

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-322

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner delayed a ruling on a motion in a criminal matter and denied him a right to appeal.

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.

Commission members Anna Mary Glaab and J. Tyrrell Taber did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: February 5, 2016

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 February 5, 2016.

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

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

Dated: ..

Re: Judicial Misconduct re: case NO.

Dear Commission,

I am filing a complaint re: the Honorable,
of County who violated Article 6, Section 21 of the Arizona
Constitution for Failure to rule on a Motion to Modify Probation within 60
days while continuing to collect monies on the Motion for over

This judge continues to show a pattern of judicial Bias
by denying the Petitioner his right to Appeal. The Court violated the
time limit to rule on original Motion and is now simultaneously denying
the Petitioner's Notice to Appeal as being "Untimely" when in fact the
Petitioner is NOT untimely as action on the original Motion has always been
timely in play before the Courts. This judge Abused his discretion from the start,
creating judicial Bias, denying due process, and amounting to a conflict of
interest. The Petitioner was well within his rights to have filed a 'Special

Action against judge. , in a timely manner, after he untimely failed to address each issue in the "as".

When the Petitioner filed the " because an abuse of discretion had occurred, the time for filing an actual " would have tolled until after a ruling on the Special Action had been issued by the Supreme Court.

The Petitioner did mistakenly file the Special Action with the Supreme Court instead of the Court of Appeals, but this would not make the Action of Appeal "untimely" as judge contends, for the Petitioner has no control over how long an Appellate Court sits on an action to the Court.

It is absurd for judge to think he does not have to follow the time constraints while simultaneously illegally enforcing time constraints upon the Petitioner who is well within time frame. When the Petitioner filed a regarding the Court's "UNTIMELINESS" and violating Art 6, Sec. 21, judge simply blamed for why his ruling would be UNTIMELY and not affect anything.

Judge illegally received payments during that year and a half the Petitioner's case sat on the Court docket. The Petitioner's case involves a, which, if found to be true, subjects

This case deserves to be heard, and must be heard as the Petitioner is NOT out of time frame for his RIGHT to APPEAL a trial Court's legally incorrect rulings.

Veru Truelu

(Pro-Per Petitioner)