

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 09-275

Complainant: No. 1375010525A

Judge: No. 1375010525B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issues raised involve legal and procedural matters outside the jurisdiction of the commission. Therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: January 15, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on January 15, 2010.

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

CR2008- assigned to Judge

On 08/04/09 Case # 2008- is assigned to Judge

A plea agreement is reached, setting sentencing on September 8, 2009.

release from Desert Vista, August 6, 2009, was due to the fact that Medicaid would stop payment for continued stay. Amy was at that time delusional and paranoid which can be attested to by the Probation Department's interview of

On 08/18/2009 appointed Guardian-ad-Litem, scheduled a hearing before Judge to consider allegations of contact between the and her father. wanted the father to state that he initiated contact so that would not be found in violation and face jail time.

On 08/27/2009 an evidentiary hearing was conducted in Judge chambers. At that time a discussion occurred as to how to prevent contact between the father and Amy. A decision was made that the law firm, would petition the family court for an order of protection for from her father.

The father, was not asked to testify at Judge hearing and did not appear. He did testify before Commissioner concerning contact between the two parties.

Judge Minute Entry, CR2008- , 09/08/2009, page 2, paragraph 2, states Mr advises the Court that the Defendant's request for Order of Protection, FN2009- , against was denied by Commissioner on September 4, 2009.

On 09/16/2009 Commissioner dismissed an Order of Protection, Case # FN2009- applied for by Law Firm, on behalf of

The question arises as to why Judge allows and takes part in the selection of a statute to promote an agenda which is not the intent of what the statute is for.

At what point is it feasible to allow a jurist, Judge to engage in the harassment of an individual through the approval of the use of state statutes?

10-06-2009
Date