

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-242

Complainant: No. 1183910624A

Judge: No. 1183910624B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a pro tem superior court judge failed to properly address her arguments or requests for discovery in a civil lawsuit.

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 all of 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 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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2012-248

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

Judge's name:

Date: 9/6/12

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Attach additional pages, as needed. Please describe in your own words what the judge said or did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. To help us understand your concern, be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places where the conduct occurred. Include only copies of original documents or court recordings that are relevant to your allegations. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

NOV. 2011 PLAINTIFF
AGAINST
FILED A LAWSUIT
FOR NON-COMPLIANCE WITH A. R. S.
12-1109(C) QUIET TITLE, RESTITUTION, ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS.
PLAINTIFF ALSO ALLEGED THAT I HAD "DEFACED HER PROPERTY". I
FILED A MOTION TO DISMISS BASED ON THE DOCTRINES OF "LACHES,"
"ACQUIESCENCE," AND "FRAUD UPON THE COURT," AS WELL AS "LACK OF
SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION" DUE TO PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS HAVING
RUN THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS 3 YEARS PRIOR TO THE COMPLAINT
NOW BEFORE THE COURT. I HAVE CHALLENGED THE COURT'S AUTHORITY
TO PURSUE THESE PROCEEDINGS RATHER THAN THE PRESCRIBED
DISMISSAL OF THE CASE. I FILED A "NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR
PROOF OF JURISDICTION" ON OR ABOUT 8-2-2012. THE COURT AND
THE FACT TRIER ARE IN VIOLATION OF SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH
AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF DEFENDANT.
MY CHALLENGES TO SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION HAVE
BEEN IGNORED AND THE COURT IS PROCEEDING WITHOUT
AUTHORITY TO DO SO. AT A STATUS CONFERENCE HELD ON
8/2/2012, I ATTEMPTED TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF THE
COURT'S LACK OF SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION AND WAS
SWIFTLY SHUT DOWN - JUDGE WOULD NOT ADDRESS IT, RATHER
SCHEDULED ANOTHER STATUS CONFERENCE FOR 8-30-2012.
ALL OF MY ATTEMPTS TO CONDUCT DISCOVERY HAVE BEEN STONE-
WALLED AND FRUSTRATED BY JUDGE ; ESSENTIALLY
DEPRIVING ME OF NECESSARY DOCUMENTS AND OTHER
"DISCOVERABLE" MATERIALS WITH WHICH TO DEFEND THE
PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ME,

(Attach additional sheets as needed)