State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 07-305 Complainant: No. 1323210306A No. 1323210306B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The allegations involve legal issues that could have been appealed. The commission is not an appellate court and cannot change a judge's decisions. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 16(a).

Dated: February 14, 2008.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\g\ Keith Stott Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on February 14, 2008.

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

Judge:

OCT 2 4 2007

CJC-07-305

Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington, Suite 229 Phoenix, AZ 85007-2926

. -

Re: Domestic trail injustice

To Whom It May Concern;

I sent a letter to the Attorney General of Arizona asking that someone look into the divorce court proceedings for my brother, Per the Attorney General's Office that correspondence was forwarded to your office. I am enclosing it as well as an application for attorney fees from my sister-n-law's

attorney, , an objection of these fees from

reply to the objection, as well as the order from Judge granting the total amount of request.

As far as I can tell, from the information I have seen about this case, it has been onesided. I love my sister-n-law as well as my brother, and only want what is fair for both but it appears the proceedings as well as the decisions were not fair. I only saw the final DVD of the case but I was truly amazed that the judge handling the case couldn't see that my brother was **way over his head**. explained several times that he wasn't competent to represent himself, but he also was unable to find an attorney who would take the case after he was dropped by NRG. I know Judge tried to help him, but he was so distraught he couldn't think and lacked the education to help with his own statements. It appeared the total case relied solely on what evidence entered. Every thing else that had been brought up by previous attorneys from NRG was simply disregarded.

It had been brought up in court that my brother had a common law wife,

prior to his marriage to told me herself that she was responsible for finding was unable to do so, I even tried to help her, but I didn't know that much about or any of her family so I wasn't a lot of help. hired a private detective and he was also unable to find so that part of the proceedings was simply dismissed. A few months after the divorce was final I was talking to and asked about any of relatives. He told me about a sister that had passed away but that was about all of the information he knew. With that bit of information I in was able to find out that had passed away after he was married to so in reality he really wasn't married to at all.

CJC-07-305

Another thing that was brought up in court was that their joint account that my brother's retirement was directly deposited into each month, had his name removed from the account. No one knows how that happened but was unable to access his own funds, eventually transferred the money from that account to her own account. She also used company funds to purchase things not related to the company.

I am not sure if there is anything that your office can do about this but, besides the one sided proceedings, the attorney fees that filed to collect the spousal maintenance were out of sight. was even charged a fee because either

office or the office trying to serve the subpoena misspelled the name knew how to spell his own name but really shouldn't be charged because someone else didn't. The charges just seem excessive to me but, were granted in full by the judge.

I am sorry for such a lengthy explanation but this was a rather complex case and it just couldn't be explained in a few words.

Anything that your office can do to check the validity of the proceedings as well as the fees involved would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ļ