State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-290

Complainant:

Judge:

No. 1139410361A

No. 1139410361B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: January 24, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on January 24, 2007.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

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

1	FO	RO	FF	ICE	USE	ONLY



COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

6.4								
У	ñ	11	æ.	ĸ	a	m	ie:	

Judge's name:

Date: 11/16/06

2

Instructions: Describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please provide all of the important names, dates, times and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.

Commissioner was assigned to hear
On the matter in and for was heard after being continued on The hearing on was again continued until due to time constraints.
Commissioner was not available during a scheduled hearing dated and by order of Judge Pro Tem who was presiding at the hearing and the matter was continued until to ensure continuity for the proceedings.
on the continued hearing for the matter was again held and Commissioner was present at the Court in his chambers at the time of the hearing.
Although Commissioner was present at the time of the hearing Judge Pro Tem was presiding over Commissioner docket.
Judge Pro Tem was petitioned to ask Commissioner to continue to hear the case, Judge Pro Tem recessed the docket and retired to chambers to make the request. Commissioner refused to hear the continued matter and had Judge Pro Tem hear the matter again from the beginning.

Commissioners refusal to hear a matter set before him while being present violates Canon 3 (A) & (B)(1)

(Attach additional sheets as needed)