

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 11-157

---

Complainant: No. 1376410933A

Judge: No. 1376410933B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged that a pro tem justice of the peace failed to timely sign an order of judgment, preventing him from appealing his case.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge engaged in conduct that violated the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After reviewing the all of the information provided by the complainant along with the judge's response, the commission decided to dismiss this matter with a private advisory letter. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(b) and 23(a).

Dated: October 21, 2011.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Louis Dominguez

---

Louis Frank Dominguez  
Commission Chair

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on October 21, 2011.

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

JUN 14 2011

---

Saturday, June 04, 2011**AZ JUDICIAL REVIEW BOARD**

400 West Congress Street  
Tucson, AZ 85701-1353  
(520) 628-6682  
[www.supreme.state.az.us](http://www.supreme.state.az.us)

AZ Judicial Review Board,

We have requested that the Court in the above referenced location appoint an alternate judge to hear our cases. This motion was delivered to the Court, and the Court agreed to have an alternate Judge appointed. However, we feel that [redacted] failed to execute their decision correctly forcing now the Plaintiff, [redacted], further delays of almost a year. Why? As reported by the Judge Prop Tem, Bradley M. Soos, of the Superior Court in Pinal County, AZ:

“Rule 54, Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, requires an entry of judgment before an appeal can be brought by a party. Since judgment was not entered in the trial court, the appeal is not procedurally proper. Thus, IT IS ORDERED dismissing the appeal without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED remanding this case back to the Maricopa/Stansfield Justice Court with proceedings consistent with this ruling and with instructions to treat Appellant’s memorandum as a motion to reconsider.”

Based on this Court Order by Judge Soos, we as the Plaintiff in the above mentioned case, do not want to see Judge [redacted] before us in order to hear or try this case again.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Cc: Maricopa Court