

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-645

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

March 31, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased, favored the victim, and excessively sentenced the defendant.

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.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

4. Judge

5. County Court

6. My daughter, had a case before this judge.

a. Case is not pending

b. case number

c. attorney:

d. Witnesses:

1. I am writing to formally express profound concerns regarding the conduct of Judge during the management and sentencing phases of case. My observations throughout the legal proceedings have led me to believe that there were significant issues pertaining to judicial impartiality, due process, and the consideration of all presented evidence. These concerns specifically highlight instances that suggest a potential for bias and an undue influence from external parties.

2. During a hearing in early , the victim's father, voiced strong objections regarding reductions in charges and bail, and ability to spend a holiday with family. explicitly stated a loss of faith in the justice system and emotionally declared, " Judge response, attributing the reduced charges and bail to another (previous) judge and expressing her own (Judge ) desire to " " created an appearance of attempting to appease a specific party rather than maintaining strict judicial neutrality in the face of an emotional outburst. This raises questions about the court's perceived impartiality. When, in fact, original charge of attempted murder was reduced to aggravated assault - prior to the bail reduction.

3. In an early hearing, the victims' father, asserted that was " " while his daughter remained terrified. Despite , counsel, promptly clarifying that was diligently adhering to all stipulated conditions of the house arrest, the court's handling of such unsubstantiated claims in open court is a point of concern.

4. entered a guilty plea to the court on . During sentencing on , Judge admonished for not accepting earlier plea offers. This admonishment was delivered despite the documented fact that was undergoing specialized mental health treatment during the period these offers were available, and the prosecutor, , had rejected request to complete this crucial treatment prior to entering custody - if accepting the plea deal. brought these mitigating circumstances to the court's attention during sentencing, yet Judge appeared to hold the delay (not accepting the plea deal) against . It is my understanding that a defendant retains the right to plead to the court at any point prior to a verdict, and such an admonishment in these circumstances seems inappropriate.

5. The sentencing on , raised serious concerns about the consideration given to the defense's arguments. Following statements from , , and our family, Judge immediately imposed an -year sentence for Charge 1 and a -year sentence for Charge 2. The swiftness of the decision, without any apparent break for deliberation or review of the presented statements, suggests that the sentence was predetermined.

The standard range for Charge 1 is years, with a **presumptive sentence of years**. had no prior criminal charges. Why did get sentenced more than the presumptive years? The initial judge assigned to case even remarked that " " prior to reducing bail.

Furthermore, the imposed sentence significantly exceeded the terms of a previous plea offer, which ranged from years and included the dropping of Charge 2. These disparities warrant further review/scrutiny.

6. In a previous court hearing in , provided Judge with a professional psychological evaluation of , conducted in , which detailed her mental health diagnosis. During sentencing, Judge cited **premeditation** prior to deciding sentence, although Judge had noted in the earlier court hearing in that she had read psychological evaluation that included . Citing "**premeditation**" as a basis for sentencing, in light of such comprehensive mental health documentation, calls into question whether this critical information was adequately considered.

7. At the sentencing on \_\_\_\_\_, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ referenced a “\_\_\_\_\_” that she previously had with the victims’ father. It’s important to note that we did not have an opportunity to discuss matters with the judge prior to the actual sentencing hearing. This situation, particularly the judge’s admission, raises significant questions about Judge \_\_\_\_\_ perceived impartiality in this case.

Furthermore, it was observed that the victim’s family did not speak during the sentencing hearing on \_\_\_\_\_. This absence of testimony leads one to wonder if the victims’ family were already aware of, and perhaps even satisfied with, the severe sentence Judge \_\_\_\_\_ ultimately imposed, and therefore felt no need to voice any further statements.

8. During the sentencing on \_\_\_\_\_, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ cited "premeditation" as a basis for the sentence – a term echoed directly from the victims’ father, \_\_\_\_\_ in early court outburst. This is particularly troubling given that \_\_\_\_\_ was **not** charged with premeditation.

9. At the \_\_\_\_\_ sentencing, \_\_\_\_\_ inquired about the unusual presence of 6-8 deputies in the courtroom throughout the sentencing. \_\_\_\_\_ stated that he had handled murder cases with less security. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ stated that she had requested the additional security presence and attributed her request to the size of the courtroom. However, this explanation did not seem entirely credible. Since seemingly, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ had predetermined a harsh sentence of \_\_\_\_\_ years for \_\_\_\_\_ to “\_\_\_\_\_”, it is obvious that Judge \_\_\_\_\_ did not anticipate any untoward behavior from \_\_\_\_\_. Given that our family is \_\_\_\_\_, and considering \_\_\_\_\_, a \_\_\_\_\_ male, had been the most disruptive party in prior hearings, concerns arise regarding the potential for racial bias influencing Judge \_\_\_\_\_ decision to implement such a visible and extensive security presence directed at (my) the defendant's family.

10. Lastly, during sentencing on \_\_\_\_\_, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ permitted the prosecution, \_\_\_\_\_, to submit graphic pictures of the victims’ injuries. Since \_\_\_\_\_ had already entered a plea of guilty on \_\_\_\_\_, and this was the sentencing phase, the relevance and necessity of introducing such evidence, which typically serves to establish facts during a trial, are unclear. \_\_\_\_\_ reportedly had not wished to file them earlier in the case, raising questions about their purpose at this late stage of the proceedings.

I believe these cumulative instances represent a pattern of conduct that gives rise to serious questions regarding the fairness and impartiality of the judicial process in \_\_\_\_\_ case and warrants serious investigation/inquiry in light of the principles of judicial fairness.

Sincerely,