State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 10-185	
Complainant:		No. 1396710210A
Judge:		No. 1396710210B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a hearing officer made a wrong decision in his small claims case because he disregarded his evidence. The commission reviewed the matter and concluded that the judicial officer acted within the scope of his authority in reviewing the evidence and deciding the case. The commission has no authority to overturn judicial rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: September 15, 2010

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on September 15, 2010.

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 2010-185

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE							
You	r name:	Judge's nan	ne:	Date: _	7/16/2010		
Pleas us un Inclu	edescribe in your own words derstand your concern, be speede only copies of original docide of the paper only, and kee	what the judge said or di cific and list all of the na uments or court recordi	d that you believe const ames, dates, times and p ngs that are relevant to	itutes judicial misc places where the co	onduct. To help nduct occurred.		
_ _ _ _	My complaint against or a hearing officer by he would appear that Mr. agreements between che ruled without any confidence that were the costs i.e. nothing frow tax, overhead and profigudge accepted this infoodisregarded the agreement and allowed the plaintiff presented to the defendence of the training of the reviewed and the cast of contractual laws and and insurance companies.	has no content and contractor on vincing evidence presented to me do the sub contract. All the numbers of the collect on costs and after the work ior to be a great injude the justice system. See be looked at by so relationships between the two relationships between the system.	oncept of construction. Based on his decided for the costs requested not show any based or illustrating costs were fabricated by ate. Furthermore, by a parties as binding with were obvious was done and the lustice and disserving the cortice of th	resented to him ion procedures ision, it is obvious the planterials the plaintiff are the completelying to the price sly, as shown induct of this induction.	a. It s and ous that intiff. cion for , labor, ad the provided n court, nunity dividual standing		