

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-190

Complainant: No. 1412210939A

Judge: No. 1412210939B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court commissioner made rulings that were contrary to the rules, statutes, commerce, and fairness.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioner 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 electronic court record, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the commissioner did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the commissioner's rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 15, 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 15, 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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2012 190

①

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: _____

Judge's name: _____

Date: 7/12/12

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

ON FEBRUARY 2, 2012, DEFENDANT FILED INTO MARICOPA
COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT "DEFENDANT'S EXPEDITED REPLEVIN IN DETINET MOTION,
"in the nature of a writ of right" TO SEQUESTER THE GENUINE ORIGINAL
ADJUSTABLE RATE PROMISSORY NOTE UNTIL FINAL ADJUDICATION OF THIS
MATTER." BEFORE A "WRIT OF RESTITUTION" IS SIGNED AND ISSUED, A CHECKLIST
NEEDS TO BE GONE THROUGH AND COMPLETED, BY THE COMMISSIONER/JUDGE.
COMMISSIONER FAILED IN HIS DUTY IN THIS MATTER. BY THE COURT
SEQUESTERING THE NOTE, IT IS TAKEN OUT OF COMMERCE, AND PREVENTS FURTHER
SECURITIZATION, AND FOR AN ADDITIONAL PARTY TO COME AFTER DEFENDANT
FOR THE SAME SUPPOSED OBLIGATION. DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED TO GETTING
BACK HIS PROMISSORY NOTE. ALL EXPLANATORY DOCUMENTATION WAS FILED
IN THIS MOTION ABOVE.

ON MARCH 3, 2012, "A MONTH LATER", PRESIDING CIVIL JUDGE
FILED A MINUTE ENTRY, THAT IN RESPECT TO THE ABOVE MOTION,
"IT IS ORDERED THAT NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN BY THIS DIVISION ON THE ABOVE-
REFERENCED DOCUMENT(S)." "THE PARTIES ARE ADVISED THAT COMMISSIONERS HANDLE
THESE PROCEEDINGS IN THIS MATTER ARE TO BE HEARD BY COMMISSIONER

THIS ONE MONTH DELAY IS UNACCEPTABLE IN AN EXPEDITED MOTION.
ON APRIL 4, 2012, "ANOTHER MONTH LATER - OR TWO MONTHS FROM
EXPEDITED MOTION", COMMISSIONER FILED A "RULING." COMMISSIONER
STATES "FINAL JUDGMENT WAS ENTERED IN THIS MATTER IN FAVOR OF
PLAINTIFF ON AUGUST 5 2011." IT IS DEFENDANT'S CONTENTION THAT PRIOR TO
THAT JUDGMENT, THE ORIGINAL PROMISSORY NOTE SHALL BE (MUST BE) RETURNED
TO DEFENDANT. IN COMMERCE, ONE PARTY CANNOT HAVE EVERYTHING. IF
DEFENDANT TURNS THE NOTE FOR THE HOUSE, THEN IF PLAINTIFF STEALS BACK
THE HOUSE BY FILING FALSE AND/OR FORGED DOCUMENTS THEN THE NOTE
MUST BE RETURNED. COMMISSIONER GOES ON TO STATE "THE RELIEF

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

CONFIDENTIAL

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

②

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2012-190

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: STEPHEN SONTAG Judge's name: JAMES MORROW Date: 7/12/12

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

SOUGHT BY DEFENDANT IN HIS MOTION FOR REPLEVIN AND HIS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ARE EITHER INAPPROPRIATE FOR CONSIDERATION IN THIS EUNCTION ACTION, POST-JUDGMENT, OR RELY ON ARGUMENTS PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED BY THE COURT'S PRIOR RULINGS." STEPHEN SONTAG COMPLETELY DISAGREES WITH THIS COURT AND COMMISSIONER MORROW'S STATEMENT. THE MOTION FOR REPLEVIN IS NOT INAPPROPRIATE. THE RULING GOES ON "IT IS ORDERED DENYING THE MOTION FOR REPLEVIN FILED FEBRUARY 12, 2012, WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO DEFENDANT SEEKING COMMON LAW AND STATUTORY RELIEF, AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE, IN SEPARATE LITIGATION." THIS COURT HAS IGNORED ITS OBLIGATION TO SECURE RETURN OF THE NOTE AFTER IT BEING DEMANDED ON MORE THAN THREE (3) OCCASIONS. COMMISSIONER MORROW IS PICKING AND CHOOSING WHAT TO FOLLOW.

ON MAY 3, 2012, DEFENDANT FILED "MOTION TO VACATE COMMISSIONER JAMES R. MORROW'S UNLAWFUL ORDERS - and - FOR UNLAWFULLY DENYING THE MOTION FOR REPLEVIN - and - DEMAND COMMISSIONER JAMES R. MORROW RECUSE HIMSELF FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT."

ON JUNE 13, 2012 "OVER A MONTH LATER" COMMISSIONER MORROW FILED A "MINUTE ENTRY" RESPONSE. IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH IT STATES "POST-JUDGMENT DEFENDANT ALSO FILED A MOTION FOR REPLEVIN AND A MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION WHICH WERE DENIED IN THE COURT'S APRIL 2, 2012, ORDER." DEFENDANT STEPHEN SONTAG VEHEMENTLY OBJECTS TO THE CLAIMS AND CONCLUSIONS THAT COMMISSIONER MORROW COMES TO, AS IT IS CONTRARY TO RULES, LAWS, STATUTES, COMMERCE, AND FAIRNESS. COMMISSIONER MORROW HAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND RECEIVES PECUNIARY GAIN, FOR RULING FOR PLAINTIFF, AND NOT SEQUESTERING THE ORIGINAL PROMISSORY NOTE. THE PROMISSORY NOTE, ALONG WITH COUNTERFEIT COPIES, ARE AT THE FOUNDATION OF THE BANKING SCAM TODAY, AND THIS COURT ACTING AS AN ACCOMPLICE TO THE THEFT OF STEALING HOMES, IN ORDER TO PRESERVE THE JUDGES RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

CONFIDENTIAL

State of Arizona

Commission on Judicial Conduct

1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2012-190

3

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: STEPHEN SONTAG Judge's name: JAMES MORROW Date: 7/12/12

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

THIS COMMISSION NEEDS TO ALLOW LENIENCY TO A "PRO SE" DEFENDANT TRYING TO EXPLAIN AN INJUSTICE, AND WOULD APPRECIATE NOT LOOKING FOR WAYS TO DISMISS THIS COMPLAINT ON SOME MIND/ UNRELATED POINT. IN PREVIOUS COMPLAINTS AGAINST COMMISSIONER MORROW: ① DEFENDANT WAS NOT PROPERLY SERVED, ② DEFENDANT FILED A NOTICE AND DEMAND STATING THE ABOVE ③ DEFENDANT MADE A SPECIAL APPEARANCE. IF COMMISSIONER MORROW FOLLOWED THE LAW THE CASE WOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED. COMMISSIONER MORROW WENT ON TO APPROVE ALTERNATE SERVICE, DESPITE THE PREJURED AFFIDAVIT FROM THE PROCESS SERVER, FAILING TO REALIZE THAT DEFENDANT WAS OUT OF TOWN AT THE TIME. SO IN SHORT, THIS ENTIRE CASE, HAS BEEN A TRAGEDY OF JUSTICE. DEFENDANT IS FULLY ENTITLED TO REVIEW OF THE NOTE.

Commissioner Morrow HAS FAILED TO:

- ① UPHOLD AND PROMOTE THE INDEPENDENCE, INTEGRITY AND IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY AND SHALL AVOID IMPROPRIETY AND THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY.
- ② SHALL PERFORM THE DUTIES OF JUDICIAL OFFICE IMPARTIALLY, COMPETENTLY, AND DILIGENTLY.
- ③ SHALL CONDUCT THE JUDGE'S EXTRA JUDICIAL ACTIVITIES SO AS TO MINIMIZE THE RISK OF CONFLICT ^{W/} THE OBLIGATIONS OF JUDICIAL OFFICE (EX. LIKE RULING FOR BANKS RE REPRESENTATIVES TO INSURE MAINTAINING JUDGES PENSION FUNDS)

COMMISSIONER MORROW CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO CONDUCT HIS COURTROOM IN SUCH AN UNFAIR MANNER, LIKE A "STAR CHAMBER." THE NOTE MUST BE RETURNED AND COMMISSIONER MORROW IS WRONG. THIS COURT CANNOT STEAL JURISDICTION, STEAL THE HOUSE, AND SIGN THE WRIT WITHOUT RETURNING THE NOTE. THE THINKING BEHIND HIS ACTIONS MAY NECESSITATE A FULL PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAM. COMPLAINANT HERE PRAYS THE COMMISSION RULES APPROPRIATELY, OPEN MINDEDLY, AND NOT IN FAVOR OF THE STATUS QUO.
THANK YOU.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)