

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-297

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made improper rulings in a civil suit.

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: December 9, 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 December 9, 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

15-297

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.

Please see attachment
There are much more details I did not write
in the case. If you have any questions feel
free to message or email me.
I'm worry about court of recosideration
date will expire in

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

key allegations against judge regarding common-law legal system is fact driven issue. False fact driven involves an unusually important legal principle.

In when elder parent fresh off the boat, misleading the party wall to property wall, "violation" written with threat. Force to repair stucco wall. requirement was stripping the stucco and painting tan color. (attachment 1)

In the period of also times make things difficult to requirement on same dispute wall repairs made which are flat and smooth and painting color. Two month late on change the requirement again, requirement was that repairs made which are virtually undetectable.

mentioned and their attorney the party wall not less than times. (evidencing a survey showing that does not own the wall, but rather the wall sits squarely on the neighboring property) judge and ignored the issue. (attachment 2)

On filed a lawsuit. The Complaint sought to enjoin from allegedly breaching the contract regard to bring the alleged shade structure and gate(I hold for safety barrier and gate issues temporarily here. has ignored responsibilities for the safety of the members; Attorney used same ways as wall issue misguided court on gate replacement and safety barrier so as to claim the fees)

Remarks operating community rules is an abuse of discretion. From the beginning stripe the stucco to bringing the stucco wall at lawsuit acted non-reasonably. forced to fix the same wall again and again and fine to make money on

oral argument on
MR. At this point, yes, but the problem -- the reason the wall issue comes in is we've spent a year and half ---
THE You just want your fees?

MR. Right.

THE COURT: Okay.

[Hearing Transcript,]

Judge did not consider the evidence that sent same order wall repairing with conflict requirement including color match during the past year. That is why the wall issue that the spent a year and half. The court simply rewards pending at court unreasonable.

ignored the ownership of the wall facts Early. Late, knew that they do not have authority and enforce to let continued fix the wall not given to Then attorney for did not act key duties for a lawyer that shall use tactics that are legal, honest and respectful of courts. Attorney misstated fact of wall in and augment offers a conflicting interpretation of express language of stucco wall (plaintiff acknowledges that defendant applied stucco to it as requested) See *minte entry and (attachment 3,4)* Judge use the question of the fact(false fact) in the trial court ruled upon related to the alleged wall repairing issue point is moot but involved the award of attorney's fees pending at court on the wall.

Both judge and attorney for are simply incorrect as a mater of law. Attorney misguided court on wall so as to fraud on fees. Investigate on wall would be necessary potentially. Attorney must prove its claims with evidence on stucco wall. Material facts prove or disprove a disputed fact that is relevant to the outcome in a case.

There are genuine issues as to material facts. Factually intensive issues are below:

@ Ownership of the wall: Property wall

Party wall

@ wall maintance result:

wall applied stucco to it as requested

Wall repaired none stucco applied

@Fee rewards on wall:

is entitled to claim the fees
is not entitle to claim the fees

@Wall repair costs.

Judge failed to Properly Consider the Arguments
and Evidence in the Defense of the Motion for Summary
Judgment. Judge says there's nothing more to decide other than fees
at oral argument. [Hearing Transcript,]

Nothing about the reply on even a court the question the ownership of the
wall at argument .Judge at low court and Judge at court of
appeal skipped the ownership of the wall issue and rushed to Denying the
wall repairing as moot. The court rushed to reward
pending at on the "mootness".
They cannot become moot;

The fees is paid via garnishment. They can not become mootness;

Wall issue mootnes was not entry by stipulation between attorney and
attorney, they can not became moot;

Most important issue is that jadge against common-law legal system
is fact driven using false fact (attachment 3,4) (plaintiff acknowledges
that defendant applied stucco to it as requested) denying the wall issue,
they can not become moot.

Judge kipped arguments and relevant issues for the sake of
expediency.

I pray on commission investigate my allegations.

I pray on justice is sometimes delayed, but justice never be absent.