

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-298

Judge:	No. 1103914809A
Complainant:	No. 1103914809B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a municipal court hearing officer was biased.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the hearing officer 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 hearing officer 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: January 13, 2014.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the hearing officer on January 13, 2014.

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

2013-298

NOV 15 2013

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

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



COMPLAINT AGAINST

Your name

is name:

Date

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Attach additional pages, as needed. Please describe in your own words what the judge said or did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. To help us understand your concern, be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places where the conduct occurred. Include only copies of original documents or court recordings that are relevant to your allegations. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

Based upon my understanding of the Judge's statement the Judge has a clear bias in favor of the Police Department and is not acting impartially. Evidence was provided to dispute statements made by the police officer. The Judge based upon my understanding of the Judge's statements at his ruling found the officers' statements as true based solely upon the fact the person is a police officer and had training ago. It is my belief the Judge has a bias in favor of the PD and did not act impartially or fairly. It is unfair to all defendants when a Judge holds statements from a police officer in higher regard just because they are a police officer which seems to be what this Judge is and has done. A Judge should decide matters upon facts and evidence not simply rubber stamp statements of the police.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)