

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-607

Judge: Anthony Bell

Complainant: Thomas Licari

ORDER

The Complainant alleged a civil traffic hearing officer improperly ruled and violated due process in a civil matter.

Hearing Officer Anthony Bell, Maricopa County Justice Courts, presided over a traffic violation trial. The driver was a minor and appeared telephonically. The driver's father was also present for the trial telephonically. After the police officer testified, Hearing Officer Bell asked if there were any questions. The driver's father, who is not an attorney, said he had some questions but first wanted the court to rule on the motion to dismiss the father had submitted. Hearing Officer Bell proceeded to allow the father to present argument on a motion to dismiss that he had filed on behalf of his son. Without ruling on the motion to dismiss or allowing cross-examination of the police officer, Hearing Officer Bell declared, "I'm going to take the information that I have in front of me and I'm going to find him responsible."

In his response to the Commission, Hearing Officer Bell indicated that he normally allowed "the plaintiff this opportunity" for cross-examination, but that he cannot remember if he did. Hearing Officer Bell did remember, however, that the officer "did a good job." Hearing Officer Bell did not address under what authority he allowed the father to act as an attorney for his son, who was the defendant, even though he was specifically asked by the Commission to address this issue.

The Commission found that Hearing Officer Bell conducted a hearing that was confusing and not orderly, and did not follow Rule 19(a), Rules of Court Procedure for Civil Traffic, Boating, Marijuana, and Parking and Standing Rule 19(a). Additionally, due to the unorganized manner in which the hearing was conducted, Hearing Officer Bell failed to provide the opportunity for cross-examination by the defendant. Further, Hearing Officer Bell should not have allowed a non-attorney to represent a litigant in this matter, even if the litigant is a minor child; and the Commission advises Hearing Officer Bell to review Judicial Ethics Advisory Opinion 20-01, which in part states:

Arizona's prohibition on non-attorneys representing third parties applies to the representation of juveniles by their parents or guardians. Although judges cannot ethically permit such representation, they may explain to juveniles and their parents the risks of self-representation. Moreover, provided they do not convey the impression of bias toward one party, judges may take additional steps, such as explaining procedures in simplified terms, to ensure that juveniles have a meaningful opportunity to be heard or may permit a parent to sit with a self-represented juvenile for emotional support.

Hearing Officer Bell did not conduct an organized trial that would have allowed for cross-examination and presentation of evidence and allowed a non-attorney to represent a party.

The Commission found that Hearing Officer Bell's conduct during the trial violated the following provisions of the Code of Judicial Conduct:

- Rule 1.1 which states, "A judge shall comply with the law, including the Code of Judicial Conduct."
- Rule 1.2 which states, "A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety."
- Rule 2.3 which states, "A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office, including administrative duties, without bias or prejudice."
- Rule 2.5(A) which states, "A judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently and promptly."
- Rule 2.6(A) which states, "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."

Accordingly, Maricopa County Justice Courts Hearing Officer Anthony Bell is hereby publicly reprimanded for the conduct described above and pursuant to Commission Rule 17(a). The record in this case, consisting of the complaint, the judicial officer's response, and this order shall be made public as required by Commission Rule 9(a).

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

///

Dated: June 9, 2026

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Christopher P. Staring

Hon. Christopher P. Staring
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were distributed to all
appropriate persons on June 9, 2026.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2025-607

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: **Thomas Licari** Judge's Name: **Tony Bell**

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.

Please see the 12 page attachment complaint

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

--

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: Thomas Licari	Judge's Name: Tony Bell
----------------------------	--------------------------------

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.

Please see the 12 page attachment complaint

1. Name: Thomas Licari (filing on behalf of _____)
2. Mailing Address: _____
3. Telephone: _____ Email: _____
4. Judge's name: Tony Bell Location: McDowell Mountain Justice Court, Phoenix, AZ
5. Court: ☐ municipal ☒ justice ☐ superior ☐ court of appeals ☐ supreme court
6. Did you have a case before this judge? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - a. If yes, is the case still pending? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 - b. Case name and number: State of Arizona vs. _____, CT
 - c. List any attorneys who appeared in the case: None (self-represented)
 - d. List names and phone numbers of any witnesses who observed the judge's conduct: D. Donofrio (Arizona DPS Officer, Badge 1048; contact via AZ DPS at 602-223-2000); Thomas Licari (_____); _____ (minor defendant; contact via guardian Thomas Licari at _____)
7. I understand the commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge to a case: ☒ Yes ☐ No
8. Please read the following statement and sign on the line below:

I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the allegations contained in the attached complaint are true.

Thomas Licari (Signature) Date: December 02, 2025

Attached Complaint Allegations

Complaint Against Hearing Officer Tony Bell – Violation of Judicial Conduct Standards

I, Thomas Licari, father and legal guardian of minor defendant _____, submit this complaint against Hearing Officer Tony Bell of the McDowell Mountain Justice Court in Maricopa County for misconduct during the civil traffic hearing in Case No. CT2025185015 on October 15, 2025. The transcripts (attached) reveal Bell was barely willing to listen to my clearly correct motion and case precedents, refused my right to cross-examine the officer (denying the right to confront the accuser under the Sixth Amendment and Arizona Constitution Art. 2, § 24), and abruptly terminated the hearing, violating _____ civil and constitutional rights to due process (Ariz. Const. Art. 2, § 4) and a fair hearing (ARS § 28-1594). As a minor eager to learn about the court system through participation, _____ instead witnessed a trampling of legal procedures, disillusioning a young mind about judicial fairness. This conduct breached the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct: Canon 1 (integrity/independence), Canon 2 (impartiality/competence), and Canon 3 (patience/dignity/courtesy). Specific rules violated include Rule 2.5 (competence/diligence), Rule 2.6 (ensuring right to be heard), and Rule 2.8 (patient/dignified demeanor).

Background and Procedural Context:

- On August 4, 2025, I filed a pre-hearing motion to dismiss under ARS § 28-1550.2(b) and Arizona Rules of Civil Traffic Procedure, citing location inaccuracies (mile post 38.5 mismatched GPS by ~5 miles) per *Mesa v. Killingsworth*, 96 Ariz. 290 (1964); evidentiary gaps in LiDAR per *State v. Gonzales*, 206 Ariz. 469 (App. 2003); and work zone issues per *State v. Powers*, 200 Ariz. 123 (App. 2001) and ARS § 28-710 (no workers present).
- Justice Michele Reagan deferred ruling.
- The virtual hearing (October 15, 2025, ~1:30 PM) featured inconsistent officer testimony (mile posts 35-38). I initiated cross-examination on LiDAR foundation.

Specific Allegations of Misconduct (IRAC Format for Each):

1. **Denial of Due Process and Opportunity to Be Heard (Violating Canon 2, Rule 2.5 – Competence, Diligence; Rule 2.6 – Right to Be Heard):**
 - **Issue:** Did Bell deny a meaningful hearing by prematurely ruling without allowing full cross-examination or evidence?
 - **Rule:** Rule 2.6(A) requires judges to "accord to every person... the right to be heard according to law"; Rule 2.5(A) mandates competent, diligent performance. Precedents like *State v. Assaye*, 216 Ariz. 406 (App. 2007) demand LiDAR foundation; judicial misconduct cases (e.g., *In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967), applied in Arizona) extend due process to minors.
 - **Application:** At ~16:02 (transcript), after partial questions, Bell interrupted: "I'm going to find you responsible based on the information I have now," ignoring evidentiary gaps (no calibration proof) and refusing GPS evidence/precedents. This curtailed defense, violating ARS § 28-1594 and due process (Ariz. Const. Art. 2, § 4), particularly harmful to a minor observing the system.
 - **Conclusion:** Bell's actions showed impatience and bias, undermining judicial integrity (Canon 1).
2. **Abrupt Termination of Hearing (Violating Canon 3, Rule 2.8 – Decorum/Demeanor):**
 - **Issue:** Did Bell's "hanging up" mid-proceeding lack courtesy/professionalism?
 - **Rule:** Rule 2.8(B) requires judges to be "patient, dignified, and courteous to litigants"; *Matter of Riley*, 142 Ariz. 604 (1984) addresses misconduct in communications. AZCJC summaries (2024) discipline for disrepute-bringing conduct.
 - **Application:** At ~16:50, Bell declared "We're done here" and ended the call without closing arguments/evidence, denying confrontation rights (Sixth Amendment; Ariz. Const. Art. 2, § 24) despite my stated "mountain of questions" (~16:02). For a minor like _____, this modeled disregard for law, eroding educational value.
 - **Conclusion:** This created bias appearance (Rule 2.3), prejudicing a minor defendant.
3. **Failure to Address Pre-Hearing Motion Adequately (Violating Canon 2, Rule 2.2 – Impartiality/Fairness):**

- **Issue:** Did Bell dismiss the motion without analysis, ignoring precedents?
- **Rule:** Rule 2.2(A) requires impartial, fair application of law; *In re Peck*, 263 Ariz. 323 (1989) emphasizes thorough evidence consideration.
- **Application:** Bell acknowledged the motion (~2:13) but refused to engage correct precedents, ruling prematurely despite jurisdictional flaws.
- **Conclusion:** This breached diligence (Rule 2.5), eroding public confidence (Canon 1).

Impact and Supporting Evidence:

- Judgment: \$150 fine, no TSS/suspension (attached judgment). Yet MVD corrective actions (October 17, 2025; attached) threaten suspension December 16, 2025, under ARS § 28-331(A)—without court order, causing undue prejudice amid appeal (filed October 16, 2025; pending Superior Court, per ARS § 28-1595). As a minor with scholarship prospects (transcript ~15:05), sought to learn civic processes but was disillusioned by Bell's law-trampling, harming youth trust in justice (*McBeth v. Rose*, 111 Ariz. 399 (1974)).
- Attached: Transcript, judgment, MVD notices, appeal packet, Taj Rahi-Loo correspondence (noting "issues for improvement").
- Harm: Denies minor's rights, impacts scholarships and civic education.

Requested Action: Full investigation; sanctions if warranted. I affirm truth under perjury.

Thomas Licari
December 02, 2025

From: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <
Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 at 2:19 PM
To: t iz
Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Subject: RE: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case CT: -

Good afternoon, Mr. Licari.

The hearing officer who heard your case was Tony Bell. And yes, the link indicated in your email is the correct COJC online site to file a complaint with the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct. If you click on the left tab (blue rectangle) "How to File A Complaint," you will see a pop-up box with "Complaint Form." Clicking on that hyperlink will take you to an online form with instructions for how to file a complaint.

Have a good day.



TAJ RAHI-LOO
ADMINISTRATIVE PRO TEMPORE
MARICOPA COUNTY JUSTICE COURTS
222 N. CENTRAL AVE., STE 210 / PHOENIX, AZ 85004

CONTACT: 602.316.3887
TAJ.RAHI-LOO@JBAZMC.MARICOPA.GOV
JUSTICECOURTS.MARICOPA.GOV

From: thomas >
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 1:20 PM
To: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>
Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court <McDowellMountainJusticeCourt@jbazmc.maricopa.gov>
Subject: Re: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case CT: -

Importance: High

One more request, can you please tell me the judge's name? We are going back and forth on it, and I want to make sure I have corrected spelling for my complaint form. Thank you

Best Regards

Thomas Licari

Phone:

Email:

From:

Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 at 1:01 PM

To: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>

Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

<McDowellMountainJusticeCourt@jbazmc.maricopa.gov>

Subject: Re: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case CT -

Hello Rahi-Loo

Would you be able to provide me with more information on filing a complaint with the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct. Are you talking about the form on <https://azcjc.azcourts.gov/How-to-File-a-Complaint> ?

Best Regards

Thomas Licari

Phone:

Email: _

From: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>

Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2025 at 12:46 PM

To:

Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Subject: RE: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case CT

Good afternoon, Mr. Licari.

Thank you for your patience as I reviewed the concerns you shared. I wanted to ensure I had all relevant information before responding. I have now obtained and carefully reviewed the recording of the hearing in question and spoken with the hearing officer.

Some issues for improvement were identified. However, as I noted in my initial communication with you, my investigation is for internal administrative review, conducted with the goal of improving judicial officer training and performance where necessary. I am not at liberty to discuss any internal administrative actions that may have resulted from my review. However, please know that concerns raised by the public are taken seriously. They help us ensure that our judicial officers are adhering to the law and conducting proceedings with the fairness, courtesy, and professionalism we expect. I appreciate you taking the time to bring this matter to my attention. Feedback from the community is important, and it allows us to follow up appropriately when needed.

I cannot provide you with legal advice on obtaining an administrative stay with the MVD, nor do I have the authority to remand your case for a new hearing, if one is warranted. That would fall within the jurisdiction of the appellate courts. However, in addition to any legal appellate remedies available to you (which it's my understanding you are already pursuing), you are always free to file a complaint with the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct. They are an independent agency that conducts their own investigations into complaints involving judicial officers.

At this time, my internal review is complete, and any necessary administrative steps have been addressed. I will be closing this matter. Thank you again for reaching out and I hope you have a good day.



TAJ RAHI-LOO
ADMINISTRATIVE PRO TEMPORE
MARICOPA COUNTY JUSTICE COURTS
222 N. CENTRAL AVE., STE 210 / PHOENIX, AZ 85004

CONTACT: 602.316.3887
[TAJ.RAHI-LOO@JBAZMC.MARICOPA.GOV](mailto:Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov)
JUSTICECOURTS.MARICOPA.GOV

From: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 11:34 AM
To:
Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court
Subject: RE: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case CT2 -

Good morning,
Yes, I've located the name. I am still conducting my review, but there's nothing further that I need from you at this time. I will reach out to you upon the conclusion of my investigation.
Thank you.

From: [thoma](#)
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 10:00 AM
To: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>
Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court
Subject: Re: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case CT -

Hello Rahi-Loo,

Were you able to find the judge's name? Do you need me to do anything? Do you need more information from me? What are the next steps?

Best Regards

Thomas Licari

Phone:

Email:

From

Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 at 12:30 PM

To: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>

Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Subject: Re: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case
CT

Hello Rahi-Loo,

Thank you so much for looking up the judge. I truly appreciate your help with this matter. The judge's information was not provided to me, and during the telephonic hearing, the judge did not announce their name.

Best Regards

Thomas Licari

Phone:

Email: _

From: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>

Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 at 11:34 AM

To: [t](#)

Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Subject: RE: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case
CT:

Hello,

Judge _____ is an elected justice of the peace and I neither supervise nor have any oversight authority over her. We do not have a hearing officer or judge by the name of _____. I will attempt to locate the hearing officer through the court staff and follow back up with you.



TAJ RAHI-LOO

ADMINISTRATIVE PRO TEMPORE

MARICOPA COUNTY JUSTICE COURTS

222 N. CENTRAL AVE., STE 210 / PHOENIX, AZ 85004

CONTACT: 602.316.3887

TAJ.RAHI-LOO@JBAZMC.MARICOPA.GOV

JUSTICECOURTS.MARICOPA.GOV

From:

Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 11:14 AM

To: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>

Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Subject: Re: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case CT: -

You don't often get email from . [z. Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning, Ms. Rahi-Loo.

Thank you for getting back to me so quickly. To clarify, there were two judges/hearing officers involved in this matter: _____ and, I believe, _____. Regarding Judge _____, I am not entirely certain of the name, as the presiding judge during the hearing did not explicitly identify themselves, which I feel contributed to procedural irregularities in the case.

To provide the details you requested:

1. ****Judge who reviewed the pre-hearing motion to dismiss****

The Honorable ****|_____****

(She is referenced by name in the October 15, 2025 hearing transcript at timestamp ~2:13 and ~3:07 when the father states, "I submitted a motion to dismiss this case by to Judge _____, who said you would review it at this time," and the presiding judge confirms she reviewed it and left the final ruling to him.)

2. ****Hearing officer who actually conducted the October 15, 2025 civil traffic hearing and entered the finding of RESPONSIBLE****

The signature on the ****Notice of Civil Traffic Judgment Due**** (dated 10/15/2025) is handwritten and difficult to read, but the ****Justice of the Peace / Civil Traffic Hearing Officer**** line is signed directly above the printed name area. After enlarging and comparing the signature to known samples from McDowell Mountain Justice Court filings, the name appears to be ****_____**** (or possibly ****_____****).

The signature block reads:

Date: 10/15/2025

[Signature]

Justice of the Peace / Civil Traffic Hearing Officer

Defendant's Signature:

This matches the signature style used by ****Hearing Officer _____**** on other McDowell Mountain Justice Court civil traffic judgments from the same period.

****Hearing confirmation****

- Date: October 15, 2025
- Time: Scheduled for 1:00 PM (actual start ~1:30 PM per transcript)
- Court: McDowell Mountain Justice Court, 18380 N. 40th St., #130, Phoenix, AZ 85032
- Case Number: CT
- Citation Agency: AZ DPS
- Officer: D. DONOFRIO, Badge 1048

I have attached a marked-up copy of the ****Notice of Civil Traffic Judgment Due**** with the signature circled and enlarged for your convenience.

Please let me know if you need anything further to begin your administrative review.

Respectfully,
Thomas Licari
(on behalf of)

Phone:

Email:

From: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>

Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 at 10:24 AM

To:

Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Subject: Request for Additional Information re: complaint in Civil Traffic Case
CT -

Good morning, Mr. Licari.

I've received and reviewed your email and the attached documents regarding your complaint. To proceed, I need a few additional details:

- The name of the hearing officer who adjudicated your hearing (the signature on the judgment is unclear).
- Confirmation of the date, court, and time of your hearing. (I was unable to locate your hearing with the information that you provided and wanted to ensure that I had accurate information).

Please note that my role is limited to investigating allegations of unprofessional or unethical conduct by MCJC pro tem judges, hearing officers and/or mediators for internal administrative and training purposes. I do not have authority to review, change, or overturn legal rulings, provide legal advice, or remand cases for new hearings.

If you believe a legal or procedural error occurred in your case, you must follow the appellate process within the required time limits—contacting me does not pause those deadlines.

You may also file a complaint directly with the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct, which conducts independent investigations. This can be done through their website using the online complaint form.

Once you provide the requested information, I will begin reviewing your complaint within the scope of my role described above. Thank you.



TAJ RAHI-LOO
ADMINISTRATIVE PRO TEMPORE
MARICOPA COUNTY JUSTICE COURTS
222 N. CENTRAL AVE., STE 210 / PHOENIX, AZ 85004

CONTACT: 602.316.3887
TAJ.RAHI-LOO@JBAZMC.MARICOPA.GOV
JUSTICECOURTS.MARICOPA.GOV

From:

Sent: Sunday, November 9, 2025 11:26 AM

To: Taj Rahi-Loo (MJC) <Taj.Rahi-Loo@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov>

Cc: McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Subject: Request for Administrative Intervention in Civil Traffic Case CT: -

You don't often get email from [t](#). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ms. Taj Rahi-Loo,

I am Thomas Licari, father and legal guardian of _____, the defendant in civil traffic case CT _____ pending in McDowell Mountain Justice Court. As a Justice Courts Administrative Pro Tem for Maricopa County, I respectfully request your assistance in reviewing procedural irregularities in this matter that appear to have violated my son's due process rights under Arizona law. I have attached the full court transcript from the October 15, 2025, hearing, the Notice of Civil Traffic Judgment, the Defendant's Notice of Right to Appeal, the appeal packet, and two recent Corrective Action Notices from the Arizona Department of Transportation Motor Vehicle Division (ADOT MVD) dated October 17, 2025, for your reference.

To provide context, on August 4, 2025, prior to the hearing, I filed a motion to dismiss the citation for lack of jurisdiction under Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) § 28-1550.2(b) and

Arizona Rules of Civil Traffic Procedure. The motion cited three controlling precedents—*Mesa v. Killingsworth* (inaccurate location description invalidating jurisdiction), *State v. Gonzales* (evidentiary foundation required for LiDAR readings), and *State v. Powers* (State's burden to prove work zone conditions)—demonstrating that the officer's reported mile post (38.5 on State Route 101) mismatched GPS data from the vehicle's Life360 tracking by approximately five miles, placing the alleged violation outside the court's jurisdiction. This motion was submitted to Justice [REDACTED], who reviewed it but deferred ruling to the hearing officer without granting dismissal, despite the clear applicability of these authorities.

At the October 15, 2025, hearing (transcribed and attached), the officer testified inconsistently regarding the mile post location (varying between 35 and 38 during cross-examination), and I sought to question him further on the LiDAR calibration, officer positioning, and absence of workers in the work zone to establish evidentiary gaps. However, the hearing officer abruptly denied the opportunity for a full defense, stating, "I'm going to find you responsible based on the information I have now," before I could complete my examination (see transcript at timestamps 16:02–16:50). The officer then terminated the virtual proceeding without allowing additional evidence or argument, effectively hanging up the call mid-process. This curtailment prevented a robust presentation of the defense, contravening ARS § 28-1594 (right to hearing) and basic due process principles under the Arizona Constitution, Article 2, § 4, which require a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

Compounding this, the attached Notice of Civil Traffic Judgment (dated October 15, 2025) imposes only a \$150 fine with no mention of Traffic Survival School (TSS) attendance, license suspension, or any MVD compliance requirements. Yet, on October 17, 2025, we received two ADOT MVD Corrective Action Notices (Customer Number 17305381; Withdrawal Numbers 38461271 and 38461272) threatening suspension of [REDACTED] driving privileges effective December 16, 2025, unless TSS is completed under ARS § 28-331(A) for minors with moving violations. These notices reference the judgment but impose sanctions absent any court order, creating confusion as to whether they stem from judicial directive or administrative action. The transcript confirms no such requirement was discussed or imposed during the hearing (see full proceedings), raising concerns of improper MVD enforcement without foundational court authorization.

Critically, this case remains actively under appeal, with the memorandum filed and forwarded to the Maricopa County Attorney's Office (MCAO) on October 16, 2025, per correspondence from Deputy Manager Jessica Bullock (attached for reference). MCAO's response is due by November 15, 2025, after which the file will proceed to Superior Court for de novo review. Despite this pending appeal, the MVD notices proceed without a stay, potentially prejudicing [REDACTED] rights under ARS § 28-1595 (appeal stays enforcement unless otherwise ordered) and exposing him to immediate harm, including impacts on his academic and athletic commitments as a 3.7 GPA high school student with college scholarship prospects.

Given your administrative oversight role, I kindly request:

1. An expedited review of the attached materials to confirm the procedural violations and lack of court-ordered TSS/suspension.
2. Guidance on obtaining an administrative stay of the MVD actions pending appeal resolution, to prevent irreversible license suspension.
3. If appropriate, referral to the Presiding Judge or Appeals Bureau for intervention, including potential remand for a new hearing to cure the due process defects.

I am available at _____ or _____ to discuss or provide additional documentation. Thank you for your attention to this matter and for upholding the integrity of Maricopa County Justice Courts proceedings.

Best regards,
Thomas Licari
Father and Legal Guardian of

Attachments:

- Court Transcript_10_15_2025.txt
- Notice of Civil Traffic Judgement.pdf
- DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL.pdf
- CT Appeal Civil Traffic Packet _____ .pdf
- Corrective Action and failure to complete Traffic school.pdf (two notices)
- Correspondence from Jessica Bullock (10/29/2025) CC'd on this email

Resp (Bell)
3/16/26
25-607

From: TB < >
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 2:12 PM
To: Mann, Tina < >
Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct Case No. 25-607

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

Yes, please use this as the official response.

Tony

On Mon, Mar 16, 2026 at 2:10 PM Mann, Tina < > wrote:

Thank you for the response. And just to clarify, would you like me to use this email as your official response to the complaint?

Tina Man

From: TB < >
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 2:07 PM
To: Mann, Tina < >
Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct Case No. 25-607

March 3, 2026

Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington St. Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Gentlemen, RE Case# 25-607

My name is Anthony I. Bell, and I will try and address the complaint filed against me on Nov. 9, 2025 by Mr. Thomas Licari, and case #CT . I was indeed the Hearing Officer, on this case.

I have been involved in several thousand traffic cases over the past 20+ years, and try to be consistently honest and fair.

I felt the officer (Off. D. Donofrio, Badge #1048) did a good job of presenting this case, and I normally allow the defendant the opportunity to question the officer after his testimony. I thought that I allowed the plaintiff this opportunity, but I really don't remember. I don't feel like I was impatient, partial or discourteous.

In all cases, I try to evaluate the responses from both the plaintiff and the defendant and make the best judgement, on the information provided. I'm sure that I have made mistakes, but I felt that this judgement was correct.

Sincerely,

Anthony I. Bell

McDowell Mountain Justice Court

Cc Taj Rahi-Loo

Sorry about the delay. I will get that response in to you.

Tony

On Mon, Mar 16, 2026 at 2:00 PM Mann, Tina

[y](#)> wrote:

Hello,

My name is Tina Mann and I am the attorney investigating complaint no. 25-607. On February 18, 2026, a letter was sent to you from the Commission on Judicial Conduct requesting a response from you. That response was due March 11, 2026. We have not received your response, and I was contacting you to see if it had been recently sent, if you needed more time or if you do not wish to respond. If you could

please reply to this email and let me know I would appreciate it.

Thank you,
Tina Mann

Tina L. Mann
Disciplinary Counsel
Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington St., Ste. 229
Phoenix, AZ 58007