

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 14-123

Judge:	No. 103301096214948A
Complainant:	No. 103301096214948B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that letters she wrote to two superior court judges have gone unanswered.

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 judges did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: May 28, 2014.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed
to the complainant and the judges
on May 28, 2014.

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

State of Arizona
 Commission on Judicial Conduct
 1501 W. Washington St.
 Suite # 229
 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

I am _____, yrs,
 grandmother of _____ and
 mother of Dr. _____ making
 a complaint on a judgement made
 by our Judicial System and its
 service and recognition to respond to a
 Citizen when submitting an appeal for
 recognition and assistance.

Judge letter (certified)
 asking for information (and giving information)
 received "no" answer or recognition.

The letter to Judge was
 an accusation (made by me)
 an accusation and a copy of evidence
 verifying and proving truth to the
 accusation. But received "no" recognition
 or acknowledgement.

The copies of both letters to the Judges state facts and requests.

The Case shows proof of my accusation is a Liar & Embezzler. The case also shows a pattern of action by behavior. The case should have warranted some kind of answer. Judge decision "Aided and Abetted" in his crime of Lying and Embezzlement. It is obvious The original owner is Dr

Uncle, and wins by Lying & Embezzlement. This is my "Plea" —

Should not be awarded for his action as Liar & Embezzler. He needs to be corrected and recognized for what he has done — what he has done is wrong. Judge has used partiality towards and prejudice towards Dr

Surely, This is of interest to someone in a Court of Law!
Sincerely,