State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 16-152

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge engaged in inappropriate courtroom demeanor.

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 Peter J. Eckerstrom did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: July 20, 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 July 20, 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 th have provided upon which my allegations of judicial misconduct are base true and correct.

Signature:

Date: _

INSTRUCTIONS

Use the following space or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint why you believe what the judge did constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific ar names, dates, times, and places relevant to your allegations. Additional pages ma and relevant copies of documents may be sent with your complaint (please do original documents). Use one side of each page only and write legibly or type your c Please keep a copy of your complaint for your records.

re

The stipulated resolution on initial bond release amount (\$, inter alia, on attorney/client privileged communication, banter, ex-parte communication, based confidentiality, fairness and judicial equality, participating in communication with non party defendant approached the attorney re: (a) Bond Amount, (b) Release Conditions, and etc bench. The requested baliff call Attorney As Attorney began to speak defendant requested to speak. The advised the defendant to "shut up" and if she opened her mouth their would be sever consequences. Defendant had no representation and a conduct, as described non-party attorney engaged in prejuidicial. The did not contest that violated Rules 1.3, 4.1(A)(2), 4.1(A)(3), and 4.1(A)(5) of the Arizona in the Code of Judicial Conduct, and constituted conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice that brings the judicial office into disrepute. a violation of Article 6.1, Section 4, of the Arizona "shall not abuse the prestige of judicial office to Constitution. Rule 1.3 provides that a or others, or allow others to do so." Rule advance the personal or economic interests of the 4.1(A)(2) prohibits a from making speeches on behalf of a political organization or another candidate for public office. Rule 4.1(A)(3) prohibits a from endorsing or opposing another ease candidate for any public office. Rule 4.1(A)(5) prohibits a from actively taking part in any political campaign other than his own campaign for election, reelection or retention in office. The conduct related to his factual basis for the stipulation and censure involved the

client privileged communications legislative recall election. The agreed to pay a portion of the costs associated with the proceeding.

In

The for failing to allow a defendant to speak on her behalf with no representation for the defendant in court after the defendant made requests to do so, for not continuing the matter to a time when the defendant's attorney could be present, for conducting an informal criminal contempt hearing without complying with the criminal rules, and for raising the defendant's bond without a valid legal basis.