State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 08-083		
Complainant:		No.	1332010706A
Judge:		No.	1332010706B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The judge's ruling occurred over three years ago and involved a legal determination that is outside the commission's jurisdiction.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule16(a).

Dated: April 23, 2008.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 23, 2008.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

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

CJC-08-083

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

a vidi a timento.	Date: $\frac{3}{27}/08$
provide all of the important names, dates, tiplain paper of the same size to explain your	what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please imes, and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.
The complaintant says,	
That on	ducing a probation violation disposition
hearing before	the presiding commissioner for
case #	Aggravated Assault Flo ND/NR) administered a
unjust and bias sentence	to complaintant. Complaintant was sent.
enced to a approvated ten	on of one and a half years in the dep-
artment of Corrections	for a terrichal violation. This misconduct wa
performed at the request o	F County Attorney
Judicial and unfoundated test	County Attorney to give prictionary before the courts, on a matter -
that he	ed not been concluded as of date. Comby
	testified to courts, that the complain-
	ed with Child Abuse F2 (Deac) and a
additional Murder chare	c would be filed soon. This is due to
the fact complaintant	played tag- a-war with a child and
she lost. This testimony	was allowed to compell the courts decesion
towards a consulted see	tence. Which was actually granted.
(This miscondink is in	violation of Codes of Judicial Ponduct CANON
2 sec. B., CANON 3 see. B	
administer	ed a aggravated sentence to complaintant on
grounds of unfoundated +	estimony and tried to impose a super agg-
ravoted term of two ye	ers instead of one and a half required

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)

	accordingly to the law (sentencing cuidelines manual). This misconduct
	was very viadictive and prejudical towards complaintent.
	(This is clearly in violation of codes of Judicial Conduct,
	CANON / Sec. A. , CANON 2 SEE. B., CANON 3 SEE. B(1)(2)(5),(2)
	(7) (8), and (12), D. (2) Also U.S. Constitution amendment Fifth
	and fourteenth. Arizona Constitution article 2 sec 4)
	2 ad issue:
	denied to modify
	complaintants unjust sentence pursant to Rule 24.3 and
	32 Comm was fully aware of the fact, complaintent
	case was remanded back to Grand
	Tury, which should have automatically reversed complaintant
	sentence. Due to the fact courts aggravated complaintant
	prison term on grounds of this matter. This was
	very prejudical and malicious towards complaintant.
	(This is elegaly in moletion of codes of Judicial Con-
	duct CANON I SEC. A, CANON 2 SEC. B., CANON 3
	su B(I) (2) (5) D. (2)
	su. B(U) (2),(5) D. (2) (conclusion)
	This Commissioner's dethis were to administer a sentence in
	in fair and unbias manner. Instead he administered a unjust
	and prejudicial seatence to compleintant based on very bias
	testimony which is against complaintants rights accordingly
	In the U.S. and Aurona Constitution. also Codes of Judicial
	Conduct
