

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 14-125

---

Judge:	No. 105271090914950A
Complainant:	No. 105271090914950B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged two superior court commissioners took inappropriate action after a case was dismissed by another commissioner.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioners 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 commissioners 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: 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 commissioners on May 28, 2014.

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

Commission Industrial Conduct  
1501 W Washington  
Phoenix AZ 85007

2014-125

re: Use of Information / file; discovery  
of case prior to decisions of  
representatives of County  
Courts (Judge and Commissioner) to  
revive case (by Commissioners) dismissed  
by A Judge

h.e. Case

\* The service, was returned with  
a signature (not defendant's) questionable

\* Judge dismissed  
due to service not completed nor  
was care given to locate the signer  
as authorized or if address was current  
of defendant

\* Numerous warrants were issued based  
on sole authority  
review of Case's address for defendant  
as

How is the decision reached  
with the Court's information  
regarding service - and its  
questionable " (after defendants)

Lead to Rule 11 Court Appoint-  
ment, and, Commissioner stating that  
defendant needs a guardian.

Thus, after  
dismissed  
Commissioner

(w/out Mr

) determined  
having as

attorney) that he needed Rule  
11 competency evaluation and  
a guardian.

XXX The Government, of Arizona / City /  
State / County is it associated  
with the website whose docket  
info changes (who authorizes it  
the changes & where are the print  
records kept?)

\* Do the police need to verify the prints said on their screen of an individual?

\* The Charges, & influence of the information provided to the viewer prior to meeting the call

The people calling about a person, is the house's owner / family

○ Why is this - if it is their home family home the police responding to non-neighbors ... Judgement call

3 know who lives their names (or) police know

manipulated

Civil Law try turn criminal charge into family so that care (is not provided if detained in jail...) is given to settling legalities instead of making sure the family home, finances are not being taken & this is horrible

Analy