

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 16-052

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was prejudiced against him and made improper rulings in a criminal 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.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2016-052

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

has continually acted in a bias and  
prejudice manner towards \_\_\_\_\_ in courtroom  
and showing favoritism towards the state placing  
who is pro per at a even greater disadvantage  
than he already was. On  
was \_\_\_\_\_ lawyer at the time stood in front of  
and told \_\_\_\_\_ that he and I had irreconcilable  
differences, a conflict of interest and that he did not feel  
he could give adequate and just representation and would  
like to be removed from the case. The feeling was mutual. Knowing  
this \_\_\_\_\_ refused too refuse \_\_\_\_\_ as counsel, forcing  
ineffective counsel on me, and forcing me to go pro per after  
only alternative. \_\_\_\_\_ refused  
to hear me on any of the multiple motions that I as the attorney.  
in fact sent in, in a timely manner affording me the opportunity  
to argue the motions in a court setting on record denied me.  
Instead a week later sent \_\_\_\_\_ denying twice  
one of my motions: my motion to compel discovery 15.1,  
my motion for evidentiary hearing, my motion for investigation.  
has continually shown favoritism towards the  
state, and proven to be bias and prejudice towards the defendant  
placing the defendant at an even more unfair disadvantage  
and disregarding his oath to be fair and impartial towards the  
defendant in the courtroom. The defendant does not feel he  
can get fair and equal treatment in \_\_\_\_\_ courtroom  
and respectfully ask that \_\_\_\_\_ be removed from  
and any and all future appearances

See Attached