State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-383	

ORDER

The Complainants alleged a small claims hearing officer did not know or follow the law.

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 10, 2019

Judge:

Complainants:

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on April 10, 2019.

Commission on Judicial Conduct Complaint

Please read the brief provided, the hearing officer Ms. apparently did not read it or follow Arizona State Real Estate Law. The Arizona law A.R.S. 4401(6). The brief was handed in on and our hearing was on this done so she would have time to read, Both of us having very serious cancers and traveling miles in our with animals. Her dereliction of her duty and not following Arizona law has seriously damaged us financially. Without my equipment I can not do small welding jobs to add to our income. The claim of \$ is no where near the value of all my equipment, these people are nothing but common thief's. I forgot to mention that in the sales contract there is no mention of any tools or garden equipment. At the bottom of the contract that wrote it states if it isn't in the contract it does not apply. There was never anything discussed about any tools or garden equipment. If this dereliction of the law isn't remedied we are going to enlist the services

Note. The letters that gathered and typed herself and then had them signed were all lies. Mr signed one of them, when we confronted him he said he was very sorry he signed it and it was not true.

Mrs. pressured him to sign it. None of her letters were notarized. I was was very ill at the time this contract was drawn and we spoke to no one.

of a lawyer to bring a law suit against the State of Arizona, and Ms

These people were only to our home once and did not know about our tools. But once they saw what was in my shop they began moving my tools to

told the hearing officer he was to leave a key so I could retrieve my things but they left for and did not leave a key. In her letter to us she stated if you want your thing we would have to buy back the home she said possession is of the law. We had to place a monetary value on our things in order to get money to replace what they were keeping.

Your immediate attention to this matter

greatly appreciated.

that have been fleeced