

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 14-220

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge had a case for over a month before looking at it and then immediately recused himself. The complainant alleged the judge's dilatory practice cost him eight weeks of time and money.

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 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 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 judge on August 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., STE 229  
 Phoenix, AZ 85007

REFERNECES:

- A.
- B.
- C.
- D. Rule 1.2 Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary
- E. Rule 2.5. Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation

Dear Commission on Judicial Conduct,

This complaint is lodged v. Judge                      This complaint should not be taken in isolation and should be considered along with                      and one more forthcoming. This case was assigned to Judge                      following the debacle with Judge

On                      Ms.                      filed an Ex Parte hearing with the court, which Judge                      signed. Complainant's former attorney could only figure out the Ex Parte Motion was approved due to a letter from                      Judge                      gal pal. The letter stated my son was experiencing difficulties with transition between homes. It is common knowledge in family court that children exhibit some transition issues that are quickly alleviated (Background). The threshold for Ex Parte Motions is a movant has to show irreparable harm and imminent danger. The Commission on Judicial Conduct might view this as a matter of law, but Complainant respectfully objects this. There is no way to seek relief at the Appellate Level due to Respondent was stuck, file a motion with the Appellate court everything stops. There is no relief in the                      Court, because Litigant become negatively prejudicial. Complainant calls this do your job - do not sign Motions that are inherently wrong, nor comport to the law. The examination of the facts to include a timeline shows Respondent was returning from                      and Petitioner did not want Respondent to exercise his parenting time. It appears the Judges in County Courthouse pencil whip motions, which is foreign to complainant.

Following the debacle with Judge                      and                      This case was assigned to Judge                      on in                      Judge                      schedule a                      case review. On                      Judge                      recused himself with no explanation provided (I understand he is within his purview to do so). Judge                      admitted in open court that he just picked up the case that morning, discovered a conflict, although he had the case for over a month. Judge                      dilatory practice cost me eight weeks - time was of the essence. FAMILIARITY!

County Judiciary's familiarity, dilatory practices, and incompetence in this case killed my relationship with . . . Further, theologians agree, even GOD has limitations on HIS power; GOD cannot create and create. Apparently, Judge is above GOD, because he can rule and not rule. Just terrible. I have never experienced anything like this in . . . with the . . . County Court House is not for a reasonable litigant, because it will drive a reasonable person to question the legitimacy of any court. Is this common? I want to believe not. Complainant finds it unbelievable that everything he worked for turned out be bogus, at least in . . . County.

Not only did this cause a . . . week delay, the . . . County Court House dilatory and incompetent practice unnecessarily drove up litigation. My attorney had to drive apx . . . to the Court House and on return. She spent in the courthouse, for a total of . . . for nothing. Apparently I have to pay for opposing counsel too, which equals . . . Judge . . . could not pick up the phone and say "don't bother coming to the court house, there is an issue. Meet me on the hello line." Judge . . . blamed me; Complainant begs to differ. Litigants are always blamed, which sometimes is not the case. climbing, is this right to bankrupt parents, is that in the best

