

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-372

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace refused to allow his appeal to be filed, was biased against tenants in eviction proceedings, failed to allow a jury trial, and was incompetent.

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).

Dated: April 3, 2019

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on April 3, 2019.

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

2018-372

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 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.

The justice of the peace refused to allow an appeal to be filed due to prefilming review even though prefilming review does not prevent filing of an appeal. This judge should be censured for failing to allow an appeal to be filed in this case.