

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 26-051

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

April 14, 2026

The Complainant alleged an appellate court judge improperly failed to recuse from a 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).

Commission member Roger D. Barton did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on April 14, 2026.

Comp

26-051

Attachments: [us](#) [court petition for writ of certiorari\(1\).pdf](#)

From:

Sent:

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

Subject: FW: Complaint AZ Ct. Justice

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

Powered by Cricket Wireless

----- Original message -----

From:

Date:

To: cjc@courts.com.az.gov,

Subject: Complaint AZ Ct. Justice

Hi,

The attached pdf is a working copy of a petition filed with the US Court. The actual caption will be not . Case number should be assigned in the next few days. The complaint is the same as petition describes. And you can apply the ethics rules its violates.

This is the first in removal requests and i will be adding more judges, and there will be complaints for disbarment of attorneys responsible for this, and a media news cycle to follow.

Your Court Justice violated due process resulting in a permanent constitutional breach.

Why? Because she failed to recuse herself from the case and sat on the ruling, as she was a former financially compensated attorney for my adversary a local billionaire. That's constitutional damage, not what Justices are supposed to do.

The court is not designed to violate people's rights. It's there to uphold rights. Now I have to go to the US court to fix this mess and if I have to do that she shouldn't be allowed to continue sitting on a bench being paid by taxpayers while upholding any potential financial schemes in the underlying matter it's not what the people want from their court Justices.

, Pro Se

No. _____

IN THE COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Petitioner

v.

Respondent

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
ARIZONA COURT

, Pro Se

Petitioner, Pro Se

Petitioner was permanently enjoined from speaking about —even though told the trial court it was a non-party and “ .” App. A-39.

used that non-party status to avoid discovery, including documents later destroyed, yet simultaneously received party-specific protections: it filed motions through purported “outside counsel,” App. A-44, obtained excusable-neglect relief for missing a subpoena deadline, App. A-49, and participated in the appeal as if it were a party. The injunction itself rests entirely on alleged harm to brand and business, even though never intervened, never appeared through counsel of record, and never subjected itself to discovery. App. A-18. Petitioner preserved the constitutional issues throughout, including the First Amendment challenge to the injunction, the due-process challenge arising from non-party status and the destroyed evidence, and the defect that pleaded under the lower standard rather than the constitutionally required actual-malice standard governing public-figure claims. Yet the state court dismissed the petition and mooted every pending motion—including motions to vacate, reinstate a reply, recuse, and address the destroyed evidence—without ruling on any of them. App. A-7; App. B-2; App. B-17. As a result, no court has resolved status, the destroyed-evidence issue, the incorrect pleading standard, or the constitutional questions this case presents.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Due Process Clause is violated when a State Court Justice with a potential conflict of interest declines to rule on a motion for recusal, creating procedural paralysis, yet proceeds to adjudicate the case and moot the party's pending motions.
2. Whether a Court may rely on a litigant's supposed "understanding" to moot the unresolved substantive issues where the litigant did not waive those issues, and where the court's action foreclosed any review of the underlying constitutional question.
3. Whether a state court violates due process when it allows a litigant that affirmatively claims non-party status and disclaims any request for damages to avoid discovery, yet simultaneously grants that same non-party party-specific procedural protections—including excusable-neglect relief, appellate participation through purported "outside counsel," and a permanent injunction based on alleged harm to that non-party—without ever ruling on the litigant's status.

**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.**