State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 12-063	
Complainant:		No. 1437310653A
Judge:		No. 1437310653B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge issued an improper ruling, failed to provide an adequate opportunity to be heard, and improperly provided legal advice to one party.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After reviewing the information provided by the complainant and various electronic court records, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to investigate the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: April 19, 2012.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 19, 2012.

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 **2012-063**

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:	Judge's name:	Date: 3/1/2012n
words what the judge did that ye times and places that will help	ou believe constitutes judicial mis us understand your concerns. You	size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own sconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates u may attach additional pages but not original cour o a copy of the complaint for your files.
On or about May 2, 2011,	Judge issued an order	r granting sole physical custody of a
Minor child who is a U.S.	Citizen to an individual who	is an undocumented illegal alien.
A fact Judge had fu	ll knowledge of as this indiv	idual said as much in Judge
proceedings. Judge	also mentioned this fact in h	nis May 2, 2011 ruling. This
awarding of sole physical	custody followed Judge	awarding temporary custody to this
illegal person. This was ar	order in which the petitione	er was denied an opportunity to respond
in a timely manner. It show	ald also be mentioned that in	his May 2, 2011 order, Judge
provided legal advice to the	e respondent/illegal person o	n how to have the custody case
domesticated to another sta	ate. This can all be seen in the	e minutes recorded in case number
FC2009 Judge	ruled against an appeal	on 5-18-2010 that was not before his
Cour and his ruling was a	conflict of interest. Judge	denied the appeal against an order
That was filed in the Appe	elate Court.	
	·	
	en de la constanta de la const	
		The state of the s