

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 06-112

---

Complainant: No. 1284210640A

Judge: No. 1284210640B

---

**ORDER**

A review of the complaint filed in this matter reveals that the issues raised are solely legal or appellate in nature and do not involve allegations of ethical misconduct.

The complainant filed a lawsuit against a doctor, and prior to a trial on the matter, the doctor filed a motion for summary judgment, which the judge granted. At that point, the complainant could have filed an appeal to a higher court, but he apparently did not do so.

The commission is not a court and cannot change a judge's decisions. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 16(a).

Dated: May 2, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on May 2, 2006.

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

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT  
1501 E, WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 229  
PHOENIX, AZ 85007.

APR 21 2006

**CJC-06-112**

IN CARE OF ETHICS COMMITTEE FOR  
JUDICIAL AND ATTORNEY COMPLAINTS  
OF THE [REDACTED] LAW FIRM AND THE  
HONORABLE [REDACTED]

THIS INVOLVE CASE NO. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

IN HEARING THE CASE THE HONORABLE [REDACTED], IMPROPRIETY DID  
INTERFERE WITH HEARING STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE DEATH OF [REDACTED]

1) SHE ONLY HEARD ONE SIDE FROM THE [REDACTED] LAW FIRM, AND DID INTENTIONAL  
DID NOT WANT TO HEAR ALL ISSURE FROM [REDACTED]

2) AS STATED FROM RESPONE TIME TO HOME CARE PERSONAL AND THAT OF OTHER  
PHYSICIANS.

3) THE LAW FIRM STATED THAT [REDACTED] REFUSE TO SIGN RELEASE FORM, IN THE  
RESPONE [REDACTED] DID NOT WANT RECORDS TO BE TAMPER WITH OUT THE COURT  
SEEING THEM ON SITE,

4) [REDACTED] ALSO WANTED , WHY AND HOW [REDACTED] INSURANCE INFLUENCE  
HIS DECISIONS NOT TO RESPONE TO THOSE MENTION ABOVE.

OVER ALL PERCISION WAS NOT FOLLOW, THE JUDGE , IN ALL SHOULD BE INTENT  
TO HEAR ALL FACTS, AND HAVE CUT OFF HEAREING FROM HIM. AS OF THE CASE WAS  
DISMISS, ONLY THAT OF [REDACTED] LAW FIRM HAS BEEN HEARD AND NOT ALL THE  
FACT WAS HEARD,

THEREFORE , AS SEEN DISCRIMIANTION WAS PERFORMED BY BOTH , THE LAW FIRM AND  
THE JUDGE IN THIS CASE ARE BOTH NEGATIVISM OFF THERE OFFICE.  
THEREFORE [REDACTED] IS ENTITLEMENTS UP ON NEGLECT OF THESE PERSONAL.  
SOME RECOGNITION SHOULD BE GIVING AND SOME SUBSTANTIAL GIVING TO [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]