

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 11-137

---

Complainant: No. 0047510689A

Judge: No. 0047510689B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge was biased, failed to follow the law, and violated his rights. After reviewing the complaint, the case history and minute entries, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The complainant did not present any evidence of bias beyond his disagreement with the judge's legal rulings, which is insufficient to support further investigation. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: September 2, 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 September 2, 2011.

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

19 MAY 2011  
THURSDAY 2100

MAY 23 2011

TO : E. KEITH STOTT, JR  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT  
1501 WEST WASHINGTON,  
SUITE 229  
PHOENIX, AZ 85007

SUBJECT: FORMER COMPLAINT  
MARICOPA SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDGE

MR STOTT,

DEFENDANTS IN CV2008-  
THIS COMPLAINT WAS ASSIGNED  
TO JUDGE OF  
THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR  
COURT.

DEFENDANTS DECLARE THAT  
DUE TO THE BIAS, PREJUDICE,

OR INTEREST OF JUDGE  
THAT THEY HAVE BEEN DENIED  
PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS IN THE  
INSTANT COMPLAINT.

DEFENDANTS HAVE FILED ON  
JUNE 28, 2010 IN THE INSTANT  
COMPLAINT THAT DUE TO JUDGE  
BIAS TOWARDS THEM  
AS PRO SE LITIGANTS THAT SHE  
HAS CLOSED HER EYES TO THE  
PLAINTIFF'S LAWYERS FAILURE  
TO FOLLOW THE RULES. DEFENDANTS  
HAVE ALSO FILED A SPECIAL  
ACTION IN THE COURT OF APPEALS,  
SA -10-1036 JUNE 28, 2010,  
THAT THEY HAVE BEEN DENIED  
DUE PROCESS DUE TO JUDGE  
BIAS AND PREJUDICE  
AGAINST THEM AND BECAUSE OF  
JUDGE INABILITY TO  
FOLLOW THE LAW.

COMPLAINT CV2008-  
SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED  
YEARS AGO IN FAVOR OF

③

2011-137

THE DEFENDANTS IF JUDGE  
HAD NOT ABUSED HER  
DISCRETION IN THE INSTANT  
COMPLAINT.

THE SACROSANCT TENETS OF  
AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE ARE  
MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY ARE  
OBJECTIVE, DISCREET, IMPARTIAL  
AND UNBIASED. JUDGES ARE  
EXPECTED TO FOLLOW THE LAW.  
DEFENDANTS BELIEVE JUDGE  
HAS FAILED TO MEET  
HER RESPONSIBILITY TO BE  
AN IMPARTIAL OBJECTIVE JUDGE.

ENCLOSED YOU WILL FIND  
THE JUNE 28, 2010 MOTION  
IN CV 2008 - "DECLARATION  
OF GROUNDS FOR CHANGE OF  
JUDGE BASED UPON CAUSE". THERE  
IS ALSO A COPY OF SA 10-0136  
PETITION FOR SPECIAL ACTION,  
JUNE 28, 2010, COURT OF  
APPEALS - DIVISION ONE. JUDGE  
INABILITY TO FOLLOW

(4)

2011-137

THE LAW ARE DETAILED IN THE TWO EXHIBITS. THE APPEALS COURT did NOT ACCEPT JURISDICTION. JUDGE WAS NOT CHANGED UPON CAUSE. SHE CONTINUES TO SHOW PREFERENCE TO MEMBERS OF THE STATE BAR AT THE EXPENSE OF THE DEFENDANTS' RIGHT TO PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS.

MY WIFE AND I REQUEST A FORMAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE ALLEGATIONS OF JUDGE UNETHICAL CONDUCT.

SINCERELY,