

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-288

Judge:	No.109691103813764A
Complainant:	No.109691103813764B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a justice court has obstructed his efforts to appeal decisions by two pro tem justices of the peace.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges 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 judges did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judges' 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 judges on December 11, 2013.

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

NOV 05 2013

Monday, November 4, 2013**Commission on Judicial Conduct**

1501 West Washington, Suite 229

Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231

(602) 452-3000

(602) 452-3201, fax

jpr@courts.az.gov

<http://azjudges.info>**RE:**

AZ Commission on Judicial Conduct,

We, the Plaintiff in this case, filed an Appeal on _____ with the _____, AZ. To date, The Plaintiff has not received any notification from this court that the Appeal was filed with the Superior Court in _____ AZ. Furthermore, the Plaintiff sent via registered mail the second filing of the _____ and since then the Plaintiff has not received any copies of this second _____ filed with the same court in _____

The Plaintiff has tried to determine the status of the Plaintiff's Appeal by leaving several phone messages with the _____ Court Clerks, but no one has returned our calls with the status of our Appeal. By the way, the clerk handling our Appeal at the _____ Court is the same clerk the Plaintiff filed a complaint against,

Our Appeal is based upon the fact that the Plaintiff was denied the use of expert witnesses:

The _____ Court has denied the Plaintiff access to these two witnesses either through the quashing of the subpoena, or the denial of expert witness statement _____ judge pro tem.

The common thread of these court decisions is that is _____ is the judge who chairs this court. The Plaintiff has filed several complaints against this judge, and those appointed by him to hear the Plaintiff's case. They are:

We ask, yet again to have a different judge handle this case as needed based upon the decision of the Plaintiff's appeal to the Superior Court's in AZ.

Since the Commission on Judicial Review has not done anything to correct this situation, we have no other choice but to post our experiences on the Internet at our website: