State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-233

Complainant:

No. 1421410797A

Judge:

No. 1421410797B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner has repeatedly failed to accept her evidence and repeatedly issued minute entries favoring the petitioner.

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

Dated: October 4, 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 October 4, 2012.

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

CONFIDENTIAL State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

1



COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

~ 1

Your name:

Judge's name:

Date:

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

TROSE VIEW attached Statement	
Tom filing this domain have been an	
I amfiling this complaint based on	
Rule 2.2 Impartiality and fairness	
Kule 2.2 Impartiality and Fairness, Commissioner refused to review very	
important accuments, yet viewed other	
Dartus information	
Rule 2.3 All of Commissioners Minuk	
Entries are both unfair and biased	
giving father favor	
Rule 2.6 Right to be heard	
Violation of Tederal VAWA LAWS	
TOTUTOTION FUNCTION VALVA LANS	
— —	

(Attach additional sheets as needed)