

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 26-060

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

April 14, 2026

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to follow the law and procedure in a civil 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 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).

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

26-060

Attachments: [m11618888.pdf](#)
[SETASIDEAZ_merged \(1\) \(resized\) \(pdfresizer.com\).pdf](#)
[Judicial Notice.pdf](#)
[MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION County - Google Docs.pdf](#)

From:

Sent:

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

Subject: - COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDICIAL OFFICER - Honorable

CASE NUMBER: (County Court)

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

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

Dear Qualifications Commission,

My name is and I am the plaintiff in the matter of

Case Number: currently pending in the County

Court. I am writing to submit a formal complaint regarding the conduct of the Honorable

While I understand that this process is not a substitute for an appeal to correct a judgment, I am seeking a formal review of what I believe to be a violation of judicial canons. Attached for your reference are the relevant minute entry, my motion, and my motion for reconsideration.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

This civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 concerns the alleged theft of my property by an Police Department officer and a subsequent department cover-up. On

, Judge issued a final Minute Entry denying my Motion to Set Aside Judgment. This complaint is based on the judge's alleged disregard for controlling U.S. Court precedent and the misapplication of state procedural statutes to bar federal civil rights claims.

II. ALLEGED CANON VIOLATIONS

I allege that Judge conduct violated the following rules of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct:

- Rule 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness): The judge applied state "notice of claim" statutes to dismiss federal civil rights claims, contrary to established precedent.
- Rule 2.5 (Competence and Diligence): The judge failed to provide a competent legal explanation for dismissing clarifying documents regarding constitutional violations.
- Rule 2.6 (Ensuring the Right to Be Heard): The judge summarily dismissed evidence regarding "fraud on the court," including UPS delivery records and suppressed video evidence.

III. LEGAL ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES

- Misapplication of A.R.S. § 12-821.01: Per *Felder v. Casey*, 487 U.S. 131, state notice-of-claim statutes are preempted by federal law and cannot be applied to § 1983 claims.
- Failure to Acknowledge *Monroe v. Pape*: The court relied on state-level res judicata to ignore the supplemental remedy established in *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167.
- Ignoring Evidence of Fraud on the Court: The court dismissed evidence of service and underlying misconduct by applying a narrow interpretation of Rule 60(c), failing to address the ethical duty to investigate government misconduct.

IV. CONCLUSION

I believe the court has prioritized state procedural technicalities over established U.S. Supreme Court mandates, failing to reflect a fair and impartial judiciary. I respectfully request an investigation into these potential violations of Canons 2.2, 2.5, and 2.6.

Best regards,

1

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

7

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF

8

Case No.:

9

Request for Judicial Notice; in re Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate

10

,

11

Petitioner,

12

vs.

13

State of Arizona et al,

14

Defendent,

15

Building and turned the backpack over to the lost and found desk at the .

- **Video Evidence:** The report confirms that PA () reviewed CCTV footage showing the backpack being taken from the ground at approximately hours.

- **Arizona Rule of Evidence 201 (Judicial Notice):** You can request the court take judicial notice of these official police records as "facts that can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned".

2. **Misconduct by Chief** : Petitioner alleges that **Chief** (ID) was involved in the drafting or oversight of the police report () to conceal the fact that the property was in the custody of the station while claiming it was "stolen" by an unknown third party.

3. **Improper Handling of Property:** Under the context of a "Good Samaritan" act or "suspicious bag" call, the contents of Petitioner's bag should never have been removed or tampered with. The removal of the laptop while the bag was in police custody constitutes a systemic failure and a violation of Petitioner's Fourth Amendment rights.

**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.**