State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 16-061

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased in favor of the prosecution, improperly allowed a criminal case to proceed after the statute of limitations had expired, and improperly failed to recuse himself.

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: April 12, 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 April 12, 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 iudicial misconduct are based are true and correct.

Signature:_	<u> </u>	
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.

I believe		izona Codes of Judicial Condu			
canon 1, Rule 1.1; C	ompliance with the law, i	ncluding the Code of Judicial C	Conduct;	Software State of the State of	
impropriety;	omoting Confidence in th	e Judiciary, by being impartial,	and avoid impropriety	y and the appearance	of
canon 1, Rule 1.3 Av	oiding abuse of the presti	ige of Judicial Office. A Judge :	shall not abuse the pre	estige of judicial office	to advance
the personal or econd	omic interests of the Judg	e or allow others to do so.			
Cannon 2 Rule 2.2 In	partiality and Fairness.	A Judge Shall uphold and apply	the law, and shall pe	erform all duties of judie	cial office
fairly and impartially.					
Canon 2, Rule 2.5, C	ompetence, diligence	an Indiain Conduct by the			
possible carron 2 Ruli	e 2.4 External innuences	on Judicial Conduct; by the pro-	osecution		
hasi	eceived irreparable inury	and emotional duress due to	unwilling	gness to take preventiv	e and
		al rights and due process were	protected by the pro	secution and her defen	se
attorneys.	defense attorney	would tell a c	ouple times or more ti	hat the prosecution was	s not
providing disclosure of		pictures of		non-compliance of pros	
tell not to	worry about it.				
In previous	On	the	granted the p	prosecutor	
Motion to Dismiss,	the	charges of Count 1; Aggravate	ed Assault, a class 4 fe	elony and Count 2: Ass	ault. a
class 1 Misdemeanor	, without prejudice for the	reasons that it will be resolved	d in	signed the	e order
Even though the statu	te of limitation would exp	ire for the refiling of the misder			arges.
	the prosecution to dismis		nisdemeanor assault to pursue misdeme		
in r		n is still pending, even though t			
	de of the prosecution, ev	en when the prosecution failed	to provide Brady mat	erial (exculpatory evide	ence) such
as her picture of her in	njuries, unwillingness of t	he	to provide the	video, unwillingn	
prosecution to comply	with Defendant's reques	st for Disclosures in		ent on for months.	
as		hearing on	allowed the	prosecution to again of	harge her
with the same misden	neanor assault charge, th	at was dismissed in	and in which the	he court currently does	not have
jurisdiction, since the	statute of limitation expire	ed. did not let the		the statute of limitation	
	assault, and was unwillin		from the prosecution	in charging for the san	ne
misdemeanor assault	. And ordering that a sum	mons shall issue, and setting t	this matter for Arraigni	ment before a different	Judge.

pending against l	d presided in the cri ner? Especially sinc		that was previously case material previously
(and Judges) are and make sure they become vict	suppose to protect neir constitutional rig ims of an unjust crir	the public (or accused) this and due process are minal system. Not allow	ustice. The justice system from malicious prosecution, e complied with, not ensure the prosecution to do always in the best interests of
I believe requires. public defenders.		of allowing the prosecuti	cution (state) , as justice on, even through
prosecution, espe			a plea to satisfy the eep being subject to new ord an independent attorney.
I understand that against her.	the filing of this con	nplaint does not affect b	oth criminal cases pending