State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 18-013
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased and hostile toward him, engaged in improper demeanor, did not afford him an opportunity to be heard, and improperly retaliated against him for filing a bar complaint.

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).

Commission members Roger D. Barton, Art Hinshaw and J. Tyrell Taber did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: March 5, 2018

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie
Margaret H. Downie
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 5, 2018.

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: Judge's Name: Honorable Judge Description of Judicial Misconduct: HEINOUS AND ILLEGAL CIVIL SUIT DENYING DEFENSES AND COUNTERCLAIMS AND ASSESSING IN PUNITIVE DAMA AGAINST (DEFENDANT) BY JUDGE BAR COMPLAINT AGAINST (PLAINTIFF'S) ATTORNEY.	NG A
On and its attorney " ' of law firm) files a lawsuit (See 5.) against ,) for additional as overtime charges and lost productivity relating to a sub-contract had with to pave the him against suit.	phalt, e efend
was surprised that accepted this case because of the charges require I " on signed (See 2.). Ironically, has spent all his discrediting just the final Lien Waiver (See 3.) which would not " a dime, if he were successful. Furthermore, it was unusual for to file a law suit for just for insign sundry items with no merit, against an iron-clad enforceable fixed-unit-cost sub-contract with From the onset, it was obvious to everyone that r did not have a viable against	to be ificant
files a "I " on (See 42.) This motion clearly demonst that was fishing for any claim he could find against wanted copies of all of correspondence, writing, and documents regarding Notice of Claim against amount of which had no connection what-so-ever to claim. It was clear case was based on the merits of any extra money going to , will be extra money for any reason. This seemed preposterous to us, and we could not figure out where was going with all of this. At this point, was desperately looking for a Case against justify his lawsuit.	in the ar that going r
Then on , (See 43.) filed a Motion to Compel demanding more bazar of documents and information not limited to; historical information regarding experience, the date my was first obtained, any years they were in-act suspended, the name of every qualifying party ever listed on and the gross annual amount of work performed for each of the years through , among a variety of a lot more point bazar records and information unrelated to case. You should also note in this Motion relied on a newspaper article where he was sure got a hefty sum of money from in the way of a change order. This was really getting very far away from initial class additional and to set up a The entire particle where the CD enclosed.	tive or dollar ore off- on, that

Then on (See 44.) Judge awards attorney's fees in favor for against for not producing the (above referenced) documents and all the information had demanded. Judge capriciously granted those attorneys' fees out of the blue. was surprised as he never asked or expected to be granted these attorney's fees. I know this because I was sitting there while Judge egregiously assessed those fees against Me and It was at that moment, it became apparent to me that Judge was bias against But I was still far from realizing that were actually working together, against me.
Then, after some had passed since filed their lawsuit on uncovers for the first time, a new exhibit (See 8.) in their Motion for Partial Summary Judgement dated (See 7.). I immediately knew this never came from my office.
I first gave an opportunity to hear my objection to the at my deposition (See 9.). After I realized was serious about submitting this into Court, I filed a Complaint (See 21.) on against for producing a fraudulent document. It is important to Note; that this Complaint included Affidavits from (See 11.) and (See 12.), both dated
Then on files a Motion for Leave to File Second(See 14.) releasing yet another New Exhibit (See 15.) said he found this email from dated by looking through emails in the 24-gig flash drive he obtained from the email instructs to send a note to all the that reads nearly identical to the I have been accusing of fraudulently fabricating.
I was not able to find the email anywhere in any of my Computers, so on another Complaint (See 20.) against claiming he fabricated the email (See 15.) However, I did make a statement in the Complaint making it contingent upon the response that assistant sent out to assistant who said she could show us how to find the email and to get word back from from the to see if he could find the same. " Consequently, the email was found in computer, and withdrew his Complaint.
It is important to note; 1.) I never submitted this Complaint to the Court as an exhibit or evidence. 2.) It is important to note that this Complaint contained affidavits, rom and of which were never submitted to the Court as an exhibit or evidence. 3.) It is important to note that the were exclusive to the Complaint. 4.) It is Important to note that only the were in direct contradiction to the email, whereas these deny ever produced the email.
On solely based on testifying to the details of therein', and the newly discovered (19.) Deeming the Corporately and (personally) and sworn affidavits with this Court on "Motion" (14.) which included Complaint (21.) and its contained (15.) from Judge launches her " a proverbial ", and finding who knowingly signed false"

also found that facilitated the filing of Armed with this Off-Point Document, Judge Hearing which was later extended to he false sworn affidavits. Judge sets a It is important to Note the date of the Affidavits cited in the " ' was It's been my position all along the (See 11.) & (See 12.) were never a (See 15.) email. Just because suspiciously found contradiction nor a coincidence to the (See 8) only proves that; 1.) We now an email that mimicked the dialogue (got the idea to fabricate the fraudulent 2.) The time-line shows know where comes up with a check stub " " (See 8.) getting the flash drive in says he sifted through emails on a flash later in his (Motion, then (15.) email, and presents it to Judge and drive and miraculously finds this over it. It is very odd that would launch an " against goes " then Judge emails looking for evidence relating that clearly never came exhaustive search into from an email. absolutely violated the law under [A.R.S. Sup. Ct. Rule 48L] when she publicly Judge by unilaterally launching for filing a Complaint against retaliated against unilaterally launched But the moment Judge ' her Under-Advisement Ruling on she flagrantly broke the law. against her on. it quickly became clear that Judge Once we got started at the on and not the based their entire Case on the and came in to the Court Room with nothing but and which were never submitted into Court by (See 23.) & was bias, hostile, threatening and intimidating towards and (See 24.). Judge totally violating Rule 2.3. of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct. and and the events that followed; it is uncanny how Judge During the Affidavits to the were synchronized in their efforts to switch " presented the at the and then switch " tried to give the Court the impression that the You should note that Judge and . were a separate document, and did not come from any Complaint, And then as a standalone document and that it was were accepted by later claiming the who provided them to the Court. You should note this infraction stays consistent with Judge during the Hearing (See 23.) and the Ruling (See 26.). and to Judge (See 45.). proposes his Then on (See 26.). You should note Order (With No Amendments) on Judge signs The Ruling is primarily based on the the Ruling is not based on the are the only evidence that Complaint and its email. could be used to contradict their " rights in a variety of ways, Although the record will show several violations made against including preventing him from presenting his evidence. The most serious of these Violations are seen in the Ruling (See 26.) The Counts Judge makes against are directly tied to Judge

up in the

efforts to set

and -

Rul	ing are central to this complaint;	other violations; the following Counts found in Jud
age 7,		"
age 7,		"
age 7,		
	".	
age 7,		
	"	
age 7,		
		"
Page 7,		
		*
Page 7 23. "/		

You should note there ar	Affidavit) in one form or another	and er, "	Rang-Out
acceptance of Exhibit 10, i	", Obviously trying to opposition.	Force the Recor	a to upnoia the
Page 7,			
24. "			
1 11 11 11	A SEL de uite a biocted		
admitted both,	Affidavits, objected. Line 21 and ending on Page 58	Line 6 of the [23.)
Transcript 8.22.17]. Where		Affidavits of	". Exhibit (14) is
Also See Pag Transcript	e 51, starting on Line 4 and end		ne 17, of the (23.
You should note there a	re instances where Judge	and	Rang-Ou
" " (Affidavit) in one form or another.", Obviously trying to	er, "	99 61 9
Page 8,	in the face of opposition.		
27. "/		").	
You should note there a	re instances where Judge	and	Rang-Ou
" " (Affidavit) in one form or a	nother, "	', "
acceptance of Exhibit 11,	", Obviously trying in the face of opposition		ord to upnoid th
Page 8,			
28. "		"	

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.