#### State of Arizona

### COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-347
---------------------------------

Judge:

Complainant:

#### **ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge did not afford him an opportunity to be heard, engaged in ex parte communication, and should have disqualified herself.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if a judicial 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 a judicial officer's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judicial 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).

Commission member Gus Aragón did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: February 27, 2019

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 27, 2019.

### CONFIDENTIAL

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2018-347

# COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: Judge's Name:	
Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a conwords what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Pleas only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.	Be specific and list all of the concerns. Additional pages may
Plaintiff s come before this court to notify Judge of the glaring pr record. On Plaintiff filed a motion titled Remedy of an Account of Profit a defendant to recover the profits taken as a result of the breach of duty, in enrichment. After filing this motion, we had an expectation of Judge The code of judicial conduct does require a judge to " ' and to ".	order to prevent unjust to reply, that never came.  ' to "
	Plaintiffs state,
An individuals right to self-representation was first recognized by Congres Act of 1789. 25 J. Legal Prof. 167, 168 (2001). This right was later codified i (1994) ( parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally). A second	n 28. U.S.C. § 1654 cond constitutional
source may be found in the First Amendment right to petition the government grievances. See Presidents	of for redress of
·	
( ) ( The right of petition is one of the freedoms protected by the B	ill of Rights, and we
cannot, of course, lightly impute to Congress intent to invade these freedom	
V. ( ).(	Petitioners, of
course, have the right of access to the agencies and courts. As indicated, it	is part of the right of
petition protected by the First Amendment. ) A third constitutional basis is to Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. In the	
Court observed: Many controversies have raged about the abstr	act words of the Due
Process Clause but there can be no doubt that at a minimum they require th	at deprivation of life,
liberty or property by adjudication be preceded by notice and opportunity for	
to the nature of the case." v.	U.S.
( ) v , U.S. (U.S. )). Du involving pro se litigants, judges should use the following protocol to guide the	ring hearings
1) Verify that the pro se litigant is not an attorney and understands that he o	Tell actions:
to be represented by an attorney, and chooses to proceed pro se without an	etterney
2) Explain the process.	attorney.
3) Explain that the party bringing the action has the burden to present evide	nce in support
of the relief sought.	neo in oupport
Explain the kind of evidence that may be presented.	
Explain the limits on the kind of evidence that can be considered.	
6) Ask both parties whether they understand the process and the procedure	<b>S</b> .
7) A non-attorney may be permitted to sit at counsel table with either party to	o provide oral
support but shall not be permitted to argue on behalf of a party or to question	n witnesses.
On Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Leave to Amend the original complaint, a	
Judge to reply. On Judge had not answe	ered multiple
motions from Plaintiffs leaving us clueless. The overwhelming feeling the Pla	intiff s had
that Judge was going to rule without answering the Plaintiffs Motion  The day the Plaintiffs filed the amended completely without writing for the day.	n came true.
The day the Plaintiffs filed the amended complaint, without waiting for the Juday of the Judge is answer filed.  There is also the new rule.	ages answer, was the same
day of the Judge is answer filed There is also the new rule	

CONFIDENTIAL		
Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct		
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229		
Phoenix, Arizona 85007		

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		

# COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:	Judge's Name:
words what you believe the judge did that constitut names, dates, times, and places that will help the comm	same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own es judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the nission understand your concerns. Additional pages may court documents. Please complete one side of the paper
be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.  concerning E-filing. If Defense is e-filing to the court, Administrative Order No. 2018 - 81 pursuant to Article Plaintiffs receive an email That email stated the Defendant ( chambers for clarification as Defendant Member of Defense team called and requested, be changed from without prejudice, to wit a violation. We had previously filed a Motion for Ex P fraudulent evidence on the court, the day evidence and the record should show the multiple time to no avail. On the of (after for possible Motion for Clarification, Plaintiffs did receive it a letter is typed up on Judge until the of How did all this happen in lefailed to answer multiple Plaintiffs Motions? request for Leave to Amend. The accusation from Judlaintiffs did, Plai	but sending Plaintiff paper, they are violating e VI, Section 3, of the Arizona Constitution. On I from Judge clerk had Counsel call the Judge s  that the Motion to Dismiss ruling h prejudice Instantly we knew this was arte pertaining to filing filed Motion to Dismiss. We do have nes we asked the court to address this issue stal delivery) Defense Counsel filed a filed via Next, on s ruling, but was not filed ess than nours, and yet Judge. The most important was the dge reads, Although ntiffs had not sought or received nude problem. Because as of the failed to rule on that motion.  15. A party may amend its pleading once a responsive pleading is served if the
or (f) is served, on or before the date on which a respective. 1. Under this rule, a judge is disqualified whe reasonably be questioned, regardless of whether any	never the judge in impartiality might of the specific provisions of
paragraphs ( through ( ) apply. 2. A judge of disqualification is required applies regardless of whet 3. A judge should disclose on the record information their lawyers might reasonably consider relevant to a the judge believes there is no basis for disqualification example. We would ask you to think of a very stressfulife. Remember how it felt when you no longer had open amplify it with times the stress and hopelessness. To before trial. This is not a hobby, nor is it the equilibrium aintain a glimmer of hope that there is justice. This system is more than a broken, insensitive, biased, an become lobbyist. A commissioner becomes a CEO of regulate. The Legal system is about what can you do	that the judge believes the parties or possible motion for disqualification, even if n. To finalize our motion, we leave you with an ul, energy draining, and at times hopeless moment in ptions to turn to for help. Imagine the stress but his is the feeling most of the Pro Se litigants feel m to our chi. We have sacrificed, studied, and tried to is a opportunity to tell people that read this, our d a highly toxic rerun. Where philanthropist f an energy company he/she is suppose to