

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 14-088

---

Judge:	No. 1107619220A
Complainant:	No. 1107619220B

---

**ORDER**

The commission learned of allegations that a pro tem superior court judge improperly conducted business as a lawyer while serving on the bench as a judge.

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 approved sending the judge a private letter advising the judge regarding his obligation to avoid the appearance of impropriety. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Dated: May 19, 2014

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Louis Frank Dominguez

---

Louis Frank Dominguez  
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on May 19, 2014

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

**Sent:**  
**To:** Riemer, George  
**Subject:** Incident with

George,

I am submitting the below facts on behalf of \_\_\_\_\_ for whatever action you or the Judicial Conduct Commission deem appropriate. The facts were relayed to \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_ and are based on an incident that occurred today with one of our judges \_\_\_\_\_. Please let me know if you need any additional information or anything else from our court.

a judge was serving as a for a high-volume criminal calendar at our  
 today. reported that asked whether one of recently-retained clients,  
 was on the calendar. While was checking to see if was scheduled to appear in court that  
 day, received an email from indicating had appeared at check-in, no charges had  
 been filed against and needed bond exonerated. shared this information with  
 , who stated that wanted to speak to client. then spoke to , gave  
 paperwork to complete, and told to return the completed paperwork to \*

The paperwork appears to have been related to representation of (it was not court  
 paperwork). told that would be providing paperwork to , which  
 needed to then be brought to .

When later provided the paperwork to in the courtroom as directed by , and  
 announced loud enough for others to hear that the judge was lawyer and the paperwork was for lawyer.  
 Although the court was not in session/on the record at the time this occurred, there were several people in the gallery,  
 including attorneys and participants in other cases who could have overheard this statement.

related these facts based on a concern that this constitutes an appearance of impropriety.

\* also handed a bond exoneration order. This is a routine order (ministerial task) that was  
 signed by and is normally provided by staff rather than