

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 08-153

---

Complainant: No. 1336710353A

Judge: No. 1336710353B

---

**ORDER**

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter, as well as the recording of the hearing, and determined that the judge did not intentionally violate the ethical canons. Accordingly, the commission voted to issue a private comment to the judge and to dismiss the case.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: December 12, 2008

FOR THE COMMISSION

    /s\ Keith Stott      
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 12, 2008.

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

Comm. made the rule 69 agreement binding  
Comm. upheld the rule 69 agreement when she was in  
contempt of court and on the case Honorable judge went  
against the rul3 69 agreement after he told me we where not renegotiating it.

He over stepped his ability of the law when he placed subdivision restrictions on a lot not part of the subdivision, which shows favoritism. His ruling was not finalized in the 60 day lawful time line

Respondent extreme sexual abusive behavior toward me in the past was admitted and ignored. The only research toward her well mental being was asking her son, if he likes his mother. Past actions predicts future behavior, most abused becomes abusers and would most likely do something to . Without the requested physiological testing and without a PH.D. level counselor and all the evidence showing her sexually abusive nature he left in her custody. The standard in any case is in the best interest of the child, you cant in good conscios award custody to a parent under a shroud an allegation of abuse. No judge can leave a child with an adult that has even an ounce of abusive questionably.

He is ignoring the unhealthy mold issues pointed out in living environment

I had requested an Telephonic Oral Argument to resolve various issues and it was ignored, after calling to about its status I came to find it was misplaced, after the other parties counsel filled a motion on the same issues I called several more times and finally got the Telephonic Oral Argument scheduled 1 1/2 months later only to find that he had already signed the motion earlier that day of the Telephonic Oral Argument.

In the court case after I was admonished he was no longer a fair judge, he had taken sides. With yelling, threatening and intimidation he bullied me to end my fair trail day in court. This is not just. As a pro-per I should be treated with a little more understanding for lack of knowledge for the law not attacked and pushed around because of it.