## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-152	
Judge:	No. 1022914545A
Complainant:	No. 1022914545B

## ORDER

The complainant alleged a justice of the peace ignored numerous violations of her rights by several other justices of the peace.

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: July 18, 2013.

## FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on July 18, 2013.

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

2013-152

JUN 1 8 2013

đ

)

Ŀ

5

Defendant/Counterclaimant, Pro Per ("Defendant") in the above-entitled matter submits this Motion For Reconsideration of the May 23, 2013 "Review Order" of

based on the record of bias, prejudice, obstruction of justice, fraudulent Complaint and fraudulent concealment, denying Defendant the exercise of her statutory and Constitutional civil rights and rights to due process. Defendant has no knowledge that the JCRCP are retroactive mor apply to cases filed prior to January 1, 2013 Defendant/CrossComplainant, Pro Per ("Defendant") in the above-entitled matter, hereby submits her Motion for Reconsideration of the ORDER of Justice of the Peace and Presiding Judge of the Judge of the dated May 23, 2013 and mailed to Defendant on May 30, 2013 for the reasons set forth in the following:

2013-152

1. Judge as ignored/not addressed Defendant's Motion For Transfer to the County Superior Court to which Defendant has a right to request in view of the Superior Court's supervisory role over the Justice Courts and is not involed in the bias, prejudice, obstruction of justice, conspiracy, prejudice, failure to comply with the ARCP, the ARS and the "new JCRCP, the Federal "Fair Deby Collection Practices Act" ("FDCPA") thus denying my Constitutional right to due process/civil rights;

2. Judge denies defendant's right to "approve' the assignment of this case with the absurd splitting of hairs as to my right to approve a judge to whom this case was assigned. My filing to get the name of the assigned to Judge was my right to know and been noticed..I never received any Notice whatsoever. If Judge believes that Plaintiff/CounterDefendant ("Plaintiff") had the right to file a response to my Motion For Name of Judge was NOT MY RIGHT TO KNOW NOR APPROCE, the Court granted Plaintiff's objection. It is preposterous to think that the Court can deny a litigant her right to know the name of the Judge to which her case had been assigned subjtec, of course, to her approval;

3. Judge as been copied, by Defendant, of numerous Motions by Defendant, requesting, among others, to compel Plaintiff to comply with AROP RUE 26.1 - 37 ; Administrative Review of case history and consistant denials of most every statutory right of Defendant; refusal to correct and clarify docket; refusal to sanction Plaintiff for assigning, WITHOUT NOTICE OF APPEARANCE another attorney (not employed by Plaintiff's attorneys); scheduling trial dates without any filing, pursuant to ARCP Rule 38.1... Certificate of Readiness and Motion to Set;

-2-

Judge review Order, sent to him by JP Judge has, effectively, approved the actions and inactions complained of/documented. 4. Commencing with this case

2013 - 152

was bounced to who has been, upon public information and belief, criticized and noticed of violations of ex-party rules FIVE TIMES; The court must note that Judge

voluntarily withdrew from this case.and assigned this case to . had the choice of assigning this matter to the Superior Court of County or leave the assignment/transfer to the Justice Court entity which has that authority. Judge of the

Court who proceeded to deny Defendant's statutory and constitutional rights.including not noticing his assignment regardless of Defendant's Motion requesting it;

5. The Court has copies of Defendant's affidavits stating she believes, BASED ON THE RECORD, that she caannot get a fair, unbiased, non-prejudicial trial in this matter;

6. All are under the supervision of the Presiding

, Therefore, all violations claimed by Derendant, AND DOCUMENTED WITH STATUTORY REFERENCES, have been done while the presiding Judge did NOTHING. Defendant believes there is some things unlawful and corruptive in the Instice Courts:

7. This matter was brought by Plaintiff as a "Breach of Contract" civil action. PLAINTIFF, BY AND THROUGH ITS ATTORNEYS, FILED A FRAUDULENT COMPLAINT alleging that

Defendant breached an application/agreement entered into between Defendant and Bank of America. <u>THE FACTS ARE THAT NO SUCH APPLICATION/</u> <u>AGREEMENT HAS EVER BEEN DISCLOSED AND THE BANK OF AMERICA AND</u> <u>FIA CARD SERVICES, N.A. DO NOT HAVE ANY SUCH COPY.</u> What "contract" was broken? It's a fabricated "ghost";

8. have refused to copy the e: breached/ unpaid yet has disclosed an Affidavit of Plaintiff's own employee stating that the complete electronic records were turned over to Plaintiff, said records kept "in the ordinary course of

-3-

business" by Bank of America.

9. The alleged "account" Plaintiff disclosed only two statements for state an account which Plaintiff claims was "charged-off" in June, 2009..THE FACT IS, from my credit reports, that account number was the Bank of America account charged off AND a redacted alleged schedule states the account was ..THREE DIFFERENT ACCOUNT NUMBERS.

2013-152

10. Plaintiff, by and through its attorneys, HAVE/ARE FRAUDULENTLY CONCEALING THE application/agreement and the records of none of these accounts, except for two statements for the account.

failed/refused to address Defendant's Motion to transfer/ Judge assign this case to the Maricopa County Superior Court based on my affidavit claiming, based on the "complete" record in this matter, that I could not get a fair and equitable trial in the County Justice Courts, currently presided over by JP Whatever goes on behind the scenes at the County Justice Courts and whatever goes on between said judges (and pro tem judges) with Plaintiffs and/or Plaintiff's attorneys appear to be illegal, corruptive, biased, prejudiced, over-reaching, refusal to do their judicial mandate, incompetance and a "good old boys" scenario thus denying, in this case, the Defendant's civil rights, the A.R.S., the A.R.C.P, the JCRCP and the Fair Debt Collection PrACTICES Act.

Like the fox guarding the hen house, Judge protects those who he is mandated to oversee. THIS IS NOT JUSTICE.

THEREFORE, upon the complete pleadings in this case, included herein by reference, and the statements herein, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court reconsider its Order dated May 23, 2013 (not mailed until May 30, 2013) and grant Defendant's Motion to Transfer/Assign this case to the County Superior Court.

Defendant also respectfully requests the Court grant her the costs, fees and expenses and punitive damages related to this case and for personal injuries.

Defendant requests/demands that a review of this case be

-4-

2013-152

done by the County Superior Court which has, as Defendant believes, has the superior authority to conduct same.

Defendant also asks that if this Motion for Reconsideration is beyond the time limit that the Court allows any additional time as Defendant suffers from serious respiratory disease and has been quite ill for the past two weeks.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 16th. day of June, 2013

20

μ,