

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-148

Complainant: No. 1359110784A

Judge: No. 1359110784B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge improperly sealed a case.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge 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, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's ruling. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 15, 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 August 15, 2012.

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

State of Arizona
Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington Street, ste 109
Phoenix, AZ 85007

JUN 01 2012

May 30, 2012

COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

Against

(presumably as he was the assigned judge)
County Superior Court

Concerning

The sealing of this civil case records in violation of the Arizona Rules of the Supreme Court, Rule 123(d) that requires a statement to be made giving the reasons for the sealing of case records. There is no record of this case on the Superior Court official public website, not even an entry that the case was sealed, and not even an entry that the case was dismissed. Like a Star Chamber secrecy procedure, the public's right to know has been trampled on. See the enclosed Motion to Unseal, which was denied by the court clerk. Serious charges against these attorneys were made by a court appointed receiver, and the public has a constitutional right to know.

Dismissed in January 2011(?)

Attorneys (to the best of my knowledge)

I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the allegations contained in the attached complaint are true.