State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition o	of Complaint	14-222
---------------	--------------	--------

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge had engaged in a clear pattern of legal error and had intentionally disregarded the law.

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.

The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. In addition, 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: October 2, 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 October 2, 2014.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

2014-222

						70.7		w judge to a case:	
Yes	No	BUT	THESE	CASES	NESD	TO P.	E	Moved	
8. Please rea	d the f	ollowing s	tatement a	and sign on t	he line belo	w:			
I alleg				of perjury, attached co			g in	formation and the	
Sign	ature					Date			
				1.1	Revised				
					ic viscu	EOD		TELOF LIGE ONLY	
						FOR	OF	FFICE USE ONLY	
			COMPI	LAINT AGA	INST A JU	JDGE			
Name:				Jı	ıdge's Name	a•			
	- x:				iugo s rium				
you believe the and places tha	e judge t will he ginals) e	did that con elp the com of relevant	nstitutes ju mission und	dicial miscond lerstand your	luct. Be spec concerns. Ad	ific and lis	st al ages	ribe in your own words what of the names, dates, times may be attached along with aper only, and keep a copy of	h,
,	-								
			856	PITA	HED				
				- Av					
									_

Complaint against a Judge

Judge:

By:

We are dealing with two cases, both assigned to and heard by Judge in County Court, in which complainant, the Plaintiff pro se in both cases, believes there is a clear pattern of legal error and intentional disregard of the law as prohibited in Canon Number 2.

There were several issues in this case. First, when Plaintiff had to leave County for medical reasons, the Clerk's office failed to correct Plaintiff's mailing address and some pleadings by Counsel for Defendants, as well as judicial rulings were never received. Then when the judge issued what was supposedly ruling against Plaintiff regarding proof of service in the initial action being defective, Plaintiff appealed to appeal was based primarily on the fact that Defendants had acknowledged receipt by virtue of their response to the complaint and that any defect in the service process was therefore mute. Arizona Rules of Judicial Procedure 4 (f) states in part: "The filing of a pleading, response to a pleading allowed under Rule 7 of these rules, shall constitute an appearance. Such waiver, acceptance or appearance shall have the same force and effect as if a summons had been issued and served." Within 20 days the attorneys for both defendants had responded, making Plaintiff's three additional services of the original complaint by a process server unnecessary, and yet Judge ruled against Plaintiff of the basis of there being no service on the defendants within 120 days of the filing of the original complaint.

On as Plaintiff was preparing to submit the Opening Brief, the found that there was judicial error made in Judge original ruling, and sent the case back to the Court for correction. (ATTACHED)There being no correction or clarification by Judge after the dismissed the case. Plaintiff then had no choice but to return to Judge Court and then requested a jury trial date be set. On Judge denied Plaintiff's request for a trial, based on an unidentified abd unknown ruling of

This is a real estate fraud case, that is now in year

Defendant, is a resident of not Arizona. However the fraud occurred in Arizona and the property was located at in Arizona.

Without going into extensive detain about this case, Judge originally issued a Default Judgment against the Defendant in the amount of to compensate Plaintiff for

exception needs to be granted so that an appeal of the ruling in the second case can move forward.

I realize that bringing this matter before the Judiciary will result in more delays, however the rulings and errors made by Judge have made it impossible for justice to be served without the intervention of a higher authority.

