

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 26-094

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

A superior court judge self-reported a delayed ruling in a conservatorship proceeding.

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 Commission approved sending the judge a confidential advisory letter reminding of the duty to issue rulings timely under Rules 1.1 and 2.5(A) of the Code of Judicial Conduct, along with Art. 2, § 11, and Art. 6, § 21 of the Arizona Constitution. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Dated: June 9, 2026

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Christopher P. Staring

Hon. Christopher P. Staring
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were distributed to all
appropriate persons on June 9, 2026.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE

TELEPHONE

SUPERIOR COURT

Comp (Self-Report)

26-094

Re: Self-Report of Violation of Rule 91(e)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am self-reporting a violation of Rule 91(e) of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Arizona. I am
County, My caseload consists of
all county and
cases filed. My caseload is currently over the 3rd-highest for our bench.

On my judicial assistant notified me that she had been periodically reviewing our active cases for any pending matters and specifically found County Superior Court Case Number a previously granted conservatorship. Upon reviewing the case, my judicial assistant found that a petition for approval of the annual accounting had been filed on but was not placed on the "pending ruling" list for my review. I have every reason to believe this was simple human error and not a systemic dysfunction. My staff and I have discussed how to avoid this in the future and best practices going forward.

Normally, these are sent to the court's accountant for review, and then a non-appearance hearing is set for me to sign the approval. This did not happen and is well out of the 60-day time frame. Upon learning of this time lapse, I scheduled a non-appearance hearing and sent the accounting to the court's accountant for review by at which time I anticipate approving the accounting.

I wanted to self-report to the Commission to err on the side of caution and to be as transparent and honest as I can about missing the timeframes under Rule 91(e). I have reviewed the tracking system my judicial assistant uses to place pending rulings on my "pending ruling" list, and I am working earnestly to complete a case review of the cases currently assigned to me for any other anomalies. I may find other cases pending a decision that are over 60 days under Rule 91(e) but of which I am not aware. If I do find any, I will self-report those and will take corrective action to ensure those rulings are addressed immediately.

Sincerely,

The Honorable
County Superior Court Judge