

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-116

Complainant: No. 1392200311A
Judge: No. 1392200311B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that two superior court judges ignored the evidence in a case and ruled incorrectly as a result. He further alleged one judge had improper business dealings with one of his adversaries and engaged in improper ex parte communications.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or 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 information provided by the complainant and court records, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: July 25, 2012.

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 25, 2012.

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

MAY 03 2012

2012-116

May 1, 2012

Arizona Bar Association
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-6266

To whom it may concern,

My partners and friends have been robbed. The court was the platform and the ex judges were the weapons. I am filing a complaint with your department. Do not sweep this under the rug to protect the system. Do not sweep this under the rug to protect political associations or alliances. I will give your department a short time to respond or I will take this obvious fraud elsewhere for justice.

I have sent you a copy of the plaintiff's argument sent to the appeals court. I have also sent to you evidence from this case. The argument is not supported by the evidence. The two ex judges ignored this evidence. The outcome was as follows: 219 LLC was not a party to the option document litigated yet the judgment was levied against 219. The judgment was used to pay for lots that Carpediem investment wanted. 219 who owned the lots was not paid because of rulings. 219 only ratified a section of the option which provided that Carpediem must assume the debts of the prior optionee if they take over their position. and together ruled that Carpediem does not have to assume the debts. Read the argument.

RECEIVED

MAY 02 2012

and rewrote both the Option agreement and a Trust agreement. 219 has now lost its remaining property (100 acres) without any money paid to them. 219, a non party to the document litigated, lost all their property without any payments.

We even caught Judge during the trial in a secret meeting with the plaintiff and his attorney, . Ask about that and other associations had with the plaintiff. This whole case was a contrived theft of property.

If you need this complaint in a different format let me know. I am going to pursue justice any way I can.

Thank you,

Cc:
The New Times
Arizona Republic