

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 11-156

Complainant: No. 1332510740A

Judge: No. 1332510740B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge and commissioner discriminated against him on the basis of religion. The commission reviewed the complaint and the additional information provided by the complainant and found no evidence to support the claim against either judicial officer. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: September 14, 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 14, 2011.

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

This Is DISCRIMINATION issue Fighting Between :

- 1- Christen Judge
- 2- Jewish Judge

Against

- 3- Muslim defendant

In case No : CV2003-

HOWEVER This Case was Already file in this office and dined Under Complaint No 09-295 However 99,99% from the complaint Its dined By This Office for same reason Its [The issues raised involve Legal - therefore the Complaint is dismissed at 01/20/2010]

HOWEVER This message or this answer from Commission on Judicial conduct ready in computer and 99,99% from this complaint received because no body want to working In Commission on Judicial conduct, HOWEVER No one coming to Commission on Judicial conduct ONLY he have too many Prove and too many reason To Proved This Discrimination against him , BUT no one In Commission on Judicial conduct want To hear or understand his complaint .

NOTICE -1- This is Not The issue of bias in the Decision .

NOTICE - 2 -This Is Not issue of error in Decision .

NOTICE - 3 -This Is DISCRIMINATION and BAD FAITH Issue Happen In This Case

pursuant Asking Commission on Judicial conduct To Accepted This Case Like DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT and BAD FAITH against defendants and taken a Strong Action against Them, That This Issue Happen In Superior Court of Arizona In the Maricopa county Case

No : CV2003- handle By Judge In the Superior Court in Arizona With

All Abuses That Took Place against the Low On racial Grounds { For Reasons of ethnic and Religious } Made Those Defendants, Utilize The Law { For Reasons of ethnic and

Religious } In retaliation for the Others .

This discrimination Judge Make This Issue Between Muslim Defendant and Jewish

Judge when he sent all motions To This Jewish Judge To Make This Case Look Like Fighting between Muslim and Jewish people .

As following :

- 1- At May 14, 2009 Thunderbird Collection Specialists. Owner Steve Kay who Is non-attorney File Affidavit for Renewal of Judgment for this case No : CV2003- .
- 2- At 5 / 29 / 2010 the Court dined Thunderbird Collection Specialists. Affidavit for Renewal of Judgment because It File By Non- attorney By Judge BRIAN S. REES pursuant To Rules 31 (a) and (b) and Rule 33 (c) and Rule 38 (a) .
- 3- At 8 / 20 / 2009 this discrimination Judge sign new Order To fix the amount of The Affidavit for Renewal of Judgment, Was Already Dined By Clerk Of the Court By Judge Brian Rees .
- 4- This discrimination Judge order completely (discrimination order and completely against) the Rules 31 (a) and (b) and Rule 33 (c) and Rule 38 (a) from Supreme Court rules .
- 5-At AUG 9, 2010 Plaintiff, file an Appeal BUT This discrimination Judge denied This appeal { For Reasons of ethnic and Religious } .
- 6- At 01 / 6 / 2011 plaintiff asking For telephonic hearing But This discrimination Judge denied It { For Reasons of ethnic and Religious } .
- 7- At 1 / 6 / 2011 Plaintiff, File Motion For New Trial Hearing To fix it his Problem To But At 2 / 10 / 2011 defendant denying This Motion also for same reason .
- 8- At May 9, 2011 plaintiff asking For Emergency Show Cause hearing, But This discrimination Judge denied It, also { For Reasons of ethnic and Religious } .
- 9- BUT because This Judge its discrimination Judge Keep working against the Rule and deliberate manner racism make plaintiff, Loss \$17,400.25 For Reasons of ethnic

and Religious .

10- At 4 / 27 / 2011 The Rose Andonyan Plaintiff, In the Case No: CV2003- asking for order For Appearance on Supplemental Proceedings and this discrimination Judge refused To Fix his odrer Or To sign new Clear Order Or to granting the motion for New hearing or for Show Cause and he keep denied anything come from Plaintiff, side { For Reasons of ethnic and Religious } .

12- At 5 / 17 / 2011 Plaintiff, file Motion For Reconsideration And amendment To finding And order of 12 / 21 / 2010, Pursuant To Rule 7.1 (e) and rule 52 (b) from A.R.C.R BUT this Judge also denied { For Reasons of ethnic and Religious } .

13- At 6 / 1 / 2011 Plaintiff, file Second Motion For Reconsideration and amendment Pursuant To Rules 31 (a) and (b) and Rule 33 (c) and Rule 38 (a) But he also denied .

ABSTRACT : A

- 1- Judge BRIAN S. REES dined Thunderbird Collection Specialists. Affidavit for Renewal of Judgment because It File By Non- attorney Steve Kay pursuant To Rules 31 (a) and (b) and Rule 33 (c) and Rule 38 (a) from Supreme Court Rules .
- 2- Judge effective Thunderbird Collection Specialists. Affidavit for Renewal of Judgment File By Owner Steve Kay Non- attorney Pursuant To No rule and Completely against The Rules 31 (a) and (b) and Rule 33 (c) and Rule 38 (a) from Supreme Court Rules, ONLY pursuant To his sick Discrimination Mind .

ABSTRACT : B

This Is Clear violation of the Law Intentional and unintentional For ethnic and Religious Reason THEREFORE : This Case should be Accepted Like Discrimination And bad faith case against This Discrimination Judge

Defendant Pursuant To Rule 7.1 (e) and 52 (2) and Rule 31 (a)
 and (b) Rule 33 (c) and rule 38 (a) From A..C. R and Supreme Court rule.
 Submitted This Motion For Reconsideration And amendment To finding And order of
 08 / 20 / 2009 To Clarification the Affidavit for Renewal of Judgment was filed by non-
 attorney Thunderbird Collection Specialists, Inc.'s owner Steve Kay at March 13, 2009,
 That The Court order At 08 / 20 / 2009 should be Reconsideration And amendment.
 HOWEVERE the Plaintiff, file Order Appearance on Supplemental Proceedings
 Was granted by Commissioner at 04 / 27 / 2011. However : At 1 / 4 /
 2011 HON- was dined Thunderbird Collection Specialists, Inc.' s Affidavit for
 Renewal of Judgment filed May 14, 2009 Because Thunderbird Collection Specialists,
 Inc Owner Steve Kay Is Not attorney and he Cant file anything With court by him self
 Only by attorneys, Pursuant To Rule 31 (a) and (b) and Rule 33 (c) and rule 38 (a). Its
 Surprise From HON- Judge to Fix the amount for Other Affidavit for Renewal
 of Judgment filed March 13, 2009 by same person Thunderbird Collection Specialists
 , Inc Owner Steve Kay Is Not attorney, In clear violation of the law and violation of the
 Court's history in any case of this kind, Where it was unprecedented for this court to
 accept any Affidavit for Renewal of Judgment filed by Agent Owner of Collection Com,
 by him self and by his sign, and That's why Judge Rees was dined 's Affidavit for
 Renewal of Judgment filed May 14, 2009, Because Thunderbird Collection Specialists
 Inc Owner Steve Kay Is Not attorney and he cant Represents any one In the court Only
 By attorneys, Pursuant To Rule 31(a) and (b) and Rule 33 (c) and Rule 38(a) From
 Supreme Court rule.

Rule 31. Regulation of the Practice of Law

(a) Supreme Court Jurisdiction Over the Practice of Law

1. *Jurisdiction.* Any person or entity engaged in the practice of law or unauthorized practice of law in this state, as defined by these rules, is subject to this court's jurisdiction.

2. *Definitions.*

A. "Practice of law" means providing legal advice or services to or for another by:

(1) preparing any document in any medium intended to affect or secure legal rights for a specific person or entity;

(2) preparing or expressing legal opinions;

(3) representing another in a judicial, quasi-judicial, or administrative proceeding, or other formal dispute resolution process such as arbitration and mediation;

(4) preparing any document through any medium for filing in any court, administrative agency or tribunal for a specific person or entity; or

(5) negotiating legal rights or responsibilities for a specific person or entity.

B. "Unauthorized practice of law" includes but is not limited to:

(1) engaging in the practice of law by persons or entities not authorized to practice pursuant to paragraphs (b) or (c) or specially admitted to practice pursuant to Rule 33(d); or

(2) using the designations "lawyer," "attorney at law," "counselor at law," "law," "law office," "J.D.," "Esq.," or other equivalent words by any person or entity who is not authorized to practice law in this state pursuant to paragraphs (b) or (c) or specially admitted to practice pursuant to Rule 33(d), the use of which is reasonably likely to induce others to believe that the person or entity is authorized to engage in the practice of law in this state.

C. "Legal assistant/paralegal" means a person qualified by education and training who performs substantive legal work requiring a sufficient knowledge of and expertise in legal concepts and procedures, who is supervised by an active member of the State Bar of Arizona, and for whom an active member of the state bar is responsible, unless otherwise authorized by supreme court rule.

D. "Mediator" means an impartial individual who is appointed by a court or government entity or engaged by disputants through written agreement, signed by all disputants, to mediate a dispute.

E. "Unprofessional conduct" means substantial or repeated violations of the Oath of Admission to the Bar or the Lawyer's Creed of Professionalism of the State Bar of Arizona.

(b) Authority to Practice. Except as hereinafter provided in section (d), no person shall practice law in this state or represent in any way that he or she may practice law in this state unless the person is an active member of the state bar.

24. Nothing in these rules shall prohibit a mediator as defined in these rules from facilitating a mediation between parties, preparing a written mediation agreement, or filing such agreement with the appropriate court, provided that:

(A) the mediator is employed, appointed or referred by a court or government entity and is serving as a mediator at the direction of the court or government entity; or

(B) the mediator is participating without compensation in a non-profit mediation program, a community-based organization, or a professional association.

In all other cases, a mediator who is not a member of the state bar and who prepares or provides legal documents for the parties without the supervision of an attorney must be certified as a legal document preparer in compliance with the Arizona Code of judicial Administration, Part 7, Chapter 2, Section 7- 208.

Rule 33. (c)

No person shall practice law in the state of Arizona without being admitted too bar by compliance with the following rules, provided that an attorneys practicing in another state or territory or insular possession of the Unit state or the district court of Columbia may be permitted by any court appear in a matter pro hac vice, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the rule 38 (a) .

Rule 38 (a)

1- no person is eligible to appear as counsel Pursuant to this rule if that person (a) is a resident of the State of Arizona, or (b) is regularly employed in the state of Arizona, or (c) is regularly engaged in substantial business, professional, or other activities in the state of Arizona .

THEREFORE : Defendant asking this office investigation This issue and to Reconsideration And also To

amendment To finding And order of 08 / 20 / 2009 To Clarification the Affidavit for

Renewal of Judgment was filed by non attorney Thunderbird Collection Specialists,

Inc.'s owner Steve Kay at March 13, 2009 and should be dined Pursuant To Rule 31

(a) and (b)) and Rule 33 (c) and 38 (a) From AZ Supreme Court rule. To Clarification For Legal Dispute, .

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS,----- DAY OF----- 2011

By-----
Defendant