

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-074

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge (now retired) improperly granted guardianship of her minor daughter to her sister.

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.

The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. In addition, 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: April 8, 2015

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 8, 2015.

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

ON Judge
 signed a Temporary Emergency
 Order to have my
 removed from my home and placed
 in the care of older sister

Apparently now in the United
 States we can walk in to court
 write what ever we want on a
 piece of paper and ~~we~~ have a
 Judge grant permission to take
 things. And with no investigation
 or proof what so ever. The
 Judge set a Temporary Orders
 hearing for Days later.

AFTER
Judge Granted her the
 order then went into another
 court room to obtain an order
 of protection keeping me from
 contacting AGAIN my

This Judge told
 he did not have jurisdiction to grant
 her that order with her having a
 court case, Ms. told
 the Judge she was told to come to

his court Room. Judge took
a recess and went to speak
with Court. Judge
came back to the bench
and stated Court instructed
him to grant the order of protection
with on it and
transfer it up to Court.
The Lower level court did as
instructed by the Higher level
court.

For DAYS I had no contact
with my whom turned
on An unconstitutional
Court order for Temporary Guardianship
and A UnConstitutional, unethical
unlawful, Protection ORDER, YES AND
THE TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ORDER Guardian
All with out any kind of Proof -
COURT ORDERED ME TO NOT CONTACT
MY AND I MISSED
THE DAY 3 GIVE BIRTH
TO THE DAY WAS granted
unavailable RIGHTS, WAS
ME AND MY RIGHTS VIOLATED BY
A Judge under the RULE of LAW.

ON Temporary ORDERS
HEARING minute HEARING THE
JUDGE REFUSED THE Admittance of
my Evidence. ULTIMELY Filing HE
SAID. minute HEARING ENDED
UP BEING DAYS Long
DAYS of CRUEL, EMOTIONALLY
AND MENTALLY INTERAGATING ME.
You WANT TO ASK ME QUESTIONS
that I HAVE PROOF FOR BUT YOU
WONT ALLOW THE PROOF. YOU TOOK
GRANTED 2 - COURT ORDERS 1 - to
REMOVE FROM Home
AND ONE to keep from Contacting
ME. YOU GRANTED THEM WITH NO
PROOF BUT YOU WONT ALLOW
EVIDENCE IN FOR ME TO
MYSELF. SO YOU BET TO BREAK THE
LAW TO VIOLATE MY CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS TO AND NOW TO
DUE PROCESS WHICH I DID NOT GET
AND Equal Protection AS well.
THEN THERE IS THE FACT THAT
JUDGE EITHER COMBINED
TWO CASES WITHOUT PROPER Procedure
OR CONFUSED THEM?

brought up in a SEPERATE CASE
TITLE 25.

Now why would JUDGE
NEED TO DISCUSS AN IN CAMERA
INTERVIEW WITH
IN A TITLE 25 CASE WHEN
IS THE MINOR IN

↓

TITLE 14 PROBATE.

PROBATE: THERE IS NO WILL IN QUESTION,
NO ESTATE IN QUESTION, THE MOTHER
IS NOT DECEASED, WHY ARE WE IN
PROBATE COURT WHEN YOU HAVE
REMOVED MY CHILD FROM MY CUSTODY.
Ms. Attorney: Discussed

DUE PROCESS IN WHICH JUDGE

IT DID NOT APPLY - Ms

Judge

FELT

ALSO WHOM

WOULD HIS

PRONOUNCE THE ATTORNEY'S NAME EVERY
TIME HE SAID IT - WHICH ALSO SEEMED
TO BE ONE PURPOSE AS TO BOTHER MS.

EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE THAT A
COULD NOT BE PUT IN PLACE FOR THE MINOR
PER AZ LAW BECAUSE OF STIPULATED THAT
THE PARENTS RIGHTS HAD TO BE
SUSPENDED OR TERMINATED BY PRIOR

COURT ORDER" IN WHICH MS.
HAD NOT. THE
JUDGE'S RESPONSE WAS TO LOOK
AT THE RESPONDENT MS.
AND SAY "MS. DID
YOU TAKE YOUR DRUG TEST?"
MS. DID ANSWER
THE JUDGE "YES" HOWEVER
JUDGE DID
NOT ORDER MS. TO
TAKE A DRUG TEST IN THE
CASE ✓
TITLE 25-

WAS HE CONFUSING CASES AGAIN?
OR INTENDING TO PROVIDE
WITH EVIDENCE?
OR INTIMIDATING THE ~~THE~~ RESPONDENT?
WHAT ABOUT

CODE OF PROBATE JUDICIAL CONDUCT
CANON 1 SEC (A)
CANON 2 SEC (A)

CANON 2 SEC (B) COMMENTARY:
Judges should distinguish between proper
and improper use of prestige: LIKE INFORMING
5

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE
REMAINDER OF THE
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST
IN WRITING TO THE
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE
THE COMMISSION CASE
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**