## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of C	omplaint 13-307
Judge:	No. 10976 14710A
Complainant:	No. 10976 14710B

## **ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly overrode a prior judge's decision.

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: December 18, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

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

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

## COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: _	Judge's name:	_ Date: _

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court

documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.
- CF HOPORABLE JUDGE.
HAD AT OPENING SENTEPCE SATIFIC THAT
HE PEEDS TO "FOLLOW THE RUCES".
- FOLLOWIPL THE RULES THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT ME
DIO 207 DO 1!
- HE ARROCATILY CONTRADICTED AT ORDER FROM HOTORABLE
JODGE WITH MO REASON WATTSOEVER!
- THE ISSUE WAS ABOUT FURNITURES THAT PETITIONER
HAS BEEN TRYING TO GET OF SEVERAL OCCASIONS,
AND WAS DENIED AS WELL AS OTHER REQUEST THAT
PETTONER HAS BEEN ASKEDU!
- HAD HONORABLE JUDGE READ AND ACKNOWLEDGED
THIS CASE BEFORE TA KILL SUCH A DRASTIC DECISION
HE WOULD HAVE LEAR PED A PERFECT EXPLANATION AS
to WHY HOYORABLE TUDGE HAD DEFIED
AU OF HER REQUEST!
_ is is obvious that JUDGE Did rot
ACKOMULEDGE THIS CASE, APO BY GRANTING HER
THE. + IN VALUE OF THE FURNITURE, HE ENDTIEVAL
STRESSED AS DAMA WED THE WELL BEITL OF MY
, Wich row HAS NO BEDROOM AND 13
PLACE TO SLEEP OF HER DWY, THX TO MA
- FIT TO METTION HOW DISRECPTIVE IS IS FOR TUDGE
ATT ALL THE WORK DEDICATED TO THIS MATTER!!
THE SHOULD DET BE ASSICUED TO THIS CASE AND SHOULD BE
HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE STALLE OF ALL THE FUNTITURES, AND
HE ABOUR AU i Groned AND PECLECTED. CONFLETELY THE ORDER
THAT WAS SHOWED TO HIM!

SHOWED TO