

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-089

Judge:	No. 1097112470A
Complainant:	No. 1097112470A

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge acted unethically by making a ruling that landlocked her properties and destroyed her business plans.

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 available 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 court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: May 30, 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 May 30, 2013.

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

To: COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT
1501 W. WASHINGTON STREET
STE 229
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

APR 18 2013

I appeared before Judge _____ Court on October 8th, 2012 because Arizona Department of Transportation was in my opinion, unfairly and unlawfully, taking a portion of my properties.

I showed the court pictures of my (3) three parcels of property, of which (2) parcels are on the tax rolls as commercial and (1) parcel is residential.

It was obvious she sided with ADOT and took no interest in my case. By her ruling she effectively land-locked my residential property and 2 commercial properties. I am a handicapped person myself and entitled by Federal Law to handicapped parking for myself and (1) one handicap parking space for my business and or potential customers.

All total I had (8) parking spaces now with her ruling I am losing (6) spaces, (2) handicap spaces and six business and or visitor's parking spaces.

Her ruling effectively destroyed my business plans, it is my understanding she was a seasoned real estate attorney from _____ t, Arizona. It seems to me she knew full well that her ruling would do great harm to my properties and business potentials.

See the pictures of my properties I presented in court.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED