

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-092

Complainant: No. 1376410969A

Judge: No. 1376410969B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a pro tem justice of the peace allowed false testimony and improperly prohibited him from questioning witnesses.

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 the recording of the trial, 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 review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 21, 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 August 21, 2012.

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

APR 17 2012

16 April 2012

Commission on Judicial Conduct

1501 West Washington, Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231

jpr@courts.az.gov
<http://azjudges.info>

RE: Judge

AZ Commission on Judicial Conduct,

This is the third judge we have asked to be replaced regarding our case. Including in this correspondence is the Court Order requesting a different judge submitted to the Maricopa Court.

Two of the Subpoenaed Material witnesses,

Inspector, lied when answering questions put to them by the Plaintiff, Both of these public employees, either through a lie, or the omission of the truth, have falsely testified in our trial.

All public employees have been served (we are not including all the Return Receipts here with this correspondence) with the trial documents. In fact, was sent the trial documents twice (Mesa, and Phoenix offices).

Compounding these events by these public employees is Assistant State Attorney General, who stood by her client, while he lied on the stand as never having received the trial documents, and their client having received the said documents.

Furthermore, Judge Pro Tem, barred the Plaintiff, from questioning these subpoenaed witnesses because in the words of Judge "these witnesses are not experts." These witnesses are empowered by their respective State and City offices to audit work done by contractors, and enforce any corrective work done by contractors found to be sub-standard.

These witnesses enforce, regulate, and issue fines for sub-standard work executed by contractors. These witnesses are material witnesses and are "experts" by their regulatory and enforcement charters given to them by the AZ State government. There is no higher authority as to the regulation and the final decision regarding whether a contractor has executed their work to code or not. Judge [redacted] terminated his performance at our trial by advising us to settle with the defense. That's right, Judge [redacted] advised us to settle with the defense!

Lastly, AZ Director [redacted] was subpoenaed, but the subpoena was quashed by Judge [redacted] by the Motion of [redacted]. It will be interesting to see the reaction, if any, by AZ Gov. [redacted] that her state employees lie in Court, and the AZ ROC Director doesn't even show up to defend a home owner who has been wronged at the plaintiff's trial.

What do all these individuals:

[redacted] and you, yes, you at the Commission on Judicial Conduct, have in common: You are all public employees that would rather lie to protect your jobs rather than admit that through your actions, a tax-paying Arizonan has been wronged. This is not the first time the Plaintiff has communicated to the State offices of this matter; and yet, the State employees have resorted to lying in Court and emboldened by judge [redacted]. It is business as usual!

The plaintiff may also pursue claims against the public employees for perjury.

If our public employees cannot tell the truth in a simple and mundane case involving fraud, what are we to say about the integrity of our government institutions? There is no integrity in our governments!

We, as a plaintiff who filed our claims in truth, we have no other option but to extract payment from those you have defrauded us as public employees. These perjuries will be posted on our web site www.ArbitrateThis.com for all to see how our government treats its tax-paying citizens confirming what the general population already knows.

Should this matter not be resolved by the end of April 2012, we will have no other options but to notify Gov. Janic Brewer, and post on our web site the lies of these public employees. Oh, and guess what the legal council for the defendant has done, slapped a counterclaim against us because we had the temerity to notify the State Governor's office regarding our claim.

Incl.:

- Proof of service for trial documents
- Trial audio record DVD