

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 13-285

---

Judge:	No. 1081914699A
Complainant:	No. 1081914699B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged there was insufficient evidence to convict a defendant of possession of drugs. He further alleged there were procedural irregularities in both a criminal case and in an order of protection proceeding.

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. 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: December 11, 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 December 11, 2013.

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

State of Arizona  
Commission on Judicial Conduct  
1501 W. Washington St, Suite 229  
Phoenix AZ, 85007

**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Judge's Name:

The case against \_\_\_\_\_ did not have enough evidence to hold up in court. I will point out the flaws in the prosecution's case to which some of their evidence should not have been admissible in court.

In Exhibit

1. It shows that there wasn't enough proof for the county attorney to file the arrest.
2. Also, prosecution cannot/did not have enough proof that she indeed was in possession of drugs.
3. I would like to point out the \_\_\_\_\_ was convicted by the heresy of an officer who lied under oath saying that Order of Protection was signed by a judge when it wasn't true.
4. The officer who testified cannot prove that she was the one at the scene who searched \_\_\_\_\_  
When \_\_\_\_\_ says that it wasn't her. \_\_\_\_\_ cannot understand why this was never debated. When she indeed does know that officer was not the one at the scene who searched her.

In Exhibit

1. The order of protection was not signed by a judge. Officer \_\_\_\_\_ lied under oath saying that it was.
2. The constitution states that a judge has 14 days to hear it and sign it. After that he gives it to the clerk and has 24 hrs. to file it and put a \_\_\_\_\_ call. It shows here that the process to 25 days from start to finish. Surpassing the time allowed by the constitution.

I feel that \_\_\_\_\_ was sent to prison because she can prove that \_\_\_\_\_ PD committed police brutality; she has a lawsuit against the City of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ court for unlawful incarceration.