

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-237

Judge:	No. 1103114749A
Complainant:	No. 1103114749B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a pro tem justice of the peace prevented her attorney from questioning the opposing party and improperly admitted certain exhibits.

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 review of the complaint, 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 court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: November 14, 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 November 14, 2013.

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

2013-237

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: _____ Judge's Name: _____

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

On July 8, 2013 I was granted an Injunction Against Harassment by
On August 15, 2013, _____ overturned the Injunction due to the "veracity" of my statements. _____ did not allow my attorney to question the defendant, instead the defendant's attorney was allowed to bring in irrelevant exhibits from my dismissal from the _____ Police Department three years prior. I did not even know the defendant at that time and they had no bearing on the hearing.

Per the procedures for the handling of _____ and _____ Against Harassment that the State of Arizona has posted online, it clearly states that both sides should have been questioned. It also clearly states that only relevant information from the past year is to be used.

I also am questioning exactly where _____ came from and who assigned him to my case. When asked, the _____ stated, "There was no assignment, _____ just happened to be on the bench and he saw the case that day."

The defendant, _____ is a _____ in the _____ I have never heard of the legal system bending so much to protect/ favor someone in power like I have since he assaulted me on _____. One would think that it is I who broke the law, not him.