

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-302

Complainant: No. 1298900622A

Judge: No. 1298900622B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issues raised are legal in nature and the correct remedy is to appeal to a court with appropriate jurisdiction.

The commission is not an appellate court and cannot change a judge's decisions; therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: January 26, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on January 26, 2007.

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

CJC-06-302

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name

Judge's name

Date: 12-6-06

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.

[REDACTED] IS GUILTY OF MANY THINGS INCLUDING LYING, SUPPRESSING EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY AS WELL AS VIOLATING THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES NOT TO MENTION HIS TEMPER AS HE YELLS AT EVERYONE INCLUDING THE PARTIES, WITNESSES PLUS HIS OWN CLERK. I AM ATTACHING A FOUR PAGE LETTER THAT BRIEFLY OUTLINES MY CASE WHERE I HAVE HAD THE MISFORTUNE TO LEARN ABOUT A MAN THAT IS SO HARMFUL TO OUR COMMUNITIES. MY EX GIRLFRIEND TURNED OUT TO BE A METH ADDICT THAT ABUSES OUR 3 YEAR OLD AND DRAGS HER ANY WHERE. ALL THE AUDIO TAPES AND EVERYTHING REGARDING MY CASE SHOULD BE SCRUTINIZED BY INVESTIGATORS. [REDACTED] LIED TO ME WHEN HE ACCUSED ME OF TRYING TO GET MY EX BACK. IN FACT I GAVE UP ON HER AND SHE HAS BEEN ARRESTED FOR VIOLATING MY ORDER OF PROTECTION MONTHS EARLIER. [REDACTED] YELLED AT ME FOR NOT TURNING IN SIMILAR EVIDENCE AS THE RESPONDANT WHEN I TURNED IN THE EXACT SAME THINGS AND THEN SOME AND WHY SHE SUBMITTED HER'S. [REDACTED] TESTIFIED THAT [REDACTED] HAD BEEN LYING TO THEM AND THEN CAME UP FOR METH ON [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] ALSO TESTIFIED THAT THE FOSTER PARENTS REPORTED HOW MUCH IT DISTURBED OUR DAUGHTER TO HAVE CONTACT WITH HER MOTHER. ACCORDING TO A.R.S. 25-403.04 IT STATES THAT AT A MINIMUM THE COURT SHALL CONSIDER THE RESULTS OF RANDOM DRUG TESTING FOR A SIX MONTH PERIOD THAT INDICATE THAT THE PERSON IS NOT USING DRUGS. [REDACTED] TESTED POSITIVE FOR METH 6 WEEKS AFTER OUR DAUGHTER WAS IN FOSTER CARE. THEN WHY IS [REDACTED] PLACING OUR DAUGHTER WITH A METH ADDICT 55 DAYS ~~BEFORE~~ AFTER SHE CAME UP POSITIVE AND THEN GAVE A METH ADDICT SOLE CUSTODY 114 DAYS AFTER A POSITIVE TEST FOR METH EVEN THOUGH [REDACTED] WAS STRUNG OUT AGAIN BEFORE THE END OF [REDACTED] SEE (1) & (2)

(Attach additional sheets as needed)