## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

#### Disposition of Complaint 16-136

Judge:

Complainant:

## ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge had failed to take appropriate action regarding his complaint about a defense investigator assigned to his 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.

After review, 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).

Commission member Gus Aragón did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: June 29, 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 June 29, 2016.

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

tomp 2016-136 To: 1 of 8 From: RE: Care #: , I was by grabbed E called a . Named In having my By a during a in person legal Visit. The visit was terminated early & I atter itmediatly, notified the , whom told me that they could not remove from my case Ewas advised that Only a Judge Can & has the inherited authority to remove him. In my past I have no such his tong of any alligation of such not have I ever filed a complaint of any notice with anyone I have had assigned to my case or worth with . In a situation that a detendant, who is proclaining his innocence & can prove it however do to the fact In indigent E cannot altered a larger or investigator

2016-136 2018 to secure the appropriate information the world exonerate him , set the perso In the coust not only approves to assist. you with those efforts instead of him actually doing what he was contracted to do , then threating that it you Come bornord with what happen be will me over. With the bedge the Judge only having that power to order an investigation, have his removed for the case, A Judge bares the responsibility to ensure the rafty of Both partys the , E the fact that a , does not give the O.K. to deliberatly ignore such serious accusation, which are crimes yet dispite repeatedly bringing it to the Courts oftention it remains unadd. vest è me being a victim of assult & the Judge providing a platter, tor a Man to get away with a crime. This was about an issue clearly in the intrest of Dustice, & from a legal Ethical Obligation, the Judge has to

3268 at the minimum excercise commosense Especially when they person the alligat. ions are made against, do not deny that these acts took place & sequested to be took of the case, the court still ignored the issue, even a none lawyer on the case filed meaning, yes he was alawyer just not assigned to my case filed a Motion to affer pt to get proper resters on the issue yet the court still ignored it. Under no circumstancer, it such an aligat. ion was ever brought to the attention of any Police, any Borr, Judge by any lay person it would never be ignored or over looked & would be taken serious. This is not about a ruling on a Motion, this is about the legal & ethical obligat. ion the Judge who is the only one that can take the appropriate action from further endangering the E to avoid compranising a detendants case . You cannot as a dedge ignore & go out of your way to not respond & address straight forward complaint of this Magnitude.

4048

this was not an issue of Oh the are not getting along, a Crime war committed, E Even it the Lowst didn't believe me, por still doit ignore it, you still don't act like you have not been advise & then after such an incident, how could you by logically or reasonably expect that the defendand E investigator could even possibly north together. On its face not plasible. Then you put the detendant in a situation st having to file a complaint on the Judge which in turn opens the detendant up to Earther Rias & retaliation by the

lou cannot as a Judicial Commission on Conduct, say that it is sit. to place a detendant at risk of any harm, especia-Il' once it is brought to your attention the Judge has an legal & Ethercal obligation to take action rather than ignore it has now been nearly years & the Judge is still ignoring the issue , it is enough time now for the record to be reviewed in the contex that deliberative ignoring is take place

Indge .

5078 E that Raigal Discrimnation in factor. Understanding that although this should be an importial investigation conducted by your office, its like you gies don't want to hold Usdges accountable, we are talking about low could nothing not be wrong with that. Your office Can service the entire record, to see that I have been diligent E consistance in tryng to get proper redress on the issue . The Case # is if all dockats are reviewed since to the present day, you will see the obvious, you will see a pattern, you will see will al E deliberate reglect Is there a difference, when a says someone grabbed , no you don't ignore it, Ir there a difference e when a without consent, no its still constitutes a crime, you don't ignore it you take it serious, you investi gate if E you definition don't try to force the (2) to nork together.

THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.

FOR ACCESS TO THE REMAINDER OF THE COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER, PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST IN WRITING TO THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND REFERENCE THE COMMISSION CASE NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.