State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 12-160	
Complainant:		No. 1427810879A
Judge:		No. 1427810879B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge failed to recuse himself based on his friendship with a lawyer representing an adverse 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, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 6, 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 6, 2012.

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

_____6/9/2012 Date

Rev. 2-1-10

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR	01	FFI	CE	US	E O	NL	Y_	
2	0	1	2	etto.	1	6	0	

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:	-	Judge's name: _	Date:	: _6/9/2012
Please describ us understand Include only	be in your own words your concern, be spe copies of original doc	in paper of the same size to file a complain what the judge said or did that you believe confict and list all of the names, dates, times a cuments or court recordings that are relevant p a copy of the complaint for your files.	constitutes judicial and places where t	misconduct. To help he conduct occurred.
Judge	failed to disclose	his personal relationship with the opposing at	torney .	He used to be business
partners in the s	same law firm. He has r	efused to change Judges or venues in this pend	ding case	All of his orders
have been with	out any hearings behind	closed chamber doors and in favor of Mr.		
Please see attac	hed motions: MOTT	ON AND DECLARATION FOR CH	ANGE OF JUD	GE, THIRD
MOTION FO	OR CHANGE OF	VENUE dated 25th day of May, 2012		
	OBJECT	ION TO ORDER DATED MAY 24, 2	2012 DENYING	PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FO	OR SANCTIONS,	SUBSTITUTED SERVICE AND MO	OTION FOR CI	HANGE OF
VENUE and	ORDER DATED	MAY 29, 2012 DENYING MOTION	IN SUPPORT	OF DEFAULT
J <u>UDGMEN</u>	<u>rs</u>	AND INDIVID	UAL DEFEND	ANTS AND
GRANTING	DEFENDANT SE	ECURAPLANE TECHNOLOGIES I	NC.'S MOTIO	N FOR AN
EXTENSIO	N OF TIME AND	FOURTH MOTION FOR CHANGE	OF JUDGE	