

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 08-150

---

Complainant: No. 1267910319A

Judge: No. 1267910319B

---

**ORDER**

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The complainant raises issues that have already been addressed and dismissed by this commission in previous years. The remaining issues are legal in nature, and the appropriate remedy is through the appellate courts.

The commission is not a court; therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: July 10, 2008.

FOR THE COMMISSION

          \s\ Keith Stott            
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on July 10, 2008.

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

**This is yet another complaint against Judge  
County Superior Court in the above referenced matter.**

**The Judge has denied my right to due process at EVERY single turn for over three  
years, as follows:**

- 1. granted a TRO without notice in  
She immediately scheduled the hearing for the preliminary injunction  
where she allowed ONLY the other side to present evidence and  
testimony at the hearing. She would not let me testify, cross examine or  
present evidence. She indicated that it would happen at a later date,  
yet after I have requested a hearing numerous times,  
she will not allow me to finish the hearing;**
- 2. TRO has remained in effect , and judge said it will stay in  
effect indefinitely. She won't allow a hearing on the injunction and has  
allowed the case to proceed without the hearing. A.R.Civ.P. Rule 65(d)  
states the a TRO may "not exceed 10 days...unless...extended for a like  
period.", and "the motion for a preliminary injunction shall be set down  
for hearing at the earliest possible time and takes precedence of all  
matters except older matters..."**
- 3. Judge will not allow us to depose party who verified the complaint. The  
A.R.Civ.P. Rule 30(a) allows that parties may be verified. In the instant  
matter, I am being sued by a corporation  
I know the allegations in  
the complaint are a 100% fiction and I could have proven it through  
deposition, but the judge will not allow me to depose the verificant.**
- 4. Judge will not allow us to use Admissions obtained through Requests for  
Admissions. A.R.Civ.P. Rule 36(c) states that "any matter admitted  
under this rule is conclusively established unless the court on motion  
permits withdrawal or amendment of the admission. The admissions  
have never been withdrawn or amended, but the judge won't allow the  
me to use the admissions.**
- 5. Judge will not compel the other side to answer interrogatories or  
Request for Production. I have had a motion to compel on which the  
judge has not ruled since 2006.**

6. The judge will not recuse herself. An independent third party testified that she heard opposing side say that judge is in their pocket. The evidence is irrefutable, as the judge has denied 100% of the motions I have filed in the last three years, while denying me the opportunity to properly appear and defend this action;
7. On one hearing for change of judge, she scheduled two hearings with less than 48 hours notice. I never got the notice until after the hearing was held, and I lost because I didn't show up. I have an affidavit from the Postmaster that the Notice wasn't delivered by the U.S. mail until after the hearing, but the judge didn't care.
8. The judge held an ex-parte hearing with the other side; we had no notice;
9. Judge has denied EVERY motion we ever filed; (over 200)
10. No motion to set ever filed by the other side;
11. I have never yet filed an answer;
12. The judge won't allow a jury trial. The court has said this is the most complicated case in the history County. A.R.Civ.P. Rule 38(a) says "The right of trial by jury shall be preserved inviolate to the parties." Rule 38(b) says "Any person may demand a trial by jury of any issue triable of right by jury. The demand may be made by any party by serving upon the other party a demand therefore in writing at any time after the commencement of the action...". I mailed by demand for jury trial to the court and the other side two years ago, but the judge says that she alone will decide this matter.
13. despite peremptory Notice to Judge and four separate Notices to Judge for cause in the first matter, she took the case without disqualifying herself, then immediately dismissed it, granting the all attorney fees and costs;
14. The judge ruled that all witnesses and exhibits had to be identified no later than We complied. The other side didn't, but she has now decided they can use all of theirs; we can use NONE of ours;
15. Immediately after I filed a Notice of Claim and Intent to file litigation against County and Judge she made the

**CJC-08-150**

arbitrary decision that I was a VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS and said no clerk in Apache County can EVER accept any pleading from me or my wife again, unless it's signed by an attorney and accompanied by a \$1,000 bond for EACH pleading. This, despite the fact that she had NEVER ruled a single one of my pleadings out of some 300 to be frivolous, nor had I ever lost a case

It is abundantly obvious that Judge \_\_\_\_\_ has made the decision that I will lose in any case filed \_\_\_\_\_ She has denied me due process at every single turn, while allowing any opposition the ultimate leeway. In the case of the Requests for Admissions in #4 above, I would have instantly won this litigation with the use of those admissions, so that is why she would not allow me to use them.

I believe that Judge \_\_\_\_\_ is corrupt and that she is abusing her office to deny me, and anyone associated with me, due process under the law.