

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 26-012

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

May 26, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to make the required statutory findings in a family law case, minimized the domestic violence allegations, and was biased.

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 May 26, 2026.

CO FIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**2026-012****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.

I submit this complaint to report judicial conduct that raises serious concerns regarding impartiality and compliance with mandatory statutory duties in a family-law matter. This complaint is not based on disagreement with judicial rulings or dissatisfaction with outcomes, but on the courts failure to perform required legal duties and statements and conduct that minimized domestic abuse and coercive control.

1. Failure to Comply with Mandatory Statutory Requirements

Arizona law requires courts to make specific findings when domestic violence is alleged or evidenced and to address how such findings affect custody, parenting time, and the safety of the parties and children.

These requirements are mandatory.

In my case, evidence of domestic violence and coercive control was presented on the record. However, the court's orders dated do not contain specific findings addressing domestic violence, coercive control, or related safety considerations. The orders either omit this analysis entirely or reference it only in conclusory terms without the required findings.

The absence of required findings reflects a failure to comply with mandatory statutory duties rather than an exercise of judicial discretion.

2. Minimization or Dismissal of Domestic Abuse and Coercive Control

During proceedings the judge characterized documented abuse as "conflict" and emphasized communication and cooperation without addressing evidence of coercive control and post-separation abuse. Statements made during hearings minimized the significance of abuse allegations and reframed them as routine co-parenting disputes.

Additionally, trauma-related reactions associated with fear and distress were treated as noncompliance rather than evaluated in context. This approach discounted the impact of abuse and failed to apply a safety-focused analysis required when domestic abuse is present.

3. Appearance of Bias and Impact on Impartiality

Taken together, the court's failure to perform mandatory statutory analysis and its minimization of abuse would cause a reasonable person to question the court's impartiality in this matter. The conduct described above reflects a pattern of discounting legally relevant evidence of domestic violence and coercive control rather than neutral application of required legal standards.

CONCLUSION

I respectfully submit this complaint for the Commission's review to determine whether the conduct described above complies with the Code of Judicial Conduct and applicable rules. I understand that the Commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge, and I am submitting this complaint solely to report judicial conduct and ensure accountability.

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:

--

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.

I am filing this complaint to report judicial conduct that I believe constitutes misconduct due to failure to follow mandatory law and statements and actions that minimized domestic abuse and coercive control in a family-court matter. This complaint is not based on disagreement with judicial rulings, but on omissions and conduct that undermined impartiality and required legal analysis.

Evidence of domestic violence and coercive control was presented to the court through testimony and filings. Arizona law requires judges to make specific findings when domestic violence is alleged or evidenced and to address safety considerations and best-interest factors accordingly. Despite this requirement, the court's orders do not contain specific findings addressing domestic violence or coercive control. The required analysis was either omitted entirely or referenced only in general or conclusory terms.

This omission was not a matter of weighing evidence differently. The absence of required findings reflects a failure to perform mandatory statutory duties.

During court proceedings, documented abuse was characterized as "conflict," and emphasis was placed on communication and cooperation without addressing evidence of coercive control and post-separation abuse. Statements from the bench minimized the seriousness of the abuse and reframed it as routine co-parenting disagreement rather than conduct requiring a safety-focused analysis.

Additionally, trauma-related reactions associated with fear and distress were treated as noncompliance rather than evaluated in context. This approach discounted the impact of abuse and failed to apply the heightened scrutiny required when domestic violence evidence is present.

Taken together, the failure to make required findings and the minimization of domestic abuse would cause a reasonable person to question the court's impartiality. The conduct described above reflects a pattern of discounting legally relevant evidence rather than neutral application of mandatory legal standards.

I understand that the Commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge. I am submitting this complaint solely to report judicial conduct for review under the Code of Judicial Conduct and applicable rules.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.