

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 13-006

---

Judge: No. 1459710259A

Complainant: No. 1459710259B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to properly supervise his court staff.

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 any of the judge's rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: February 20, 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 February 20, 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

2013-008

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

Judge's name:

Date: 1-10-13

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.

#1 - ONLY MISCONDUCT BY JUDGE WOULD BE LACK OF SUPERVISION OF HIS COURT CLERKS @ #701. THEY HAVE PROCESSED A NON-REGISTERED LAWSUIT FROM COMPLAINT <sup>TO</sup> PERSONAL EVICTION OF THE DEFENDANT. THEIR BEHAVIOR, INCLUDING THE SUPERIOR COURT CLERKS, HAS BEEN EVASIVE, QUESTIONING, PROTECTING OF MY DIRECT CONTACT AND THERE APPEARS TO BE SUBVERSIVE INDIVIDUALS IN CLOSE PROXIMITY OF THE OFFICE.

THIS CASE HAS LASTED OVER 2 YEARS FOR A SUIT THAT CONCERNED UNPAID HOA FEES & OTHER FEES. THERE HAVE BEEN MULTIPLE JUDGMENTS + RULINGS THAT WERE ISSUED JUST PRIOR TO A HOLIDAY.

COMMISSIONER WAS SCHEDULED FOR A HEARING CONCERNING DEFAULT. ANY JUDICIAL ACTIVITIES WERE PRESENTED + DISCUSSED DURING A RECESS THAT WAS CALLED (PRIVATELY) MIDWAY THROUGH THE SCHEDULED DOCKET. OTHER MISTEPS HAVE BEEN FORTHCOMING INCLUDING A WRIT OF POSSESSION w/ THE HOA AS THE PLAINTIFF. THE PROPERTY WAS TO HAVE BEEN SOLD TO RBM INVESTMENTS, INC, A TENANT OF THE SAME OFFICE SPACE AS LEGAL COUNSEL. - THE WRIT, THUS THE CONSEQUENTIAL EVICTION WAS ILLEGAL.

ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2011, I WROTE/APPLIED FOR CLAIM AGAINST THE STATE. ON MY VISIT TO THE RISK MANAGEMENT OFFICE, I SPOKE TO AN ADJUSTER. VERY BRIEFLY. THIS CLAIM WAS CONCERNING THE ACTIONS + LACK OF FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES. I HANDED IT TO HER + SHE FANNED THE PAGES RAPIDLY, THEN RETURNING IT TO ME w/ AN UNEASE MOTION. - LATER, I CHOSE NOT TO FILE THE CLAIM BECAUSE OF THE DISTRUCTIVE POTENTIAL OF THE FILING. CLEARLY, THE CLERKS AT THE SUPERIOR COURT BUILDING ~~ARE~~ HAVE NOT PERFORMED TO THEIR SWEARN DUTY.

IT IS MY BELIEF THAT CV 2010- IS EITHER UNREGISTERED OR HAS BEEN HANDLED IN A DEVIANT WAY FOR OTHER'S GAIN.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)