

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-648

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

March 31, 2026

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace denied a litigant due process in an eviction.

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.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2025-648

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: Judge's Name:

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.

heard witnesses that were unannounced to the defendants, and did not take the defendants evidence that exonerated the defendant (family). The result was that she allowed two people, , and to unjustly evict resulting in homelessness for the entire family. In addition, claimed threw an object at her, and under oath claimed he threw it at her, and then later in the same trial, said he never threw anything, which was now perjury. This was a retaliatory eviction based on and his family's months of complaining about roaches. They have a right to complain, and a right to safe housing. The company, , ran with their story, despite many incongruencies. They claimed swore at them, but could not recall any swearing, when questioned in cross examination. She allowed two hostile witnesses from the same company with the same agenda to testify back to back allowing them to match their stories, but also failed to identify the many lies they shared. The lies included that one could not recall any swear words, and that was infact innocent of any wrong doing. They also claimed there was a throw, and greatly exaggerated the situation. We believe acted against Arizona state law by allowing this retaliatory eviction, and in doing so, biasedly claimed behavior, which again was lied about profusely, went against rule 20 of the lease, which was never signed or seen by the family prior to the eviction hearing, because falsely claimed he had informed and his family of the evidence they were presenting. Despite protest, allowed all of the leighway for and his witnesses to commit perjury, while not hearing evidence. She ignored the fact that , when pressed on the issue, said never threw anything. The entire trial was a kangaroo court, and because and his family lacked representation, was taken advantage of by the court due to their lack of legal knowledge.

