failing to memorialize the substance of the hearing—including my requests for reunification, the financial assessment, and the admission of exculpatory expert evidence—and by summarily denying my motions without findings, the judge has failed to perform her duties with the transparency, diligence, and impartiality required by her oath and the Code of Judicial Conduct.

**Apparent Motive and Effect:** The only plausible explanation for these omissions and denials is to interfere with my appellate rights and to benefit the opposing party. The judge is aware of the pending Court review and appears to be acting to make my case unappealable, which can only be explained as an effort to assist my ex-wife, with no findings on the Child's best interest. There is no legitimate judicial reason for this conduct.

**Controlling Arizona Authority Supporting This Complaint:**

- *Gersten v. Gersten*, 223 Ariz. 99, 104–05 (App. 2009): Minute entries and orders must reflect the substance of the hearing, and the absence of findings or memorialization of substantive matters is a procedural defect and can warrant reversal or remand. [0]
- *Hart v. Hart*, 220 Ariz. 183, 187–88 (App. 2009): The court must make findings supporting supervised parenting time and cannot order restrictions without statutory findings. [14]
- *Paul E. v. Courtney F.*, 418 P.3d 413, 418–19 (App. 2018): Findings are mandatory for any order restricting or supervising parenting time, and the court must determine whether the parent can pay for any ordered services. [7],[1]
- *Olesen v. Daniel*, 251 Ariz. 25, 484 P.3d 139, 143 (App. 2021): The absence of findings is reversible error;

findings must be specific and comprehensive.

- *Gish v. Greyson*, 514 P.3d 937, 947 (Ariz. App. 2022): The court must make an on-the-record determination of the parties' ability to pay before allocating costs for supervised visitation.

**Attachments:**

- My recent Court filing (including the transcript and minute entry)
- The transcript of the , hearing
- The minute entry for the same hearing

**Request:** I respectfully request that the Commission review these materials as part of my pending complaint. The pattern of omitting substantive matters from the record, refusing to assess financial ability, and summarily denying motions—especially when those matters are central to the rights of a parent and child—raises serious concerns about the judge's adherence to her oath and the Code of Judicial Conduct. I believe this conduct warrants investigation and appropriate corrective action.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

**Cited References**

- [1] *Paul E. v. Courtney F.*, 418 P.3d 413 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2018)
- [3] *Matter of Appeal in Maricopa Cty*, 178 Ariz. 372 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1994)
- [7] *Paul E. v. Courtney F.*, 418 P.3d 413 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2018)
- [14] *Hart v. Hart*, 220 Ariz. 183 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2009)
- [15] *Matter of Appeal in Maricopa Cty*, 178 Ariz. 372 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1994)
- [12] *In re the Appeal in Pima County Juvenile Action No. S-933*, 135 Ariz. 278 (Ariz. 1982)
- [13] *Lindsey M. v. Rizona Department of Economic Security*, 212 Ariz. 43 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2006)
- [16] *Ruben M. v. Ariz. Dep't of Econ. Sec.*, 282 P.3d 437 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2012)
- [17] *Chapman v. Hopkins*, 404 P.3d 638 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2017)
- [18] *Chapman v. Hopkins*, 404 P.3d 638 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2017)
- [19] *In re the Appeal in Pima County Juvenile Action No. S-933*, 135 Ariz. 278 (Ariz. 1982)
- [20] *Manuel M. v. Arizona Department of Economic Security*, 218 Ariz. 205 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2008)

Good afternoon, this is Judge [redacted] speaking. We are just

Judge [redacted] speaker. Hi, we just lost you. Are you there now? Yes, I'm here. Thank you. I I was just starting to say, and then you dropped out. Uh, we're waiting on our clerk, and hopefully she'll uh pop on to our meeting in the next minute or two, and then we'll get started. So thank you.

Your Honor, hopefully it won't take that long, but I do have a resolution management conference in uh Judge [redacted] division at [redacted].

We're we're sending people to literally get the clerk. So I think she's here with us now. Oh, okay.

She's in the office here. Okay, is she logging on?

She can hear it here from the team. Oh, okay, thank you. Okay, we will start our recording in just a moment.

This is the time set for a status conference in [redacted] and [redacted]. Uh sir, go ahead, tell me your full name, please.

Me? [redacted], go ahead. Yeah, it's [redacted]. Thank you. Counsel? [redacted] on behalf of the respondent, [redacted], who's up hearing via teams as well. Thank you. As I said, we're set for the status conference today. Um where where do things stand as of late and where do we go from here? I guess I'll go ahead and start there. Uh, [redacted], I'll go ahead and start with you since it's your um petitions to modify. Go ahead. Um, so since the temporary orders have been entered, um there has been submitting to drug testing over the past several weeks. We've been receiving those. Um there have been, I believe, two supervised visits that have taken place. Um, we did get the court submitted entry this morning um regarding the motion uh to compel.

And I actually um spent the morning drafting response to that that was filed uh just a few moments ago, so that will be for the court to consider. The plan was to ask the court to set a trial today. Um there is one issue, and depending on how the court wants to handle it, um the with the order for the test and under the evaluation with

That has not taken place but in [redacted], finally, I believe. He attached a psychological evaluation that he went and obtained on his phone in [redacted] with uh [redacted], I believe is how you pronounce her last name.

Um which is pretty typical in these types of evaluations. Um I will note that there was also um discussion about individual counseling,

but I don't see in that report that any of those records were reviewed by the evaluators. So we wanted to see one if the court was looking, we had seen that and did the court believe that that satisfied the prior order. If it did, then we would need time to have an expert review it and submit a report before a final evidentiary hearing. Um if the court is of the opinion that it doesn't satisfy the prior order, then I think we're ready to move forward with trial at this point in at least um 75 days. That way we have the 60-day um timeline. Uh , and how long of a trial would you be asking for? Two hours? I think three hours that would give each side an hour and a half to address both of the pending petitions.

Thank you. Uh , I'll turn to you and we'll kind of pick up uh with what was addressing with respect to this site eval. So I guess one of my questions that I had um was why you use this new provider. And so we'll start there. Go ahead. Oh, um well, I mean, before you know, Judge uh addressing any you know substantive matters in this, uh, first of all, I I don't know what we would be having a hearing on.

Uh that's the first thing. And we'll get we'll put a pin in that and come back to it. Um I I but I must know for the record that um, you know, I've complied with the court orders and requirements in this case. Uh there is no credible evidence, uh, no expert testimony, no professional reports, and no findings uh supported by actual evidence that I'm a danger to my child. The only professional evidence in the record, including from uh are included, are from the child psychologist

and my own psychologist, and it's unopposed and confirms that I'm not pause you. I'm not a risk, I'm not a risk. Are you interrupting me? , I'm gonna pause you because I'm losing you. Oh, you're what sir is he is he cutting out for other people, or is it just on my end? Okay, okay. So, , if you could turn your camera off, that should help with that feedback. Okay, great. And then I'll have you start. You were saying uh is that better? Yeah, so the FL from the child psychologist. And that's right. The only the the only professional evidence in the record, um, you know, that are included in this record, uh, you know, is from the child psychologists and my own psychologists. It's and it's unopposed, and it confirms that I'm not a risk. Uh the court has relied solely on unsupported statements from the mother, which are directly contradicted by the expert evidence. I also have a pending unopposed motion for mandatory evidentiary hearing regarding the court appointed psychologist, as well as a you know, motion for the judge's recusal. Um, you know, I do intend on um uh you know on calling uh the judge, the judge's husband, the evaluator, the evaluator's son-in-law, and her daughter-in-law's material witnesses regarding the conflicts of interest with regard to the uh psychological evaluator. This is known, uh, and and also because of procedural irregularities. The facts are unopposed and

**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.**