## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 16-047
Judge:	
Complainant:	

## **ORDER**

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge was prejudiced against him and did not diligently handle his family law case.

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(a).

Dated: March 31, 2016

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 March 31, 2016.

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.
Based on the items listed below, I believe that did not perform duties impartially, diligently, or competently in the hearing for this case that was conducted on
1) It was clear throughout the hearing that had not thoroughly read all of the motions, minute entries, and prior orders from this case since it had been assigned to nearly a month prior to this hearing. even came into the hearing believing that parenting time had been incorrectly taken from Father because had missed it in the case documentation. lack of diligence and preparedness on this matter was alarming. Furthermore, more than three weeks went by from the time was assigned to the case and when any action was taken (hearing), and then it was only after Father filed a motion requesting a hearing that it was scheduled.
2) Father (Respondent) mentioned in court that he would like to take the case to Settlement conference. After the petitioner's attorney stated that his initial offer had been immediately rejected, "didn't want to waste anyone's time" and denied the request, thus further prolonging the case. The petitioner's initial "settlement offer", much like most initial offers I suspect, was beyond ridiculous, and completely in favor of his client. Of course it was rejected, but that does not mean was correct in immediately rejecting the idea. was clearly biased against Father.
3) was biased against Father because he was representing himself, and does not have an attorney. repeatedly gave the petitioner's attorney the time to speak and raise his concerns, yet did not afford the respondent the same courtesy. After denying Settlement (#2 above), wanted to schedule the final trial. When Father said that he would like to hire a vocational expert, would not consider his appeal for financial relief. only gave two options to hire the vocational expert and delay the start of the trial, or not. would not consider Father's request for financial relief. actions clearly indicate (in Father's opinion), the was biased against Father because he did not have an attorney, mostly because he can no longer afford one. As Father stated, he had already had to borrow money from his mother to be able to pay his rent.
4) In Father's opinion, the most egregious failure by to fulfill judicial duties in a fair and unbiased way was when asked Father/Respondent why he had not fully complied with former "temporary orders". Father stated, under oath and on the record, that he had been a victim of spousal emotional abuse / domestic violence for several years leading up to and continuing since the divorce case, in violation of ARS 13-3623, and that the temporary orders were in violation of Father's rights as a Victim. These were the same issues raised in Father's motion "RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANCE AND REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS AND SUSPENSION OF PARENTING TIME RIGHTS/RESPONSE which was filed on and id not explore that serious allegation any further, and simply ruled to re-affirm former rulings. There was no suggestion of any investigation, or any other action. It was clear that simply did not like Father, perhaps because of appearance. Instead, used judicial power to continue bullying Father, and violating his Victim's Rights under the Arizona Constitution.
If the same abuse and bullying that Father has been subjected to happened on a school playground, the alleged bullying incident would have been thoroughly investigated, and the alleged victim's rights protected. However, in this case, and this court are ignoring it.
Regards.