

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 11-099

---

Complainant: No. 1417010843A

Judge: No. 1417010843B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge demonstrated bias by allowing the opposing party to file a document just before a hearing and by ruling against her. The commission reviewed the complaint and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. Allegations that involve legal rulings fall outside the jurisdiction of the commission, and rulings against a party are not evidence of bias. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: July 22, 2011.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

\_\_\_\_\_  
George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on July 22, 2011.

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

**Statement of Judicial Misconduct:**

negated all the claims of Brenda Moreno, her sister Marcy Barbose who prepared the action, and attorney Otilia Diaz who represented the action in court, by Brenda's own statements, official court records, affidavits, and discovery that confirmed the factual issues in this case. Judge [redacted] court ordered [redacted] discovery "MOOT" in the Motion for Summary Judgment that was filed in accordance with the FRCP, but allowed attorney Otilia Diaz to enter motions minutes before trial to create a trial by ambush forum. Attorney Otilia Diaz represented a case prepared from a non-lawyer, Marcy Barbosa, that works in the legal industry, and did not prepares the case herself. The pleading of [redacted] brought this to the courts attention, these were disregarded also. Judge [redacted] exercised undue digression to the extreme advantage of a licensed attorney, guilty of bias double standards of discovery toward a Pro Se litigant, violated the F.R.C.P. Rule 56 and 57, and failed to comply to the Canon Rules of Judicial Conduct. The case Judge [redacted] referenced in the minute entry to overturn my Grandparent rights, *McGovern vs. McGovern* and is an incorrect application of law in this case due to the incongruity of the facts. Child moved to another city, was only over 4 years old, parents were not convicted felon domestic violence, parents were not in a current grand jury incitement trial for weapons, and the court ordered third party to evaluate the children for emotional and mental status, along with their wishes, this court did the evaluation themselves and is not qualified to make that determination.

Judge [redacted] is there to uphold the law, not make law as he sees fit.