

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 09-205

---

Complainant: No. 1369510692A

Judge: No. 1369510692B

---

**ORDER**

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no evidence of ethical misconduct or bias on the part of the judge. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: December 18, 2009.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 18, 2009.

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

## JUSTICE COURT

Case #: CC

Pro per plaintiff,

Vs.

**Motion to change judges  
because bias decisions and  
comments aiding the  
defense**

Defendants.

Dear

On 08/03/09 and 08/07/09 we met for a status and pretrial conference. On both occasions you ~~said~~ made comments to try to intimidate me because I am a Pro per plaintiff inferring "I don't know what I'm doing". I'm sure you realize that our constitution provides for self representation. Are you putting down our founding fathers. Furthermore and more importantly, you keep referring to my car as a "14 year automobile with a salvage title" inferring something I believe "bad" for me. You have never drove the car and you have no idea of what you are talking about yet somehow I believe you believe you are "right". Even this is not bad enough behavior for me to ask for a new judge (I agree). However the following behavior you exhibited does require a new judge:

- (1) You refused to let a real appraisal of damages in because I did not get it in a timely manner (30 days prior to trial). This behavior is terrible because you know the defense insurance company produced a in house appraisal (\$1,700) worth of damages and you knew through my testimony that the real damages or cost to repair is between \$6,500 and \$8,500. You are obviously not interested that the jury could be tainted by this evidence and that is grounds for a new judge. A judge not interested in the truth and fairness maybe should look elsewhere for employment.
- (2) You set the parameter for the loss of use (201 days) at what I wanted out of the wrecked automobile \$5,219 and not at what I was offered \$2,069. Why not split the difference and if the jury is above the difference I get loss use and if the jury value comes in below the difference the defense gets attorney fees. Herein, you showed a terrible bias for the defense and you have set me up to lose my car and even maybe more than that. This reveals ill will judgment and unless you change this ruling I am forced to ask you to resign on this case. My friend who goes to trial every day could not believe the ~~about~~ fact pattern. If you are trying to burn the plaintiffs case you have accomplished it already. Very immature behavior on your part.
- (3) Of course the defense asked for a directed verdict after listening to you everyone knows where your headed. One problem, the defense caused all of this and you

got on board with the bad guys so to speak. Fact (1) she committed negligence  
Fact (2) Gainsco insurance settled personal injury part for peanuts first before  
settling property part. Fact (3) They tried to ram offer down my throat of \$2,069  
whereupon I would never have a car because of a lien that existed for around  
\$1,000. Fact (4) They destroyed my vehicle during than inspection. Fact (5) They  
never offered any more not even reimbursements of \$1,200 plus improvements.

I am going and turning this in to the State Bar of Arizona today.

Sincerely yours,

CC: