

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-613

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

April 7, 2026

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace made an inappropriate comment and was biased against Complainant in an order of protection 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 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 April 7, 2026.

Attachments: [1000080303.mp4](#)

From:
Sent:
To: Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>
Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

From:
Sent:
To: Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>
Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

Here is the new complaint separate from the matters previously dismissed. The three mp4 attachments are the court recordings for each incident.

From:
Sent:
To: Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>
Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

Okay, thank you. I will be sure to refine the complaint to your specifications and this will conclude everything I needed until then. I do appreciate your timely responses and assistance in these matters; it has been helpful. I will send in the new complaint via mail when I have it complete.

From: Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>
Sent:
To:
Subject: RE: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

Once submitted, your new complaint will be evaluated to determine if it raises any new allegations. By allegations, we are looking at the judge's conduct – not what laws you claim the judge violated. The Commission is not a court and limits its review to whether the judge's conduct violated the Code of Judicial Conduct. Another way to look

at this is that we are focused more on the judge's behavior, not the judge's rulings. You cited a variety of statutory and caselaw – the Commission is not an appellate court and is not looking at whether a judge's rulings are legally erroneous. If you believe a judge's ruling was legally erroneous, your remedy was to seek an appeal.

We will evaluate what you submit as a new complaint, but as noted, we will not reconsider the allegations raised in . The review would be confined only to allegations not previously considered. If those are not present, no new complaint will be opened.

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington, Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-452-3200

From:

Sent:

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

Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

I will spend the remainder of the day trying to fully encapsulate the situation for you. I do not mean to integrate anything more than once, it is because these things were not properly relayed in my first report. I suffer with (), so I do hereby request that the matters be reassessed under ADA Title II Accommodations.

This is an actively developing matter in which irreparable harm has already occurred, I ask the Commission to please give consideration for my disability to all future engagements.

From:

Sent:

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

Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

This was not a part of the initial complaint; the initial complaint focused of procedural errors regarding my parental rights. There are people dying due to this information being suppressed.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S24 FE, an AT&T 5G smartphone

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

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

Sent:

To:

Subject: RE: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

With respect to this agency, the allegations in your “updated report/new complaint” below appear to have previously been raised in CJC Case No. _____ against Judge _____. The Commission will not reconsider allegations that were part of a previously dismissed complaint. In order for the Commission to accept a new complaint, you would have to make an allegation that was not part of the prior complaint/motion for reconsideration.

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington, Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-452-3200

From:

Sent:

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

Subject: Re: Commission on Judicial Conduct – Case No.

I had sent in an entirely new complaint; I will update it and send it back out for you all to review. This is a very significant case that is seeming that it will have to be resolved in a federal venue. This was the updated report;

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

Judge’s Name:

On _____, I was unlawfully arrested and interrogated by Assistant Chief _____ of the _____

Police Department without being advised of my Miranda rights, in violation of Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966). During this unlawful custodial interrogation, [redacted] directed my former partner to electronically transmit alleged evidence to him, which she did two days before the [redacted] protection order hearing. That same evidence, tainted from its inception, was then presented against me in court. Under Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963), this constitutes “fruit of the poisonous tree,” rendering the evidence inadmissible. By permitting its introduction, Judge [redacted] legitimized unconstitutional law enforcement conduct, poisoning the entire proceeding and violating my Fourth and Fifth Amendment protections against unlawful searches, seizures, and compelled self-incrimination.

During the [redacted] hearing, Judge [redacted] compounded these violations by explicitly allowing my former partner to present this tainted evidence while forbidding me from presenting any defense of my own. This denial of a fair opportunity to be heard directly contravenes Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), which defines due process as requiring notice and a meaningful chance to present evidence. Judge [redacted] went further and declared that I had “ [redacted] ” as a father despite being listed on my daughter’s birth certificate. Such a categorical denial of parental rights contradicts Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000), Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982), and Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645 (1972), which establish parental rights as fundamental liberties protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. These violations were magnified by the fact that I was denied legal counsel and forced to endure a multi-front legal assault coordinated through the advice [redacted] gave my former partner, ensuring I had no fair defense.

Judge [redacted] bias and hostility escalated further during a hearing where I was not even present. After asking my former partner about my history with firearms, and hearing that I had an extensive background with weapons, [redacted] laughed and remarked, “ [redacted] ” This remark, made in his official judicial capacity, is not harmless banter but evidence of judicial misconduct and prejudice. By trivializing the potential for state-sanctioned violence against me, [redacted] displayed bias incompatible with judicial impartiality, condoned the prospect of lethal force, and mocked my right to life. Such conduct violates Rule 2.3 of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments’ guarantees of due process, and the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition of cruel or degrading treatment. It further constitutes a deprivation of rights under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983,1985 and 18 U.S.C. § 242.

Judge [redacted] also suppressed my attempt to introduce the [redacted] Model ([redacted]), which contains validated biomedical data concerning Desmoplastic Small Round Cell Tumor (DSRCT) affecting a minor relative of my daughter. His suppression of this material obstructed urgent advocacy for life-saving medical intervention, during which time the child’s tumor burden increased by more than 200%. Such suppression constitutes reckless endangerment. Under 42 U.S.C. § 14141 (34 U.S.C. § 12601) and *Monell v. Dept. of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), this pattern of suppression constitutes systemic unconstitutional practice warranting federal oversight.

The misconduct in this case must be seen not as isolated errors but as a deliberate, multi-pronged legal assault designed to deprive me of rights from multiple directions simultaneously. [redacted] illegal interrogation supplied tainted evidence; [redacted] courtroom rulings ensured I could not present a defense; my former partner was emboldened and guided by law enforcement’s improper involvement; and at every stage, I was denied counsel. This orchestration mirrors the selective prosecution concerns raised in *Wayte v. United States*, 470 U.S. 598 (1985), where government actors exploited discretion to target individuals in ways incompatible with constitutional fairness. Here, the combined efforts of law enforcement and the judiciary created a closed loop where outcomes were predetermined, and my rights were erased before I ever entered the courtroom.

**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.**