

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-173

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner was biased against her.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioner 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 commissioner's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the commissioner 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 15, 2015

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the commissioner on July 15, 2015.

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

I understand the commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge to a case.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the facts I have provided upon which my allegations of judicial misconduct are based are true and correct.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

INSTRUCTIONS

Use the following space or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint. Explain why you believe what the judge did constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list the names, dates, times, and places relevant to your allegations. Additional pages may be used and relevant copies of documents may be sent with your complaint (please do not send original documents). Use one side of each page only and write legibly or type your complaint. Please keep a copy of your complaint for your records.

This case has been on-going Judge has shown bias against the petitioner and for the respondent in many instances throughout the case. The final straw was a refusal to award a pick-up order on attorney for the petitioner, filed a pick-up order because the father has not returned the to the primary custodian in over The petitioner and respondent had agreed to a father (respondent). The order for the same had not been put into affect after an hearing. The father decided to keep the and against petitioner's will and their mutual agreement. He actually placed them a to the property and a originally filed to support the time when Judge filed a minute order denying a summer order existed, although it was discussed. It doesn't due to the fact that the respondent's attorney, had not produced the final order. However, then filed a pick-up order based on what is current time orders. Judge denied this claiming again the time order which was not in the pleading, but mentioned. The filing was based on previous time orders. There is a current time order which the respondent is clearly in violation. Judge continued denial of enforcing time and her previous rulings against the petitioner regardless of evidence shows a bias, at minimum, based on If there were to be a review of the entire case from the beginning to this latest blatant disregard for her own orders, it would be quite obvious that Judge shows a preference towards the father regardless of fact and evidence. Her blatant refusal to enforce her own rulings clearly shows a lack of validity in any of her rulings thus far.

Attached are the current time order, the from for enforcement of parenting time and a pick-up order, the orders from Judge denying both, and text messages between the petitioner and respondent agreeing to a period with father.