State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-281

Complainant:

No. 1453710878A

Judge:

No. 1453710878B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge made rulings that improperly prevented her from receiving what she was entitled to receive in her dissolution 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 and various electronic court records, 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: December 5, 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 December 5, 2012.

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



Judge

Mon, Oct 8, 2012 at 2:39 PM

DCT 1 8 2012

012 - 28

Commission of Judicial Conduct 1501 W Washington St Suite 229 Phoenix, AZ 85007 TO: Whom it may concern: I am writing to file a formal complaint regarding Judge of Superior Court Arizona, Maricopa County. Regarding FC-How a judge can start off the proceedings by announcing he is very tired since he had 70 cases the day before is clearly reflected in the "EASY WAY OUT" findings.

Instead of thoroughly reviewing the evidence presented and verifying the facts, he chose to re-write a divorce consent decree effective July 2012. The original consent-decree was rendered in March 2008. Pursuant to this action it appears as the Mr. has been absolved of any questionable if not criminal acts committed regarding the original divorce consent-decree of 2008. The purpose of Mrs. seeking a judicial case with regards to the original consent-decree was to correct the wrongs that occured originally. She presented all documentstion from various banks and other financial institutions dating back to March 2008 and previously. The documents proved there was approximately \$65k in liquid assets at the time of the original divorce. Of which she did NOT receive half at the time of signing. (incidently Mr repeatedly threatened to sue for full custody and constantly reminded Mrs that she had no money to contest it). another little tidbit that was not presented for Judge to consider.

A question for Judge If your family member say Mother, Sister or Daughter had bestowed upon her the vial, despicable, aggression that this "man" perpetrated upon a woman (in poor health mind you) and a defenseless 9 year old little girl would he feel good about the decision he rendered???

In my opinion the decision rendered basically blesses actions and puts the blame soley on is basically rewarded for stealing (the equitity in the marital home) and hiding assets and then roughly 4 months after the original divorce in March 2008 using the money that should have gone to Mrs (as part of the settlement)and purchasing a home for himself ALL CASH \$115k. As well as he is being given "credit" of \$56k for fulfilling an obligation to provide a roof over his daughters head (which every divorced father MUST do but also split half the assets). Which Mr has NEVER done. And based on Judge decision the law does not seem to apply to Mr ???!!The decision has also seemed to have Mr step up with his brutal aggressive behavior since he feels he was proven right.

Please review this and if at all possible request further documentation than 2 money orders from Mr brother as proof of where the money came from. In order to purchase the home 4 months after the original divorce of 2008. Consequently the purchase of Mr home ALL CASH is deemed a "hardship" in that he has to maintain his home he purchased outright and then maintain the original marital home that houses his 9 yr old... How is that a "hardship"?That is a willfully created "hardship". Actually I do not beleive hardship is the proper term for what he chose to do. A HARDSHIP is not by choice and does NOT result in a person bettering themselves simultaneously. With half of someone elses money I might add.

A true hardship has been created by Judge decision. As Mrs. is being forced to sell a home her and her child feel safe and secure in. Which also is the only tangible item left that Mrs. can feel connected to her Mother and Father as they are both deceased and co-signed for that original marital home. (which makes the

actions of Mr stealing the equation in the home even more disturbing) The decision renedered has created even more turmoil and torment for this defenseless woman and child.

2

12-281

All Because she went to the court to seek a proper settlement of a 20 plus year marriage. She is facing losing her home, uncertain as to where her and her child will live and how they will survive. In 20 plus years of marriage there were numerous assets acquired for which Mrs. NEVER received half of. And had the nest egg of the equitity in the marital home stolen out from under her as well. So Mr got away with stealing her future. This is a complete travesty of justice. Regards,

CC: American Bar Association 740 15th st NW Washington, DC 20005 CC: AZ Coalition Against Domestic Violence 2800 No Central Ave Suite 1570 Phoenix, AZ 85004

feel like Il been albed all over again by the courts this time.