

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 09-248

---

Complainant: No.13732105214A

Judge: No.13732105214B

---

**ORDER**

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no evidence of ethical misconduct 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.*

## COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

Judge's name:

Date: **Sept. 15, 2009**

- 1) Docket of **Case No. C -** is attached.
- 2) From beginning and Throughout ALL PLEADINGS **Judge was:**  
  
**Hon.**
- 3) **Then on August 14, 2009 abruptly appeared: AMENDED ORDER**

Signed **Hon.**

- 4) **AMENDED ORDER of August 14, 2009** (attached) reads:

“Plaintiff filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Judgment under Rule 60(c). The court cannot determine from the motion for which reconsideration is sought or the legal grounds which might justify such a motion. Plaintiff makes reference to various police reports, facts contained within other cases, statutes and cases related to statute of limitations issues, state and federal sovereignty, and previously filed motions for reconsideration.

None of this makes any sense or requires any response by Defendants or the court. Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED** summarily denying whatever relief is sought.”

Signed HON.

Beyond an hysterical tone, the AMENDED ORDER makes manifest a complete unfamiliarity with the proceedings and consequently an undeniable violation of **RULE 63 Disability of a judge** Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure

This signed ORDER was the first and only notice that:

**THE Hon.**

had been replaced by:

- 5) **There was never any notice of change of Judge by either:**  
**, Presiding Judge – Superior Court;**  
**nor by , Court Administrator;**  
**nor by , Calendar Services**

- 6) was brought in as a  
**JACK IN THE BOX POP-UP JUDGE**

by **to curry favor with powerful**  
**interests of County and the State of Arizona.**

- 7) **Pro se litigants are treated as the lowest class of citizens in the Arizona Court System but even then they deserve to count on the impartiality of the Judges and compliance with the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.**

**I declare under penalty of perjury that all the foregoing is true and correct.**

**Executed September 15, 2009**

**RULE 63 Disability of a judge** Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure reads:

“If a trial or hearing has been commenced and the judge is unable to proceed, any other judge may proceed with it upon certifying familiarity with the record and determining that the proceedings in the case may be completed without prejudice to the parties. . . .”

“Respondent’s conduct clearly did not promote public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary as required by Canon 2. *See In Re Hendrix*, 145 Ariz. 345, 348, 701 P.2d 841, 844 (1985)”