State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Con	mplaint 13-165
Judge:	No. 1097614710A
Complainant:	No. 1097614710B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly superseded decisions another judge made concerning entitlement to various pieces of property in a dissolution case.

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 review, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: July 25, 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 July 25, 2013.

CONFIDENTIAL

State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2013-165

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your nam	e: _
----------	------

CAW TAHT

SHOWED TO Him!

Judge's name:

Date: 06.27.13

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.

documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.
- CF MAY 14TH 2013
HAD AT OPENIAL SENTERCE SATIFF THAT
AE PEEDS TO "FOLLOW THE RULES".
- FOLLOWIPL THE RULES THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT
1.00 40T DO!!
- HE ARROCANTLY CONTRADICTED AN ORDER FROM
WITH MO REASON WATTSOEVER!
- THE ISSUE WAS ABOUT FURNITURES THAT PETITIONER HELENE
FOR MISAPO HAS BEEN TRYING TO GET OF SEVERAL OCCASIONS,
AND WAS DENIED AS WELL AS OTHER REQUEST THAT
PETTOVER HAS BEEN ASKEDU!
READ AND ACKNOWLEDGED
THIS CASE BEFORE TAKING SUCH A BRASTIC DECISION
HE WOULD HAVE LEAR LED A PERFECT EXPLANATION AS
HAD DEFTED
ALL OF HER REQUEST!
is is obvious that Did rot
ACKONULEDGE THIS CASE, APO BY GRANTING HER
THE \$11.000+ ir VALUE OF THE FURNITURE, HE ENOTIONALL
TREESED AS DAMAGED THE WELL BEITL OF MY DASQUTER
, wich you HAS to BEDROOM AND HO
PLACE TO SLEEP OF HER DUP, THX TO
- T-T TO METTION HOW DISRECPTALL IT IS FOR
ATT ALL THE WORK DEDICATED TO THIS MATTER!!
THOULD NOT BE ASICHED TO THIS CASE AND SHOULD BE
HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE YVALUE OF ALL THE FUNTITURES, AND
HE ABOUE AU i Granso Ard Rects as needed)