

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 10-079

---

Complainant: No. 1011300314A

Judge: No. 1011300314B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged that five judges have made erroneous rulings in a defamation case since the matter commenced in 1985 and that the court most recently denied her request for a change of judge because of bias. The commission reviewed the matter and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judges. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23 because the allegations are either too old to justify further investigation or they involve legal court rulings outside the jurisdiction of the commission.

Dated: June 15, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

    \ \ Keith Stott      
Executive Director

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

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

THESE ARE THE POINTS OF LAW NEVER ADDRESSED AND NEVER RULED ON BY COURTS AND JUDGES

In case no. C229771 in the superior court of Pima County, Arizona:

and \_\_\_\_\_ v Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ - Complaint filed December 20, 1985.

EX A

1. The \_\_\_\_\_ alleged that Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ defamed them on October 12, 1984; however, they did not file the complaint until December 20, 1985, over two months past the one year statute of limitations, thus making this case a nullity, but this has never been addressed or applied. This makes the statute of limitations invalid, which could set a dangerous precedent in Arizona and in other states. Why I did not press this issue is because I knew nothing about this case until 8/15/91 because I was never notified, never served with process. Records verify this.

2. No proof to this date, 3/26/2010 has ever been produced of the alleged defamation, in court records, in the dockets, anywhere. No court has ever pressed this issue.

3. On 5/10/91 court commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ - ex parte- awarded a \$100,000 default judgment, never notifying me.

EX B

4. The jurisdiction issue - Arizona had no jurisdiction over me because I was not an Arizona resident, rather Illinois. I had no business or property in Arizona. Arizona had no in personam or subject matter jurisdiction over me.

5. Only \_\_\_\_\_ signed the complaint and affidavit, making her the only true plaintiff. \_\_\_\_\_ never signed the complaint nor an affidavit; therefore he was not a party and had no legal standing in case no, C \_\_\_\_\_. He insinuated himself into the case, and the courts allowed. Yet, \_\_\_\_\_ awarded ONLY him the \$100,000 judgment, which by law is not assignable.

EX C

6. On 5/10/91 there were <sup>no</sup> listing of compensatory damages. To this day never found. Law requiries an enumeration.

7. In the complaint is mentioned alleged defamation was in the presence of various persons, which to this day have never been named No third party, no defamation.

In a November 29, 1993 request for admissions \_\_\_\_\_ admits to no third parties. EX D

8. In a request for admissions on November 29, 1993 \_\_\_\_\_ admits that there were EX E no \$1000,000 worth of damages.

9. There was no proof of service although it was claimed to be January 15, 1988 at \_\_\_\_\_ a place never my abode or residence. If I had been served then, why would \_\_\_\_\_ lawyer say that "if I had not been served by the end of 1988, he would consent to a dismissal?"

10. I had many business records and affidavits from my landlord and apartment neighbors who saw me every day and a paramedic who picked me up via ambulance to hospital, also ComEd, Cablevision, and a host of business people.

EX F  
a-n

11. The fact of no service was proven by documents and legal records.

12. On January 20, 1992 a notice of a lawsuit against me was issued, which I never received. It was an Alias Summons, which means that there must be an original

POINTS OF LAW NEVER ADDRESSED, NEVER RULED ON.

An Alias Summons means that there should be an original summons somewhere. There is no original in any courthouse, not in any state. This is sewer service.

13. The only time I was served was when Judge \_\_\_\_\_ made me attend a deposition the afternoon he had "no time" for me. A deposition is for a trial. There was never a question of a trial although I repeatedly asked for one. A jury would have at once understood the massive fraud in this case. The serve was in 1992, seven years after the filing of the complaint.

14. The date of January 20, 1992 of notice of the lawsuit was eight months after the award of \$100,000 of the default judgment. Default because I was never notified. This was unlawful. Cart before the horse. How could I respond and prevent default?

15. Never addressed or found in court records was the death of \_\_\_\_\_ on October 17, 1991, the judgment then terminated and not assignable to  
Pursuant to Ariz. Stat. sec. 14-3110:

Every cause of action, except a cause of action for damages for libel and slander, shall survive the person entitled, thereto.

16. These and some other instances prove that \_\_\_\_\_ defendant, was sorely denied her due process and constitutional rights. She is entitled to redress under the law for the terrible injustice done to her for 25 years. She wants her good name, credit, reputation, and other considerations restored to her - as is rightly due her.

17. Massive fraud on the courts have been committed by plaintiffs and their attorney, \_\_\_\_\_ and by some judges who were so recalcitrant and unyielding meting out their "idea" of justice.

17. Anyone reviewing the facts of case no. C \_\_\_\_\_ would surely conclude that this case must be dismissed, with prejudice and the odious judgment set aside and vacated forthwith - otherwise the case smells of a broad cover-up.

18. SUI GENERIS - one of a kind. As a professional teacher of research in some of the best law libraries, I have never encountered a case similar to this one.