

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 14-396

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

An anonymous complainant alleged a superior court commissioner exhibited bias against a mother in a custody proceeding.

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 commissioner'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: February 2, 2015

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

A copy of this order was mailed  
to the commissioner on February 2, 2015.

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

FROM: THE WHISTLE-BLOWER

TO:

HELLO:

A YOUNGSTER' S LIFE IS IN JEOPARDY, CONSEQUENTLY, I HAVE BECOME A WHISTLE-BLOWER. IF I LOSE MY POSITION BECAUSE OF THIS ACTION-AND I BELIEVE I WILL BECAUSE

-SO BE IT. MY CONSCIENCE WILL BE CLEAR, AND IT WILL BE UP TO YOU TO HANDLE THE SITUATION IN A COURAGEOUS (OR COWARDLY) WAY.

HAVING BEEN AFFILIATED WITH THE COURT SYSTEMS OF COUNTY, ARIZONA FOR MANY YEARS, I HAVE SEEN CASES GALORE OF INEPT, IGNORANT, TOTALLY BAD, JUDGEMENT. HOWEVER, IN ALL THAT TIME, NEVER HAVE I WITNESSED SUCH AN EGREGIOUS BIASED, VENGEFUL, AND HATE-FILLED MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE AS WHEN COURT-TOOK PRIMARY CUSTODY OF OF AZ AWAY FROM HIS STAY-AT-HOME-MOTHER, AND AWARDED IT TO FATHER, WHO WORKS AT JUDGE COVER- LEGAL- REASON FOR SO DOING WAS CONSIDERED LAME EVEN BY ATTORNEY. (IT SEEMS THAT WAS NOT ROCKET-FAST IN GETTING AN APPOINTMENT FOR FOR ) WAS FLABBERGASTED AT WINNING THE CASE AND POINTEDLY ADMITTED IT TO SEVERAL BYSTANDERS.

WELL, I CAN ENLIGHTEN HIM AS TO THE 'WHY' OF HIS WINNING. YOU SEE, SHORTLY BEFORE HEARING THE CASE, JUDGE HAD BEEN RANTING AND RAVING ABOUT SAYING THAT "HATED THE LITTLE WAS NOTHING BUT TROUBLE" AND COULD TOOK THAT MIEN WITH INTO THE COURTROOM TO HEAR THE CASE, BUT EVEN IF HAD NOT, HAD NO CHANCE IN HADES OF KEEPING PRIMARY CUSTODY OF JUDGE IRE AT ONLY ADDED FUEL TO A FIRE ALREADY BURNING INSIDE THE JUDGE' S BIGOTTED BRAIN.

AFTER THE HEARING WAS OVER AND JUDGE WAS "CHATTING" ABOUT IT, LIP-SMACKINGLY SAID HOW PLEASED WAS TO HAVE USED TO "PUT (REFERRING TO ) IN HER PLACE." ACCORDING TO JUDGE AND NEW FATHER AND STEP MOTHER) WERE BUT SHE PREFERRED RULING FOR PEOPLE OF THAT CALIBRE OVER RULING FOR CASE (NO PUN INTENDED) FOR QUITE SOME TIME BEFORE TIRING OF IT, AND IF PUT UNDER OATH, THERE ARE SEVERAL COURT WORKERS WHO WILL TESTIFY TO THE ABOVE-MENTIONED STATEMENTS.

AS I REMARKED, I AM AND ALL ONE HAS TO DO IS ASK AROUND TO LEARN THAT HAS STATED FIRMLY THAT IS A CRYBABY, DETESTS DOES NOT WANT TO LIVE WITH IS SORRY THAT WON IN COURT BECAUSE NOW WILL HAVE TO "BABY-SIT" . AS TO WHY DOES NOT TELL FATHER HOW SHE FEELS? DOES NOT HIDE FROM CONFIDANTES THE FACT THAT WORKS FOR IS MEAL TICKET, AND IS AFRAID WILL LOSE IT. AS OF NOW, PLAN OF ACTION IS TO TREAT COVERTLY-IN MEAN WAYS IN ORDER TO MAKE SURE WILL ASK TO RETURN TO WHILE WILL BE CONSIDERED BLAMELESS. KNOWS AND IT IS OPINION THAT DECISION FAVORING WAS A POWER PLAY AS THE JUDGE HAS AND WAS OFFENDED BY

OKAY, FOLKS, FOR BETTER OR WORSE, THE BALL IS IN YOUR COURT (NO PUN INTENDED).

MOST SINCERELY/BUT NOT VERY HOPEFULLY, IS . . . THE ARIZONA WHISTLE-BLOWER