

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 13-247

---

Judge:	No.1081914772A
Complainant:	No. 1081914772B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge demonstrated bias by allowing the state to falsely charge him and by denying him applicable statutory defenses. He further alleged the judge reneged on an agreement to classify his conviction as a misdemeanor rather than a felony

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, 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: October 30, 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 October 30, 2013.

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

2013-247

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

N

\_\_\_\_\_ 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.

1. The Judge Allowed the state to falsely charge Defendant, who is the Natural and Paternal father of \_\_\_\_\_ under Paragraph A1 of the ARS 13-1302 statute for custodial interference. The A1 Paragraph is NOT intended for parents and the actions of the Judge and the state ARE unconstitutional.
2. The Judge Displayed complete and total biased actions that favored the state, by consistently approving all motions and actions by the state and fully denying all motions and actions by the Defense.
3. The Judge Allowed the systematic deprivation and denial of the statutory defenses that are available for parents who had filed for emergency custody petitions that clearly state that child is in harm's way if left with other parent.

2013-247

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Instru \_\_\_\_\_ paper of the same size to file a \_\_\_\_\_ words  
what you believe the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial r \_\_\_\_\_ 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.

4. The Judge verbally Agreed with the states Proposal, During the settlement conference, That the Defendant would be sentenced to A misdeemeanor At Sentencing, And the Agreed that he would Designate the case/charge As A misdeemeanor if the defendant took the Plea. Then, At Sentencing the Judge fully went back on his word and Retaliated Against the Defendant for clearly stating that the court was in violation of Regarding Parental Rights And the Rights of unmarried parents. The Judge Retaliated by hearing the case undesignated and sentenced the Defendant to A felony, which is fully Against the Provisional Statutes of the Law and is fully in contrast to what was Promised At Settlement conference.
5. Pursuant to ARS - 13-1302 - This case should have Been Dismissed.