State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Co	omplaint 13-252
Judge:	No. 1069911125A
Complainant:	No. 1069911125B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge did not rule properly on his discovery motions.

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.

2013-252

A COMPLAINT

SEP 3 0 2013

IN THE

Exhibit Photograph at Accident 3/30/2011 Bad Faith Jury Instructions for Ins. Cases; Rule 26(b)(1)(a);(b)(3); Rule 30 (d); Request Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Exhibit provided here of Defendant talking on a cell phone at the Accident Scene at

approximately 2:00 P.M. on March 30, 2011. All requests for

cell phone

providers' records and "Onstar" records have been refused by the

including the

has Denied all of

Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests and Subpoenas.

These Records have been requested since February 26, 2013 and refused to be ordered produced by this Court.

The photograph is unretouched and has been provided previously to the Court on April 20 2013 showing a black outline of the winshield. (See exhibit 2) When printed on Photograph quality paper, it clearly shows the Defendant holding a cell phone to his left ear, while sitting in his white 2006 Chevrolet Impala, after the accident on March 30, 2011, at approximately 2:00 PM. See exhibit 3

Plaintiff now requests that the

his attorney

or.

in the above captioned case

provide the name of the person that the is talking to on this cell phone, due to the fact that no one has produced Defendants phone records from that day.

Jury Instructions: Bad Faith 1, Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

'intentionally denied the claim, failed to pay on the claim, and has delayed payment on the claim<u>" after "liability" has been established through</u>

ettled on April 14, 2012.

"...5th Bad Faith Instructions are drafted for use in <u>Insurance Cases only</u>...." "Third party coverage arises when the insurer contracts to indemnity the insured against liability to third parties.... The type of claim is not determined by the identity of the party bringing the bad faith action against the insured." But " ...by reason of the insurers bad faith refusal to settle...."

knew that it "acted without a reasonable

Basis...." By losing at the

and then forcing the Plaintiff here

into protracted expensive litigation,

acted in "bad faith" towards Plaintiff after liability was established.

Bad Faith (2) Adequacy of Investigation. "In all aspects of investigation or evaluating a claim",

though

is "required" "to give as much

Consideration" to Plaintiff

and "other improper conduct of the insurer" for "improper withholding of an investigative report".

or Unfavorable Information "Refusal to Disclose

Unfavorable Information"

Reckless Disregard (1)"Lack of a reasonable basis for the insurers decision and (2) knowledge or reckless disregard or the lack of a reasonable basis.'

had been established.

again where he states that they

"will need to go before jury to let them decide the issues", 13 months after the '

decision was handed down against

where they were the

' which has been

continually refused by

. whether it relates to the claim or defense

of the party seeking discovery to the claim or defense of any other party.... Including the

existence of, description of, nature, custody, condition and location of any... documents, or

other tangible things(phone records, onstar, dr.s office,, witnesses names, etc all requested

previously)...and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of any discoverable

matter... It is not grounds for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at the

trial....'

required as a condition of either deposition or interrogatories .' recognized the interest of a party in getting a copy of his own statement...." In other words, a copy of the previously taken Deposition. of must be provided for the asking; and at "this must be applied to prevent a war of attrition

or as a device to coerce a party whether affluent or financially weak";

By Defense

n"...abuse of the deposition ... for the

unreasonable, groundless, abusive, or obstructionist conduct by deposing attorney"

	wants to depose Pla	<u>intiff</u>	a second time	fter failing to provide				
the previous deposition transcription in order to determine whether or not he is going to ask								
the same exact same questions and/or is instead trying to abuse the Plaintiff by making him sit								
in a room, asking questions in order to intimidate Plaintiff again with "armed off duty								
	and then plea	ading with this	Court, before	, that he				
"wasn't done", or needs more time, when he has <u>of the transcribed deposition</u>								
statement from the <u>of the Plaintiff</u> that he will not release to the Court or								
the Plaintiff. All Plaintiff is required to do is "Ask" for the "statement" or "Deposition" under the								
	to obtai	in a copy of tha	t statement, whic	h were "Denied" by				
	in her "Orders" prov	vided to the	last '	'Minutes".				
Plaintiff requests I	Disclosure of any Conf	lict of Interest	between the Appo	pinted				
and Defense	, or any firms he m	nay represen						
	and Does; -	 .		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
	or	o	r					
Plaintiff still seeks Exemplary and or Punitive damages over and above the actual damages								
suffered as a resu	lt of the Defendant	Negligo	ence and	Liability, as his				
insurer, for the accident he is responsible for on March30 2011, and his attorney's refusal to								
comply with Plaint	iffs	and	s' "Bad Faith Ac	ts" in the handling of				

this claim for damages.

CERTIFICATE OF M	<u>IAILING</u>				
l,	, did on this date	9/22	/13	_send via Unite	d States Postal Service
a true and correct	copy of the attached	"Requ	, lest Identity	of	Talking to on a
Cell Phone in the	at the Acc	ident :	Scene	Bad Faith Ju	ry Instructions; Rule
26(b)(1)(a),(b)(3);	Request Conflict of In	terest	Disclosure"	with exhibits to	the following parties

.

.