#### State of Arizona

#### COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 16-123

Judge:

Complainant:

#### ORDER

The complainants alleged a superior court judge was biased against them, denied their right to be heard, incompetently reviewed the file, improperly communicated with another judge, and improperly delayed advising them of his ultimate decision costing them time and money.

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: June 22, 2016

#### FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainants and the judge on June 22, 2016.

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

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.

Sign

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.

## ABSTRACT

This complaint submits facts as Exhibits I-VII supporting violations of the Arizona Judicial Code of Conduct against Honorable in his conduct towards Plaintiffs This complaint illustrates a pattern of behavior and conduct by Judge towards Plaintiffs, across two separate cases involving Plaintiffs. Judge pattern of conduct demonstrates lack of impartiality, fairness, competence, diligence and cooperation. It also demonstrates denial of the Plaintiffs' rights to be heard, as well as an improper ex parte communication and judicial statement to another judge on an impending case. The ex parte communication appeared to be intended to deny Plaintiffs the right to a fair hearing in the future, as well as indicate

disagreement with the other judges ruling. These overall violations of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct tarnish confidence in the Judiciary.

# Points of Fact Supporting Violations of Rule 1.2, Rule 2.2, Rule, 2.5, Rule 2.6, Rule 2.9 and Rule 2.10 for Case Number

Rule 2.6: Evidence Against Ensuring the Right to Be Heard, Rule 2.2: Evidence of Partiality & Unfairness;

Plaintiffs site lack of impartiality and fairness against Plaintiffs from Judge in that Plaintiffs were self-representing as their right. Plaintiffs feel self-representation was used against Plaintiffs, where demands were placed on them being specifically disadvantaged without an attorney. These demands created scenarios where Judge could site the need for an attorney. Judge states in Court Order dated second page, paragraph four, presented as evidence **Exhibit I**:

"The court would highly suggest to the Plaintiffs to either retain, or at minimum, consult with an attorney as it is very apparent that there are pleading, service and statutory issues the Plaintiff has to address in this matter."

### Rule 2.5: Evidence Against Competence, Diligence and Cooperation;

"Comment 4. In disposing of matters promptly and efficiently, a judge must demonstrate due regard for the rights of parties to be heard and to have issues resolved without unnecessary cost or delay. A judge should monitor and supervise cases in ways that reduce or eliminate dilatory practices, avoidable delays, and unnecessary costs."

Case Numbers and were filed by Plaintiffs as Tax Lien Purchases with the Notice of Intent to File Foreclosures. The property and parcels for both cases are vacant parcels without any roads or improvements in The value of the parcels are considerably low, and the cost of an attorney over a two year period of filing paperwork would far exceed the value of the properties.

### Rule 2.5: Evidence Against Competence, Diligence and Cooperation;

Plaintiffs site incompetence in case review evidenced by the Treasurer's Affidavit noting a "fatal discrepancy" of not sending the Notice of Intent Certified Mail, which would cause the case to be dismissed. Plaintiff's filed the Treasurer's Affidavit in person on at the Clerk of the Superior Court the afternoon before the Default Hearing on before the Honorable in . The Treasurer's Affidavit was not reviewed by Judge on the day of the Default Hearing to cause dismissal. Judge ordered Plaintiffs to show Proof of Service to Defendants, and Treasurer instead. The Treasurer's Affidavit and Court Order granting the Default Hearing are presented as evidence Exhibit II A Exhibit II B.

### Rule 2.5: Evidence Against Competence, Diligence and Cooperation:

Plaintiffs submit Judge own words in his Court Order dated demonstrating incompetence in case review to find the fatal defect on the Treasurer's Affidavit mentioned previously, presented to him in Court on which sites a separate case with the same Plaintiffs as evidence Exhibit III:

"The Court would further question whether this matter even remains viable. At a Default Hearing on today's date, in the matter of Cause No. it was brought to the Court's attention that the pre-litigation notice was not sent by certified mail to the COUNTY TREASURER. The failure to send the pre-litigation notice by certified mail to the COUNTY TREASURER constitutes a fatal defect in a tax lien or certificate of purchase foreclosure action. In accord with A.R.S. 42-18202(A), the Plaintiff must send notice of intent to file the foreclosure action by certified mail to the COUNTY TREASURER. In accord with A.R.S. 42-18202(C), the Court is not to allow any action to foreclose the right to redeem under Article 5 of Title 42, A.R.S. 42-18201, et. seq. until the purchaser sends a notice required by A.R.S 42-18202..."

### Rule 2.2: Evidence of Partiality & Unfairness, Rule 2.5: Evidence Against Competence, Diligence and Cooperation, Rule 2.6: Evidence Against Ensuring the Right to Be Heard:

1) In a case that should have been dismissed, but ordered to continue with time and cost to Plaintiffs, Proof of Service to County Attorney to satisfy the Court had to be demonstrated by the Deputy County Attorney, signing the receipt of the Complaint and Summons.

Plaintiffs called office to fulfill the Court's demands, and were instructed by the office that an agent of will sign the return receipt sent to their specific P.O. Box, or Plaintiffs may use a process server.

Plaintiffs proceeded with service according to the Deputy Attorney's office instructions, presented Proof of Service to as not signed by herself.

Plaintiffs have learned through multiple conversations with the County Attorney's office on how to have the County Attorney personally sign receipt of Complaint and Summons to satisfy the Court. The Court's demands can only be achieved in person at the County Attorney's office. A process server does not achieve a personal signature from the County Attorney, nor does registered receipt mail. These two avenues of service are the only ways the County Attorney processes these matters. It is unknown to Plaintiffs if an appointment with the County Attorney in person to sign the receipt of Complaint and Summons personally is even possible, as this is not the standard in these matters. Plaintiffs live in

2) Proof of Service to Defendant. was presented to Judge through Registered Return Receipt Mail with the word "Complaint" accidentally omitted on the Proof of Service form by Plaintiffs. responded with certified letters to both the Plaintiffs and the Court. containing the exact words "Complaint and Summons", In disavowed any continued ownership in the property. Judge rejected letters. proper service by Plaintiffs in Court Order dated and rejected responding to the "Complaint and Summons" as evidence of Defendant. receiving the "Complaint and Summons" Judge held in partiality and unfairness was not served the Complaint and just the Summons. that

Furthermore, Judgeapplied different and unfair standards to the same letterwritten byThe words ofwere not accepted when theysupported Plaintiffs in proper service, yet the words ofwere accepted whenthey allowedto name another Defendant,for Plaintiffs toserve.serve.for Plaintiffs to

In the of Honorable Court Order of the Court stated: "Defendant answer clearly indicates he transferred title to therefore, must be named as a Defendant and served with a copy of the Summons and Complaint"

Plaintiffs prepared a notarized motion in response to Judge having named the additional Defendant, . Deed and Title search by Plaintiffs, with the aid of the County Recorder and County Assessor's offices directly, revealed there was never any instrument recorded in the name of on the said property.. The Deed and Title research presented the Defendant and owner as a single man, in a Special Warranty Deed recorded in . The Defendant, did not appear on the Deed and Title research, but was present on the Assessor's tax payer information. This notarized motion containing proof of recorded titles was rejected by the Court as not acceptable without an original copy. Plaintiffs were denied the right to be heard.

As stated previously, an extensive search was conducted with the help of the County Assessor's and Recorder's offices. The additional demand that the Plaintiffs serve and are unfounded. In all, every important document submitted to this Court was individually notarized, as required by this Court, and sent by certified mail with return receipts copied and submitted in evidence.

The letter from and Judge response in Court Order dated as well as the Plaintiffs notarized and rejected motion with receipt of Certified Mail are presented as evidence Exhibit IV A, Exhibit IV B. Exhibit IV C and Exhibit IV D.

# Rule 2.9 Ex Parte Communication, Rule 2.10 Judicial Statements on Pending and Impending Cases;

Plaintiffs submit Judge own words as ex parte communication to sway another Judge under his authority against Plaintiffs on a separate impending case as well as to sway another Judge under his authority on any future filings from Plaintiffs in Court Order dated It is known to Judge that Plaintiffs' cases are dismissed, and would need to be re-filed in the future presented as evidence **Exhibit V**:

"As Plaintiffs have specified, Judge has already proceeded to render a Default Judgment in a factually similar case (Cause No. therefore, the Court is providing a copy of this Court Order to

)

The rational to communicate with a Commissioner under his authority and under these circumstances appears to show his disagreement with the other Judge's ruling and an attempt to change past, or sway any possible future rulings in his Court.

# Points of Fact Supporting Violations of Rule 1.2, Rule 2.2, Rule, 2.5 for Case Number

## Rule 2.2: Evidence of Partiality & Unfairness, Rule 2.5: Evidence Against Competence, Diligence and Cooperation:

On the other case in front of Judge did not review Plaintiff's Application of Due Diligence and Means of Alternative Service, which demonstrated Proof of Service to diligence to attempt to serve son, as well as Proof of Service to County Treasurer. Incompetent case review is evidenced by his rejection of Proof of Service to County Treasurer in the Default Hearing dated and presented as evidence **Exhibit VI**.

Plaintiffs submit the Application for Alternative Means of Service approved by Judge<br/>at an eventual cost of \$ to Plaintiffs, should have been rejected, and costavoided if Judgemaintained proper service was not completed toCountyTreasurer. Approval of Application for Alternative Means of Service in Court Order<br/>datedProof of Service toCounty Treasurer, and Affidavit of<br/>are presented as evidence Exhibit VII A, VII B, VII C.

## Rule 2.2: Evidence of Partiality & Unfairness, Rule 2.5: Evidence Against Competence, Diligence and Cooperation:

Plaintiffs submit evidence of partiality and unfairness as well as further evidence against competence, diligence and cooperation in that demands for proper service to County Treasurer increased beyond the demands of Case No. as previously advised.

Judge demanded at the Default Hearing on that proper service not only include a personal signature from the County Attorney, but in addition, an Acceptance of Service form to be completed by the County Attorney with an additional Addendum, asking the County Attorney to give "consent to entry of judgment". The Acceptance of Service torm with Addendum must then be copied to the

County Treasurer, presented as evidence in the Court transcripts, which were never conveyed to the Plaintiffs.

As stated previously, Plaintiffs live in and have learned from actions in that the demands of Judge for proper service can only be achieved in person with a personal appointment with the County Attorney. It is unknown if this is possible, as stated previously, as the office of the County Attorney has stated clearly its means of acceptance of service in two ways, and both do not include an in person appointment or personal signature from the County Attorney.

If all these actions for proper service were necessary to apply for showing Due Diligence and Requesting Alternative Means of Service, Plaintiffs should have been advised at the time of Application, and not allowed to proceed, resulting in a high cost and effort.

#### **Summary of Evidence & Conclusion**

ι.

Plaintiffs respectfully submit the above with Exhibits I-VII in evidence as a pattern of behavior and conduct towards Plaintiffs, across two separate cases involving Plaintiffs on behalf of Judge Judge pattern of conduct is demonstrated by a lack of competent review causing Plaintiffs to proceed forward in a timely and costly manner with unviable discrepancies known by Judge yet unknown by Plaintiffs. Judge

conduct displays action to deny the right to be heard, and shows blatant partiality and unfairness in ex parte communication, swaying known impending cases, ultimately demonstrating utter lack of confidence in the judiciary. It is added that Judge

boasted to Plaintiffs that he has never had a case overturned on appeal. also went on to say that authored all the documents which required the Plaintiffs to obtain, and submit to the County Clerk of the Superior Court from their website.

Plaintiffs fully accept the outcomes and dismissals of their cases due to the fatal defects found in the Treasurer's Affidavits, and do not seek to change these outcomes. Plaintiffs only seek to be treated fairly under the law.