State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 16-141

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a justice of the peace made statements in a semipublic forum that might reasonably be expected to affect the outcome or impair the fairness of a matter pending or impending in a court.

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 Margaret H. Downie did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: August 15, 2016

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

A copy of this order was mailed to the judge on August 15, 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.

See	at tached

TO: Members of the Arizona Commission on **Iudicial Conduct** FROM:

RE:

It is with mixed regret and responsibility that we send this inquiry and complaint to the Commission. Due to personal positions and community standing, we are unable to disclose our identities. Nevertheless, the situation described necessitates your investigation and sanction.

We had the on

in

While the were appropriate in and

of the community, the delivered addresses to

of attending

took many of us aback. While it is certainly

at the

understandable that may affect the reasoning and responsibilities of

did not demonstrate any such Rather, as a

he engaged in a political diatribe against and especially

While he declared his faith in the the person

legal system, he also said that as it was necessary to was a

by making people more aware by imposing serious consequences

It was evident that his comments and speech was in a direct contradiction of his duties under the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct.

Under the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct 2014, Arizona Supreme Court Rule 81, Rules of the Supreme Court, as amended November 2009, Rule 2.10: Judicial Statements on Pending and Impending Cases:

(A) A judge shall not make any public statement that might reasonably be expected to affect the outcome or impair the fairness of a matter pending or impending in any court, or make any nonpublic statement that might substantially interfere with a fair trial or hearing.

In this seemed to lose sight of his constant judicial role and responsibilities as well as the due process rights of the accused. Judge seemed to be more intent on making a name for himself in the public spotlight The Defendant is than he was

presumed innocent until proven guilty. By Judge declaring that the was due to the direct actions of

announced to the community that as a judge, he found the defendant to be guilty The impact of his statements and declarations were politically charged, evidence of an individual soapbox and personally disdainful.

Furthermore, Judge is assigned to hear , including cases for

combination thereof. His condemnation and public declarations indicate his bias, prejudice and partiality as to the presumed guilt of the offender. How, given the statements he made, can any defendant expect to have a perception of fairness or independence?

His appear to be a violation of the Commission Rules pursuant to Rule 3.1 Extrajudicial Activities in General:

A judge may engage in extrajudicial activities, except as prohibited by law or this code. However when engaging in extrajudicial activities, a judge shall not:

(A) participate in activities that will interfere with the proper performance of the judge's judicial duties; (B) participate in activities that will lead to frequent disqualification of the judge...

Perhaps v

was made to , it could be overlooked as

although that was not evident. The

The was

As indicated, this is an anonymous complaint, but it represents the discomfort and distain that many as well as those who

felt that a sitting judge should not reverse our Constitutional principles and declare an accused is guilty unless proven otherwise and when so denounced by a judge.