State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 14-156
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge failed to issue timely rulings, which hampered her ability to pursue an appeal.

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. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 21, 2014

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 August 21, 2014.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2014-156

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:	Judge's Name:
what you believe the judge did that times, and places that will help the	in paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and records.
Please see attached lett	er.

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

This complaint is in regards to , and alleges violations of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 1 Rules 1.1 and 1.2, and Canon 2 Rule 2.5 in relation to proceedings of .

- 1. It is complainant's position that has routinely ignored A.R.S. 12-128.01, Canon 1 Rule 1.1, and Canon 2 Rule 2.5, and in doing so undermines any confidence in the judiciary and violates Canon 1, Rule 1.2:
 - a. Motion for Signed Orders/Entry of Judgment Pursuant to ARFLP Rule 78(A) and 81 filed on

 to formally sign and enter previous rulings so that Complainant could file a Notice of Appeal. Over days later, Judge still has not signed a formal and proper order.
 - b. Motion for Reconsideration; or in the Alternative Objection to Lack of Findings Pursuant to A.R.S. 25-403 and 25-403.03 filed on

 No Response was filed and this matter was submitted for decision
 - c. Complainant filed Motion to Correct Clerical Mistake Pursuant to ARFLP Rule 65 on . A Response was filed and the issue was submitted for decision on . , or day as of the date of this complaint.

It is Complainant's position that she believes Judge has violated A.R.S. 12-128.01 and Sup.Ct.Rules, Rule 81, Code of Judicial Conduct, Rule 2.5.

days as of the date of this complaint.

Complainant requested Judge sign and enter proper orders for the current orders dated and . Complainant even attached the relevant minute entries.

On , the parties were in court wherein Judge reviewed on the record what the outstanding issues were. The above listed issues were reviewed by Judge

. This evidences Judge knowledge on , that the issues were still pending and from what date they had been pending from. (See attached certified transcript. Exhibit A, from page 23 line 9 – page 24 line 11.) On Complainant filed Motion for Judge to recuse Within that Motion Complainant pointed out the above pending issues and how long they had been pending for. (See attached Motion for to recuse himself as Exhibit B.) On , the parties were in court again and Judge ordered the parties to file a list of all pending issues by On , Complainant filed Notice of pending issues, again listing the above items. (See attached Notice as Exhibit C.) On. , in light of the recent Arizona Supreme Court decision in Complainant filed proposed orders that comply with both ARFLP Rules 81 and 78(B), as the court's versions did not comply with ARFLP Rule 78(B). By doing so, Complainant was hoping once again that Judge would just simply sign the orders so that Complainant could file Notice of Appeal. (See attached Notice as Exhibit D.) On , after the issues had been submitted to Judge for ruling/signing for over days, after it being brought to Judge attention no less than times that the issues were still pending, Complainant filed Notice of Deadline Pursuant to

Due to the court's actions, the court has purposefully tied Complainant's hands in ability to file a Notice of Appeal.

A.R.S. 12-128.01. (See attached Notice of Deadline as Exhibit E.)

Complainant has been waiting over days for Judge to simply sign and enter proper orders so that can file her notice of appeal over those orders. Complainant has done everything can do in order to gain Judge compliance in doing so, short of filing a Petition for Special Action, and yet Judge has refused to do so.

Complainant has since asked for other orders to be properly signed and entered pursuant to ARFLP Rules 81 and 78, and again, no action has been taken by Judge (See attached Exhibits F and G.) Complainant does not believe that signing and making an order complaint with ARFLP Rule 78(B) is a complex issue that under any circumstances would warrant taking over days to complete, especially in light of the fact that Complainant provided the orders to the court for signing.

In relation to the Motion to Correct filed and the Motion for Reconsideration filed , while these would take consideration, it has been more than days for Judge to consider the motions and by any reasonable standard this is not complaint with Canon 2 Rule 2.5, and most certainly does not comply with A.R.S. 12-128.01 and Rule 91(e), Rules of the Supreme Court.

Sincerely,