

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 10-268

---

Complainant: No. 1131110740A

Judge: No. 1131110740B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge failed to rule on motions in a timely manner. The commission reviewed the allegations and found no evidence of ethical misconduct. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: December 10, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed  
to the complainant and the judge  
on December 10, 2010.

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

State of Arizona  
Complaint Against a Judge

Pro-Se

Petitioner,

Complaint Against Judge

Statement of Complaint

J.

In the matter of,

Judge

Superior Court Maricopa County,

Respondent.

Mr. Petitioner, request an investigative panel composed of members of the Commission on Judicial Conduct (Commission), determining that there is reasonable cause to commence formal proceedings against Judge (hereinafter) Respondent, for misconduct in office. This complaint sets forth the jurisdiction of the Commission and specifies the nature of the misconduct.

Jurisdiction

1. The Commission has jurisdiction of this matter pursuant to Article 6.1, § 4 of the Arizona Constitution.
2. This complaint is filed pursuant to Rule 24(a) of the Rules of the Commission on Judicial Conduct. (Commission Rules).

3. The Respondent, served allegedly as a full time Superior Court Judge until 11-19-09 in this case CV. 2009. Upon Information and Belief, Respondent WAS Elected And or Appointed as a full time judge in Superior Court in Maricopa County.

Respondent, was serving in his capacity as a judge at all times relevant to the Allegations contained herein.

4. As judge, Respondent, is and has been subjected to all provisions and canons of the Code of Judicial Conduct as set forth in Supreme Court Rule 81.

### (Count I, One)

#### Failure To Decide CASES in a Timely Manner.

5. Respondent's dilatory handling of Mr. case is clearly unjustifiable.

In Mr. case: CV. 2009. the Commission should reprimand Respondent for failing to rule on Mr. civil complaint; its Petitioner's Pleadings, motions that exceeds approximately 20 twenty plus months.

After Mr. filed his Special Action with the Appellate Court Div. 1, 1 CA-SA, 09-165, the Court notified Mr. Baugh by merely dismissing the Petition without citing law or reason.

6. The Commission should seriously censure Respondent for failure to Rule on Mr. Petitions, a total of 35 Thirty-five, in a timely manner. Canon 3B(8) of the Code of Judicial Conduct and Article 6, § 21 of the Ariz. State Constitution requires judges to rule on matters promptly.

7. The Commission should formally reprimand Respondent for failing to Rule on Mr. different petitions of his complaint for 20 plus months.

Obviously, and clearly, the Respondent (his) dilatory handling of this matter is unjustifiable and highly prejudicial toward Mr.

8.

Despite Mr. request and Attempts for Hearing and Strong repeated request for Rulings, including Special Action Filed in Court of Appeals Div. 1, Respondant ignored and continued to fail to Timely rule on the petitions of the case, Respondant contributed to being complicit with defendants and their counsels of the Attorney General's office (Mrs. Lisa Parsons and Valery M. McCarthy).

9.

Through-out 2009, Respondant failed to Enter Timely Rulings on the Multiple 35 Thirty-Five Separate Petitions before him, prejudicing Mr. knowing, Superior Court Judges are required to decide submitted matters within 60 days of Submission, pursuant to Article VI, § 21 of the Arizona Constitution, A.R.S. § 12-128.01 (A) and Rule 91 (c) Rules of the Supreme Court, the delays in the 35 Petitions Exceeded 60 day By:

545 days, 525 days, 549 days, 451 days, 453 days, 445 days,

441 days, 445 days, 426 days, 434 days, 434 days, 426 days,

424 days, 419 days, 413 days, 413 days, 409 days, 398 days,

393 days, 388 days, 382 days, 364 days, 364 days, 364 days,

364 days, 364 days, 354 days, 306 days, 300 days, 300 days,

293 days, 305 days, 294 days, 284 days, 284 days.

See paragraphs 9-(A) p. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 1-thru-35.

## Delays in Petitions Exceeding 60 Sixty-Days:

9. (A):

Respondent, intentionally or knowingly extended the time for rulings on matters submitted herein below.

Respondent, neglected to issue rulings within Sixty-Days required by Arizona Constitution, Art. 6, Section 21:

1. In the following case, N. : CV. 2009.

20 month delay, No ruling on

petitioners, "Civil Complaint" filed 1-15-09, Exceeding Sixty-Days by 545 days.

2. 19 Month delay, "Motion to Amend Notice of Service of Non-Uniform Im-

munistrations to Sgt. A. Ohshita, Capt. J. Long, A.D.C. Dir. Dara B. Schreie", dated 2-9-09,

No ruling on petition, Exceeded Sixty-Days by 525 days.

3. 20 Month delay, Failure to Rule on Petitioners: "Plaintiffs Motion for Injunction

Against Harassment Order of Protection", dated 12-25-08, filed not until 1-18-09, Exceeding Sixty-

Days by 549 days.

4. 16 Month delay, Failure to Rule on Petitioners, "Application for Entry by Default

pursuant to Rule 55, Ariz. R. Civ. P.", dated 4-24-09, file stamped 4-24-09, Exceeding Sixty-

days by 451 days.

5. 16 month delay, Failure to Rule on, "Affidavit of Service by Plaintiff, upon de-

fendants, A.D.C. Dir. Dara B. Schreie, et al", filed 4-22-09, Exceeding Sixty-Days by 453

Days.

6. 16 month delay, Failure to Rule on, "Plaintiffs response to defendants opposition

to plaintiffs Injunction against Harassment Order of Protection", dated filed 4-30-09,

Exceeding Sixty-Days by 445 days.

7. 16 month delay, Failure to Rule on, "Motion for Extension of time", dated

4-30-09, Exceeding Sixty-Days by 441 days, filed 5-4-09.

8. 16 month delay, Failure to Rule on, "Affidavit of William F. Boush", filed 4-30-09,

Exceeding Sixty-Days by 445 days