

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-075

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly granted the state an extension of time to file a response to his petition for post-conviction relief.

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 1, 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 1, 2015.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2015-075

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

Judge's Name:

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

ON I FILED A RULE 32
PETITION. SEE PETITION RECEIVED-
(ENCLOSED).

ON JUDGE GAVE
THE STATE AN EXTENSION OF TIME. (ENCLOSED)

I - I I

JUDGE EXTENSION IS A DIRECT
VIOLATION OF RULE 32.6(A).

THIS CONSTITUTES AN ACT OF FRAUD FOR
THE PURPOSE OF UPHOLDING A CONVICTION.*

2

* WHICH HAPPENS TO BE FALSE.