## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 12-343	
Complainant:		No. 1457910082A
Judge:		No. 1457910082B

## ORDER

The complainant alleged a municipal court judge denied him the opportunity to present his case, violated his constitutional rights, and made incorrect rulings.

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 judge's response, and the recording of the hearing, 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: March 7, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on March 7, 2013.

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 - 343

## COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:	Judge's name:	_ Date:
words what the judge did times and places that will documents. Print or type	that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be thelp us understand your concerns. You may attack on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the paper only and keep a copy of the paper only.	e specific and list all of the names, dates, h additional pages but not original court the complaint for your files.
Myself (Defendant valid jurisdiction	owingly & nuliciously proceeded in nt) Constitutional Rights, and i, cause of action was presented.	this ease by deniving where No
Stating that D Defendant ente  accepted tes an objection was  Noticing her own of the Court and h of witness even a continued to accept	eferdant is Not allowed to ask guestimony from a Witness with No for soiced. She stated there doesn't no lenied Defendant cross-examina Objection, thus acting as the Prosecuer own Oath. Judge confer it was shown that the witness is the testimony & Day Motion to Dismit a Not File a valid Cause of Action	has nothing to do withis case.  acts or evidence, even after  ped to be facts or evidence.  etion, even going so far as  otion and violating the fules of  timed to accept testimony  was incompetent. Judge  so even after the only witness
understanding of when she says ".	edibly shocking to see that Je even the most basic elements of a just take it upon appeal" is appauling the isdoing. Judge display oved from her position & reprinced	ra and shows that she is malicious