## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 07-020

Complainant:

Judge:

No. 1292510348A

No. 1292510348B

## ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The judge did not act unethically in denying the complainant's motion for a new attorney.

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

Dated: February 14, 2007.

## FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on February 14, 2007.

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

Commission on Redicial Conduct NOI W. Washington JAN 2 3 2007 St. 229 CJC-07-020 PMy, 4, 85007 ke i Greeting, My complaint involves specific vitations The Camer of Sudicial Ethics open fically Canon 3, Section E, Para graphs (4), (5) and (7) Carron 3, Section &, Paragraph (5) states in part: " a gudse shall perform (their) indicial duties with out bias or prignatice... During hearings begore the judge Ord stated the following in open court: he needed is ober not wasting the tax payer's money by Spiring you another dawlyer."

CJC-07-020 Thial council filed a motion secking to be with drawn as connact, and it also Fled an additional motion for reappoint. ment of coursel, due to me fectivenes and was informed that the judge was set to que on these motions on lighter openking with coursel, on or about , the informed me that the Trial and se intimated to her that he would delay his auting unter I week begore my trial date. The gudges actions are both bias and shows pregudice, which are in violation of the Sudical Canon cited. Canon 3, Section B, Para spaph (4) states in part: " a judge shall be patient, dignified and conterns to detisants ... During the Mearing Regire the trial gudge his attitude towards me Was extremely hostile as well as agreeners when he began questioning me by asking have you studied Maw?" me: 4 121

(2) too the to such to such the toot. thur where I cuttone meeding to be Winder a contain degal purcedant witabled Be allowed to withdrew, stature that to exiter with the recend why are aloned hearing triof counsel was attempting Why fuent by during the wany contraz When 3, Section B, Paragraph (2) of The will as undergou field, thereby watabing apple to me was both discounteres as The many o mannes in which he tak would will any questions degree the bar? any chard any legal back good grand The guilding dego's what been ung il Obreve ad adation of the postine. Altuning of two tore as well as the W The court was could see the curred at the grunding towards others present Aby which questioning and the turned Conterning and logal buck grande because more regid as he quedraned me this plugated pratume which acted The guild a de and and changed were 020-70-020

CJC-07-020 During Coursel's testimony the Judge never allowed counsel to complete stating the S cuterra, subsequently making the "Free ride to over " statement. The gudge's actions were in total Vislation of Canon 3, Section to, Paragraph (7), wherein it states in part: "I judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the night to be heard according to Mars ... Jashed to excicise Judge discretion that he drad a duty to exercise and he made determinations that were artitizan and capticious and that were an advise of discretion For the afre stated deason il more That alter be taken against Judge which this oversight board deens appropriate. Respect Jully