## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 15-191
Judge:	
Complainant:	

## **ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner (now retired) altered the electronic case record and made improper rulings in a family law matter.

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: August 19, 2015

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 August 19, 2015.

I understand the commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge to a case.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the facts I have provided upon which my allegations of judicial misconduct are based are true and correct.

Signature:	 	 
Date:		 

## INSTRUCTIONS

Use the following space or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint. Explain why you believe what the judge did constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list the names, dates, times, and places relevant to your allegations. Additional pages may be used and relevant copies of documents may be sent with your complaint (please do not send original documents). Use one side of each page only and write legibly or type your complaint. Please keep a copy of your complaint for your records.

To Whom It May Concern:					
As of the filing of this Judicial Complaint, has been active for nearly While there are numerous filings in this case, I will attempt to keep the violations simple and include attached paperwork as exhibits to demonstrate.					
Past information has been altered to align with the desired outcome of the case. Of note, the printout and highlighted those items that are not accurate. Please see Exhibit A.					
"Report" There was no report excepted into evidence on this day. There is a connotation that the custody report done by Dr. accepted into evidence. The report was actually received by the court on During a hearing on both and state that the verification of the report, Judge states that he has received the report, but he not had time to read it. The reflects the statements of those involved. Please see Exhibit 8 Of note, there is no written mention of the Report by Judge in the Minute Entry.					
"Trial" There was NO TRIAL on this day. On we had a scheduled trial and negotiated a Rule 69 Agreement that was read onto record. A TRIAL never took place. The does not list anything taking place on					
No was put in writing. What is the "order"? Previously there was an entry for the appointment of a At some point and I don't know exactly when, the 'entry is changed to					
Judge stamps Petitioner's version of a lodged decree that is the written form of the Rule 69 Agreement negotiated on it contains proof of the division of community property. Please see stamped decree on file and supporting tabbed binder turned in by Attorney					
3. On Respondent files '.  And Motion for Leave to Amend." See Exhibit C. Petitioner files Petitioner's Motion to Strike; Motion For Judgment on the In the pleading. Attorney, asks Judge to issue a Minute Entry Order granting leave to amend or a judgment. See Exhibit D.  Al is never completed by Judge The issue continues on through					
4. An Expedited Motion for Order Requiring Petition/Wife to Sign Quitclaim is filled on Judge calls both attorneys and sets a conference for at It is requested that attorneys only are on this call. I Insist that I am present for the call. Judge orders that I sign the Quitclaim Deed on my marital home. He does this despite the fact that our stamped decree cuttines how Respondent will refinance the property and how Petitioner will sign the Quitclaim concurrently. This is to guarantee that I will receive a check for my portion of the home. Judge (increas my attorney) warning that I will not receive my portion if safety provisions are not demanded. Judge states verbally that should issue a buy-out check by to me. In a issued on Judge orders that I shall sign the order to issue a check for the refinance by or to sell the home if the refinance is NOT authorized. This was verbally stated on the call but not issued as an order in the Minute Entry dated See Exhibit E. At this point. I no longer own my marital asset but I am required to pay my portion of the debts assigned to me in our Rule 69 Agreement.					
5. On May a Status Conference is set by Judge The states that the conference is for attorneys only. Please see Exhibit F. I am present for the conference. Judge assistant states that Judge wants this in chambers and I presume unrecorded. I object and insist that, I am present, the conference take place in the courtroom, and that it be recorded for the record. What follows is opposing counsel attorney. Attorney and Judge completely changing our written and stamped decree. My attorney attempts to speak but is ignored. Judge verbally orders that our Rule 69 be changed according to his orders. To add insult to injury, my attorney, Is ordered to make the changes. So I will be paying all legal fees for these changes that I did not agree to.  The states that Judge is the present from the conference to the conference take place in the country and that it be recorded for the record.  The conference is set by Judge assistant states that I am present for the conference. Judge assistant states that I am present for the conference take place in the country on the ment of the country on the time. The conference take place in the country on the time of the country on the ment of the country on the country on the country on the ment of the country on the country of the country of the country on the country of the country on the country of the country of the country of the country of the country					
6. Judge leaves the bench on The final decree that is really a Rule 69 Agreement is never signed by either party. Judge does not sign it as a final order.					
This case should have been resolved months ago. At this point the   is no resolve and the details have been complicated by the numerous filings and the passing of time. Lack of orders put in a minute anti- have also complicated matters. I personally, have spent an additional in attorney fees that were unnecessary had this case been adjudicated properly and the signed end stamped decree of been left in place.					
A new judge versed in Arizona statute and constitutional law would need to read and investigate all the filings to issue orders in this case. I have attached a similar Special Action Jurisdiction case for your review. This case involved Judge See Exhibit I.					