

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-052

Complainant: No. 1279410321A

Judge: No. 1279410321B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge.

The complainant alleged that the judge wrongfully upheld a lower court ruling. The commission reviewed the transcript of the argument and found that the judge listened to both sides before making his ruling. It also noted that the complainant was represented by an attorney. There was no evidence of ethical misconduct.

The commission is not a court and cannot change a judge's ruling or decision in a case. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 16(a).

Dated: June 28, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on June 28, 2006.

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

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

CJC-06-052

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name Judge's name: Date: 2/10/06

Instructions: Describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please provide all of the important names, dates, times and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.

THIS JUDGE WENT INTO ORAL ARGUMENT AFTER AN APPEAL WAS FILED ON THIS CASE.

THIS JUDGE IGNORED THE FACT THAT THE SUMMONS BEFORE THE APPEAL WAS FOR NON-PAYMENT OF RENT.

THE JUDGE SPENT 45 MINUTES SLAPPING THE HAND OF THE APPELLEE'S LAWYER, FOR NOT DOING HIS CASE ACCORDING TO THE LAW. HE NAMED ALL THE THINGS DID NOT DO ACCORDING TO THE LEGAL STATUTE.

THE JUDGE, AFTER SLAPPING HAND, AWARDED THE APPELLANT'S THE JUDGEMENT.

THIS IS A TRUE VIOLATION OF MY RIGHTS.

DID NOT FILE A FORCIBLE DETAINER FOR A HOLD OVER & THAT IS WHAT THE ORAL ARGUMENT WAS ABOUT. THE JUDGE COMPLETELY IGNORED THIS HIGHLY VALUABLE PIECE OF EVIDENCE, THUS VIOLATING MY RIGHTS BY LAW.