## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition	of	Compl	laint	14-273

Judge:

Complainant:

## ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner had engaged in repeated instances of judicial misconduct in handling a guardianship and conservatorship for his father.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioner 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 judicial officer's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the commissioner 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 8, 2014

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the commissioner on October 8, 2014.

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

FROM:

TO: The Commission on Judicial Conduct in the State of Arizona

RE: Judicial Misconduct of Commissioner

DATE:

Dear Commission on Judicial Conduct,

Please accept this letter as a formal complaint against for violation of the judicial canons, failure to uphold the integrity and the independence of the judiciary, failure to perform the duties of the office impartially, and performance of conduct that brings the judiciary into disrepute—noting herein that the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct provides, in the commentary to Canon 1, that, "A judicial decision or administrative act later determined to be incorrect as a matter of law or as an abuse of discretion is not a violation of this code unless done repeatedly or intentionally." misconduct has been oft repeated, and oft times intentional, as will be shown below.

The nature of misconduct under several different categories, and this complaint takes into account the general principles that the code of judicial conduct requires a judge to "respect and comply with the law," to "be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it," and to "accord to every person who has a legal interest in

a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law."

In the case of

the specific and repeated instances of

misconduct fall under the aegis of:

- 1) Appealable Demeanor
- 2) Failure to Exercise Discretion
- 3) Clear Legal Error
- 4) Pattern of Legal Error
- 5) Decisions Made in Bad Faith
- 6) Egregious Legal Errors and continuous disregard for Due Process
- 7) Abuse of the Contempt Power
- 8) Making In-Court Statements about other Pending Matters
- 9) Disclosure of non-public information

This complaint arises out of

oversight of the

Matter of

, under which case

was conserved on

The officers of the court in the matter are:

court

appointed attorney;

the conservator;

the conservator's attorney; and myself,

son and court appointed Guardian.

Mssrs. and are considered notorious from a series of

articles printed in the during and about

misdeeds of the officers of the County Court, which

prompted a series of reforms at the direction of the Arizona court

to prevent abuse in conservatorship matters.

To my dismay, Mr. and Mr. have continued the pattern of

misconduct that led to those reforms, and have successfully secured the

extra-judicial support of one of the of the Court,

in continuing their Abuse through exploitation of the

person and his Estate, which has a present value of roughly

wrong-doings in the Matter of

the State

Bar of Arizona has already initiated litigation against

for

fraudulent actions in the matter of conserving through Falsely

Swearing on a Petition, and Fraud upon the Court. However,

has refused to remove Mr. from this court-appointed position, even though she was petitioned to do so. Importantly,

But the fraud and misconduct are more broad than what is mentioned above.

has made it publicly clear that she is a friend of Mr.

has engaged in judicial misconduct, in a repetitive pattern, to further , and goals of defrauding by Making Judgments in Bad Faith in violation of Rule 1.1, Using Threats to Coerce in violation of Rule 2.3A, creating a Parody of a Court Proceeding, Failure to Exercise Judicial Discretion in violation of Rule 2.7, making in-court Statements about other Pending Matters in violation of Rule 2.10, repeatedly violating the procedural requirements of the court in violation of Rule 1.1, preventing the right to be heard in violation of Rule 2.6, and Disclosure of non-public information in violation of Rule 3.5.

## most notable and recent acts of judicial

misconduct, thus far, took place when 1) she ordered to follow an Amended Order to Show Cause that does not exist in the court record, putting him automatically into Contempt of Court, and then changed the Order to Enforce a Plea Sham Order to Show Cause, which had already been fulfilled and was constructively ruled so, when the Motion to Cancel the hearing for that Order to Show Cause was ruled moot on because it was no longer relevant, 2) she refused to Rule on a Motion for Sanctions for Rule 11 violations against her friend, and opposing counsel, for filing repeated Plea Shams (Exhibit 1), and 3) for refusing to allow argument against the conservator for 14 counts of Breach

of of Loyalty, and removal of conservator.

Please see attached for a list of the acts of judicial misconduct of in the Matter of

In the large, attempts to expose the frauds in forming and conducting the conservatorship have been treated by with such a large volume of judicial misconduct, far outside of the law, that an ordinary course of appeal would be an overwhelming undertaking for

THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.

FOR ACCESS TO THE
REMAINDER OF THE
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST
IN WRITING TO THE
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE
THE COMMISSION CASE
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.