State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 14-013

Judge:

Complainant:

No. 1034714854A

No. 1034714854B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge was biased in favor of opposing counsel and prejudiced against African Americans.

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: March 20, 2014.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on March 20, 2014.

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 US	E ON	LY	
5014	0	1	3

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

JUDGE'S Name:

is the Plaintiff and attorney is representing Dr. and Dr.

and he has made judicial is very biased toward Judge decisions that suggest Plaintiff has zero changes of receiving any unbiased ruling in this lawsuit. It is speculated that Judge and Counsel have conspired together to have this case dismissed or ruled an Arbitration Case with a dollars limit although Plaintiff is suing Defendants for million plus in punitive damages. All filed evidences from licensed doctors in this lawsuit valued Plaintiff's dental procedures at or around dollars. Judge gnored all of the estimations presented from licensed dentists and ruled with attorney that this case is valued at less than (EXHIBIT 1).

It appears that Judge Arbitration ruling was based on the Nationality of the Plaintiff and not according to Arizona Judicial Rules of Conduct. Every Arbitrator assigned by Judge was an alleged friend, college friend, law friend, or worked together in the same work place as Defendants' attorney. The first Arbitrator

went to the same college, the same law school, and worked with attorney Ms. at the same time. Although over Ms. was out of the country, Plaintiff received signed court document or court Motions that was allegedly forged by an unlicensed employee (see EXHIBIT 2).

Almost every Motion filed in this lawsuit was a forgery performed without the services of a licensed attorney. It was speculated that attorney mind was over-stressed and unstable, so she assigned this court case to her unlicensed assistant, From the very beginning of this lawsuit that was filed on Plaintiff, started receiving forged court documents from Attorney allegedly signed by her assistant (see EXHIBIT 3)



CONFIDENTIAL State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

013 2014

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

JUDGE'S Name:

Name:

Allegedly Judge knew that attorney would not honor any court "Order" ordered by this court. Attorney only would respond to Motions that were related to Dismissal of the case or Motions for an Arbitration. Below is a list of Motions Ms. refused to honor and Judge would not make Ms. comply:

 Discovery Rule 26 (a) states that each Defendant shall supply the other party within 40 days information requested for Discovery. Attorney mailed Dr. Discovery that was never seen by Dr. Ms. retyped Dr. requested Discovery and allegedly had one of her employees forged Dr. answers to the Discovery and sign attorney signature to the Forgeries. Judge was notified about forgeries and said he would accept all forgeries against a Plaintiff in his court room (see audio on conference on

at in courtroom (Judge

2. Discovery Rule 26 (a) states that each Defendant shall supply the other party within 40 days requested for Discovery. Defendant Dr. never saw request for discovery. Counsel for Defendants had employed retype request and mail fake forgeries to Plaintiff. Judge was notified about forgeries and said he would accept all forgeries against an Plaintiff in his courtroom.

3. Interrogatories Rule 37 (a) states that each party must supply the opposing party a written list of requested Interrogatories within 20 to 30 days. Attorney refused to supply Plaintiff any requested interrogatories from Dr. that was not allegedly forged by her assistant. On at Judge told Plaintiff he would accept all forged documents against plaintiff in his courtroom. (See audio tape from courtroom conference).



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

FOR OFFICE USE OF	NLY	
	-	

013

1-4

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

JUDGE'S Name:

4. Interrogatories Rule 37 (a) states that each party must supply the opposing party a written list of requested Interrogatories within 20 to 30 days. Attorney refused to supply Plaintiff any requested interrogatories from Dr.

that was not allegedly forged by her assistant. On at a.m. Judge told Plaintiff he would accept all forged documents against plaintiff in his courtroom. (See audio tape from courtroom conference).

5. Joint Pretrial Memorandum and proposed Scheduling Order. Attorney refused to meet for Joint Pretrial Memorandum and Scheduling Order. Plaintiff gave Defendants' attorney his copy of the Pretrial Memorandum and Scheduling Order before the court's due day. Plaintiff gave Counsel the rights to choose any dates that fit Counsel's schedule for Scheduling Order. Attorney refused to comply with the court Order. Judge would not order Counsel to comply with the court Order.

Arizona Rule A.R.C.P. 72-77. Arizona Rule 72-77 was designed to value 6. court cases over or under the Compulsory Arbitrations limit of \$50,000 dollars. There and appear to be a conspiracy involving Judge attorney Evidence gathered by Plaintiff confirmed allegedly Ms attorney were friends for years. It appeared they conspired to and Ms rule this case lawsuit by having Judge defraud the plaintiff out of his limit Arbitration case. Plaintiff discovered that all of the court papers filed a were fake and forgeries. Allegedly Ms. left the country by attorney for the Holiday Season. However Plaintiff kept receiving court documents with signature. All of the court file documents were fakes and forgeries. attorney's stated he would accept the forgery documents and the Judge Plaintiff must honor request listed in the forged documents. Plaintiff thinks that all judges should only allow legal filed Motions in a court of law. Also, Judge would not explain why he ruled this case is a lawsuit under the Arbitration \$50,000 dollar limit. When Plaintiff asked Judge about his ruling, Judge walked out of the court room without answering. (See audio Conference



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

814 013

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

JUDGE'S Name

Evidences suggest Judge allegedly met with Counsel without Plaintiff on 7. after Plaintiff left the courthouse. Plaintiff will be presenting evidences to Arizona Judicial Commission that suggest Judge met with attorney and allegedly she supplied Judge with the next on name to trick Plaintiff into a phony new Arbitration Hearing and talk to Judge about cancelling a scheduled Telephonic Conference scheduled for telephone (See exhibit 4). Exhibit 4 sent to Plaintiff cancelled the Conference. However, the court document sent to Plaintiff was not mailed until knew the telephone Counsel attorney How did she know the Telephone Conference was cancelled on Conference was cancelled? It appears that someone talked to her at the courthouse .. this is why. was on was on Birthday and the was was court was closed. Attorney did not call Tuesday morning on because allegedly she already knew that the telephone Conference was cancelled. is the only person that had the power to cancel the Telephone Judge Conference. Who told attorney (See Exhibit 4)

Plaintiff wants Judgeto remove himself from this lawsuit. Plaintiff feelsthat every ruling in this case was ruled to benefit Defendants and their attorney. On
JudgeJudgetoldPlaintiff,people representing a client in his court did not need an Arizona law license to file
Motions against anPlaintiff in his court. In other words, Plaintifffeels it is impossible for Plaintiff to receive a fair trial or fair ruling in this court case.

Sincerely,