State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 18-032
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased against him, failed to promptly perform her duties, and failed to report attorney misconduct.

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).

Dated: March 28, 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 28, 2018.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

2018-032

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: _	Judge's 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 constitu	ites judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the	
names, dates, times, and places that will help the com	mission 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	·	

Narrative: brought a lawsuit to enforce payment for on defendants home, herein known as agreed to pay 20% profit to for all work, materials and purchases for the home. See **Deposition pages** decided not to pay 20% as agreed. became vindictive. see Deposition page violated rules. Rule 2.3 Denying Summary Judgment and amended Rule 68, and Prompt Pay Act. Deny ruling on requiring to remove libel & slander from web sites, allowing damages to continue. Judge knew from testimony that his experience was an for to Arizona and further was a with and brought national attention with the developments, and further was for the State of for the City of by not having the and slander and libel remove from web site as demanded in pleadings, caused damage to reputation and continues to this day, this speaks to her bias against me. Statutes 12-341.01 deliberately denied ruling on Prompt Pay Act & Rule 68 knew this would from receiving attorney fees in the amount charge her bias in awarding only prevent no choice but to discontinue business and seek bankruptcy. attorney fees, left total expenditure were approximately and 20% is . Attorney fees at a minimum should have been Judge allowed discovery two years prior to contract with was to delay and increase costs to banking records before any contract was approved this was to delay and further allowing discovery of further: allowed personal bank records to be investigated years before contract approval increase costs to and 7 months after conclusion of work again was to increase costs and delay to Further: required hearings in court to allow defendants attorney to proceed with further discovery upon misrepresentations by attorney to increase costs to Further: favoritism in rulings. see Rule 60 Motion for Relief from judgment or Order, only one example. Rule 2.5 (4) Review Case History attached hereto. Proof of delays by attorney to increase costs. presided over trial starting a unanimous verdict by Jury on was made and did not send out verdict until and then the notice was not proper. Rule 2.15 (B) Representation to the court by and filings, again see Case History and Complaint Form to and increase costs. See Complainant letter from made to harass attached. See attorney filing of fraudulent damages, noted as compensatory damages. See Email Extortion statement, attorney. filing Permit document with court, showing committed a Class II Misdemeanor by not getting a final for the permit and not referring the violation to the proper authorities. See attached fail permit final.

herein known as