

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-204

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner improperly issued an injunction against harassment against multiple defendants and did not afford a party an opportunity to present witnesses and evidence at a hearing.

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 judicial officer'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: August 26, 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 August 26, 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.

Under Canon 3 A(4) of Judicial Ethics "A judge should accord to every person who is legally interested in a proceeding..., full right to be heard according to law..." Mr. appeared at Ms hearing with the express purpose of giving evidence in yet was denied the right to offer any testimony; no reason was given for this denial of his rights.

Ms had brought to court with her and information which conclusively showed that Ms was lying about Ms Judge did not want to look at this evidence. also never had any intention of to work on her wall. Ms had brought evidence that this was a lie has been using for the years; again, Judge was not interested in seeing this evidence.

Ms had brought measurements and photos confirming that it was the same distance to whether driving past house or not; and who is to say when it is necessary for Ms to drive her car? Judge did not want to see or discuss this information.

Ms had brought a police report confirming was going to take a light meter test of Ms lights. This was done, and no violation was found. She also brought dated photos of purposely shining a spotlight on Ms property. Again, Judge did not want to see this evidence.

Finally, A.R.S. 12-1809 B.(3) states; "An injunction against harassment shall not be issued against more than one person." Judge states that the injunction is only against yet in the "other orders" section of the injunction he states "the defendants(plural) must not film or take pictures of the plaintiffs. The defendants(plural again) must not have any direct or indirect contact with the plaintiffs (plural) or their(plural) property. This misinformation alone should void the order. It has been used in later developed proceedings against Ms word for word, by the prosecution against Ms to discredit her.

I believe that, for the abovelisted reasons, Judge should be censured, and this order be decalared void. It is plain that Judge was biased, and had made his mind up to uphold injunction before refusing to view any evidence or testimony to the contrary.

Signed,