State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 08-322					
Complainant:	Stephen Mercer	No.			
Judge:	Dennis L. Lusk	No.			

ORDER

After reviewing the complaint, the evidence gathered during preliminary investigation, and the judge's response, the Commission on Judicial Conduct finds that the judge's conduct in this case violated the Code of Judicial Conduct.

Canon 2A requires a judge to follow the law. After a judge has been disqualified in a case, the judge may not act on any matter other than in situations involving necessity, such as a probable cause hearing or a temporary restraining order. Rule 10.6 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure sets out the judge's duty after disqualification: "When a motion or request for change of judge is timely filed under this rule, the judge shall proceed no further in the action" In this instance, the case had already been transferred to a pro tem judge. Although that judge was not available, no necessity for immediate action existed, and Judge Lusk had no authority to act in the case.

Accordingly, the judge is reprimanded for his conduct pursuant to Rule 17(a), and the record in this case, consisting of the complaint, the judge's response and this order, shall be made public as required by Rule 9(a).

Dated: April 7, 2009.

FOR THE COMMISSION

Hon. J. William Brammer, Jr. Commission Chair

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 7, 2009.

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

			FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		
State of Arizona Commission on)	fudicial Conduct				
1501 W. Washir	ngton Street, Suite 229		i		
Phoenix, Arizona	a 85007		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	COMPLAIN	NT AGAINST A	JUDGE		
Your name:	Stephen Mercer	udge's name:	nis Lusk	12/17/08 Date:	
provide all of the plain paper of the	escribe in your own words what timportant names, dates, times te same size to explain your com . You may attach copies of any	s and places related to plaint, and you may a	your compla ttach addition	int. You can use this form or nal pages. Do not write on the	
On	September 25, 2008, Mr. N	Midkiff retained the	Weingart I	aw Firm to represent him	
on a DUI a	allegation. Counsel filed a t	imely notice of cha	ange of judg	e pursuant to Rule 10.2	
of the Rule	es of Criminal Procedure. 7	hereafter the case	was reassign	ned to Judge Pro Tem	
Kerry War	ngberg. On December 11, I	appeared on Mr. N	Midkiff's bel	half for a pretrial	
conference	e. The prosecutor and I file	d a joint motion to	continue be	cause discovery had just	
been provi	ded and interviews of witne	esses had not been	completed.	I learned from the	
prosecutor	that Judge Wangberg was	not present at court	, but would	be available by phone.	
W	nen I presented the motion t	o continue to the c	lerk, she pro	vided the file to Judge	
Lusk, who	took the file into chambers	. A few minutes la	iter, he retur	ned from chambers and	
told me he	was unable to reach Judge	Wangberg. Judge	Lusk told m	ne that because he had	
been notic	ed, he could not rule on the	motion, but he had	l been given	authority by Judge	
Wangberg	to schedule matters for tria	l in his absence, bu	t not to grar	nt a continuance. He told	
me my opt	ions were to stipulate to set	ting the case for tri	ial, or to wai	t to see if Judge	
Wangberg	called the court. I told Jud	ge Lusk that it wou	ıld be prema	ture to set the case to	
trial, that t	his process amounted to hir	n denying the moti	on, and I pro	otested his involvement in	
the case. J	Judge Lusk then gave the fil	le to the clerk with	instructions	to set it to trial.	
<u>Juc</u>	lge Lusk should not have ha	ad any involvement	t with this ca	ase after the Rule 10.2	
motion wa	s granted. The Court of Ap	peals has previous	ly found tha	t Judge Lusk has failed to	
properly re	ecuse himself when present	ed with a notice of	change of ju	udge, observing "[w]hen a	
motion or	request for change of judge	is timely filed und	er this rule,	the judge shall proceed	
no further	in the action, except to mak	ce such temporary of	orders as ma	y be necessary in the	
interest of	justice before the action car	n be transferred to	the presiding	g judge" <i>Hornbeck v</i> .	
Lusk, 217	Ariz. 581, 585, 177 P.3d 32	23, 327 (Div. 2, 200	08) (quoting	Rule 10.6).	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	ton ton the ton				

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

January 26, 2009

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

JAN 2 8 2009

Re: 08-322

Members of the Commission:

At the time of the pretrial conference I had Judge Wangberg's express consent to set the matter for trial on his behalf. My instructions from him were that if counsel wanted anything else, that I should consult him by phone for a telephonic appearance or further instructions. Judge Wangberg was not available by phone after several attempts. I followed Judge Wangberg's instructions to set the matter for trial on his behalf.

I explained to counsel that he could file a motion to continue the trial date, and that the motion would be forwarded to Judge Wangberg for review. Although defense counsel has filed three separate pleadings since December 11, 2008, he has made no attempt to file a motion to continue the March 11, 2009 trial date. I can only speculate as to why counsel did not ask for a continuance if he was so concerned about the trial date.

After receiving this complaint I discussed this recurring problem since Division 2 rewrote the rules of Criminal Procedure, with Staff Counsel for the Commission. I was seeking guidance as to what I was expected to do in the future. We agreed that in the future, if the assigned judge was not available for the pretrial, that the attorney should file a written motion at that time, which would be forwarded to the assigned judge for review. This process means however that the Defendant will leave the court with no set date for return which would complicate FTA's or a trial *in absentia*.

I am in the process of creating a set of written instructions to be forwarded to defense counsel upon the reassignment of a judge pursuant to Rule 10.2. If the Commission wants that set of instructions when it is completed, I will provide the same.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Dennis L. Lusk

g