

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-108

Judge:	No. 1419410550A
Complainant:	No. 1419410550B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge erroneously dismissed his 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 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 court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: June 13, 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 June 13, 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

2013-108

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: _____ Judge's name: _____ DATE: MAY-6-2013

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.

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS THAT COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL BARS PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS, AND ANOTHER ONE HERE IT GO'S LIKE THIS IT IS FURTHER ORDERED DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE. ^{DATED: 4-25-2013} PERSONAL INJURY ISSUE, AND THIS IS FROM A CAR ACCIDENTS.

YOU ALSO STATED! THE COURT FINDS THAT PLAINTIFF'S FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR RELIEF. DEFENDANTS STATED ON MARCH-28-2013. ANY CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF THE 2011 LAWSUIT ARE BARRED BY COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND/OR RES JUDICATA AND CANNOT BE PURSUED IN A NEW SUIT AGAINST _____ BECAUSE HER FATHER IS DEAD, AND I NEVER HAD A LAWSUIT AGAINST HER FATHER. NOW! IF YOU ARE ATTORNEYS,

AND WHO? MADE THIS STATEMENTS ON MARCH-28-2013. THIS ON PAGE 3 EXHIBIT NEXT PAGES OF ATTACHMENTS? "PERSONAL INJURY TO, THAT, CAUSE!" Id. THAT SINGLE SENTENCE MAKES UP THE ENTIRETY OF ALLEGATIONS AGAINST MS.

NOW! ON YOUR ISSUE OF "I.J." THIS MEANING= COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL OR RES JUDICATA. "I.J." THESE ARE JURISDICTION: FEDERAL QUESTION CAUSE! 42:1983, AND BY 28 U.S.C. §1915(c)(2). BUT 28 U.S.C. §1915(c) APPLIES TO ALL IN FORMA PAUPERIS PROCEEDINGS, NOT JUST THOSE FILED BY PRISONERS. PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS ARE BARRED BY THE DOCTRINE OF RES JUDICATA. Id. JUDGE:

USING! FEDERAL JURISDICTION, 28 U.S.C. §1915(c)(2). IDENTITY OF CLAIMS, AND THIS IS THE NOERR-PENNINGTON DOCTRINE. DERIVES FROM THE PETITION CLAUSE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND PROVIDES THAT "THOSE WHO PETITION ANY DEPARTMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS ARE GENERALLY IMMUNE FROM STATUTORY LIABILITY FOR THEIR PETITIONING CONDUCT." LOOK UP THESE TWO CASES: _{INDI}