## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 07-042		
Complainant:		No.	1303310001A
Judge:		No.	1303310001B

## ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issue raised is legal or appellate in nature, and the more appropriate remedy would have been to appeal the judge's decision to a court with proper jurisdiction.

The commission is not an appellate court and cannot change a judge's decisions; therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: March 21, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on March 21, 2007.

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

CJC-07-042

	COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE	3
Your name:	Judge's name:	Date: 2-7-0
provide all of the important na plain paper of the same size to o	own words what the judge did that you belie mes, dates, times and places related to your co explain your complaint, and you may attach add sch copies of any documents you believe will he	mplaint. You can use this form or litional pages. Do not write on the
DUR CONS HAVE BEE GUILTY W	N BREACHED. WE	DOUR SCHEDUL
COURT DA'	E TWO PAGE ATTACK	LED.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

CJC-07-042
In we were notified of a Law Suit filed against us. We responded to the Court and told them that we were frauded (bait & switch) and would be happy to defend ourselves in Court. However, between we had a conflict. We had already paid for our first real vacation at those times and would be out of State.
Some two months later the Court set the date for appearance for This date was horizonally opposed to our written Motion and request. We again filed a Motion for an alternate date because it would cost us much money to re-arrange our plans. "OUR MOTION WAS DENIED".
We decided to re-schedule our plans and absorb the pangs and expenses.
On about we received Notice from the Court that our Case was reviewed by Pro Tempore Judge and that we had been found guilty of all charges and that the Plaintiffs were granted all fees, penalties, and interest charges requested and that our Trial date of was cancelled. THIS ACTION DENIED US OUR CIVIL RIGHTS AND OUR U.S. & State CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVELEDGE TO DEFEND OURSELVES IN COURT.
We filed a motion for re-consideration on objecting to this action. We submited evidence as to the fact that the Credit Card Statute of limitations ( SS 12-543) had ran out for the Plaintiffs in This evidence was not submitted prior because we were waiting for our Court Date. We also submitted 10 or 11 precedented Court like cases. "WE WERE DENIED THIS MOTION".
We then requested by Motion as to an explanation of why our established Court date was cancelled and why we were denied our Civil Rights and rightful day in Court. (TITLE 22-AZ SS 22-201 et seq ) "OUR MOTION WAS ONCE AGAIN DENIED".
SUMMATION:
Although we are innocent citizens, and are victims of Credit Card fraud, and the Statute of Limitations had expired over three years prior, these are not the issues at this particular time. This is not a guilty or innocent point or argument. We have been denied our day in Court.Our Constitutional protective Rights against such actions have been breached. Pro Tempore Judge is trying to enforce illegal Actions and undermine
(1)

CJC-07-042

our Civil Rights. His views, opinions and actions are completely adverse to the Laws, Rules and Statutes of the Constitutions of the United States of America and the Grand State of Arizona. (Title 22 AZ.SS 22-201 et seq. & Artical 3 sec.2 US Constitution) "WE HAVE BEEN DENIED OUR CIVIL-RIGHTS"

## CONCLUSION:

We would now ask this Board to declare a Mis-review, or Mis-action, to squash all previous actions declared against and to restore our Civil Rights and entitlement to our day in Court. If granted we would ask for a change of venue because this Court could be biased.

"We only ask for the same courtesy as Constitutionally given to any citizen" - nothing more.