

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-118

Judge:	No. 1093414681A
Complainant:	No. 1093414681B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a pro tem superior court judge discriminated against him during an injunction hearing by noting he suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder.

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 all of 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 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 June 20, 2013.

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

04/05/2013

Your Honor,

At the hearing of Oct. 22, 2012 in the cases mentioned in the Motion to Vacate Judgement was untruthful in her testimony about having called me for almost an hour, trying to get me to continue to work with her granddaughter . Twice in her testimony she denied ever having made such a call. Please refer to the email and my phone records to see that she not only called and talked to me for 47 minutes but also emailed me that she was going to call. Since it was advised that look in to submitting charges against me for filing a false report, in the interest of justice and equal treatment under the law, I would expect someone to look into filing perjury charges against I would think that perjury would be dealt with quite seriously in Superior Court. It is curious why chose the Superior Court rather than the Municipal Court in Cottonwood to bring this case.

In the sheaf of letters that I have included as evidence you will find that was less than honest in her testimony about my character and about whether I had made an accusation. Within that testimony she also referred to , who was in the courtroom for some reason, by head and arm gesture while reiterating what I had said to her about he and his son) confidence. It was quite obvious to me that she is familiar with | She actually behaved as if he was her superior. He is said to "run" (. Maybe he "runs" - - He doesn't "run" me. He never will.

manipulated my statements in my interview to serve her purpose which does not appear to include justice. Her actions seem conspiratorial. I don't know that but that is what it seems. I'm still willing to take a polygraph to clear things up.

Lastly, my P.T.S.D. was raised as an issue in both of the afore mentioned's testimony. As an American with Disabilities it is not nor place to bring up my Medical History without my consent. It is discriminatory to vilify me without records of symptoms and treatment. Not even the Federal Government can ask me questions or make statements as to my disabilities. Any information I put forth under oath was connected to a circumstance that the email and phone records prove was the true state of affairs. My reactivity to a particular situation is not a description of my whole being. I think you understand that.

I appreciate your wisdom and time in dealing with this matter.

Your humble servant

Procedural Rules Motion Is Based On

1. Perjury, ARS 13-2701: Email of 3/14/2012 and phone record of 3/15/2012 as well as the 2 phone messages I mentioned at the Oct. 22nd 2012 Injunction against Harassment hearing that are still in my phone that prove that indeed was harassing me despite her testimony that she had made no such calls to me.
2. Obstruction of Justice, ARS 13-2409: By lying under oath skewed the truth which in turn led to an erroneous decision that denied me justice. obstructed justice as well by skewing the facts of my interview with her on 10/04/2012 by goaded me into using the word "certain" to make it as if I had made a direct accusation.
3. Due Process, 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States: By showing up as a witness against me in the afore mentioned hearing of Oct. 22nd 2012 hearing without providing me a copy audio file of the interview that she was using as evidence against me, I denied me Due Process by depriving me my right to obtain evidence used against me. I had asked for a copy exactly one week before the hearing and despite her word under oath that a copy would be made available I have yet to receive said copy.
4. Discrimination: By mentioning my Disability as evidence against me without having my medical records and treatment schedule they both defamed my character to the court. The court also discriminated against me by unintentionally using my own words against me to put further restrictions on the Injunction even though I had proven that I am not a credible threat. It was unintentional because the original decision had been based on perjury which is proven in this motion. The court still discriminated by focusing on my Disability.