## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 07-094	
Complainant:	No	. 1307410054A
Judge:	No	. 1307410054B

### ORDER

The Commission on Judicial Conduct reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judges. Although their decisions were controversial and widely reported by the press, there is no evidence that the judges violated the Code of Judicial Conduct. In the absence of bad faith or an abuse of judicial discretion, neither of which was present in this instance, the commission is prohibited from taking disciplinary action against judges for their decisions. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 23(a).

Dated: September 7, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judges on September 7, 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

FOR	OFFICE	USE	ONLY	
		manage in the local	and the second second second second	-

# CJC-07-094

#### COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your	name:	

Judge's name:

Date: 3/31 07

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.

ROND FOR THE DEFENDANT AT FISADO <sup>25</sup> WHEN THE FARTS OF THE CLASE CLEARLY CALLED FOR UNBONDAGLE. HE LATER ALLOWED COMM. TO REDUCE THAT UNLAWFULL ROUD TO SSO,000 <sup>25</sup> THE CONTRY ATT FILED & MOTION TO OVER RULE REDUCTION OF THE BOND & MOKE IT FITHER (MBONDABLE AS RE- ONITED BY FAW OR AT LEAST INDREASE IT TO \$500,000 <sup>29</sup> CASH. JUDGE ACREED TO HEAR THE MOTION. ALL HE SAID AT THE HEARING RAS HE WASN'T & COURT OF APEALS. HE POST DOUED THE HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAYING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIM THAT HE, JUDGE HAD THE ADTHORITY TO OVER RULE COMMAN HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAYING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIM THAT HE, JUDGE HAD THE ADTHORITY TO OVER RULE COMMAN HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAYING THEY TO ADER RULE COMMAN HAD THE ADTHORITY TO ADER THE DEFENDANT HAD THE ADTHORITY TO ADER THE DEFENDANT HAD THE ADTHORITY TO ADER THE DEFENDANT UNBONDABLE ISAN'T UNDERSTAND HOW ANY JUDGE DOESN'T KNOW HAD TO VIOLATE THE FAW HE CON POSSIELY ALLOW TWO COMM'S TO VIOLATE THE FAW HE CON POSSIELY ALLOW TWO COMM'S TO VIOLATE THE FAW HE CON POSSIELY ALLOW TWO COMM'S TO VIOLATE THE FAW HE CON POSSIELY ALLOW TWO COMMISS TO VIOLATE THE FAW HE CON POSSIELY ALLOW TWO COMMISS TO SOMETHING TO DIE WITH HIM STEPPING DOWN, ORE ENTINE FAMILY BECIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISSIONERS. <b>4</b> SAORAD BE REMOVED FROM THE SYDTEM IMMEDIATERS	Judge	ALLOWIED COMM.	UNLOW FULLY TO SET
COMMENTS AND	BOND FOR	THE DEPENDANT AT SACOO	" WHEN THE FACTS OF THE
SSO, DOOS THE COUNTY ATT FILED & MOTION TO OVER RULE REQUICTION OF THE BOND & MAKE IT FITHER CHBONDABLE AS RE- CHINED BY LAW OR AT LEAST INDEREASE IT TO \$500,000 °° CASH. JUDGE AGREED TO HEAR THE MOTION. ALL HE SAID AT THE HEARING RAS DE WASN'T & COURT OF APEALS. HE POST DOUED THE HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAVING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIM THAT HE JUDGE HAD THE ANTHORITY TO OVERRULE COURT BOND REDUCTION. DID JUST THAT SO JUDGE HAN'T UNDERSTAND HOW AND JUDGE POESN'T KNOW WANT ANDORTY HEINAS OF HAV HE CON POSSIBLY ALCON TWO DONNA'S TO VIOLATE THE HAW LIKE THESE TWO HAVE. I'M SURE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DUE WITH NEW STEPPING DOWAN. OOR ENTITLE FAMILY BECIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISSIONERS.	CASE CLEA	RLY CALLED FOR UN BONDAGE	LE. HE LATOR ALLOWED
REDUCTION OF THE BOND & MOKE IT EITHER GNBONDABLE AS RE- ONITED BY LAW OR AT LEAST INDREDSE IT TO \$500,000° COSH. JUDGE OF REPORT OF HEAR THE MOTION. ALL HE SAID AT THE HEARING RES HE WASN'T & COURT OF APEALS. HE POSTPOUED THE HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAYING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIM THAT HE, JUDGE HAD THE ANTHORITY TO OVERRULE COMMA BOND REDUCTION. DID JUST THAT, SO JUDGE HAD NO PHONGE BORT TO ROCE THE PERFONDANT UNBONDARLE I CAN'T UNDERSTAND HAW ANY JUDGE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT ANDHORITY HE HAS OF HAW HE CON PASSIELY ALLOW TWO DOLANG'S TO VIOLATE THE HAW LIKE THESE TWO HAVE. THE SARE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DUE WITH HIM STEPPING DOWAL COR ENTITE FRANCY BELLEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISSIONER AS	Course	To REDUCE T	HAT UNLOWFULL ROUD TO
ONINED BY LAW OR AT LEAST INDREDSE IT TO \$500,000° COSH. JUDCE ACREED TO HEAR THE MOTION. ALL HE SAID AT THE HEARING RAS HE WASH'T & COURT OF APEALS. HE POSTPOLED THE HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAYING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIM THAT HE, JUDCE	\$ 50,000 20	THE COUNTY ATT FILED & MOT	NOW TO OVER RULE
JUDGE AGREED TO HEAR THE MOTION. ALL HE SOLD AT THE HEARING RAS HE WASN'T A COLLET OF APEALS. HE PORTPOLLED THE HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAYING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIM THAT HE JULGE	REQUESTION	OF THE BOND & MOKE IT EM	HAR CABOUDABLE AS RE-
HEARING RAS HE WASN'T & COURT OF APERLS. HE POST POUED THE HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAYING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIM THAT HE, JUDGE	GUINED BY	LOW OR AT LEAST INCREAS	E IT TO \$300,000 - COSH.
HEARING FOR TWO DAYS SAVING THEY MUST PROVE TO HIG THAT HE, JUDGE HAD THE GUILDORITY TO OVERRULE COMM BOND REDUCTION. DID JUST THAT, SO JUDGE HAD NO CHOICE BLET TO ROCE THE DEFENDANT UNBONDABLE ICAN'T UNDERSTAND HOW ANY JUDGE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT AND MARITY HEINAS DE HOW HE CON POSSIBLY ALLOW TWO JOHN'S TO VIOLATE THE HAW LIKE THESE TWO HAVE. HA SURE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DWE WITH WAS STEPPING DOWN. OOR ENTIRE FRANCY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIONERS.	JUDCE	AGREED TO HEAR THE	MOTION. ALL HE SALD AT THE
JUDGE . HED THE ANTHORITY TO OVERRULE COMMINISIONER . HED THE ANTHORITY TO OVERRULE COMMINISIONER . SO SUBGE DID REDUCTION. DID JUST THAT, SO JUDGE DID JUST THAT, SO JUDGE DID JUST THAT, SO JUDGE DID JUST THE HAVE BEET TO RUCE THE DEERIT KNOW JUDT ANDHORITY HE HAS DE HAVE HE CON POSSIBLY ALLOW TWO JUNT ANDHORITY HE HAVE DE HAVE THESE TWO HAVE. THE SURE ALL DE THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DUE WITH WAS STEPPING DOWN. OOR ENTIRE FRANCY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISSIONERS	HEARING	Reas the Warm's a Could of	APEALS, HE POST POUED THE
BOND REDUCTION. DID JUST THAT, SO JUDGE DID AND CHOICE BORT TO ROCE THE DEFENDANT CHUBONDARLE LEAN'T UNDERSTAND HOW AND JUDGE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT AND ADRITY HE! NAS DE HAW WE CON POSSIBLY ALLOW TWO JOHN'S TO VIOLATE THE HAW LIKE THESE TWO HAVE. I'M SURE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DWE WITH WAS STEPPING DOWN. OOR ENTIRE FRANCY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIDIERS	HEARING	FOR THEO DAY'S SAYING THEY MUS	PROVE TO HIM THAT HE.
JUDGE HAD NO CHOICE BEET TO ROCE THE DEFENDANT UNBONDABLE ICAN'T UNDERSTAND HOW ANY JUDGE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT ANDHORITY HEINAS OF HOW HE CON POSSIBLY ALLOW TWO DOWN'S TO VIOLATE THE HAVE LIKE THESE TWO HAVE. HA SURE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DWE WITH WAS STEPPING DOWN. OOR ENTIRE FRANCY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIONERS			
UNBONDABLE ICAN'T UNDERSTAND HOW AND JUDGE DOESN'T KNOW JUDT ANDHORITY HEINAS OR HAW HE CON POSSIBLY ALLOW TWO LONAN'S TO VIOLATE THE HAW LIKE THESE TWO HAVE. HA SURE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DUE WITH WHA STEPPING DOWN. OOR ENTIRE FRANCY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIDHERS	3	OND REDUCTION.	OID JUST THAT, SO
JUST AWHORITY HEINAS OR HAW HE CON PASSIBLY ALLOW TWO LONNIG'S TO VIOLATE THE HAW LIKE THESE TWO HAVE, HA SURE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DUE WITH HIM STEPPING DOWN. OOR ENTIRE FRANCY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIONERS	Juber	Han No Choice Bar Ic	RUCE TOE DEFENDANT
DOWN'S TO VIOLATE THE HAW LIKE THESE TWO HAVE. IN SURE ALL OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DUE WITH WIM STEPPING DOWN. OOR ENTIRE FRANKLY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIONERS			
OF THIS HAD SOMETHING TO DUE WITH HIM STEPPING DOWN. ODE ENTIRE FRANCY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIDEERS			
ENTIRE FAMILY BELIEVES THAT JUDGE COMMISIONERS			
+ SHOREAD BE KENDUED FROM THE SYSTEM (NIMEDIALE)			
	\$X	SHOLELD BE KEMOVED FROM	N THE SYSTEM (MMEDIATLE)
	MEASE 13	SAD THE CARLOSED BEFORE	MAMANE YOUR DEDISION.
REASE READ THE ENCLOSED BEFORE MALANE YOUR DEDISION.			

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

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

## CJC-07-094

#### COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Judge's name:	Date: <u>4-7-07</u>
	Judge's name:

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.

We have spoken with Judge three times
Within the bast few days, The first time we
discussed all the Rincumstances Surrounding
our Grandsons death. We made our position clear
that we felt Conm's acted completely outside proples in Setting ball and Later reducing
outside proples in Setting bail and Later reducing
It. If bail had been made after it was reduced
the perp would probably be back in and
never face the charges against her. We tald ber
We beliene the tuncommissioner should be fined
Immediately and presecuted for preaking the law.
Since they report to her she has that authority.
She promised to review the circumstances and
ach hard da un
get back to us.
She did call back as promised, she said she
had spent two hours with the two commissioners
had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take any action appliest them since she believes the
had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take any action appliest them since she believes the
She did call back as promised she said she had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take any action against them since she believes they acted in good faith? Does good faith negate
<u>She did call back as promised she said she</u> had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take any action against them since she believes they acted in good faith". Does good faith negate. their responsibility to uphold the law?
She did call back as promised she said she had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take any action against them since, she believes they acted in good faith? Does good faith negate their responsibility to uphold the law? We asked about the bond reduction to
<u>She did call back as promised she said she</u> had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take any action against them since she believes they acted in good faith". Does good faith negate. their responsibility to uphold the law?
She did call back as promised she said she had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take any action against them since. She believes they acted in good faith? Does good faith negate their responsibility to uphold the law? We asked about the bond reduction to by She told us "that was doe to A Police
She did call back as promised she said she had spent two hours with the two commissioners and she told us she would not take goy action against them since she believes they acted in good faith". Does good faith negate. their responsibility to uphold the law? We asked about the bond reduction to by She told us that was doe to A Police officers rec". We asked for the name of the

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

. To call us back as soon as she could find it , She called back later that day, guess what, no Police officer was involved. Somebody lied to some body. Judge Said sho still would take no action against him. We were told by various police agencies that goite often sets low bonds in spite of what has been requested, also that he very often reduced bonds. The last thing we asked Judge was what she planned to do about the of Pretrial Services, who broke the haw, as we understand it, by issuing the memois ordering that noone discuss Immigration status of Perps. Judge Said was on vacation so she couldn't discuss her action with her untill she returns, As we understand it does not have the authority to do this on her own, Someone had to order it, Who is that someone? Members of the commission please help US. The entire family facts lost in a Very Small life boat, on a stormy sea with no usible help on the horizon. Please help us achieve justice. Our Goal is to keep this heartache from happening Please read the attached for background Thank your CJC-07-094