

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-078

Complainant:	No. 1281410480A
Judge:	No. 1281410480B

ORDER

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

The trial judge ruled in a timely manner, and there was no evidence of an ex parte communication. The complainant was represented by counsel, who was given notice of all hearings. Many of the complainant's allegations involve legal issues that can only be reviewed by an appellate court. The commission is not a court and cannot change or modify a judge's decisions.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 16(a).

Dated: June 27, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on June 27, 2006.

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

March 5, 2006

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

CJC-06-078

Re:

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

This is a very complex case, which apparently easier to avoid than to judge accurately.

This letter is written, with the hope that it may help someone else. It is also certain with time, children will return to mother. With the pressure they had, it is difficult to realize truth. It could have been made easier and sooner, with a competent Court.

All complaints made, with expectations, are consistent with the Arizona State Revised Statutes, as well as the rules of the Judicial Commission.

There are facts regarding this saga (case):

1. There were four judges involved, **the first judge, [redacted] had less than [redacted] experience as a judge, moreover no experience as a Family Court Judge.)** The next three Judges assigned to the [redacted] Case, were also newly appointed judges to the bench, as well as Family Court.

It is obvious that inexperience is not of value in the Family Court.

2. Judges failed to follow their own rulings.

3. The utmost care was not provided to protect the minor child. The daughter's medical records, were altered by the physician by instructions from the father. The fact that the minor daughter was having significant seizures, however was redacted, that the mother may not know, of the state of health of the daughter, despite the Decree of Dissolution.

This same daughter was recently in an ICU "suffering from a series of grand mal Seizures. (Will this daughter, fall to the same demise as her sister, because the [redacted] Superior Court did nothing, while they were anxious for this daughter to Emancipate?

4. There is a tape of documented abuse to mother and daughters, documented by Conciliation, and it was totally ignored. The oldest daughter was being hit with her Cane. This same daughter later died while with the father (Respondent) following 18 hours of repeated seizures, without calling 911. This daughter died of severe "cerebral edema" (brain swelling) resulting in cardiac arrest.

5. Severe allegations of "Munchausen's by Proxy," against mothers and never requiring documentation as to the validity of his allegations.. Munchausen's was an attention devise for the Respondent, as children came into this world with the maladies.

Not one judge would accept validation against this allegation being false.

Never did the Respondent have to verify the state of health of the minor daughter. Yet Father used the maladies, to avoid paying mother.

6. Ignoring the death of an older daughter while with the father. This should have sent a "red flag" to the court, since father told the Court that children were in better health without the mother."

7. The questionable ex parte communications from the Respondent's attorney and / or Respondent. The Respondent's Attorney was a long time friend, who also has had allegations of misconduct, with the Arizona State Bar.

8. The minor daughter told the mother, on multiple occasions, referring to conversations listened to by daughter, that the [redacted] Superior Court is corrupt, and so mother could never win," because "dad's attorney, knows lots of people in the court." From all appearances, it may be true.

Please investigate these issues, and respond accordingly.

Again, I realize that these were [redacted] However, upholding the laws and Arizona revised Statutes, would be helpful.

It is understood that the Arizona Supreme Court, had ordered changes. There needs to be a better evaluation system.

Hopefully, this may ultimately help someone else.

Respectfully,

[redacted signature box]

March 13, 2005

CJC-06-078

NOTE:

The Minor Daughter, told the mother on several occasions, that the "father's attorney Knew people in the Court system and she could never win. The [] Superior Court is corrupt," she told her mother.

These are submitted to the Judicial Commission for the following reasons:

1. For four years, mother was denied all rights with ordered "joint custody," due to the failure, of the [] Superior Court, to enforce any rulings. The Mother was never informed of anything regarding the minor daughter. No documentation required.
2. Tapes of heard by Conciliation, deemed as abuse to mother and daughters, were ignored, by three judges.
3. Father's continual violation of Court orders ignored.
4. Father making allegations of "Munchausen's by Proxy" (A parent making a child ill to gain attention) This Petitioner's daughter died, of untreated seizures and ignored, while living with the accusing parent and the minor daughter's health was never verified by father. Known illnesses, including seizure like older sister, with medical records altered under father's instruction, this was ignored.
5. Failure of judges to do anything, as each was anxious for the minor daughter's emancipation.
6. Severe false allegations, and failure for daughter to be allowed counseling.
7. Failure to address all issues.
8. Ex parte communication from Respondent's attorney.
9. Failure of "speedy disposition," of matters (Article 6 Section 21)
10. The failure of **impartially** discharging the duties of the office.
11. Failure to require any documentation for allegations.
12. Unwillingness to have evidence against the Respondent.
13. Failure to follow the State Statutes regarding Custody.
14. FAILURE TO RECOGNIZE SEVERE PARENT ALIENATION.
15. Refusal of the Court to take any action on a non-compliant Family Court Advisor.
16. Continual delays at the request of the Respondent's attorney.
17. Refusal to allow the allotted time for trial, being anxious to move on to the next case.
18. Refuse contempt when orders continually violated.
19. Ordering, and then ignoring Conciliation and Expedited Services Reports.
20. Refusing the Petitioner a chance to defend herself of false allegations.
21. Refusal of a judge to allow daughter to speak with the judge.

CJC-06-078

Thank you for your assistance. I will await your response.

Respectfully,

