## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

# Disposition of Complaint 18-026

Judge:

Complainant:

### ORDER

The complainant alleged a small claims hearing officer denied him the ability to present evidence, was biased against him, and engaged in improper demeanor.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the hearing officer 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 hearing officer's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the hearing officer 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: March 28, 2018

# FOR THE COMMISSION

<u>/s/ Margaret H. Downie</u> Margaret H. Downie Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 28, 2018.

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

#### CONFIDENTIAL

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2018-026

### COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Judge's Name: Name: Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records. V. Defendant'(s) In the matter of Plaintiff'(s) The substantive nature of various problems has generally involved the adequacy of the factual allegation of biases and prejudices against Plaintiff(s). We the Plaintiff(s) Motion to Stay until fairness of injustice is upheld, or corrective actions have emerged pending a judicial investigation. The statement of facts: In before The initial occurrence evolved around Case On whom failed to make a the midst of arguing a counterclaim, at the time against named Plaintiff(s) and timely response, failed to comply with a subpoena duces tecum, made an open admission of unlawful lock-out while illegally securing personal possessions of Defendant'(s) During the trial, a discovery exposed Plaintiff(s) presented a fraudulent itemization with the intent to extort parties quickly recanted the statement and claimed the record was a mistake on her Witness end before a hearing. swore to uphold the judicial laws in fairness, in fact, she rebuffs Defendant'(s) argument by repeatedly denied Defendant'(s) mocking and abruptly interfering in the statement of fact on claimed damages. presentation of evidence and averted an applicable Default Judgment. clearly stated under her muffled voice she wanted opposing parties to win against us, but she was left with no offered her counsel to them and advised choice but to call it a draw and dismissed the case without prejudice. acknowledges us with "Your getting nothing without them to come back with receipts and refile a new claim. We made a valid threatens us in court.

receipts and get out of my court now." threatens us in court, We made a valid attempt to respect the court and avoid confrontation but in fact, there was no order in the midst of subjected to unfair biases and prejudices.

On Case I refiled my complaint in good faith that my claims would be heard before Honorable, The Case in this matter has been extenuated well beyond the circumstances where two out of the eight filings where accepted then denied. The Defendant (s) Sworn before the court and stated a receipt of forwarding mail address could be forward to or

Plaintiff(s) substantiated grounds for reconsideration of service by publication after presenting evidence (Eight returned certified receipt letters and two different affidavits of failed non-services with eight attempts). The Court provided no cause for denial and ruled because of prior biases or prejudices.

2