

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-610

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

March 3, 2026

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace made improper legal rulings.

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 member Regina L. Nassen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 3, 2026.

From:

Sent:

To: Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>

Subject: Ethics complaint against judge

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

To: Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

Re: Complaint against Judge _____, _____ County _____ Court

Complainant:

Name:

Address:

Phone:

Email:

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

This complaint arises from a pattern of judicial misconduct, bias, denial of due process, and disregard for established law committed by Judge _____ in State v.

_____, Case No. _____. Her conduct violated multiple judicial canons and deprived me of a fair proceeding.

The totality of the misconduct demonstrates not merely error, but a consistent, repeated, and intentional disregard for my constitutional rights, including:

denial of due process

failure to apply controlling law

refusal to consider exculpatory evidence

improper alteration of criminal charges on the day of trial

defective instruments

improper hearing notifications

mischaracterization of my motions

coercive attempts to push unwanted counsel

ignoring ineffective assistance of counsel

disregard of prosecutorial misconduct, fabricated charges, and unlawful involuntary commitment

Rule 8 violation (speedy trial)

These actions violate the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, the Arizona Constitution, and the U.S. Constitution.

FACTS AND GROUNDS FOR COMPLAINT

1. Judge used a defective charging instrument and allowed prosecutors to change the charges on the day of the bench trial (), calling it “a clerical error.”

This is a structural due process violation.

A criminal defendant must be tried only on the charges actually filed.

Changing charges on the day of trial violates:

Sixth Amendment notice requirements (Cole v. Arkansas, 333 U.S. 196 (1948))

Due Process (Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307 (1979))

Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure 13.5(b) – charges may not be changed unless the defendant is given adequate notice and opportunity to prepare.

Judge ignored this binding law, overruled my objections, and permitted trial to proceed on charges I had never been properly notified of. This deprived me of any meaningful ability to defend myself.

This is misconduct, not harmless error.

2. Improper and misleading notice of hearings

Judge sent me a remote hearing notice for , but unbeknownst to me: she had vacated and canceled the bench trial for that date, moved it to , and never notified me.

This violates:

Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 6.1(b) — defendant must be properly notified of every hearing

Canon 3(B)(2) — judge must ensure procedural fairness

Due process (Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank, 339 U.S. 306 (1950))

A judge who schedules, vacates, and reschedules hearings without notifying the defendant denies the most basic requirement of justice: notice and opportunity to be heard.

3. She mischaracterized my “Motion to Overturn Conviction” at sentencing as a “Motion for New Trial” even though that is not what I filed.

This is not a “judicial mistake”—it changed the legal standard applicable to my motion.

This violates:

Canon 3(B)(4) — obligation to fairly read filings

Canon 3(B)(1) — competence

Due Process — defendant is entitled to meaningfully present arguments (Chambers v.

Mississippi, 410 U.S. 284 (1973))

Her reinterpretation of my motion shows either incompetence or intentional obstruction.

4. She repeatedly pressured me to accept another public defender when I explicitly rejected them due to prior misconduct (including a Rule 11 filed to punish me).

Judge repeatedly asked:

“ ”

Even after I:

clearly declined representation, and

explained that my prior defender () Rule 11'd me in bad faith as retaliation.

This violates:

Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975) — right to self-representation

Canon 3(B)(3) — obligation to respect defendant's rights

Canon 2(A) — failure to maintain fairness and impartiality

Trying to coerce counsel is misconduct.

5. She ignored my documented claims that public defenders refused to file motions on my behalf and failed to advocate for the return of my service dog.

I notified Judge that:

my public defenders refused to file motions,

refused to address fabricated evidence,

refused to seek return of my service dog,

and failed to raise clear constitutional violations.

She took no action, violating:

Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984) — ineffective assistance must be addressed

Canon 3(B)(5) — judge must ensure parties' rights are protected

Canon 2(A) — appearance of impropriety

6. Ignoring evidence that Detective fabricated allegations, and that state witnesses lied under oath

Detective admitted:

the veterinarian did not report any wrongdoing,

and he later called her back and fabricated allegations.

State witness :

lied about the condition of my dog,

claimed cancer falsely,

ethanized my service dog without my consent and without required second opinion,

The veterinarian also put down my dog without contacting me, the owner, another violation of law that Judge [REDACTED] refused to address and denied that was a law. Judge [REDACTED] refused to dismiss the case even though officers' and witnesses' lies were proven.

...

...

My trial occurred more than _____ years later.

Misconduct by Judge _____ :

She knowingly violated Rule 8, allowing the prosecution to delay my trial far beyond the statutory limit.

She accepted the prosecutor's claim that "_____ " even though I never received it, making her reliance on it improper and a due-process violation. She never held the State to its burden of demonstrating extraordinary cause, as required under:

State v. Hinson, 150 Ariz. 306 (1986) – Trial courts must ensure Rule 8 compliance and dismiss cases when violated.

Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514 (1972) – Courts must consider length of delay, reason for delay, and prejudice.

Ethical violations:

Canon 3(B)(1) – failure to perform duties diligently and in accordance with law.

Canon 3(B)(5) – failure to ensure parties' rights are protected.

Canon 1 and 2 – loss of integrity and public confidence.

2. Obstruction of my ADA-Protected Service Dog's Return

Despite multiple motions, evidence of perfect health on intake, and the dog's legal status as an ADA-protected service animal, Judge _____ :

Denied every motion I filed for the return of my service dog, without explanation.

Ignored intake records showing _____ was healthy, contradicting the fabricated allegations.

Ignored that seizure of a service dog without cause violates:

Arizona ADA laws

Americans with Disabilities Act Titles II & III

ARS § 11-1024 (Interference with service animals)

28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(7) – reasonable modifications required for disabled individuals

ARS 13 2910 - animal cruelty

Caused intentional or reckless emotional distress, disability discrimination, and interference with medical equipment (service dogs are legally medical equipment), an animal cruelty to my service dog, Doctor _____ .

Ethical violations:

Canon 3(B)(4) – failure to be fair, respectful, and responsive to litigants with disabilities.

Canon 3(A) – violation of constitutional rights.

Canon 2(A) – fostering appearance of favoritism toward prosecutors and PACC.

3. Judicial Misconduct for Repeatedly Mischaracterizing my Motions

Judge _____ repeatedly:

Mischaracterized my motion to overturn conviction as a "motion for new trial."

**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.**